

U.S. Congress

Appendix

Television in Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 11, 1955

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, recently Martin Codel, publisher of Television Digest, an authoritative news service specializing in the broadcast and electronics field, visited Great Britain and had an opportunity to look over the television and electronics developments in that country.

On his return to the United States, Mr. Codel wrote a number of articles on this subject for his publication. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several articles that appeared in the November 6, 1954, issue of Television Digest, which deal with television in England.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Television Digest of November 6, 1954]

BRITISH TO PROFIT BY UNITED STATES EXAMPLE

Booming Britain is currently enjoying a flourishing TV trade that's virtually certain to be stimulated even further by the introduction of commercial TV as an additional service, scheduled for September 1955.

First competition against British Broadcasting Co.'s one-channel service, more choices of programs, greater opportunities for talent and personnel, probably even an expanded program day from the present 3-10:30 p. m.—all this should, if the American experience means anything, bring about increased set sales and bigger audiences.

More license revenues, at £3 year (\$8.40) for a TV plus radio, might even permit the noncommercial BBC to undertake its own cherished plans for a second service, eventually giving Britons a choice of 3 programs.

It's our conviction, after many talks with many people in all walks of British life during a 5-week, 1,600-mile tour of England, Scotland, and Wales, that the citizenry and the business community preponderantly welcome a fair try for the new ITA (Independent Television Authority) recently authorized to set up TV stations and lease time segments to program contractors who in turn will sell commercials to sponsors.

They want it despite strong opposition by the Labor Party and high churchmen to legislation passed by Winston Churchill's Conservative government. They want it because they dislike monopoly no less than do their American cousins—and, any way you spell it, Government-chartered BBC is a monopoly often accused, fairly or unfairly, of giving the people what it thinks is good for them rather than what they may want. Moreover, the British are an ad-minded people—so much so that—

1. They watch film and slide commercials in theaters, big and little, into which they have paid admission—and they seem to like them. These are hardly different from the kind they will soon see on TV; indeed, piled

on top of one another, they're much more blatant in the theater than are most of our TV spots.

2. They're accustomed to commercial radio from Normandy and Luxembourg, with British advertising dominant. This audience is greater than seems apparent, for the European wavelength interference problem is so great, aggravated by Russia, that much of Britain gets poor AM signals—so much that 9 new FM transmitters have been projected by the BBC in the 88-95-megacycle band. The example of FM in Germany, with 94 stations, is said to apply much more realistically than that of the United States.

3. They've heard a lot about the achievements of competitive American TV; they like such American programs as they occasionally see on BBC; they enjoy American films and dote on our film personalities. Moreover, the Government is so determined upon a free-enterprise policy that it refuses to subsidize another BBC service, though BBC's 3 radio services aren't in any danger of going into private hands.

4. British industrialists and advertising folk, among the smartest in the world, know that commercial TV will be a powerful force for creating wants and moving goods. The director of one of England's biggest ad agencies told us:

"I shudder to think what this powerful advertising force is going to do to our distributive system. Some of our people don't realize it, but they're due for such a huge demand for their goods that neither the production nor distribution system at the outset will be geared for it. Our people have been starved for the good things of life so long, have known austerity so long, that demonstrations of modern products we will give them on TV are going to create vast changes in our economy."

His agency, incidentally, handles the British account of a popular American beverage which has long used TV and radio here with telling effect.

Even the newspapers aren't overtly fighting TV, in fact, seem to place more emphasis on it as a news subject, both as to progress of the industry itself and as to critiques of programs, than ours do. (Daily program listings, of course, take up only about a half-inch of agate type, and there's plenty of TV set advertising.)

And the intellectual aversionists and clergy, who testified in Parliament to their abhorrence of commercialism, seem to be looking forward tolerantly to the second service, now that the die is cast. One reason may be the high caliber of ITA and of the men chosen to run it.

The hope generally shared, though perhaps not by all within BBC, which has a payroll of some 12,000 and an inevitable quota of jealous bureaucrats, is that commercial TV in Britain will profit by the example of America while avoiding our excesses and borrowing from our best; moreover, that it will provide wider sway for the nation's own vast reservoir of entertainment talent and business ability.

It could be that TV can help cement the precious affinity with America that, thanks to common language and kindred heritage, has so long prevailed in literature, in all the arts, in government and in law.

While in Britain recently we talked with scores of people—from topkicks at BBC and ITA to industrialists, advertising folk, jour-

nalists, and man in the pub—and in the 10 days since our return we've compared notes with American confreres who also have had a look at British TV. Our conclusions are much the same:

The average Briton isn't much different from the average American and, once he tastes the sweet fruits of competition, not even the powerful BBC nor the politico-clerical opposition to commercial TV can stop it. That is, of course, unless the ITA, the sponsors and the ad men muffle the ball in the early stages of the game. Our guess is that they're much too shrewd for that.

You read occasionally of British visitors coming over to study our TV structure, and there will be a lot more of them. The big American ad agencies, with London branches, have been quietly swapping visitors and personnel and ideas ever since ITA was authorized, preparing for the advent of commercial TV.

ITA hasn't yet decided much more than that it will have its first stations in London, Birmingham, and Manchester; that there will be more than one program contractor, though whether there will be more than one on each station or more than one splitting time on the whole group is as yet undetermined; that the "magazine concept" will prevail, i. e., the contractors and not the sponsors shall own the programs and determine their order; that there will be no censorship of program content or commercials, but that there must be none of the horrendous "Yankee excesses" (not merely of distasteful advertising but of crime and horror stuff) which they've heard so much about.

Headquarters not unlike the usual temporary quarters for new Washington Government agencies has been set up at 16 Wood's Mews, in London's Mayfair district, with Sir Kenneth Clark as chairman and Sir Robert Fraser as administrative chief.

Sir Kenneth, 51, was in this country for the last few weeks, looking into TV but primarily to receive an honorary degree from Columbia University. The citation will give you some idea of the man: "Cultural counselor of the people; chairman of Great Britain's Art Council; England's custodian of priceless works in years past as keeper of the Department of Fine Arts in Oxford's Ashmolean Museum, as director of the National Gallery, and as surveyor of the King's pictures; Slade professor of fine art at Oxford; adviser to the Victoria and Albert Museum and Covent Garden Opera Trust; gifted scholar of our timeless treasures."

A long hair? Not really, say those who know him; essentially he's a fine administrator, they say, and he struck us as a knowledgeable and open-minded executive still rather puzzled by the strange new task set before him. He's expected to maintain the tone and prestige of the new agency while Sir Robert Brown Fraser, 50, a graduate of Fleet Street newspapers, recently chief of the government's information services, provides the practical know-how. Sir Robert talks like a Madison Avenue agency executive, seems as high strung as a network vice president, acts like he's rarin' to go. His philosophy of advertising, as enunciated before an agency conference in Birmingham last week:

"I can think of no subject about which there is more nonsense talked than advertising. The idea that advertising is inherently degrading has always seemed to be ludicrous. As a point of view for a great nation that lives or dies by selling goods—

or falling to sell them—it crosses the imbecile and verges on the suicidal. [Advertising] will be an asset, worn as a bright feather in the cap of free TV, not as a soiled choker round the throat."

About his editorial concept of commercial TV, Sir Robert Fraser had this to say last month before the Institute of Practitioners of Advertising:

"Free television should now evolve on principles that will place it beside our free press, our free books, and our free arts as a normal part of the equipment of our free society. For this was, in essence, the great decision—to rest the future of TV, as far as initial physical shortages of transmitting stations permit, on the same foundations as those of a free press; to give freedom to individuals to offer TV programs to the public, as newspapers and entertainment are offered; to give freedom to the public to see the TV programs of their choice."

Backgrounds of the other members of the ITA board would seem also to assure a realistic and at the same time an adequate cultural approach: Sir Charles Colston, manager of Hoover, Ltd. (vacuum cleaners), vice chairman; Miss Margaret Popham, ex-principal of Cheltenham Ladies College; Miss Dilys Powell, movie critic of the Sunday Times; Lord Aberdare of Duffryn, president of Welsh National School of Medicine; Lt. Col. Arthur Chichester, chairman of big Moygashel textile concern; Sir Henry Hinchcliffe, director of Barclays Bank; Dr. T. J. Honeyman, director, Glasgow Art Gallery; G. B. Thorneycroft, director of the British Travel & Holidays Association; Lord Layton, publisher, News Chronicle and London Star.

ITA will run the stations and any day now should announce program contractors, but it will not have studios of its own or put on shows. Sir Kenneth Clark actually expects to run ITA with a staff of not more than 60, except for engineers who actually come under the postoffice department. His budget is £750,000 (about \$2,100,000) and he is expected to put the agency on a self-supporting and even profitable basis with that sum as the pump primer.

Commercial TV could profit the Government more than it realizes right now, for the fact is that many advertisers are itching for a crack at TV. Often cited is one experience of BBC. Though it is ever careful to avoid trade plugs, the name of a toy was inadvertently mentioned in a program; within a few days, it couldn't be had, and the toyshops were clamoring for more stock. Also, recently, BBC carried a tear-jerker about a stray pup; within 48 hours, just about every day pound in the country was emptied.

Ad men told us—and Sir Robert Fraser verified—that there were plenty of seekers after the program contracts. Someone said there were at least 25 applicants, all willing to take the risk in the face of the political dangers inherent in a system eyed askance by the Laborites and requiring that the contractor secure his own program originating equipment—all, that is, save transmitters. He must contract for studios, cameras, crews, programs, talent, etc., always unsure what a new government may decree. The applicants include theater men, newspapers, ad agencies, program builders, et al.

(Editor's Note.—Since this article was written, ITA announced selection of the first 3 contractors: (1) Granada Theaters, operating a big chain of movie houses. (2) Broadcast Relay Services, operator of a widespread and vastly successful community antenna service, in association with Associated Newspapers, Ltd., publishing the Daily Mail and other papers. (3) Showman Maurice Winnick, in association with Kemsley Newspapers, Inc., publisher of the Sunday Times, Sunday Graphic, Sunday Chronicle and various other newspapers in England, Scotland, and Wales. They're all extremely well-heeled, but the fact that the newspaper

owners are Tories has already provoked criticism that's expected to reverberate in Parliament. Two other major applicants, also strong in program fields, are Associated Broadcasting Development Co., headed by ex-BBC Chief, Norman Collins, and the newly formed Incorporated Television Program Co., which includes such stockholders as Alan Towers (Towers of London) and other big names in British entertainment. They await further decisions of ITA, and everybody still awaits details of plans for dividing the hours of the day or days of the week among the program contractors on its stations.)

So many eyes and ears will focus on their offerings, so outspokenly critical as a matter of habit are the British people and their influential press, so far committed is the Labor Party to doing away with commercial TV if and when it returns to power, that the burden is on industry as well as on ITA to do an acceptable job. If they do, we were told, no party in power would dare attempt to do away with commercialism. If they don't, a simple fiat of Parliament could switch the whole structure overnight to BBC.

As a writer in the *News of the World* of London put it: "The politicians were much more interested than the public in the why and wherefore of commercial TV during the endless debates in both Houses, and the public breathed a sigh of relief when at long last it proved possible to hand the demoniacal babe over to the ITA. If the Cabinet now find the infant left on their doorstep overnight, I think we can expect a spot of bother."

Some 3,500,000 TV sets are in use in Britain today, most of them tunable only to 1 station. It's expected the total will be 4 million by end of this year, reach at least 5 million by end of 1955, then zoom to better than the current 1 million a year rate when the second service is under way. How much more, the set makers are reluctant to guess. One told us, "We should have 10 million sets in use by 1960"—covering most of nation's nearly 15 million family units.

The American industry's postfreeze experience—that second stations in a community have invariably zoomed the rate of receiver sales and installations immediately—seemed to interest the British manufacturers greatly. But their native inclination is to move cautiously, to underestimate their market, not to pressure things. There are some who (familiar folk) don't like all this talk about color, mostly emanating from America and played up heavily in the British press, because it might rouse false hopes in the breasts of prospective buyers.

(The British color situation is a story in itself, about which more later. Suffice to state now that the post office department's TV advisory committee, under the chairmanship of Adm. Sir George Daniel, has been conducting closed hearings on the subject, figures a year or more of work ahead of it, can be counted on to take advantage of all of the American experience—without the pressure of politics, such as we had here, to bring color to Britain in a hurry.)

There is a problem, of course, of converting existing sets to receive 2 channels in lieu of one—but plans are afoot to do it at small cost, maybe as low as \$10 or \$15 and the fact that the second service's signals will come from the same towers as BBC's should help simplify the installation jobs. Most sets being sold today are equipped for the second channel, a hot selling point.

Some 30 receiver manufacturers share the 1 million annual output. They sell direct to retail outlets, for the most part. "Hire purchase," or installment selling, has only lately come back on a big scale, having been prohibitively restricted until recently.

Standard size is 14-inch, with trend lately to 17-inch. Only one 21-inch model was shown in the whole National Radio Show in London's Earl's Court in early September.

There seems to be no push on to sell size, one manufacturer explaining that the extra cost isn't worth it for homes which mostly have small rooms.

We saw a scattering few TV shows while motor touring the country, but rarely did we find even the best-rated hotels TV-equipped, although in a space of 3 weeks we were in a different one nearly every night. They seldom had TV's or radios in their lounges, and they looked at you as though you were crazy if you asked if they might be rented. Very few pubs had TV's either, though radios were commonplace in them. Looks like the British TV industry is missing an extremely good marketing bet here.

Cost has been the major factor in set sales up to now—still is with most families, though the current high employment and prosperity wave, along with the vast publicity about TV in general and ITA and commercialism in particular, are making more and more people TV-minded. Receiver list prices have been brought down to an average of about \$150 for a 14-inch, \$200 for 17-inch, table models predominating. How can they priced that low in the face of a government exercise of 50 percent? The answer is much simpler for the British than for us, albeit we offer good 21-inch sets at \$200 and under. The girls on the assembly lines earn £5 a week (\$14) and the men at the parts-stamping machines very little more.

Workmanship is the finest. The 14-inch set we rented for our London hotel room gave us a picture (on British 405-line standard) that for clarity and contrast and all-around quality is vastly better than what we generally see in the United States (on 525 lines). Signals came from a multiplex antenna atop one of the tallest hotel structures (10 or 12 stories) in Mayfair. Receiver was a Kolster-Brandes; remember the brand names from our old radio days here?

The explanation for the good picture seems to lie also in superb transmission facilities and plenty of power. Great Britain has magnificent engineers, second to none, and some of the best are in the BBC.

The programs you see are something else again. By our lights, there's not only not enough choice but a lack of pace and a disregard for timing that seems queer to the American observer. The British people and press are quite outspoken in criticism, sometimes unfairly so—for the fact is that quality and craftsmanship stand out in everything the BBC-TV people do; their dramatics are finished products, their news films excellent, their "outside" (remote) pickups extremely well done, especially sports.

But the day's program more often than not seems unbalanced, aiming at the few rather than the many. Consider these program listings for two different days, presumably typical, exactly as clipped from the *London Times*:

"3 p.m., *Knights for a Day*, British comedy film. 5, children's television. 7:25, weather. 7:30, news. 7:45, public inquiry: The trade unions—too much power, too little responsibility. 8:30, *Music for You*. 9:30, amateur boxing: London ABA versus Paris. 10:30, news (sound only).

"3 p.m., *About the Home*. 4, *Watch With Mother*. 5, children's television. 7:30, news. 7:55, *Sportsview*. 8:15, *Down You Go*. 8:45, *Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida*. 11:5, news (sound only)."

The home and children's shows weren't particularly exciting, the latter going in for American cowboy films as part of a potpourri intended to interest different juvenile levels. The Shakespearean production, running well over 2 hours, was a repeat of the identical show also carried in prime night time the preceding week. The news films and sports pickups were excellent. The news via sound only at 10:30 (or thereabouts, depending on whether the preceding program ended at

that time or a little earlier or later) seemed peculiar, to say the least.

Twice we viewed classical soloists, one a pianist, one an operatic singer—and in each case the camera was focused on the artist without shift for the entire 30 minutes. It was very dull viewing despite the excellence of the talent. One Sunday night we watched the British version of *What's My Line?*—very popular and as much fun as the CBS-TV show; 2 of its 4 panelists were American, and it offered no prize money.

NOTE.—The 5-6 p. m. Childrens' Hour is followed by a long gap until the weather at 7:25 and news at 7:30. We asked a top BBC official why. His reply: "So that the mothers may prepare dinner and put the children to bed without any distraction from TV. The children have had it, and if they know the screen is dark they make no fuss about staying up for more."

British Broadcasting Corporation, which gets the largest part of post office department's collection of £1 license fees on radios and £3 on TV-plus-radio, reports it spent £9,387,166 on sound services and £3,991,439 on TV in fiscal 1953-54. (The pound is currently around \$2.80.) It suggests that it will require more funds during the next 3-year period in annual report just released by Her Majesty's stationery office, London (cmd. 9269, price 4s. 6d., about 65 cents, 144 pp.).

Gross income from sale of licenses was £16,474,081, which, after deductions, left net payable to the corporation at £12,963,451 for BBC. Total revenue expenditure of £14,563,283 was £9,545 in excess of total income and reserves fell by £691,907. Grant-in-aid receipts for external (overseas) services totaled £4,905,000; total income for these services, £4,947,812; total expenditures, £4,914,695.

Report shows number of combined TV-radio licenses was 3,248,892 last March 31—up more than 1 million in a year; figure is deemed closer to 4 million now, counting licenses sold since then and the nonlicense payers, of whom the manufacturing industry knows there are many. Report says BBC plans to provide coverage of 97 percent of the United Kingdom with TV service by 1956-57.

Another BBC report, more up to date, notes that the diminution of adult audiences for sound radio continued last summer. For July-September quarter it's estimated the adult radio audience averaged 26 million against 28 million in the same 1953 quarter. Drop is explained in report as due to fact some 1 million families bought TV sets during the year. Average TV audience for July-September was 10 million versus 8 million in 1953.

NOTE.—Phenomenal circulation of BBC's *Radio Times*, which lists all TV-radio programs in advance along with feature articles, is revealed in annual report showing average net sales of 7,903,969 in 1953—believed to be even larger now. The *Listener*, companion BBC weekly, featuring texts of broadcast material, had 133,105 average.

Our National Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me to extend my remarks, I present a most able address presented by Brig. Gen.

E. C. Itschner, Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, on February 7, 1955, before the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, Mo. I believe everyone will be interested in this able address.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY BRIG. GEN. E. T. ITSCHNER, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS FOR CIVIL WORKS, BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI VALLEY ASSOCIATION, IN ST. LOUIS, MO., FEBRUARY 7, 1955

It is a pleasure and an honor to appear before this association, which is devoted to development of the water resources of the great valley of the Mississippi River. Since the Mississippi Basin is the very heartland of our country and the great river drains some 40 percent of its expanse, it follows that your interests are national as well as regional in scope. I would like, therefore, to present to you something of the current national water resources picture, as well as discuss certain problems of more direct concern to you.

In thinking of the relationship of the Mississippi Basin to water-resource development in this country, I am reminded of a horse race at a county fair where an old farmer had approached a rather disreputable looking bookie and offered to bet several hundred dollars on "Old Sam" in the fourth race. Strangely enough the bookie objected, saying, "Listen old man, you are not rich and I just don't think you ought to bet so much money." After some argument back and forth in which the old farmer insisted on betting, the bookie said, "Now, I'll tell you why I don't want you to bet. I own Old Sam and he is not supposed to win today." The farmer replied, "Well, then, it's sure going to be a mighty slow race, because I own the other four horses in it." So you can see that the Mississippi Basin is much in the position of the old farmer who owned most of the horses. Water resources development can lag or race ahead depending upon the interest and initiative shown by its people, since much of our water resources are in the Mississippi Basin.

From a national viewpoint, the year 1954 was one characterized by a tremendous increase in interest in water resources problems—and for good reason.

Above all of its other characteristics, it was a year of low water. Severe droughts ravaged much of the country, resulting in loss of crops in the 5-State area in the vicinity of the Texas Panhandle, reduction in crops elsewhere and depletion of water supply and hydropower reservoirs. Pollution problems were aggravated by low flows. Fish and wildlife suffered. Expanding industry selected sites for new factories with the availability of water more than ever before one of the most important considerations. You and your neighbors saw many streams dry up.

At the other extreme, the year saw a series of devastating floods higher than ever recorded on a number of rivers. In the center of the country the Iowa River, whose waters originate in rich farmlands where land conservation measures have been intensively practiced for years, reached stages well above the previous flood of record; in the Pacific Northwest the Kootenai River, swollen by rapidly melting snowbanks many feet deep in the mountains of the United States and Canada burst levees in attaining its record crest; in Pennsylvania and West Virginia a number of rivers reached stages 4 to 6 feet above the highest previously recorded. But possibly the most astonishing flood of all was the Rio Grande flood, which reached a stage of 62.2 feet at Laredo, Tex., on a gage where the past record was 49.6 feet. At least 62 lives fell victim to the sudden deluge. Terrific damage was inflicted, which would have been much worse had the country through which it passed been more highly developed. Fortunately, waiting to receive

this flood was Falcon Reservoir, with little water in it, and thus the flood was changed in this man-made reservoir from a potent and sinister force to a life-supporting commodity for use in the widespread, intensely cultivated irrigated area downstream.

In the field of navigable waterways, too, 1954 was a memorable year. Waterborne commerce reached new peaks on many of the waterways of the Nation, and the notable trend of increase in tonnage on our inland channels continued. The Congress authorized the important deep-sea channel on the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, which will permit the largest ore carriers to transport Venezuelan iron ore to huge steel mills already in operation. The move toward deeper-draft, larger, deep-sea supertankers and ore carriers and the outlook for increased importation of the commodities they carry has created a pressing demand for correspondingly deeper and improved channels in our major seaports. But probably the most important navigation event of the decade was the passage of the St. Lawrence Seaway Act, and before the year was out the initial large construction contract for this project had been awarded.

In the field of hydro-power generation, also, did 1954 focus attention on deficiencies in the supply of electrical energy from hydro plants now in operation, which were accentuated during the drought and emphasized by an unprecedented rise in the consumption of electrical energy. There was an increased awareness of the rapidly approaching period when further development of our hydro resources for power will be economically infeasible. Nevertheless, during the year 1954 the corps brought 803,000 kilowatts of new installed hydro capacity on the line as a bonus in projects designed primarily for navigation or flood control purposes.

All of these events caused an awakened public interest such as we have never experienced before in the problem of optimum development of our water resources. It was evidenced in many ways. The Bureau of the Budget remarked that it never had had so many delegations pressing for appropriations for particularly favored projects, or, in at least one important instance, for navigation and flood control projects in general. All over the country individuals and local organizations urged their Congressmen and the corps to construct or adequately maintain projects which meant very much to them in their business and personal activities. Also, for the first time in several years, an improving short range international situation permitted the start of a limited number of new projects. But above all there appeared to be a widespread crystallization of a conviction that our best preparation for extreme national emergency is the development of our resources so they will be immediately available in the critical days or even hours that might come.

While the increased interest in water resources development during the past year is encouraging, recent construction progress has not been sufficient to keep abreast of the country's evergrowing water resources requirements. I shall furnish some figures to illustrate this retrogression. Eight years ago, after the Nation had had time to recover from World War II, we had a backlog of \$7,400 million of needed, economically sound, congressionally authorized rivers and harbors and flood control projects. During these 8 years \$1,300 million of work was authorized, as compared to an appropriation of \$3,400 million. In the meantime the value of the dollar shrank, so that today we have a backlog totalling \$8,800 million, which is about 20 percent more than we had 8 years ago. Obviously the tempo of our program must be increased. We estimate that a well balanced annual program of \$650 million for rivers and harbors and flood control projects is the minimum which will permit the

corps to perform its civil works mission to your satisfaction. We have a specific program formulated to utilize that entire amount, including \$50 million annually for new starts. The \$650 million proposed compares with \$442 million actually appropriated for the current year—an increase of 47 percent.

All of us recognize, of course, the difficult problem involved in obtaining larger appropriations for our water resources development work. The cost of national security, added to the sum total of all the other costs of operating our Government, poses a most difficult budgetary problem for our lawmakers and the administration, who jointly bear the tremendous responsibility for safeguarding the interests of our Nation. We must face the fact that these budgetary problems have been, and will continue to be for the foreseeable future, a prime factor to be reckoned with in planning for the development of our water resources.

Of equally great importance is the need for the establishment by Federal legislation of a national water-resources policy. Recognizing this need, the President appointed a committee known as the Cabinet Committee on Water Resources Policy, composed of the Secretaries of the several Federal departments interested in this activity. This committee has the principal mission of recommending to the President a comprehensive and specific national water-resources policy. It is planned that the committee will dissolve when this work has been accomplished.

The President also appointed a companion committee called the Cabinet Committee on Transportation Policy, which has the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, and the Treasury, and the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization as its principal members. The corps has not been privileged to participate in the activities of this committee, as we have in the Water Resources Policy Committee. The recommendations of this committee may have a major effect upon water transportation interests.

The President has also reorganized and revitalized the Committee of Federal Agencies interested in water resources now known as Icewater (ICWR) (Inter-Agency Committee on Water Resources). Generally the agencies are represented by assistant secretaries. This committee is a permanent one, having as its mission the coordination of water resources matters among the agencies.

And finally, the last Congress established the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, referred to as the Hoover Commission, for the purpose of recommending to Congress certain broad policies, and organization for effectuating these policies, among the principal subjects being water resources development. The report of this Commission is due in March. We have no information as to what this report will contain. However, it is indicated from the questions asked by the Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power at several hearings, that reaching a decision as to policies to be recommended has occupied much more of the task force's attention than determining whether a change in organization involving the realignment of functions among the Federal agencies is necessary.

It would be presumptuous and conjectural to attempt at this time to predict the outcome of all these studies. However, the reports of similar committees submitted in the past few years and the questions that have been asked during recent committee hearings indicate some subjects that are being considered. The more important of these from your viewpoint are:

1. That a review board, composed of non-Federal consultants, be established for the purpose of reviewing all projects recommended by any Federal agency prior to sub-

mitting them for congressional authorization. The corps would not object to such a board, providing its functions were limited to review and not broadened to include the selection of projects and establishment of priorities for planning and construction. We firmly believe that the individuals on such a board must be qualified as engineers and economists, impartial, and without political obligations. And regardless of the functions that might be assigned to the review board, present review procedures within the corps must be retained.

2. That tolls be charged on existing waterways at least sufficient to pay for the cost of maintenance and operation, and on new or improved waterways to reimburse the Government over an appropriate period of years, for the original cost plus the expense of maintenance and operation. The proposal for imposition of tolls on waterways would reverse a long-standing statutory policy that our waterways shall be public highways, forever free. National policy on this subject stems from one of the first acts of the first Congress of the United States, and has been reaffirmed on numerous occasions. The Corps of Engineers, as the Federal agency entrusted with the Nation's navigable waterway-construction program has studied this question thoroughly in order to determine the possible effect of the imposition of user charges on navigation facilities. Our conclusions, based on months of intensive study by economists and engineers skilled in waterway development, is that if tolls are to be imposed, and the corps has been traditionally opposed to them—they should be imposed upon all of our water-transportation facilities alike; they should be charged by some method which would control the rate structure for all modes of transportation so that the advantages of each are preserved and unfair competitive practices are avoided, and they should be made uniform by regions for ports and by integrated systems for inland waterways in some arrangement that would result in a minimum of adverse competitive effect as a result of tolls. Finally, we are convinced that the possibility of achieving these requirements is doubtful, to say the least, and that in any event the results would not be worth the immense readjustments and costs that would be involved.

3. That legislation should be enacted by Congress which would, in many instances, decrease bridge clearance requirements and reduce the operating hours of movable bridges. It would also require substantial Federal contribution to the cost of bridges across waterways important to foreign commerce or used by defense vessels. Under present law the Corps of Engineers is charged with the responsibility for determining whether a proposed bridge would be an unreasonable obstruction to navigation, and in making this determination we consider the economic effect of the structure upon both navigation and land traffic. You are well aware of the conflicting opinions of bridge owners and navigation interests with respect to clearances for fixed bridges and operating regulations for movable bridges. The great expansion of both highway and waterway traffic in recent years has focused greater attention on this conflict of interests which necessarily arises wherever the rights-of-way of the two types of transportation intersect. In an effort to find a reasonable and practicable solution to the problem, the corps has adopted the policy that an economic analysis of comparative costs and benefits be made in bridge clearance cases. This analysis is utilized as one part of the study leading to the final decision as to what constitutes an unreasonable obstruction to navigation. Some of the data for the analysis originates with the navigational interests, who must analyze the characteristics of waterway commerce passing the intersection in question and determine the

resultant damages or losses if certain restrictive clearances are provided.

Conversely, navigational interests must demonstrate the resulting benefits in terms of dollars to be realized by the provision of clearances proposed by them. The problem resolves itself into one where both land and water transportation interests must fully consider the economic effects of the final decision on the overall economy of the region. There is no reason why there cannot be achieved an equitable balance of interests under existing law between waterway and highway traffic through the coordinated study of the requirements of both modes of transportation and their relative impact upon the general economy. Compromises on both sides are inevitable, but I can assure you that the Corps of Engineers will not be a party to an approval in any instance of an unreasonable obstruction to navigation.

But regardless of the recommendations of any committee or commission, there is in being only one organization best able to undertake the navigation and flood control and related phases of Federal activity in water resources development—the Corps of Engineers. With 12 divisions and 45 districts, the corps covers the entire United States and some important overseas areas. It has 25,000 employees, mostly civilian. The corps' civilian engineer force is the largest, most capable body of engineers in the world today, and to them goes much of the credit for the success that the corps has had throughout its many years. I need not remind you that civil works and military construction are accomplished by the same organizations, with resulting greater efficiency in each, and, of course, the existence of such an organization is of extreme importance at the outset of war in order to get the military construction program underway.

So much for the national picture and interest. I would next like to discuss briefly a few points which I believe are of more immediate concern to the people of the Mississippi Valley and to this association.

I am sure that you, who have been so alert to the problems relating to the economy of the Mississippi Valley and to the Nation generally, fully recognize the large part the Mississippi River system has played in the development of the Nation. Though the benefits thus far realized have been enormous, further accomplishment is necessary if the people of the valley are to maintain their high national position, and correspondingly, if the Nation is to meet its ever-expanding economic goals.

The alluvial valley project is now about two-thirds complete and is the farthest advanced of the Federal programs for the Mississippi River system. The major development programs upstreams are in a lesser stage of completion—the upper Mississippi being 46 percent complete, the Missouri 43 percent, and the Ohio 29 percent. Even in this incomplete state, several major floods have been passed to the Gulf without mishap, and there has been no general overflow of the alluvial valley since the project was initiated. We have, indeed, been fortunate. Some areas of the valley are still vulnerable to flooding and will continue to be so until the entire comprehensive plan is complete.

Control of floods in a major river basin must be approached on the basis of planning for flood control in combination with other water uses and problems, with the objective to make the best possible use of land and water resources from an overall public viewpoint. Disastrous floods can be prevented by the execution of carefully prepared plans which utilize all flood-control measures and structures in their proper place. These measures can be accomplished most economically when they provide for complete development and use of our water resources; for example, by providing for beneficial use of floodwaters as well as control of them.

In carrying out such comprehensive plans of improvement it is entirely logical to take first things first and provide protection against the disaster flood as the first step. It is, however, wasteful to emphasize one phase of river-basin development and ignore others.

I feel we have followed a prudent course in the selection and accomplishment of the water-resource-development program for the Mississippi River system. We have already reaped tremendous benefits far in excess of the investment made. Yet, certain people have attacked the basic principle of river-basin development, contending that watershed-treatment programs—soil conservation and small dams—are effective substitutes for major flood-control structures. While it is recognized that measures and practices which conserve the soil and improve the vegetative cover on watersheds will contribute to flood control and definitely reduce flood flows, it is dangerous to claim for such measures the ability to control or materially reduce large floods when all history and experience point to the contrary. The Corps of Engineers believes that watershed-treatment programs, small dams, large dams, channel improvements, levees, and all feasible and economical measures must be utilized in appropriate cases if the flood problem is to be solved. There is no single panacea for flood control.

Biased articles on the subject of watershed treatment attacking the principle of large dam construction are dangerous because they build up in the public's mind a belief that soil conservation and small dam programs will accomplish far more than can be expected of them, and because they tend to undermine public confidence in programs and structures which sound engineering and scientific experience have found to be necessary if floods are to be controlled.

You of the Mississippi Valley Association are well aware, I am sure, that the critics of large dam construction, either through lack of knowledge of the subject or for other reasons, choose to ignore the fact that the best watershed treatment practices that can be devised by man are ineffective in preventing disastrous floods resulting from heavy widespread downpours on land already saturated by prolonged rainfall—as occurred in the Kansas River Basin in 1951.

The more radical elements of the proponents of soil-conservation measures—I speak of the prolific writers of deliberately misleading books and articles rather than the more conservative responsible Federal officials—would have you believe that soil-conservation and land-treatment practices constitute a new science just recently come to light. How strange that some of the most backward nations in the world today have practiced watershed treatment for centuries to a much higher degree than we may ever hope to attain in the United States. Korea is an example. Except in rugged mountain areas, every acre of land in that country is completely terraced for the culture of rice. During the growing season the paddies are kept full of water so that a bucketful of water poured into the top terrace results in the same amount of water leaving the lowest terrace and entering the sea. It fell to my lot to be a worried spectator at a demonstration of what happens when a heavy rain falls with the stage thus set. Four to seven inches fell in a few hours, causing the Imjim River, 600 feet wide at a bridge site, to rise 32 feet in 21 hours, becoming a river 1,800 feet wide as it surged over its banks. I do not suggest that land-treatment measures be discontinued in Korea or in the United States, for that matter, but I do submit that they are by no means a complete answer to the flood-control problem. A similar ineffectiveness of land treatment in preventing floods occurs when rapid snowmelt, accompanied by rainfall, occurs in drainage areas where the ground is still

frozen in the early spring—a situation that existed in the upper Missouri River Basin in 1952. Critics of comprehensive flood-control measures ignore historic evidence that great floods occurred in this country prior to its settlement by the white man. Such critics also fail to give proper credit to the collateral benefits that are realized from a balanced program which includes large reservoir units. Economical power is provided to serve existing needs and encourage the further development of industry in the region and floodwaters are conserved to serve such needs as navigation, irrigation, domestic and industrial water supply, and pollution abatement. The water-conservation benefits realized from the Fort Peck and other reservoirs in the Missouri River Basin last year in aiding navigation, alleviating salt-water intrusion at New Orleans, and similar functions are still fresh in our minds; neither have we forgotten that operation of Fort Peck during the flood of 1952 made the difference between success and failure in the tremendous efforts that saved the levees at such critical locations as Omaha and Council Bluffs.

I began this talk with a glance backward to the year just past—an eventful, important year in water-resource development. Let me conclude with a look into the year ahead. First, I would like to suggest that you and your association be optimistic about the outcome of the widespread interest now being shown to the matter of water-resources development, but that you be alert with a view to guarding against any move to discard the experience and gains of the past and substitute some new untried schemes—however plausible they may appear on the surface. I believe that the year to come will require great unanimity, courage, and a fighting spirit among all those interested in sane water resources development, in view of the tolls and bridge clearance problems, and the misleading propaganda by opponents of scientific and complete flood control. That your organization is experienced in bringing a fight to a victorious conclusion was demonstrated last year in connection with the Old River control problem. Your executive vice president, for whom we in the Corps have the highest regard and respect, appeared before the House Public Works Committee in behalf of this project and clearly set forth by convincing words and illustrations the widespread adverse effect the forecasted events would have upon the entire Mississippi Valley. It is significant that the budget and the President in his budget message recognized the necessity for this control and have recommended funds to initiate construction in fiscal year 1956. General Hardin, the president of the Mississippi River Commission, will perhaps discuss this project in his talk tomorrow, but since the Chief of Engineers had a deep personal interest in this subject and visited the area last fall with Assistant Secretary of the Army Roderick, I thought I should mention it.

It appears to me that the association, and other navigation and flood-control associations throughout the Nation, must gather forces for what might well go down in history as your greatest fight—and I am sure it will be a successful one. I believe it would be appropriate, in the difficult but rewarding times ahead, to remember the words of a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, who said:

"It is not the critic who counts—not the man who points out how the strong man stumbled or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena—whose face is marred by dust, and sweat, and blood—who strives valiantly—who errs and comes short again and again—who knows the great enthusiasms, the great devotions, and spends himself in a worthy cause—who, at the best, knows in the end the triumph of high achievement, and who, at the worst, if

he falls, at least falls while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat."

Pros and Cons of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to an informative series of articles written by one of the Nation's outstanding journalists, Mr. Phil Goulding, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. Goulding has ably outlined in this series the pros and cons of the argument over foreign-trade agreements and how the latest Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act proposals affect Ohio's stake in the huge annual import-export business.

This series merits the attention of every Member of Congress.

The first article of the series follows:

OHIO EYEING BIG STAKE IN TRADE GOALS—
SOME SAY IKE'S PROGRAM WILL BRING BILLION DOLLARS, OTHERS RUIN

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—Government experts claim Ohio has a billion-dollar annual stake in the administration's foreign-trade program.

Perhaps so, answer some Ohioans, but it still means ruin to us.

Each day a dozen witnesses appear before a congressional committee to describe why it is vital to the free world that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act be extended and foreign trade expanded—

Or to testify that the lowering of tariffs will wash their business down the drain.

The hassle has been going on since something called the tariff of abominations threw the South into one of its periodic fits in 1828. Up and down went duties on goods from overseas until they were pegged at an all-time peak by the Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930.

DEMOCRATS CUT RATES

President Hoover and the Republicans were retired. From Franklin D. Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and the Democratic Congress of 1934 came the original Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It authorized cuts up to 50 percent in rates prescribed by the Smoot-Hawley bill.

It has regularly been extended for 3 years or less.

Extension time is up again on June 12. The administration wants lower tariffs. The current legislation permits the President to reduce rates up to 50 percent of those prevailing in 1945, but most of this authority has been used.

Foreign nations selling to the United States pay the Treasury Department in three ways on the goods they send in. Some items carry a duty figured on a certain percent of the value of the product. Some tariffs are a set rate—so much a pound. Some are a mixture.

Congress does not set specific rates, but gives the President power to establish them, within certain ranges. He is advised by a tariff commission, before which industries may plead their case.

Mr. Eisenhower has requested authority to reduce rates by as much as 5 percent

below levels of next July 1 in each of the next 3 years as reciprocal agreements are made with other countries. He wants power also to cut any rates now in excess of 50 percent of the product's value to that level. And he wants to halve 1945 rates on items being imported in negligible quantity.

Some rates, cut 50 percent by the 1934 authority and 50 percent of that figure by 1945, are now 75 percent lower than the level fixed by the Smoot-Hawley legislation.

Ohio legislators, both rookies and veterans, are once again asking questions. What do tariff rates mean to the people of Ohio? What industries are affected? Which manufacturers in the State favor the bill now before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and why? Who opposes lower tariffs? What is their case?

Proponents of the act give two chief reasons for their support. They say our friends in the free world must be kept economically strong. And they cite the advantages the United States secures from its export trade.

United States foreign trade in 1953 amounted to \$37 trillion in imports and \$21 billion in exports.

What is Ohio's share of this foreign business?

Commerce Department experts say if the sale of the State's products manufactured for export was suddenly cut off, Ohio's business loss would be an estimated \$980 million a year.

Their latest figures show 100,000 Ohioans employed in making goods that are sent out of this country. More than 800,000 worked in industries turning out goods which are shipped out of the United States in greater quantity than brought in.

OHIO INDUSTRIES SPREAD OUT

Ohio industries with substantial foreign business transactions are spread throughout the State.

Blast-furnace and steel-mill operations exported some \$90 million worth of products in 1953. Sixty-five plants were operating. Nearly 50,000 worked in the Youngstown area alone. Others were employed chiefly in Cleveland, Portsmouth, Cincinnati, Canton, Massillon, and Mansfield.

Trade-agreement concessions on these products have been made with Canada, the United Kingdom, Chile, the Union of South Africa, Cuba, and Sweden.

Another Ohio export lion was the machine industry. An estimated \$309 million in equipment was shipped abroad, including some \$73 million in construction and mining machinery, and \$34 million in metal working equipment.

More than 500 plants turned out the metalworking gear, employing some 17,000 in the Cleveland area, 11,600 around Cincinnati, and others in Toledo, Springfield, Hamilton, and Kent. Among nations with which trade concessions have been negotiated are the United Kingdom, Canada, France, Switzerland, India, Pakistan, and Chile.

CLEVELAND HAS BIG SHARE

Service—industry and household machines were exported in quantity. Ohio's share was an estimated \$35 million. Two-thirds of the workers were in refrigeration machinery, one-fifth in vacuum cleaners. More than 7,000 were employed in Cleveland, others in 87 plants there and in Canton, Dayton, Cincinnati, Mansfield, and Fremont.

Ohio exported \$138 million of motor vehicles and equipment, made by 69,000 workers in 171 establishments in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Toledo, Greenville, Lima, and Loudonville.

Trade agreement concessions have been made on electrical machinery with Switzerland, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom, Italy, and other countries. The State's estimated contribution to the national export was \$66 million. Eighty thousand were employed in 302 fac-

ories across the State—Cleveland, Dayton, Cincinnati, Elyria, Toledo, Alliance, Lima, and Troy among them.

Ohio employs more than one-third of the rubber workers in the United States. Goods worth \$44 million were shipped out. More than 61 thousand persons drew wages in Akron alone; another 23,000 in Cleveland and other cities.

The department experts say all these industries have benefited from trade agreements. Foreign nations have reduced their tariffs and relaxed other trade barriers, they add.

OTHER OHIO LEADERS

Other leading Ohio industries and their estimated exports are these:

Fabricated metal products (from cutlery to bolts and nuts) \$36 million, chemicals and allied products \$27 million, ceramic and glass products \$18,200,000, paper and allied products \$9,900,000, miscellaneous (toys, plastics, and others) \$6,100,000, furniture and fixtures \$3,900,000.

These dreary statistics are quoted to support the fundamental position that industrial Ohio does have a tremendous stake in international trade. It does not follow that the industries mentioned are all in favor of the administration's program. Some of their views will be presented in other stories.

Pros and Cons of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the second in a series of articles written by Mr. Phil Goulding of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

IMPORTS ESSENTIAL TO OHIO'S INDUSTRY

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, January 30.—A major Akron tire company imports crude rubber from 10 countries.

It exports to all free nations. It needs trade. Its officials are in favor of an extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act now before Congress.

Commerce Department economists contend that Ohio imports are just as important to the State's economy as its exports. Almost all Ohio plants, they say, are dependent in some degree upon raw materials from abroad or the product of another United States industry which is dependent.

More than 36 percent of American rubber stocks must be imported. Ninety percent of the asbestos used in Ohio industry is imported, 85 percent of the tin, 91 percent of cobalt, 75 percent of tungsten ore, 75 percent of aluminum.

Ohio's machine tools need industrial diamonds, all of which are imported. Manganese and chrome put the starch in steel. The ferroalloy industry of the State draws on foreign sources for ferromanganese, ferrochrome, and other alloys.

Even such unlikely products as wattle bark and quebracho extract are needed for Ohio's leather industry, which employs some 18,000 workers.

The State Department concludes that Ohio industries employing nearly a million persons and paying nearly \$3 billion in wages could not operate without imports.

Ohio's manufacturing payrolls are five times its income from agriculture, but Government proponents of lower tariffs say trade agreement concessions have aided the Ohio farmer as well as the average factory worker.

Dairy exports, mainly from the northeastern quarter of Ohio, were from Wayne, Ash-tabula, Medina and Stark Counties, plus Darke, Portage, Lorain and Trumbull. Shipments were an estimated \$3,670,000 in 1953.

The trade agreements on these and industrial products began in 1934. Between then and 1946, bilateral agreements were concluded with 29 nations. The next year the program was greatly broadened by shifting negotiations from a bilateral to a multilateral basis.

Twenty-two countries met with the United States at Geneva to sign the general agreement on tariffs and trade—GATT. Concession on 45,000 items were made. Further concessions were made in 1949 and 1950-51; the group grew to include 34 nations.

No one comes up with the same answer on how much these agreements have lowered tariffs since 1934, on products coming into Ohio or into the rest of the United States.

A report by the Tariff Commission put out in mid-1953 attempted to compensate for price fluctuations and other factors in deciphering the complex tariff schedules. It concluded that the tariff level averaged a 25 percent drop until more authority to cut was voted in 1945, and an additional 25 percent reduction since, for a total slash of about one-half over the 20-year period.

But the American Tariff League, Inc., a high-tariff association, says flatly that the level has fallen 70 percent since 1934.

RECIPROCALITY DISPUTED

There is also violent debate over how reciprocal the reciprocal agreements have been. An official of the committee for a national trade policy says that over 50,000 items of more than 40 countries have been reduced or prevented from increasing under the program.

A spokesman for the American Tariff League replies there are more restrictions against the United States abroad now than when the original act was passed in 1934.

A Cleveland industrialist, head of a large drill concern, points out that England has low duties—but 100 percent embargo on the importation of any goods manufactured in sufficient quantities within the commonwealth.

GROUPED IN NORTHWEST

The State's share of national farm exports was estimated at about \$100 million at last reckoning. Twenty-three counties produce most of this, although many others contribute. Except for the dairy industry, the exporters are concentrated in the northwestern quarter of the State.

Wheat is grown on some 110,000 farms, nearly 50 percent of those in Ohio. Wood and Seneca Counties lead. Important production also comes from Wayne, Pickaway, Henry, Hancock, Darke, Huron, and Sandusky. The Department of Commerce estimates that \$32 million worth was exported in 1953.

Chief producers of some \$15 million in corn sent abroad were Darke and Wood Counties. Madison, Pickaway, Putnam, Preble, Green, and Henry exported nearly as much.

Canada, Finland, Cuba, and Denmark are among nations which have made trade-agreement concessions on corn; the United Kingdom, Denmark, Switzerland, Norway, Italy, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Nicaragua on wheat.

Wood County also heads soybean production in the State, followed by Van Wert, Putnam, and Paulding. One-quarter of Ohio farms grow soybeans. Their share of overseas business amounted to \$10 million. Denmark, Finland, the United Kingdom,

Italy, and Cuba have made trade concessions. The State's export of oats was an estimated \$265,000, from Wood, Henry, Mercer, Seneca, and Wayne Counties. Hog products valued at \$4,800,000 were exported from Fayette, Clinton, Preble, Pickaway, Darke, and Madison Counties.

Conscientious Ohio legislators, whose duty is to consider their own districts as well as the welfare of the Nation, are understandably perplexed by the conflicting testimony.

The files of some, including the two Senators, JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, of Columbus, and GEORGE H. BENDER, Republican, of Cleveland, are filled with correspondence from constituents. Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Cleveland, sent letters by the hundreds to persons within Ohio and in other States requesting their views and advice.

Pros and Cons of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the third in a series of articles written by Mr. Phil Goulding, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

OHIO INDUSTRY IS SPLIT ON BID FOR TARIFF CUT

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, January 31.—Big Ohio industry differs on tariff protection.

Some major concerns go right down the line with the administration position. One is a Cleveland stove producer.

"We are for free trade," it says. "We want exports. High duties mean less income in foreign countries. That means fewer dollars and fewer exports."

A large Cleveland chemical company feels the same way. High tariffs were necessary before World War I, it believes, but not today. An official thinks 80 percent of chemical products are not affected by foreign competition.

This is an unusual position for the chemical manufacturers. Most industry spokesmen oppose the legislation now before Congress to extend the reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and broaden the President's authority to lower rates.

Take the American Cyanamid Co., with 33 plants and 15,000 workers. It has a plant in Hamilton, another in Marietta.

Despite a provision in the 1954 act that there would be no reductions which threatened domestic production necessary for national defense requirements, nearly all organic intermediates are on the proposed list in a Japanese trade agreement.

"The congressional mandate," says the company, "was ignored."

An American Cyanamid officer points out that the industry is about 7 billion pounds shy of required mobilization capacity. Displacement of American production by increased exports would discourage the installation to meet such requirements, he says:

CITES DWINDLING MARKET

Westinghouse Electric has plants in Mansfield, Cleveland, Bellefontaine, Columbus, Newark, and Lima. Its president says there has been no liberalization of trade by other nations in return for United States concessions.

He declares that it is harder to sell American-made electrical equipment in foreign nations today than it was in the 1930's or before the war. Yet with a few minor exceptions, all rates on this apparatus have been cut 50 percent or more by the United States since 1930.

Under the Smoot-Hawley Act, they ranged from 20 to 35 percent; now they scale from 8½ to 17½ percent.

SAYS PROTECTION NEEDED

"Completely inadequate" to protect United States workers from foreign competition, the Westinghouse official says.

"Any foreign producer can undersell us in this country by up to 30 percent, even after paying shipping cost and duties."

He points out that Germany, England, and Switzerland all bar electrical power equipment imports—yet England and Switzerland are the largest exporters of this gear to the United States.

"The State Department has obtained very little reciprocity in return for the economic concessions it has made," he asserts.

CALLS IMPLICATIONS SERIOUS

Ohio opinion is also split on machine tools, of which it is the Nation's largest producer.

One giant Cleveland concern strongly favors low tariffs, on the theory that only then can overseas nations sell enough here to get dollars to buy American products.

But Frederick V. Geier, president of the Cincinnati Milling Machine Co., biggest in the world, said in an interview published in U. S. News & World Report last March that the tariff policy was the most important thing facing the industry today.

"The Randall Commission proposal to reduce tariffs across the board has serious implications for our technical industries," said Geier. "Foreign competition is increasingly serious."

CITES HUGE INCREASE

Chemical imports are up 500 percent since 1948, a Dow Chemical Co. executive adds.

Other industry spokesmen are not against extension of the act, but oppose certain sections—particularly President Eisenhower's request for authority to cut all rates over 50 percent ad valorem (of the value of the product) to that level.

Ohio has some 13,000 workers in organic and inorganic industrial chemicals.

There are more than 80,000 in electrical machinery.

EXECUTIVES DIFFER

Company presidents in this field differ, too. One Cleveland producer of electric motors says that imports of heavy power equipment, while still accounting for a small percentage of sales in the United States, are increasing more rapidly than total demand for the products.

At the same time, he adds, exports have gone down. They were 9.1 percent of sales in 1920, 5.2 during the 1930's, 4 percent today.

Another Cleveland, head of an electric company, says this:

"People who are hurt are not as efficient as they should be. Mr. Eisenhower's program would open a tremendous market."

So there you are.

FOREIGN WAGES LOW

Two more Clevelanders in the same business take conflicting positions. One thinks trade should be more free, the other tariffs should be increased.

The industry formerly depended on Europe for 22 percent of its sales, the latter adds. Now exporting has fallen below 10 percent. Foreign import restrictions are impossible to beat. Their wages are one-fourth of ours and their prices 50 to 100 percent cheaper.

One Cleveland industrialist, whose firm turns out huge equipment, notes that his hourly rate, with fringe benefits, is \$2.83, the Japanese and German 50 cents. German

plants, built with Marshall plan money, are producing equipment equal to American machinery and underselling us here, duty paid, by 25 percent, he says.

A German firm representative told him in New York that the German concern could beat his price on a piece of boat-unloading equipment by \$250,000.

SIMPLIFICATION IS URGED

Akron rubber companies are generally for an extension of the act. One president said he was not in the least worried about elimination of all tariffs on rubber tires. These outfits appear more concerned with simplification of customs procedures.

On office-equipment producer in Cleveland favors extension for at least 3 years, longer if possible. He would also like to see customs simplification, tax relief on earnings abroad, and an easing of export-import bank restrictions.

The head of one of the large steel companies believes there should be tariffs recognizing the labor rate differentials, plus import quotas by general characteristics—pig iron, carbon and alloy bars, sheets, structural steel, rails, and wire products.

ARGUMENTS GIVEN

In general, the reasoning of Ohioans is similar to that of the rest of the Nation. A summary:

Pro: The legislation must be passed to keep the free world economically strong. Military and political ties must be backed up by economic substance. The bill is so moderate it would hurt no one. It is consistent with free enterprise and free competition. It is toward gradual and reciprocal elimination of world trade barriers.

Where the United States leaves a trade opening the Soviet moves in. The United States cannot sacrifice its export industry to protect a sheltered minority.

Con: There is no guaranty the act would promote exports, only that United States tariffs will be cut. The escape clause allowing contracting parties to withdraw or modify concessions that injure domestic producers, has been invoked only 5 times in 12 years.

The peril-point provision, which requires the Tariff Commission to fix limits below which rates cannot be cut without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic interests, has never been tested in multilateral negotiations, only bilateral.

SPLIT ON CUT BASIS

Congress should set tariffs on an item-by-item basis, not delegate authority to the executive branch.

The authority is too broad. The damage to essential industries—coal, hurt by residual oil imports—cannot be reckoned as injurious only to those industries but to millions depending on them. The United States must play its part in strengthening the free world—but our rates are already low, among the world's lowest.

Another story will deal with the specific Ohio industries which claim that continuation of present legislation, let alone additional tariff cuts, will mean ruination.

Pros and Cons of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include

the fourth in a series of articles written by Mr. Phil Goulding, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

OHIO POTTERY WORKER SEES HIMSELF AS "GOAT"

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, February 1.—The East Liverpool pottery worker is not impressed with the theory that his job is less important than improved living conditions in Japan.

His average age is 50. "Adjustment" as a casualty of freer trade would be difficult. He does not see surrounding industries hiring men his age in vast quantities. As he looks south to Steubenville and north to Youngstown, he does not see surrounding industries hiring anyone in vast quantities.

He is one of some 6,000 chinaware workers in the immediate area. Within 100 miles of the city, there are 10,000. Some are across the State line. In Ohio, they are found in Sebring, Minerva, Crooksville, East Palestine, Coshocton, Salem, Steubenville, Wellsville, Cambridge, and Bedford.

PAID FOR PRODUCTION

If he is familiar with the arguments of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters (A. F. of L.), or of his employer, he has accumulated quite a batch of statistics.

He has learned that his wages and those of his colleagues are about two-thirds the total cost of dinnerware production.

The average wage in his industry is \$1.68 an hour—compared to 41 cents in England, 34 in West Germany and Paris, 30 in Italy, and 22 in Japan.

He is a pieceworker and is paid chiefly for what he produces. He has heard that United States production dropped 10.3 percent between 1949 and 1952, another estimated 10.1 percent to 1954.

While his company and others in the United States supplied 29.7 percent of the domestic market in 1948, they supplied only 15.9 percent of it in 1952.

Spokesmen for him say that imports of decorated household chinaware have increased 138 percent since 1948; from 2,070,000 dozen to 4,940,000. Dinnerware brought in from overseas competition 12 years ago totaled \$7 million. Imports in 1953 were \$29 million.

Vicious disaster will be the end result of the enactment of President Eisenhower's reciprocal trade agreements program, his union tells him. His boss says the same thing.

LOSSES IN 1954

Congress has been told that four large vitrified china plants had a profit of 13.7 percent before taxes in 1948 and a loss of 1.4 percent in 1954. During the same years, four other concerns were liquidated. Three of them had been in business a total of 184 years.

The pottery people do not ask a tariff sufficiently high to make up for the wage differential. The current rate is about 70 percent of the value of the import, plus 10 cents per dozen pieces. To equalize a duty of 248 percent plus 15 cents per dozen would be required. The industry recognizes this as quite impossible.

But they would like to see an import quota established, which, they say, would dissipate the fears that low-priced imports will take over the market completely. The argument is that these fears retard production and depress the market.

They recognize that the dollar shortage in foreign nations must be overcome.

SACRIFICE UNITED STATES INDUSTRIES?

"But we do not accept the concept that American industries should be sacrificed on the altar of economic appeasement," they say.

Frank Hull, president of the International Brotherhood of Potters, East Liverpool, would like to have dinnerware and chinaware elim-

inated from the list to be negotiated with Japan on a multilateral basis under GATT.

If pottery remains on the list, he feels import quotas should be applied and the treaty made bilateral with Japan only.

The chairman of the foreign trade committee of the Vitrified China Association, E. L. Tolbert, believes that Congress should return to itself the right to set tariff rates specifically.

He does not deny that logrolling might result, but better the logs should be rolled within Congress, he says, than by 30 or 40 foreign nations within GATT.

FIGURES TELL TALE

Twenty-three United States plants manufacture 85 percent of all earthenware tableware produced in this country. Their sales in 1953 amounted to \$53 million. Some \$45 million of the total was from the East Liverpool area.

The national sales figure in 1947 was \$56,620,000. Earnings before taxes were \$6,688,000 then, \$1,026,227 in 1953. Earnings after taxes dropped from \$4 million to \$255,000, total dozens shipped from 27 million to 19 million, wages from \$32,896,000 to \$31,744,000, total manhours worked from 25,681,000 to 16,703,000.

During these same years, imports of earthenware increased nearly 300 percent, while American production dropped 30 percent; imports of chinaware went up 700 percent, while chinaware held even.

Practically all of the increased imports have come from Japan.

"Yet," says the United States Potters Association, "we are told by the State Department they are now ready to negotiate a treaty with Japan in which it is contemplated that duties will be reduced on both china and earthenware."

SUFFERING ACTUAL INJURY

"It is painfully evident we are far past the 'threatened with injury' stage and for at least 3 years have been suffering actual and serious injury. It is just as evident in comparing imports and domestic production figures that a major portion of that injury is due to imports under present tariff rates."

The potter industry, spokesmen point out, does not have the advantages of some American industries which thrive on international markets—including the patent advantage.

People making automobiles, typewriters, washing machines, business machines, and other goods do not need tariff protection, they say, because the Government gives them a monopoly through their patents that protects them from foreign competition.

When proponents of lower duties point out that relief is available through the escape clause of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, they reply that Americans have sought such relief 53 times and been granted it in 5 cases—women's felt hats, watches, clover seed, dried figs, and hatters' furs.

The next story will give the cases of some other Ohio industries protesting the current legislation and the executive trade agreements.

Pros and Cons of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the fifth in a series of articles written

by Mr. Phil Goulding of the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

LOW-TARIFF FOES CITE OHIO LOSSES

(By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Four out of five Cleveland industries favor the administration bill to lower tariffs.

That was the testimony before Congress of N. C. Rubin, president of the Cleveland World Trade Association.

The White Sewing Machine Corp., is one of the 20 percent opposed. It contends that any further reduction in duties would result in serious harm and it cites these figures to prove its case:

Net earnings after taxes were \$4,126,000 in 1949, only \$207,000 in 1953. The rate of return on invested capital was 28.4 5 years ago, 1.0 in 1953. It sold 342,500 units in 1949, 179,363 in 1953.

QUOTES FIGURES

Hourly workers on the production line numbered 1,650 in 1950. Last year there were but 500.

The white people say they retooled their works during the war and engaged 100 percent in war activity. Not until 1946 was the reconversion completed. During this 4-year suspension a great consumer demand built up. Importers found the market.

Before Pearl Harbor, foreign manufacturers sold only \$186,000 in sewing machines to the United States and the white business was \$11 million. By 1949, imports were nearly \$9 million and white sales \$31 million. Year before last, buyers paid \$24,500,000 for machines made overseas and \$19 million for white products.

Foreign manufacturers have taken over nearly half of the market, White spokesmen say, with the Japanese alone having carved out some 30 percent.

COMPARE WAGES

Wage differentials show why. The White rate is \$1.85 an hour, plus fringe benefits worth 30 cents. Average European pay in sewing machine plants is 60 to 70 cents. The Japanese get 20 to 40 cents.

Exports of the Cleveland company have declined. Excluding Canada, in 1950 shipments to other nations were worth \$232,000; in 1953 only \$53,000.

Another Ohio industry which claims to be in trouble is glass. The latest census of manufacturers showed there were 12,610 Ohio workers in pressed and blown glassware, 7,000 in other glass products. That was a 1947 count.

No figures are available in Ohio glass employees today, but here is an illustration of what has taken place. A handmade glass factory in Morgantown, W. Va., was started before the turn of the century. Five years ago the plant had 300 employees shipping \$1,125,000 of ware. Today it has 150, working 7 days a week. Shipments have fallen to approximately \$750,000 a year.

MANY OHIO PLANTS

Among Ohio hand glass manufacturers are plants along the eastern edge of the State in Toronto, East Palestine, and Bellair, others in central Ohio in Newark, Bremen, and Lancaster and one in Tiffin.

The handmade pressed and blown glassware industry produced \$31,835,000 of ware in 1953. Ohio's share was an estimated 14 percent. About half was hand blown, half handpressed. The hand blown sales in 1953 were some \$15 million, which is less than 1 percent of the entire glass industry. Yet it has felt the impact of 17 percent of all imports of the entire industry. Handmade blown imports went up \$400,000 in 1953 over 1952—from \$4,200,000 to \$4,600,000.

Hardware table service glassware consumption in the United States was 43.7 percent imported in 1953. Pressed-ware importation was 10.7. Both have increased substantially

since 1948, when the former was 22.3 percent and the latter 3.5 percent.

And from Tariff Commission reports for 1954, an increase of 20 percent in imports is indicated. In addition, the American Glassware Association predicts a 1954 sales decrease of 12.5 percent.

"If this rate of increase for imports and decrease of domestic production continues," says an association spokesman, "it is but a short time before American production of these wares must be abandoned and our workmen will have to seek less lucrative employment in other industries in which they are not trained."

The industry denies that foreign manufacturers have superior knowledge of manufacturing, designing, or merchandising. It blames wage rates. United States workmen average \$1.72 an hour. Swedes average 69 cents, Britons 53, Parisians from 49 for skilled males to 35 for unskilled women, Belgian men 46 and women 25, Italians and West Germans 37 and Japanese 22.8.

OPPOSES BILL

The industry opposes the administration bill. It contends the President would be given the widest latitude he has ever had in lowering tariffs and determining trade regulations. It says the legislation means surrender of congressional approval for 3 years. It believes the bill urges reckless, uniform slashing of rates, without item by item scrutiny.

William A. Daugherty, of Newark, a glassworker and president of the Ohio Glass and Pottery Workers' Protective League, adds a footnote. His plant has three giant furnaces. Only one is in operation.

Makers of rubber sundries in the State do not take the same favorable position toward lower tariffs as the large Akron tire and rubber companies with big export markets.

Ninety percent of all toy inflated balls in the country are produced by two Ohio concerns, one in Ashland and another in Sandusky. In the last decade nine other makers have gone out of business or ceased production of the balls. Four were in Ohio—in Ashland, Akron, Barberton, and Mansfield.

These outfits are protesting proposed reductions by the United States Tariff Commission and the committee for reciprocity information. They are unhappy over forthcoming negotiations with Japan. They say the proposed cut hits 90 percent of their products.

European wages are one-third of those paid in Ohio and Japanese one-tenth. The present tariff rates—50 percent on rubber playballs, 70 percent on toy balloons and 50 percent on "other rubber toys"—do not eliminate imports. Further reduction would be ruinous, they contend.

The Ashland company employs 350 to 500, or about 7 percent of the local labor market, the Sandusky concern 300. The latter firm notes that Sandusky is already a surplus labor area.

Both companies turned out vital military goods during World War II—liferafts, lifebelts, Mae West jackets, and similar products. One produced \$6,500,000 of items for the armed services.

One figures it indirectly employs 411 persons in southeast Asia, an area critical for the free world. The other uses crude rubber produced by 329 Asiatics.

Northern Ohio also turns out about half of the toy balloons made in the United States. Plants are operating in Willard, Akron, Ashland, Sandusky, and Ravenna. There are nine in all. A Ravenna concern employs 8 to 10 percent of the local labor force.

It points out that Japanese pay \$7.60 for a 40-hour week, whereas 5 local employees, picked at random, drew from \$262 to \$275 for a 2-week wage. It notes further that the Japanese pay for latex with cheap manu-

factured products, while United States companies pay in needed American dollars.

QUESTIONS SANITATION

And it questions the sanitary conditions of the Japanese home labor.

The case of the bicycle industry has been one of the most publicized. Bicycle manufacturers in Ohio include the Cleveland Welding Co., the Murray Ohio Manufacturing Co., in Cleveland, the Colson Corp., in Elyria, the Shelby Cycle Co., in Shelby, and the Huffman Manufacturing Co. of Dayton.

Frank W. Hannon, head of the Murray Ohio concern, says foreign competition has increased from 1½ percent of total sales before 1948 to 22.8 percent in 1953. He estimates that 1954 foreign sales will be 50 percent when the figures are in.

His company was forced to lay off 220 employees in the last year. Production was down from 300,000 in 1953 to 215,000 in 1954. Payroll reduction the first 6 months of 1954 was \$526,000.

American bicycles sell for \$20 to \$30 more than those made by foreign competitors.

Like many others, Murray wants an import quota, of 15 to 20 percent. He says the maximum allowance increase in tariffs up to 22.5 percent would not do him any good.

The examples in this story do not cover the field. The Ohio coal industry's plight has been aggravated by imports of residual oil from Venezuela. The western Ohio woolen industry, with mills in West Unity, Lima, New Bremen, Jackson Center, Piqua, Hamilton, and St. Mary's, says that 1953 imports of blankets were 250 percent higher than in 1946.

OTHERS PROTEST

Ceramic tile companies, plate glass outfits, a Coshocton rubber bathing cap concern, an Xenia cordage industry, a Lisbon maker of electrical porcelain insulators are all protesting. Cutlery people, including several concerns in Fremont, are asking protection. One noted that the R. H. Macy Co., of New York, purchased \$8,700 of merchandise from them and \$100,000 from Europe in one period.

The European shears were selling for \$1.88; the old Ohio firm's for \$2.25 to \$2.90. United States wages are four times those of Germany. The tariff on shears has twice been cut and now is at the maximum allowable minimum.

A final story will give a rebuttal to the bicycle case and describe proposals to alleviate distress for some of the minority damaged industries.

Pros and Cons of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the sixth and last in a series of articles written by Mr. Phil Goulding, of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, relative to the argument over foreign-trade agreements:

MORE JOBS THAN JOBLESS SEEN IN TARIFF ABOLITION (By Phil G. Goulding)

WASHINGTON, February 3.—Abolition of all tariffs would jeopardize the jobs of 200,000 to 400,000 Americans.

But some 4,500,000 owe their employment directly or indirectly to imports and exports.

Those are the contentions of supporters of President Eisenhower's foreign-trade program and the believers in reduced duties. They build part of their case on the simple "greatest good for the greatest number" base. They point out further that the cuts which Mr. Eisenhower would be authorized to make under the legislation being considered would endanger only 100,000 to 200,000 jobs.

Clarence B. Randall, the President's special consultant on foreign economic policy, notes that the program is a gradual one, directed toward moderation. He submits that there is "hardly any industry in the United States that can't face a change of 5 percent in its competition."

REPLIES TO BIKE INDUSTRY

Another approach of the program's advocates is to tear down the position of the protectionists. Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, uses these tactics in replying to the bicycle industry.

Bicycle makers use one set of figures to plead for higher tariff rates. Taft uses another. He asks how serious the damage really is, asserting that American manufacturers turned out 1,250,000 bicycles in 1939, 1,470,000 in 1949, and up to 2,000,000 in 1953.

Taft concedes a recession in the industry in 1954, but says a recession affected substantially every United States industry and was not due to imports. Only one of the top 10 bicycle makers is in a labor distress area, he says.

ASSAILS BICYCLE MAKERS

The Ohioan argues that bicycle manufacturing is centered in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, where metal fabrication is general in many lines and opportunities for shifts to other products are obvious.

He assails the industry for paying no attention to expanding its market until it was forced into it. Then lightweight bikes went up from 37,000 in 1951 to 88,000 in 1952 and 127,000 in 1953, he says, adding:

"How could this happen if there were anything at all in talk about slave wages in England?"

Taft points out that there are bicycle paths everywhere abroad and he asks why the big 10 manufacturers have not worked to push such a program here. In times of recession, when transportation costs are important, bicycle sales should go up, not down, he asserts.

CUTS WOULD BE SELECTED

"There are 70 million families or more in this country," he points out. "Two million bicycles a year, compared with 5 or 6 million automobiles, is not much of a showing."

Randall, who fathered the administration program, denies the claims of some industries that reductions would be across the board. He says they would be made on selected commodities, with careful screening before any cut is put into effect.

The Presidential adviser, who is board chairman of the Inland Steel Co., also feels an incorrect inference has been drawn from the testimony of some cabinet officers on the Trade Extensions Act.

Some proponents have oversold their case by harping on the advantages to other nations of the free world. This has aroused the resentment of United States workers who might be injured. Randall agrees that it is important to have allies who are economically strong. But far underlying that is the future economic welfare of our own Nation, he says.

STRANGE BEDFELLOWS

Support for lower tariffs comes from many directions. The labor unions, Americans for Democratic Action, the chamber of com-

merce, and the American Farm Bureau Federation are among the strange bedfellows.

James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, concedes there are some "short-run problems" to be handled. He thinks it is possible to lessen the hardship that may befall individual workers, industries, and communities by enacting additional legislation, based on the premise that the Government must assume some responsibilities in this direction.

David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, recommended a readjustment program when he served on the Randall Commission a year ago. Bills to carry it out have been introduced by Representatives HARRISON WILLIAMS, Democrat, New Jersey, HAROLD DONAHUE, Democrat, Massachusetts, and HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania, in the House, and Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, Massachusetts, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, in the Senate.

UNITED STATES AGENCIES WOULD HELP

Under present law, the President must accept or reject recommendations of the Tariff Commission for duty adjustments based on the escape clause or peril point provisions of the Trade Agreements Act.

The Kennedy bill would authorize him to make the facilities and resources of various Federal agencies available to individuals, communities, and industries suffering injury when he turns down tariff relief for them because of the overriding national interest.

Individuals might be given supplemental unemployment compensation benefits, a lower social security retirement age, vocational education, and retraining programs, and in certain cases financial assistance for relocation in a different labor market.

For injured companies, technical information and advice, rapid tax amortization, and special small-business administration loans to aid modernization and diversification would be available.

Communities could also obtain technical information in establishing an adjustment program and loans to themselves or industrial development corporations for implementing the adjustment proposals.

KENNEDY points out that no real relief has been granted under the existing law. Consequently, he says, industries legitimately in need of relief from imports are reluctant to go through the time-consuming, expensive procedures of the tariff commission.

The Massachusetts Senator says it is clear that the trend is toward lower tariff barriers and increased international trade. Even without that trend, the existing situation calls for assistance to those who are injured by the current tariff structure, he adds.

PRODUCERS BOOSTED

Another bill introduced would enable any domestic producer found by the Tariff Commission to be in danger from foreign imports to receive a certificate entitling it to a percentage advantage up to 25 percent in its bids for Government contracts.

Meanwhile, the hearings on H. R. 1, to extend for 3 years a Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and to broaden the President's rate-cutting authority, continue. And Ohio legislators continue looking for the answer.

At a recent party at the home of Representative OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, Mentor, five Ohio Republicans spent several hours discussing the law. This reporter was an interested bystander.

Two were strongly in favor of the program, two were dead against it. One, a freshman, had no opinion and was trying to learn.

Textile Industry and Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very truthful and interesting article from the Washington Sunday Star, February 13, 1955, by Joseph A. Fox:

NEW ENGLAND TEXTILE INDUSTRY SEES DISASTER IN TRADE PACTS—MILL OWNERS AGREE ON LAST DITCH FIGHT TO BLOCK MORE FOREIGN COMPETITION

(By Joseph A. Fox)

BOSTON, February 12.—President Eisenhower's trade-agreement program, which last week got the warm support of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, is drawing frigid reception in New England, where the long-suffering textile industry regards it as the last straw.

As though things were not tough enough already, because of ruinous competition from the South, harassed mill owners see more disaster creeping up in the new assault on trade barriers.

To them, it's like waiting for the other shoe to drop. There is fear for the economic future of the six-State area from Connecticut to the Canadian border.

SEES INDUSTRY FUNERAL

Striding about his plainly furnished headquarters here, William F. Sullivan, president of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers and the Northern Textile Association, employs a macabre figure of speech as he talks about the troubles of the industry:

"You're in a funeral parlor," he tells a visitor.

"This is one fight we just can't lose," seconds Seabury Stanton, rugged chief of the famed old Hathaway Co., of New Bedford. He still sees hope for New England's biggest business unless Government policies knock out the shaky props remaining by giving foreign importers easier access to home markets.

In nearby Lawrence, once the wool and worsted capital, where employment had dropped from 28,000 to 4,000 because of plant liquidation and migration—Arthur Brown, CIO spokesman for the area, looks from his desk at rows of deserted factory buildings and asks rhetorically:

"Do the people in Washington who talk about encouraging trade to check communism abroad ever stop to figure what putting men and women out of their jobs could do toward spreading communism in this country?"

The story is the same everywhere—Fall River, Woonsocket, Lowell, Manchester—wherever bread and butter depend on the clatter of spindle and loom. And while booster organizations such as the New England Council put up a brave front and talk about a new prosperity, the fact remains that the fate of the region today is bound up in textiles. With things as they are, that's a shaky reed.

QUESTION OF COSTS

Labor knows it.

The textile industry is a sensitive one. It is a business where an eighth of a cent a yard in production cost may mean the

difference between getting or losing a contract involving thousands of dollars. And workers have come to realize that no possible avenue of savings can be overlooked by prudent management.

Increasingly heavy workloads are assumed without the interminable discussion that used to accompany every effort to effect the operating changes made possible by modern machinery. There are other evidences, too, of a new spirit of cooperation in the production lines.

The average textile worker ordinarily pays little attention to economics, but he can understand the drains of southern competition and has a natural fear of weakened trade barriers.

At Hathaway, where cartoon posters keep the workers aware of what more foreign competition could mean, a union boss started a petition to let Congress know how his membership felt.

The textile industry of the South, it should be added, is making common cause with the North in bucking tariff cuts.

There's nothing new about the decline in New England textiles. The industry has been drying up since the twenties, when low wages, nonunionization and tax concessions began to lure cotton southward. Woolen and worsted followed, and as synthetics moved into the manufacturing picture and started to cut in on cotton goods production, the same thing happened.

Today, the same people turn out cotton and synthetics, and synthetic blends are appearing in woolen-worsted.

STATISTICS WILL STARTLE

But while the story is old, some of the statistics still are startling.

New England textiles once employed 400,000 men and women. Today they support less than half that number—approximately 171,000. About 20 percent are in the cotton-synthetic business and about half the woolen-worsted. The remainder, for the most part, has gone South to enjoy a wage differential of approximately 27 cents an hour.

The jobless in the textile centers are counted in the thousands.

In mid-January, according to Labor Department figures, there were more than 60,000 persons drawing unemployment compensation in the Lawrence, Providence, New Bedford, and Fall River areas. Nobody would guess how many other thousands had exhausted their compensation credits and no longer were part of the statistical array, and, of course, there are lesser textile communities in the region where idleness has hit.

PLANT ATTRITION BAD

Plant attrition has been correspondingly bad. The latest figures show 236 liquidations involving 92,000 employees since World War II boom days. This includes both closings and site transfers and is indicative of what was happening before war demands gave the industry a shot of oxygen.

There also have been some casualties in the South, for dry rot and competition play no favorites.

This is the cumulative picture that causes New England textile leaders to question the logic of encouraging more imports, particularly since at least part of the decline is due to foreign goods, with Japan getting a nice slice of the business.

Ironically, these foreign competitors are profiting by American ingenuity, for there already is a good market for American-made textile machinery reported in Japan, India, and Egypt.

TARIFF WORKS BOTH WAYS

Foreign countries which seek to build up their own textile industries are not backward either in applying tariff rates calculated to do just that. Where the United States has a rate of 10 to 25 percent on cotton-goods imports, depending on fineness, and an average rate of 22 percent, Pakistan imposes a 60-percent levy; India, 100; and South America, anywhere from 60 to 300.

Significantly, the New England textile decline has gone far toward exploding a pet theory of free traders—that men and women displaced in industrial shifts can be channeled into new lines of activity without too much trouble.

That just doesn't happen, according to a recently completed study by Dr. William H. Mierny, director of Northeastern University's Bureau of Business and Economic Research.

CASE HISTORY OF 1,700

Tracing the case history of 1,700 workers who lost out in 6 mill areas, Dr. Mierny learned that one-half still were unemployed more than a year after their textile jobs folded.

More than 35 percent found other textile work through plant turnover.

The so-called growth industries—electronics and apparel—took on only a few of the idle, and 64 percent of those in new employment were getting wages lower than the textile rate of about \$14.2 hourly.

AGE IS BIG BARRIER

The study demonstrated plainly that age is the great barrier to reemployment. Seventy percent of the jobless were over 45.

"Too old to work—too young for social security," says CIO's Brown, who lives daily with this problem.

"It is a saddening commentary when men and women literally wish away their lives, looking to the time when they are 65 and can qualify for old-age pensions. But that is what is happening."

That particular situation has gotten so bad that Rhode Island is attempting to correct it by legislation. Pending in the legislature there is a sort of fair employment practices bill to penalize employers who refuse to hire the overage workers.

Whether that move will get any place is questionable.

Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let go unnoticed the fine tribute paid by my colleagues, the Honorable EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of Brooklyn, and the Honorable FRANCES BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11 and January 13, 1955, to Max Abelman on his retirement as secretary to the president and director of public relations of the Brooklyn Jewish Hospital.

Inasmuch as Mr. Abelman is a particularly good friend of mine, I am placing in today's RECORD some letters from distinguished people with regard to these articles.

The letters follow:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,

Washington, February 5, 1955.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: This is just a note on the eve of our departure on our goodwill trip to Latin America to thank you for your letter of January 24.

It is a pleasure to send you under separate cover copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 11 and January 13 in which the tributes you received at the time of your retirement were inserted.

They certainly are well-deserved tributes, and I join with others in extending congratulations and continued good wishes.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

FARVUE FARM,

South Salem, N. Y., January 27, 1955.

DEAR MAX: I am so glad you had such a fine Republican Congresswoman as FRANCES BOLTON, make such fine remarks about you. I have never met her but from all I hear she is a truly unique woman—not merely wealthy but intensely anxious to make her wealth serve the highest ends.

We are both very well and trust that you and your wife are enjoying life.

I learned a lot about your career I never knew before. You have certainly come a long way and learned a lot and warmed many hearts.

Our heartiest regards to you my dear friend,

H. A. WALLACE.

McGILL UNIVERSITY,

Montreal, January 25, 1955.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Thank you very much for your letter of January 20 and for your kindness in sending me the relevant pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think that this is the first occasion on which I have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since I left the United States in 1939, but I certainly enjoyed reading all the rest of the extension of the remarks of Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

Best personal wishes to you, as always, from,

Yours cordially,

Cyril

F. CYRIL JAMES,

Principal and Vice Chancellor.

COMMANDANT, THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT,
New York, February 1, 1955.Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Thank you very much for sending me the clippings from the Brooklyn Eagle and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I read them with a great deal of pleasure, and you certainly are to be congratulated. Of course, the clippings, praiseworthy as they are, only tell the truth about your good work, but it is a great thing to have such good work recognized.

Please let me add my congratulations to those of your other friends.

With best wishes, believe me.

Very sincerely yours,

R. H. HILLENKOETTER,

Rear Admiral, United States Navy.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., October 1, 1954.

Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MAX: Cele joins me in wishing you and all your dear ones a very happy New Year.

Last night's tribute to you was a well merited one. It was indeed a memorable occasion and it will be long remembered by

everyone who had the privilege of attending it. The cross section of those fine people who were there is indicative of the esteem with which many hold you. I am sure that the authorities of the Jewish Hospital must have been impressed by this tribute paid to you. I am glad that the present leadership of the Jewish Hospital medical board saw fit to give you that dinner. I know of no one connected with the Jewish Hospital who had a similar tribute paid to them.

With best wishes for continued good health and happiness, I am, as ever,

Cordially yours,

IRVING J. SANDS, M. D.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1955.
Mr. MAX ABELMAN,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ABELMAN: Thank you for sending me the pages from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I have read with avid interest. Such a tribute, I know, is well deserved and the praise and admiration of such outstanding people is an attestation of the tremendous amount of work that you have done for the population of Brooklyn and particularly for the Jewish Hospital in that city.

With kindest regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

J. Q. OWSLEY,

Rear Admiral (MC), United States
Navy, Assistant Chief for Personnel and Professional Operations.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, must our livestock men be sacrificed on the free-trade block as they were under the low Tariff Act of 1913?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD the following statement of L. Blaine Liljenquist on behalf of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., before the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to H. R. 1, the trade-agreements extension bill:

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, my name is L. Blaine Liljenquist. I have been the Washington representative of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., since 1946. The association has several hundred member companies. Most of them are located in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific coast States. Our members are known as independent packers. They are engaged in slaughtering livestock. They process about 70 percent of the meat in the States in which they do business. Our president and general manager is Mr. E. F. Forbes, of San Francisco.

Meat packing is an essential service in the American economy. Our members are making use of the latest methods of doing business to increase their efficiency. Their constant goal is to provide better meat and meat products to the public at reduced cost. Livestock producers, consumers, and the Federal Government are the beneficiaries of the faithful efforts of the packers to do a better job.

Our members are progressive businessmen. They are also alert and responsible citizens. They are interested in world trade and want to see the maximum volume of export and import business that is consistent with the national welfare, and in the interest of world peace.

After several years of consideration to tariff problems, backed by their experience in world trade, the independent meat packers reach a much different conclusion than that expressed by the administration in H. R. 1. We believe the major provisions of this bill are unwarranted, improper, and against the best interests of the United States.

H. R. 1 as we view it, has three major purposes: First, it would extend the authority of the President to enter into new trade agreements with foreign countries for a 3-year period or, more precisely, from June 12, 1955, through June 30, 1958. Second, it would go far to deprive Congress of its authority and responsibility to regulate our foreign commerce by lodging this power in the hands of the executive branch. And third, it would give to the President the arbitrary power to slash back to 50 percent all tariffs that are over 50 percent of the value of the imported goods, and to cut all other tariffs by 15 percent over the next 3 years.

In the few minutes allotted to us today we will call to your attention our reasons for believing that each one of these objectives as defined in H. R. 1 are contrary to the best interests of the United States.

For several years the State Department, with the approval of the President, has sought to take control of the tariffmaking authority, which, under the Constitution of the United States, is the responsibility of the Congress. Industry and business depending on tariff protection does not, in general, have confidence in the State Department to administer tariffmaking responsibility for the following reasons: First, the State Department officials are not elected, but are appointed and are not responsive to the public. It is doubtful that few if any of these officials could even be fired due to the job protection they receive from the administration. Second, career employees in the Department of State tend to be over-nationally minded. Indeed, it is our observation that some of these officials appear to feel that any amount of suffering by American producers from import competition should be cheerfully borne if it contributes to the advancement of the international policies of the Department of State. As a result, the businessman usually thinks that tariff levels under domination of the State Department are decided on the basis of international politics rather than on economic considerations. Third, not only does the State Department seek to take the control of the tariffs away from Congress, but it is trying to turn these powers over to an international trade organization in which the United States will have but one vote. This is exceedingly dangerous. It is an important first step in losing some freedoms and rights which we have heretofore regarded as adequately protected by our Constitution.

Our members are not unmindful of the need for world cooperation, but we cannot subscribe to an international agency such as GATT that could bind the United States from using quotas to control imports or could prevent our Government from raising tariffs when foreign goods produced with cheap labor enter American markets in quantities large enough to put American producers out of business.

We believe the freedom of the American people is a priceless possession. This freedom has made us a strong nation, fully capable of protecting ourselves from those who would destroy us. But how can we safeguard our own liberty or prevent friendly nations from being overrun if we willingly

yield our freedom to international organizations such as GATT?

We feel it would be a mistake to further strengthen GATT. Indeed, we believe that for the benefit of this Nation and for the benefit of those people in other countries that love freedom, there should be a forthright abolishment of GATT as a tariffmaking organization. However, we would have no objection to GATT as an agency to study tariff matters as long as its authority is limited to gathering information and making recommendations.

The Constitution (art. 1, sec. 8) charges Congress with the sole authority to set tariffs. Congress delegates, but does not yield, some of that authority when it gives the United States Tariff Commission a share in tariff setting.

In the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, Congress delegated part of its authority to the President to change rates of duty within 50 percent of the current rate by entering into trade agreements with other countries. However, to show it did not delegate the power forever, Congress limited the President's right to enter into trade agreements to 3 years, but put no limitation on his power to proclaim duty modifications to carry out or to terminate agreements already entered into.

His authority to enter into new agreements has been extended for varying periods ever since, but never for more than 3 years at a time.

H. R. 1 is a broad authorization to the executive branch. If it is passed without modification, we may find that the State Department will center the tariffmaking authority in an international body. Many feel that H. R. 1 is a preratification of just such a move. By executive authority based on H. R. 1, we could wake up sometime to learn that we had granted our control over tariffs to an international organization.

It would be much safer and more practical to declare by law that the present tariffs shall be the prevailing tariffs of the United States. That they may be modified up or down by a showing of just cause for such action.

If this course were followed, other countries would know our tariff intentions. Uncertainty that now exists would be largely eliminated. American producers that must depend upon tariffs to remain in business should be assured that tariffs would not be lowered below the peril point. The escape clause, which has been little more than a mockery in recent years, should be used as intended by Congress.

In addition, we suggest that the recommendations of the United States Tariff Commission, as the fact-finding agency of the Congress, should be made mandatory upon the executive branch, and that the veto over the Tariff Commission should be exercised only by the Congress.

We think world conditions require a change in United States trade policy. Greater emphasis should be placed on preserving American wage levels and living standards against unfair competition from low-wage subsidized imports. This must be done not only to avoid the unemployment of many thousands of employees in this country, but also to maintain the productive capacity and worker skills essential to national defense.

The United States is already a low-tariff Nation. Approximately 58 percent of goods entering the United States are duty free. The United States American Tariff League, in a study of 1951 world trade, came up with the conclusion that 35 out of 43 leading trading countries had higher tariffs than the United States. This study reported that of the five leading trading countries (the United Kingdom, France, Canada, Germany, and the United States), the United States had the lowest average tariffs. The league

found that average United States tariffs were only 5.1 percent of the value of the imported goods.

In 1930 Congress established a tariff of 6 cents a pound on meat and 3 cents a pound on livestock. On October 30, 1947, tariff concessions on fresh and frozen beef and veal were granted through United States participation in GATT at the Geneva Conference. This concession, which became effective January 1, 1948, reduced the import duty on beef and veal, fresh, chilled, or frozen, from 6 cents to 3 cents, a reduction of 50 percent. Let me give you an example of the extreme harmfulness of this ill-advised action.

Prior to 1948, beef and veal imports from Canada had averaged less than half a million pounds a year. Up to that time we had received the surplus livestock production in Canada in the form of live animals that were slaughtered in American plants. When the concession became effective in 1948, beef and veal imports from Canada that year jumped to 71,634,243 pounds or an increase of 14,000 percent. In 1949 imports from Canada increased to 74,534,016 pounds.

Canadian meatpackers were quick to recognize that the reduction in the tariff made it possible for them, with their lower labor costs, lower taxes, and other economic advantages, to ship beef and veal to the United States and sell it at prices below the cost of production of American packers.

The injury suffered by our members in areas close to Canada, such as Seattle, was outlined in our petition for relief under the escape clause in March 1950. But the administration, intent in its drive to establish free trade, saw to it that we were given no relief.

Let me call to your attention the increase in imports of canned hams and other pork from Europe in 1954. Pork imports from Europe, according to official figures of the United States Department of Agriculture, reached a record total of 99,163,000 pounds last year, against 77,707,000 pounds in 1953. This is an increase of 28 percent.

The canned hams received from these countries were equivalent to the hams from about 5,500,000 hogs. Included in the totals were 19,717,000 pounds from Communist Poland. Although Poland can send meat products into the United States without restriction, Poland is not a market for American pork or other products, such as lard, hides, or tallow. There is reason to believe that Poland is using the dollars she receives from pork sales in the United States to purchase in dollar-hungry third countries strategic materials, which under current regulations are not permitted to be exported from the United States to areas behind the Iron Curtain.

Tariffs protecting the meat and livestock industries are already dangerously low. It would be a tragic mistake to authorize the President to reduce them further as a tool to trade for concessions from other countries.

Consider for a moment the cost of producing beef in the United States. A good cowhand, for instance, will cost the rancher as much as \$150 a month or more. In addition, the food consumed by the hired hand may cost the rancher as much as \$90 a month. Compare this to the Argentine cow-boy who receives the equivalent of about \$8 to \$10 a month in our money, and a bag of chili beans and some jerked beef to sustain his life.

Higher wages, higher taxes, and higher costs of doing business certainly justify the small tariffs which still exist on livestock and meat.

Again may I emphasize that we are looking for an expansion of world trade. It is quite possible that some tariffs now in effect could be reduced without serious jeopardy to the particular industry concerned, but such reductions should be made only after careful

examination of economic facts and not by the arbitrary action that could result through the authority of H. R. 1 in its present form.

All of us have a common objective in keeping America strong and in securing the peace. Just as surely we must be concerned with import competition that derives its advantages from lower wages than those our own producers pay. As we all know, competing goods are being produced in many parts of the world with labor receiving much less than half the rates being paid in the United States. Obviously tariffs or quotas are the only means of equalizing situations of this kind.

One of the reasons for establishing minimum wage laws in this country was to prevent low-wage employers from gaining a competitive advantage over those who pay higher wages. The same principle should apply internationally by means of the tariff. American producers of cotton, wheat, peanuts, and sugar are protected by import quotas. Domestic prices for these commodities would tumble drastically if this protection were removed. In fairness to all American producers and workers tariffs or quotas will continue to be needed until wages and living standards in other countries rise to levels more nearly in line with our own.

We are asking that the Congress accept the simple fact that it is not fair for our Government to place cost-raising burdens upon our producers on the one hand, no matter how desirable the objective, and on the other to allow them to be put out of business by foreign goods that derive their advantage through wages that are only a fraction of those in the United States.

In conclusion may I say that H. R. 1 in its present form would give the President of the United States more power than a good man should want, and more than a bad man should have. It would give him the power to destroy American industries.

The Unlimited Importation of Foreign Residual Oil Is Ruining the Jobs of American Coal Miners and Railroaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the adverse effect on the coal and railroad industries by the unlimited importation of foreign residual oil is effectively portrayed in the following statement delivered by J. M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., before the House Ways and Means Committee, January 31, 1955, in connection with the so-called Cooper bill, H. R. 1, providing for the extension of reciprocal trade agreements:

STATEMENT OF J. M. SYMES, PRESIDENT, THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD CO., BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN CONNECTION WITH H. R. 1, JANUARY 31, 1955

My name is James M. Symes. I am president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; also a director of the company. I have had 39 years experience in the railway industry. Witnesses for the coal industry have explained to you the effect of the unrestricted importation of residual fuel oil upon that industry.

It is my purpose to inform you of the effect of that importation upon the large coal-carrying railroads in this country.

Coal has been the most important item of traffic in the development of these enormous transportation systems. Their whole economy has been built around the coal business which has furnished the major economic justification for such roads as the Pennsylvania, New York Central, Baltimore & Ohio, Chesapeake & Ohio, Norfolk & Western, Louisville & Nashville, and many others.

As an example, in 1953—the last full year for which figures are available—bituminous coal traffic provided 59.9 percent of the carload freight revenue of the Norfolk & Western Railroad; 51.8 percent for the Chesapeake & Ohio; 26.5 percent for the Louisville & Nashville; 25.6 percent for the Baltimore & Ohio; 19.3 percent for the New York Central; and 18.5 percent for the Pennsylvania. In 1953 the railroad industry consumed 23 million tons of coal and transported an additional 347 million tons. For all class I railroads, coal provided 13.7 percent of their entire carload freight revenue—approximately \$1,277,060,000. No other commodity approached this.

If the coal business were taken away from these carriers their survival as free enterprises would be seriously jeopardized if not impossible. The catastrophic economic effect upon this country of any governmental policy producing such a result, in whole or substantial part, is obvious.

The importation of large quantities of this fuel from foreign countries, which displaces our own coal production, is a very serious blow to the railroad industry—and more particularly to those carriers serving eastern seaboard territory. The direct effect of this importation of residual-fuel oil upon the railroad industry may be illustrated by the loss in freight revenue caused thereby, the resultant decline in railroad employment and the decreased need for rail facilities for handling coal, with consequent eventual abandonment and retirement of facilities and equipment.

According to the records of the United States Bureau of Census practically all residual oil that is imported into the United States moves through Atlantic coast ports.

In 1953, 136 million barrels were imported. On the basis of equivalent British thermal units, it takes 4.167 barrels of average residual fuel oil to equal 1 net ton of average bituminous coal. Thus, the 136 million barrels of residual oil which were imported in 1953 were the equivalent of 33 million tons of bituminous coal which the railroads carrying eastbound coal could have transported.

Sales of residual oil in the northeast coastal States alone have increased from 120 million barrels in 1939 to 245 million barrels in 1953 or an increase of 125 million barrels. During this same period, imports in this 1 area increased from 14 million barrels to 123 million—an increase of 109 million. Thus 87 percent of the total increase in sales of residual oil in this natural market area for coal was the result of this flood of foreign residual oil.

The average rail freight revenue on coal moving from production areas to the Atlantic seaboard where import residual fuel oil is consumed is about \$4 per net ton. The importation of residual fuel oil during 1953 represents almost \$131 million of revenue which could have accrued to our large coal carrying railroads if coal had been used.

This tremendous loss of revenue does not tell the whole story. Such loss of coal traffic greatly reduces railway wage payments. With about 50 percent of 1953 gross revenues going to labor, averaging \$4,347 per employee, this coal traffic loss represents about \$66 million in wages, the equivalent of approximately 15,000 full-time jobs for American railroad men throughout that year.

The effect on the Pennsylvania Railroad of this loss of business is substantial. About 30 percent of the eastbound domestic bituminous coal traffic is normally handled by the Pennsylvania. It would thus have carried about 10 million tons of the coal displaced by import residual fuel oil. With average revenue to the Pennsylvania for eastbound bituminous coal of \$3.25 per net ton, its gross revenue was reduced \$32½ million or almost double the entire net income earned by this one railroad last year. This loss of revenue represents an equivalent of 4100 full-time jobs. The loss of railroad employment is particularly serious in those communities which rely primarily upon railroad work to support the populace.

These figures represent only the year 1953. As the coal industry witnesses have stated, there has been a tremendous increase in the importation of residual fuel oil since 1945. In that year less than 46 million barrels were imported. This increased steadily to 136 million barrels in 1953. In the 8-year period, 731 million barrels were imported, equivalent to 175 million tons of coal. This represents a \$700 million loss in gross rail revenue, and a decrease in wage payments to railroad employees of \$350 million.

Certainly, the use of this country's resources should be preserved and promoted—particularly where there is an abundance, which is the situation with both coal and rail transportation. Both industries are operating substantially below capacity. That means higher unit costs which must be passed along to the coal consumer and, through him, to his customer. With over 50 percent of coal production going to the steel mills and utilities, these added costs reach practically every person in the country.

Neither industry can be expected to own and maintain surplus facilities to protect emergency conditions. The railroad industry simply cannot afford to hold and maintain coal carrying cars, locomotives, and other railroad facilities to meet the possible transportation requirements of some future emergency.

To illustrate this situation—during the winter of 1954, the railroads had stored, in serviceable condition, an average of 36,600 coal cars. These cars were lying on side tracks, not being used. At today's cost this represents an idle investment of some \$220 million. Many locomotives were in the same category. The importation of residual oil was responsible for a large part of this equipment being idle. Excess equipment logically will be scrapped as it becomes due for repair, reducing total ownership to actual normal requirements.

It is estimated that the railroads as a whole have a net investment of \$2,244,000,000 in facilities and equipment for the handling of coal traffic, or about \$6.25 per ton of coal originated in 1953. The Pennsylvania Railroad alone has a net investment of \$330 million in equipment and facilities for handling coal.

According to figures furnished by the National Coal Association, approximately two-thirds of all residual fuel oil consumed in this country competes with coal. In other words, about 90 million tons of annual coal production are displaced by oil. Of this tonnage, the equivalent (in residual oil) of about 33 million tons of coal came from overseas in 1953.

What would happen in the event of a national emergency?

Truly, the railroads are our first line of defense when it comes to carrying the burden of wartime transportation. Basically, this is because only the railroads have possessed the elasticity and reserve capacity necessary to take up the tremendous increase in transportation requirements generated by a world war. In addition, the railroads can handle traffic with less strategic materials and less manpower than other forms of

transportation. According to reports by the class 1 motor carriers to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the average load handled by such carriers on the highway is just under 9 tons. It takes one man to handle that. On the other hand, the average freight train load, in 1953, was 1,301 tons. It takes only a 5-man crew to handle that—or 260 tons per man.

In producing a revenue ton-mile of transportation, the railroads use far less fuel than their competitors—with 1 gallon of diesel fuel the railroads produce 215 revenue ton-miles of transportation, while the trucks produce only 64. Most highway transport uses gasoline—a much more critical fuel in a national emergency than diesel fuel oil. Finally, in the heavy traffic eastern territory, the Pennsylvania Railroad depends on electricity, produced by waterpower or the burning of bituminous coal, for power.

While just as vulnerable to enemy action through air bombing, guided missile, or sabotage, the railroads are peculiarly adaptable to repairing such damage. Experience during World War II, on both sides, proved this.

On the other hand, when the locks and dams which make inland waterways possible are blown up or severely damaged, it takes a very considerable time to restore them to service. Heavy highway transportation requires good hard surfaced roads. A damaged railroad can be restored to service much faster than either an inland waterway or a highway.

A national wartime emergency would certainly call for a tremendous increase in power output while oil imports would cease or be substantially reduced. Coal would have to replace immediately not only the foreign residual—equivalent to 33 million tons of coal—but also meet the major part of the energy demands now supplied by imported crude and its products. The demand for refined oils and gasoline would increase so greatly that it would necessitate cracking down nearly all the remaining domestic residual oil, and coal would have to fuel most of this 90-million-ton market. This is 1,520,000 carloads requiring 63,000 cars to move within 1 calendar year, based upon the average turnaround time of freight cars. Can we safely assume that a depressed coal industry and the railroads could immediately expand sufficiently to provide and handle this added tonnage plus the increased coal that a war economy would require?

Even though the coal companies could produce the coal the railroads would not be in a position to transport it, because of lack of equipment, facilities, and trained employees to do so.

As stated above, the railroad industry cannot afford to maintain its great investment in facilities for carrying and handling coal unless there is current use for them—in today's economy they cannot be maintained for standby emergency service.

Residual fuel oil, unless further refined, can properly be called a byproduct of the refining process. Its price has historically fluctuated widely based on available supplies and competitive fuel prices. As a result, even if it were economically possible, any downward revision in the delivered price of coal would no doubt be met by corresponding reduction in the fuel-oil prices when such oil is in surplus.

Statements have been made as to the inability to keep the cost of coal down so that it can meet competition from other fuels. The coal industry has repeatedly explained the various methods it has adopted to reduce costs. The railroads are also making a large contribution to this cause. Rail freight charges on coal have been held down, in an effort to help the coal industry solve its marketing problems against competing fuels. Average railroad revenue per ton on commodities other than bituminous coal

has increased 85 percent since 1939, against only 49 percent on bituminous coal. Yet average prices for railroad materials and supplies have gone up 135 percent, and average hourly railroad wages 155 percent. Further comparisons emphasize this point—such as the increase since 1939 in wholesale commodity prices of 120 percent; average hourly earnings of coal miners—159 percent; and the average price of bituminous coal at the mines—up 167 percent.

The unlimited importation of residual fuel oil—a byproduct of foreign oil refining—depriving our own transport system of handling very sorely needed coal traffic, is diametrically opposed to the declared national transportation policy as announced by Congress in 1940, particularly insofar as it relates to national defense.

In this connection it is highly significant to note that certain European countries which are now producing substantial quantities of refined oil products are exporting the residual oil to this country. Newspaper articles have indicated that those countries have imposed a heavy tax on the use of that residual oil at home in order to protect their own coal industry. An article by J. H. Carmichael, a recognized and impartial authority, in the New York Times of July 5, 1953, so stated.

To permit foreign countries to ship unlimited quantities of residual oil to this country and dispose of it at dump prices to the serious detriment of the American coal and railroad industries, at the same time that those foreign countries effectively prohibit the domestic consumption of that oil in order to protect their own industries, cannot possibly be justified on any free trade or other basis.

We submit that no matter what general foreign trade policy Congress may adopt, this situation is one which demands specific treatment in order that the coal and railroad industries may not be further weakened by a dumping of this foreign byproduct with which they cannot possibly compete and which will inevitably cause them to be less able to supply the energy and transportation needed in a national emergency.

What Was It Like?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert an excellent descriptive article written by Mr. Harlan Trott, of the Christian Science Monitor, concerning the flight from Los Angeles, Calif., northward over the polar regions to Europe.

Mr. Trott has captured the true feel of polar flight and recalls the pioneers in polar travel. His article expresses the new age of polar travel so that the reader imagines that he is actually along on the trip.

And, as one reads, he is struck with a thought as chilling as the polar regions Mr. Trott describes. These same airways over the polar ice traveled so swiftly and so safely by peaceable passenger stratoliners are open to the angry whine of military bombers intent on invading our boundaries across the icecaps and into the very heart of our Nation.

Because this article presents this fact so clearly as well as for its splendid descriptive nature, I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

WHAT WAS IT LIKE?

(By Harlan Trott)

GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.—From Copenhagen to Zurich, from Rome to Paris, the inaugural transpolar flight from Los Angeles to Europe has excited lively interest.

Nearly everyone I have met from the Oberburgomeister of Frankfurt to the night porter here at the Regina, the little hotel where I am stopping close by the Pone de Mont Blanc on the magnificent lake front at Geneva, have asked: "What was it like to fly over the North Pole?"

Invariably, too, they seem a little disappointed when told that flying across the Arctic region is just like flying from Stockholm to London.

"Well, what did you see?" they persist, and then they are in for it. Here is one pioneer polar router who will be reliving this epic Arctic journey for some time.

To say that the inaugural flight over this great white trade route was uneventful is the best kind of praise for the Scandinavian Airlines System whose direct Arctic service opens a new era in air travel that makes the peoples of the Pacific west and the whole of Europe overnight neighbors.

The winged vikings who man SAS's big white Douglas airliners only confirm the theory of the Friendly Arctic propounded by explorer Vilhjalmur Stefansson, who contended that "adventures" were a sign of inefficiency. His uneventful journeys of the sledge-dog era projected into Arctic travel the philosophy that there is nothing so spectacular as a safe and normal "arrival."

That is the star these SAS pilots steer by in these twice-weekly both-way flights between California and Europe.

Flying at 20,000 feet over the white wilderness that stretches from the Canadian coast of Hudson Bay to Denmark Strait on the east coast of Greenland, we did not feel a single dip, much less a jolt such as air travelers sometimes feel in the air turbulence of lower altitudes and lower latitudes. We literally flew above the weather. And we made our touchdowns at Winnipeg, Sondre Stromfjord, and Copenhagen right on time. Sondre Stromfjord is the landing field at Bluie West 8 about halfway up the Greenland side of Davis Strait.

I still cannot open my passport without a thrill from the very first entry stamped on my visas: "Transit Gronland 16 November 1954"—signifying the first time, I am told, that travelers have passed through customs north of the Arctic Circle on a regular polar trade route.

In the brief span of daylight beyond 67 north, we saw contrasting scenes of stark and silent grandeur in the white desolation around us. And once when the sun was near its low southerly zenith—what navigators call noon at the ship—our great winged shadow sped over a fluffy white ocean of clouds framed within an east-racing rainbow circle. The passengers all peered down speechless, but no one seemed to know what cast this rainbow diadem around our east-going shadow. One may only paraphrase the poet Masfield, perhaps at such a moment, for—

"I cannot tell its wonder nor make known Magic that once thrilled me to the bone."

From time to time, the captain's voice was heard over the cabin loudspeaker pointing down to historic waymarks along our polar pathway. "We are approaching the southern end of Baffin Island. It was here that Roald Amundsen entered the pack ice in his search for the Northwest Passage." The stout Nordic accents had an authentic

ring. Naturally the Scandinavians are proud of their polar heritage and the part Nordic navigators have played in helping to unlock the Arctic's silent centuries.

It was midafternoon. Already the Arctic night was closing in around us as we gazed down upon the ice-strewn gray water. At this time 51 years before, the Gjo was snuggled down in winter quarters, Amundsen's little company was away from the ship with their sled dogs and rifles laying in a store of walrus meat to last them through the 6 months' Arctic night.

What would that hawk-beaked old viking have said to see us blazing this new north-west air passage dressed in business clothes, sitting down to the captain's dinner of caviar and roast wood grouse, cruising at a comfortable 300 miles an hour across the vast and frozen stillness?

What was it like to fly the polar route? People are asking. I wish I were a poet with a poet's art of brevity.

How else can one impart the spell of the Arctic—when reluctant-going twilights turn the Greenland glaciers into a tumbled world of crimson-tinted crystal, of Arctic midnights when the Great Dipper wheels low on the polar snowline just an arm's length out of reach, and the luminous, lemon-hued fingers of the aurora borealis dart and flash across the northern night? Or say what it was really like to make this epic journey which by its uneventful ease only proves why these 20th-century vikings who fly the new polar trade route are the masters of the Arctic air?

Increase in Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to and intend to vote against H. R. 3828, which is scheduled to come before the House of Representatives this week. This bill in its present form would provide for a \$10,000 increase in the annual salary of the Members of Congress. This is a 66 2/3 percent increase. Even if it is amended to provide for an annual salary of \$22,500 instead of the \$25,000 figure, which it now provides, this would still be an increase of \$7,500, or 50 percent over the present salary of \$15,000. It seems to me highly inappropriate that a new Member of Congress such as myself, having been here less than 2 months, should vote for a pay increase of this magnitude.

There are so many Federal employees, postal workers, industrial employees, and farm workers in my district who would be delighted just to receive a 10-percent increase, or in some cases even a lesser increase, in their pay, that I think I would not properly be representing them if I voted for an increase of congressional salaries of so much greater proportion.

The Gallup poll shows that approximately two-thirds of the people of the United States are opposed to an increase of \$10,000 per year in congressional salaries. For these reasons, I feel that I must oppose and vote against this measure.

The summary of the Gallup poll, as reported in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, February 6, 1955, is as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—SIXTY-THREE PERCENT GRUDGE CONGRESS PAY RISE

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

As Congress plans to ease through a pay raise for its own Members and Federal judges, a survey by the Institute finds that the people back home still tend to resist the idea of hiking congressional pay.

Sentiment today is more than 2-to-1 against it.

However, the Nation's taxpayers are slightly more receptive to a \$10,000 pay boost than they were a year ago.

Typical voters across the country were asked:

At present, United States Congressmen receive \$15,000 a year in salary and expenses. Would you approve or disapprove of raising this to \$25,000?

The vote today and 1 year ago:

	Today	1954
	Percent	Percent
Approve.....	26	22
Disapprove.....	63	68
No opinion.....	11	10

Today's survey finds wide differences of opinion by degree of education and by occupation.

A considerably larger number of persons who have attended college are sympathetic to a pay hike than are those whose schooling was limited, as the following table shows:

	College	High school	Grade school
	Percent	Percent	Percent
Approve.....	42	25	14
Disapprove.....	52	62	75
No opinion.....	6	13	11

Voters in all parties hold about the same attitude toward the subject. Republicans and Democrats, as well as persons who regard themselves as independents politically voted more than 2 to 1 against the boost.

The main opposition comes from farmers and workers in the skilled, unskilled, and semiskilled groups, the survey finds. Considerably less opposition is found among white-collar workers and people in the business and professional classes.

The problem for congressional leaders is essentially one of public relations. Public support for salary jumps perhaps would follow if they were to explain the situation and give convincing reasons to those segments of the population where the present \$15,000 seems like a bountiful sum.

Each voter was asked to give his reasons for voting in favor of the proposal or against it.

Major reasons cited by those who approve of the pay boost: More money will attract a better type of Congressmen; the raise is needed to cover expenses of living in Washington, and the responsibilities and duties of the job today are worth more.

Voters who expressed disapproval listed these principal reasons: Present salary is adequate, a pay boost means more taxes, and the proposed pay boost is too great.

In 1945, when President Truman proposed a plan for increasing congressional salaries from \$10,000 a year to \$15,000 after wartime wage ceilings were removed, the public vetoed the idea with 50 percent disapproving, 31 percent approving, and 19 percent expressing no opinion.

The British public likewise is cool to the idea of giving a raise to the hard-working civil servant.

Last year the affiliated British Gallup poll found 50 percent disapproving an increase of 500 pounds (\$1,400) in the salary of members of Parliament, 25 percent approving, and 16 percent expressing no opinion.

Members of Congress now receive \$12,500 base pay, plus a nontaxable \$2,500 expense allowance. An income-tax deduction of \$3,000 is permitted to cover the cost of living in Washington.

Our Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial that appeared prior to Veterans' Day, November 11, 1954, in the columns of the Lawrence Sunday Sun, Lawrence, Mass.:

THEY CARRY THE TORCH

Long years ago, in the era of World War I, a poet named John McCrae produced a masterpiece in verse which carried an inspiring message. John McCrae passed away in 1918. Year after year, the import and impact of his metered gospel of patriotism have grown more pronounced, and it strikes us with full force today as we look ahead to the observance of Veterans' Day on November 11.

Wrote he of the dead in Flanders Fields:

"We are the dead.

Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow.

To you from falling hands we throw the torch.

Be yours to hold it high.

If ye break faith with those who die, we shall not sleep."

Those who have fallen in battle to protect our Nation still fight on. They fight on in the inspiration they have given us by their sacrifice. From their falling hands they have passed us the torch. Too many of us have refused to accept it; or having taken it, have buried its light in the vacuum of carelessness, in the dark cowardice of refusal to accept responsibility, in the cavern of infidelity.

Those who did not die on the battlefield we know today as the veterans. It is they who have accepted the torch and have held it high so that all of us might be inspired by the light of their buddies whose lifeblood has been spilled over all of the world's continents.

It is the veterans who raise their voice loudest in their united insistence that we must preserve the heritages which have been bequeathed to us by those who never came back, or who, having come home, arrived in the dignity of death in a flag-draped casket.

It is the veterans who fight the cause of the widows of these heroes, who stand between distress and the children of these who did not come home.

It is the veterans who insist with unrelenting vigor that the hasty promises of wartime be kept, and that those who by the grace of God did not pay with their lives for their devotion to duty be considered first in the distribution of the bountiful good things of our society to which they are justly entitled.

It is the veterans who cry out against the disarming plights of the pacifist and demand that our Nation be kept strong as the best guaranty of safety in a brutal world.

We owe our veterans more than we can estimate. About all, we owe them the sanctity and the sovereignty of our land. For us, they kept freedom intact. And freedom to us is everything.

The veterans are the reincarnated spirit of those heroes who people the graves which are marked by thousands upon thousands of crosses in lands across the wide seas.

The veterans are the voice of those people. They are carrying on the work which those who perished started to do and fell in the gallantry of their effort. Now they lie in the shadow of "the crosses, row on row, that mark our place."

First, it was the veterans of World War I who took up the torch. To their warnings that we must remain strong, a deaf ear was turned, and we found ourselves pitched into World War II almost unprepared. After the second global conflict, millions more of veterans lent their strength to the task of holding the light high and keeping faith with those who died in both wars. Then came Korea, bitter casualty lists, and millions more of veterans.

Although few of us stop to realize it, the ranks of the men who fought in 1917-18 are thinning rapidly. But they, with those who returned from World War II and Korea, will march again on November 11, to remind us that we still have a great mission to carry out—to protect our Nation by remaining strong, and to heed forever the warning that "if ye break faith with those who die, we shall not sleep."

If there are public exercises in your home community next Thursday in observance of Veterans' Day, show these men who once bore arms in your cause that you have not forgotten what they did and what they are doing. They do it for you the year around. Do something for them on this one day.

Lincoln and Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, February 12, our Nation observed the anniversary of the birth of two great men—Abraham Lincoln, one of our greatest presidents, and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, hero of the Revolutionary War.

The names of these two men shall always remain engraved in the hearts of lovers of liberty and democracy. Both men have fought courageously, in their own ways and in their own times, for the liberty of man and for each nation's right to self-determination. Their nobility of character, devotion to principle, and love of justice shall continue to inspire men of all ages, creeds, and nationalities.

The world is reminded by patriots like Kosciusko—who fought for the independence of the United States and of his native Poland—that the struggle for liberty is endless and that ours is not the only generation that has fought for it and sacrificed in its name. It seems that each period in history has its chal-

lenges, its own dictators, and its own despot.

This should not discourage us or lead us to despair. Instead, we should draw courage and inspiration from the example of valiant men like Kosciusko, who defied overwhelming odds and spared no sacrifice where principles in which they believed were involved. Our task, as great as it is, is no more difficult than theirs.

Let us, therefore, rededicate ourselves to the unfinished task to which they devoted their lives.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting the following statement in the RECORD:

My name is John G. Lerch, of the firm of Lamb & Lerch, 25 Broadway, New York City. I am an attorney specializing in the practice of customs law.

I am appearing today in opposition to enactment of H. R. 1, just as I did in opposition to the initial Trade Agreements Act of 1934, and all recurring extensions of that law.

Today I am representing the following domestic interests:

American Manufacturers of Thermostatic Containers.

The Candle Manufacturers Association.

Collapsible Tube Manufacturers Association.

The Industrial Wire Cloth Institute.

The National Building Granite Quarries Association.

The Rubber footwear division of the Rubber Manufacturers Association.

The Toy Manufacturers of the United States of America, Inc.

The Twisted Jute Packing and "Oakum" Institute.

United States Potters Association.

The American Manufacturers of Toy Balloons.

When, in 1934 the first Trade Agreements Act was introduced, I, along with the Honorable James M. Beck, former Solicitor General of the United States, but at that time a Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania, urged the Ways and Means Committee to give careful consideration to its constitutionality. On May 1, 1953, at a hearing on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, I was granted permission to incorporate as part of my remarks a speech the Honorable James M. Beck made on the floor of the House in opposition to the enactment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. This appears on page 482 in the record of hearings on the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953. I have studied the reports of the Ways and Means Committee on the original bill of 1934, and each successive extension of that act, and I find no intimation that consideration has ever been given to the constitutional phase of the legislation. As evidence of the fact that the sponsors of the original bill had doubts about its constitutionality, however, it is a matter of record that they suspended the operation of section 516 (b) and section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, on

any article reduced under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 gave American producers of competitive merchandise the right to litigate in our customs courts the proper classification of imported merchandise, together with its constitutionality. It was not until 1951, when extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was in doubt, that Congress grudgingly restored this privilege to American manufacturers (sec. 9 (a), act of 1951). Previous extensions of trade agreements acts have attempted to placate domestic producers for the loss of protection by providing for peril points, escape clauses, etc., but now H. R. 1 goes far beyond any previous act in delegating power that has been attempted in the past 2 decades.

It might interest you to know that a client of mine, Star-Kist Foods, Inc., Terminal Island, Calif., is litigating this question of the constitutionality of the Trade Agreements Act, and we are now in the process of unwinding the redtape surrounding such an action. It is hoped that we soon will be in the United States Customs Court with this case, where it will be litigated.

In *Hampton & Co. v. United States* (276 U. S. 394), the United States Supreme Court held that section 336 (the flexible-tariff provisions) of the Tariff Act of 1932 was constitutional because it erected a yardstick to govern the Tariff Commission and the President, and was based upon an investigation of comparative costs. Nothing like that has governed the negotiators of agreements with any foreign nation under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act. Reductions have been granted on items which the treaty country had never produced, and never could produce the product, yet wholly regardless of what comparative costs in any foreign nation might have been, those reductions were made effective to foreign nations, in many of which the item in question was being produced at a very low labor cost. (See Japanese imports with respect to the Icelandic treaty reduction on tunafish.)

Last year, when extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was before Congress, we were told that the administration had only one more treaty to negotiate, a trade agreement with Japan, and that the administration would accept a 1-year extension of the act in order to perfect that one treaty. Now the administration comes up with a request for a 3-year extension, with arbitrary powers to further reduce tariff rates to foreign nations, regardless of comparative costs of production here and anywhere abroad.

This bill sets as the maximum protection to be afforded any industry a rate of 50 percent ad valorem. In the exercise of its jurisdiction, under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the United States Tariff Commission has made reports of comparative cost investigations. Some of these have shown that a rate far in excess of 50 percent was necessary to equalize the cost of production abroad and here.

Congress in the past has recognized the fact that in some instances no rate expressed in terms of percentage was adequate to protect a given industry, and in such instances has legislated quotas and even imposed embargoes. Wherein is the charm of the 50 percent rate proposed in H. R. 1? Is it to serve notice on American industries that if they cannot operate with a maximum duty of 50 percent, their domestic markets will be turned over to their foreign low-labor-cost competitors? The criteria in H. R. 1 for reducing a rate to 50 percent is the fact that there are no imports, or that the imports are negligible. Could it not be that imports are negligible because American industry is operating so close to cost that it makes importing unprofitable with the existing rate of duty? It could well be that

a cut to 50 percent would throw some American industries into the red, or drive them completely out of business.

With the enactment of the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, Congress suspended operation of sections 336 and 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 as to any rate negotiated under a trade agreement.

In 1951 in an act extending the operation of the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, Congress restored the provisions of 516 (b). The provisions of section 336 are still inoperative as to any rate adjusted under the Trade Agreement Act.

In the President's message on the state of the Union, he intimated that our expansion of foreign trade was to be accomplished without injury to our domestic industries. Certainly, if foreign made merchandise can be sold in this market at less than the cost of production of its American competitive product, industry has to be injured.

It was against this kind of competition that section 336 operated.

If the administration really intends to administer the Trade Agreement Act so that it will not endanger domestic industries, a very simple means of insuring this would be to reinstate the operation of the provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Many of the industries which I represent have spent millions of dollars on research and the equipment of their plants with the most modern and efficient machinery, yet the proponents of H. R. 1 would have us believe that American industry is operating in the horse and buggy era, and that if American industries cannot increase their productivity to a point where they can compete with cheap foreign labor, they should shift into other fields of endeavor. Does the administration propose that if an American industry cannot operate with a 50 percent tariff, it should junk its equipment and years of know-how and investment, and start over in some other field of activity? What fields? The chosen fields of some of those foremost American industries which are frequently spoken of as prospering in international markets? It is true that some of our foremost American industries do thrive in international markets, but that may not altogether be so because of efficiency in operation, as it is to the fact that some members of those foremost industries hold American-owned patents which afford them protection from any competition the world around. That, it would appear might apply to the automotive, typewriter, washing machine and business machine industries. Few of these industries need tariff protection; our Government gives them a monopoly through their patents, and by that means protects them from foreign competition.

Furthermore, the administration now proposes to subsidize the establishment of foreign low-labor-cost plants by United States capitalists through giving them a reduction of 14 percent in their taxes on profits derived from such plants. If that is done, how long will it be before many small United States producers will find themselves competing with their own countrymen who are producing abroad, at low labor costs, and an income-tax subsidy of 14 percent; products which they are able to ship back into the United States under the mere token rates of duty proposed in H. R. 1? Why, under such conditions, would any United States manufacturer, who has the capital with which to establish a plant abroad, continue to operate his plant, and employ high-cost labor in this country?

The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1954, approved July 1, 1954, section 2, reads: "Sec. 2. No action shall be taken pursuant to such section 350 to decrease the duty on any article if the President finds that such reduction would threaten domestic production needed for projected national defense requirements."

It will be seen that under this provision it leaves with the President the obligation to find that a reduction would threaten domestic production and national defense requirements. This has been construed to mean that only the President may make such a finding.

This would seem to be one of the facts inherent to a finding by the Tariff Commission under the escape clause provision of existing law, which would place the jurisdiction within the Tariff Commission, to make a factual finding in this respect and to receive evidence leading to such a finding.

As this provision is now administered, it permits of an arbitrary finding on the part of the defense administration, without a factual finding, or an opportunity on the part of domestic industries to offer testimony as to defense necessities.

Certainly, the Congress does not intend to abolish an industry necessary to national defense. To insure this, it should include in H. R. 1 a provision requiring the United States Tariff Commission to make a finding in its recommendation to the President upon this fact.

The administration has repeatedly urged privately sponsored research into the production and consumption of many of our domestically produced materials and articles of commerce. H. R. 1, I feel, would have the effect, intentionally or otherwise, of reversing that policy, as it bids fair to turn over to foreign producers a very material share of the United States market to the marked detriment of American industry and labor.

To digress for a moment from the foregoing line of thought, it is difficult to understand why the 84th Congress would be willing to go to the extremes of H. R. 1 to placate GATT, when prior sessions of Congress have repeatedly refused to ratify GATT in their trade-agreement extensions.

My closing observation is that our present United States economy is geared to mass production and increasing consumption. If this bill is enacted into law, and the contemplated reductions are put into effect, what is to become of those domestic industries with factories in towns of 50,000 population or less, where that is the only source of steady employment in those towns? Are the displaced workers to be subsidized or pensioned by our Government? If that is contemplated, with a consequent shrinkage in tax receipts, from what source will the income with which we accomplish that objective be obtained? My clients and I feel that if this bill is enacted into law, and the contemplated reductions are made, it will have a grave effect upon our economy. For this, and the other reasons I have given here, we earnestly urge that H. R. 1 be not enacted into law.

Forward With Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 30, I turned on my radio and heard a sermon given by Rabbi Ariel L. Goldberg, of Richmond, Va., which he called Forward With Faith.

I was so stirred by this sermon that I wrote to Rabbi Goldberg and asked that he send me a copy of it. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this sermon, and I commend it to the Members of this body:

FORWARD WITH FAITH

(Based on Exodus 14: 8-15)

My friends, I am delighted to be in Washington with my good friend and colleague, Dr. Norman Gerstenfeld, who has given me the opportunity to speak in his pulpit and to share in this radio program. I am going to speak to you this morning on a subject that expresses deep confidence and bright optimism. I call it Forward With Faith, and I base it upon two things: First, a verse in the book of Exodus, when the people of Israel were stopped in their journey to freedom by the Red Sea. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Wherefore criest thou unto me? Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward;" secondly, the stirring conviction expressed by the poet Bernard Clausen in these never-to-be-forgotten words:

"Lord, I believe in man:

In his strength thru the terrible struggle
Out of the darkness which once engulfed him;

In his patience to try again and again to rise
When the forces of Nature seemed to overpower him;

In his yearning for the better
Which has led him toward kindness and peace.

"Lord, I believe in man:

In the tear-stained courage with which he now seeks

To maintain his honor and his dreams in these black days;

In the traces of selfless sacrifices with which he builds,

Out of the wreckage of his day, a better tomorrow;

In that consecration to the destiny of his children

Which will be content with nothing less
Than a new world for them.

Lord, I believe in man."

Understood correctly, the Biblical verse is an exhortation to move forward courageously into the unknown and the untold. The hour of deliverance had come to the children of Israel, just as it came a few years ago to England, to France, to the allied nations. Our ancestors were celebrating an original V Day. Their hearts were filled with gratitude. Where are the words that can describe the mood of these people—harried, hounded, oppressed—at just the thrilling moment when the chains that bind them are broken and the loving light of liberty is reflected in their faces?

But, hark. There is a distant rumble, a sound still feeble, but ominous. It is coming nearer. Suddenly, someone points to what appears to be a cloud of dust way back on the road. "Look," he cries, and every eye turns toward the new danger. No one has to be told what is happening. They know that their lives are again in jeopardy. The tramp, tramp, tramp, of marching feet draws nearer and nearer. It is their old master, the tyrant Pharaoh, and his army in hot pursuit after them. What are they to do? Where can they turn? Before them are the cold waters of the Red Sea. Behind them are the trained charioteers, the husky, brutal soldiers of Egypt.

Here is the classic example of the old adage, "between the devil and the deep blue sea." All seems lost, and the people in typical manner, acting like frustrated mobs have acted throughout the centuries, berate their leader. They heap scorn and invective upon Moses. They cry out against him. He urges them to keep quiet. He counsels silence. And then it occurs—the unpredictable, the unforeseen, the unreal, the miracle. The Red Sea opens, and the children of Israel are saved.

This is the story. It has been heard and read by millions. The vast majority of people accept it literally. They like the way it ends, just like they enjoy the "and they lived

happily ever after" ending in motion pictures, fairy tales, and in most best sellers in modern literature. Talk about escapism, wishful thinking, and daydreaming, we have been fed on a steady diet of it from ancient times until this year. In Europe, in the Pacific, and in Korea, our soldiers and sailors had to learn through their own agony and hardship that they could not depend upon the unreal, upon some last-minute intervention to save them from destruction. Amid dangers beyond description, they learned to place their faith in their own weapons and in the courage of their own hearts.

Take this Bible story literally, and you have a miracle—a handful of gossamer threads. But why must it be taken that way? The author was not interested in weaving a fanciful tale that would evoke the "oh's" and "ah's" of the people. He was not a romanticist at all. He was a stern and hard realist. He was a preacher bringing out a moral and a lesson for his day and for all the days to come. He pictured an event. He described a touching scene. He gave word to the fear that grips people at the most crucial moments of their lives—when they stand at the gate of freedom, even as that gate seems closed to them. In one sentence, he gives the crux of the problem and offers the only solution possible: "Wherefore criest thou unto Me? Speak unto the children of Israel and tell them to go forward." Do you see how clearly and forcefully he puts it, so that the people would not look for outside aid, for a miracle, but to themselves?

This is not the time to curse the leader. This is not the time for tears and sighs and lamentations. This is not even the time for prayer. Don't cry and entreat in this moment of anguish. The call is for action to do something. Go forward. "God helps those who help themselves" is another way of saying what this Bible author taught thousands of years ago. We must not give up hope. We must not despair. We must not curse our lot. We must not retreat. We must not compromise. We must achieve—advance—push on.

Who among us has not been doomed at times to the Red Sea of failure or discouragement? Who has not felt the turbulent waters rising up to his neck, and at the moment when all seemed lost, made one last desperate effort that brought him to a haven of safety? There are many people who do nothing but pray when trouble comes. Of course I believe in the efficacy of prayer. I would not be a minister if I did not so believe. Prayer is an important part of life. Everyone should offer prayers in one form or another. Let me not be misunderstood. There must be more than prayer. If prayer is naught but the repetition of words, it cannot be effective—it can gain no end—it can accomplish no beneficial purposes.

For example, we pray, and our Christian neighbors pray, that poverty and disease shall cease to exist in the world. But unless we dig deep into our pockets and help those who are in need—unless we support wholeheartedly and completely, for example, the March of Dimes campaign which is now in progress—we are not doing our duty. We pray that better working and housing conditions shall exist for the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow; but unless we pass legislation to meet this need and replace crowded slums with respectable living quarters, we are not accomplishing what we pray for. We pray that man will give up his prejudices and his hatred for his fellow men, that he may become more considerate and more humane; but unless we ourselves practice loving kindness—unless we are just and tolerant and friendly—our prayers are empty forms.

Remember how we prayed for victory when our sons and daughters were on the firing line? That was the thing to do. But if we hadn't made sacrifices, if we hadn't

offered our blood for the healing of the wounded, if we hadn't put our shoulders to the wheels of industry, our prayers would have been valueless. Prayer with action is the lesson of our Scriptures.

The rabbis of old commented upon this scene when the people stood terrified between the lashing waters and the rapidly approaching Egyptian horde. They related that in the hour of panic there were four groups among the Hebrews, each group with its own plan of action. The first group counseled, "Let's jump into the sea." The second group advised, "Let's turn and fight Pharaoh." The third group, the timid one, said, "Let's go back to Egypt." The fourth group naively suggested, "Let's just make a big noise perhaps we can frighten Pharaoh." Suddenly, out of this welter of confusion, out of this conflicting mumbo-jumbo, of stupid counsel, there was heard the voice of God, "Why criest thou unto Me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward."

The commentary says that when God made this statement, he also added to Moses: "There are times when one must be brief and times when one can be lengthy. My children are in great danger. The Red Sea is closed. The enemy is coming, and you stand there praying a long prayer to me. Speak at once, 'Forward.'" The Bible text looms up large before our eyes in our present crisis. We fought a war, a terrific war, a world shattering war, and we won the victory. How we used to look forward to the time when the last bomb would fall. We would picture a world with new gadgets and new conveniences—a world of peace, plenty, and prosperity—a world of fellowship and brotherhood. We looked for the promised land, and we have found instead a self-made Red Sea. Less than 5 years after our victory, we had Korea. Now we have an uneasy armistice and a cold war—a war of nerves. How are we going to get out of this new predicament? What will happen? A miracle? Are we looking for that? No. Out of the very air we breathe comes the answer, which, thank God, men of principle have always heard and heeded: "Speak to the children of Israel, and tell them to go forward."

There is an inevitable rule about crossing the Red Sea that we must not lose sight of. It is like the law of progress. After crossing one sea, there is no rest. It is not long before you have to cross another. There is always some force to impede your way. There is always an obstacle placed in your path. Look at the Red Seas of the past few years—the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific. They had to be crossed—the Channel to Normandy, the Siegfried Line, the airlift over Berlin, the atom bomb route to Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the mud and filth and slime of Korea. Now that these are but unpleasant memories, we find that there is still the Red Sea to the new and peaceful world to be crossed—and what a time we are having to cross it.

There are those whom we call reactionaries, standpatters, and defenders of the status quo who seem fearfully agitated at the prospect of crossing this last Red sea. They fear and hate a new world even more than they feared and hated their enemies. They are afraid of change—afraid of the unknown and the untold. They want to go back to the past—back to their special prerogatives and privileges; back to empire grabbing and exploitation; back to the white man's supremacy; back to the secret contracts with cartels and giant combines; back to armament races, the big fist, and power politics; back to the very factors, causes, agreements, and combinations that gave birth to the last World War. They literally tremble at the thought of democracy being made real—to include not only the right to vote but the right to eat, the right to learn, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of one's own conscience. They are afraid of racial and religious equality; afraid of extending educational and democratic oppor-

tunities to all; afraid of expansion in production and consumption; afraid of abolishing tariff barriers; afraid of high ethical concepts; afraid of the United Nations Organization; afraid of international control; afraid of every sign and token of progress. They cry out in their rage and in their distress when the Red sea is before them; they squirm and curse and bellow; they refuse to plunge in; they refuse to cross. But the Red sea is there. You can't hide from it; you can't deny its presence. Denunciation will not solve the problem.

In this fast-moving age you cannot post a long delay; you cannot appease; you cannot stand still; you cannot retreat. That sea has to be crossed now—today. No miracle will solve our dilemma; no outside force will make possible our peace, our safety, and our well-being; no bolt will suddenly come forth out of the blue to guarantee happiness and security. With us and within us alone must be the initiative, the determination, and the courage to cross that sea. Will we go forward to understanding, to sympathy, to fellowship, to brotherhood, and to peace; or will we stand still with our prejudices, our lusts, and our hates—stand still until chaos engulfs us? The question is not merely communism or capitalism. It is our world or their world. Who will create it—the madmen of Malenkov or the wise advocates of freedom and liberty for all?

The poet said, "Lord, I believe in man." Phyllis Bottome, the novelist, said, "There is no mine that can permanently explode the heart of man; nor yet a poison gas that can stop the breath of God that has created the spirit of man." We have to hold on to that conviction. These are trying days for all of us. It is a terrible ordeal through which we and our brethren are passing. Will we survive the calamitous conditions that we face? We must survive.

We have become the active trustees of the classic tradition of civilization. We and all other men of good will are challenged by a force before which we dare not bow or bend. The insolence and the naked impudence of raging heathens must not deter us from our course. In this great hour of testing we must be found worthy. The text from the Bible speaks to us—speaks to us as a people and to each of us as individuals. It bids us to take heart in our march and our climb. It tells us that a thousand Pharaohs, a hundred Red Seas, and the most scorching wilderness cannot stop us if we are willing to take the risk and pay the price for progress. It is the way of the strong, the resolute, and the man who fights with heart and soul.

Let us not give in to our fears. Let us not bemoan our fate or curse our lot. There is work to be done. There are never-ending tasks for all of us. Let us not sit idly and dejectedly by the rivers of Babylon, moping and sighing, and remembering what once we were and what we might have been. Let us be in the vanguard to fulfill our Godlike mission—the mission Moses and the prophets commanded us—the mission the poet restated in such inspiring words:

"Build me a house, a home,
In the hearts of hungering men—
Hungering for the bread of hope,
Thirsting for faith, yearning for love,
In a world of grief and pain.
Build me a house.
Build me a world, said God,
Out of man's fairest dreams;
Heaven must be its dome,
Lighted by prophet-gleams;
Justice shall be the stones
On which my world shall rise;
Truth and love its arches,
Gripping my ageless skies.
Out of dreams, on the earthly sod,
Build me a world, said God."

Build Me a House,
—By Thomas Curtis Clark.

Such a world we must have, my friends, for happiness and security. Such a world we will have if the builders thereof have vision and ideals and faith—if they have courage and hope—if they are ready and willing to make the necessary sacrifices to achieve it—if they walk forward toward distant goals. May God in His wisdom grant us the strength of will, the tenacity of purpose, and the depth of character to keep on building the divine structure that will lead all mankind to justice, to righteousness, and to peace. Amen.

A Warrior Talks of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith as a part of my remarks an editorial that recently appeared in the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital. It is entitled "A Warrior Talks of Peace." It concerns General MacArthur's statement on his 75th birthday anniversary.

The editorial follows:

A WARRIOR TALKS OF PEACE

General MacArthur's call for an end to all wars was almost drowned out by the preparations for defense of Formosa, and the wrangling between the United States and Communist China. Almost simultaneously, Red Russia tried to muddy the European defense waters with a proposal that could not be accepted by any of the NATO nations. Congress was putting finishing touches to President Eisenhower's request for authority to defend Formosa, even to the possible extent of action on the China mainland.

There is no question but that the famous old warrior, hero of the war against Japan, and in Korea, is right in his assertion that abolition of war would be a blessing to mankind beyond the wildest imagination of mankind. He probably was correct in his analysis of the antiwar sentiment among the people on both sides of the Iron Curtain. No sensible people want war, and have not since the dawn of written history. But they have been led into the conflict by selfish leaders, who themselves rarely had to fight.

With the present nuclear weapons as a threat of total destruction, it is foreseeable that in time mankind must either forgo warfare or face extinction. The blundering politicians, diplomats, and greedy profiteers who grow fat on human misery must in time evolve peaceful means of settling international disputes. This may entail an almost complete change in human nature, for the rank and file of the people always have arisen to defense of their countries, or to attack other nations, when emotionally aroused by demagogues of the type that have started wars since time immemorial.

General MacArthur said that strong leaders are needed to bring about an end to war. He is right, of course, but the Communist conspiracy must be coped with before peace is established. If the Reds succeed in dominating the world, as they confidently expect to do, the ensuing slavery would be worse than the peace they would impose. But call to start leaders in the free nations to thinking more about peace than of war. He may be the "John the Baptist" who points the way to outlawing war for all time.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert an address I delivered at the ceremonies commemorating the birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko, held Sunday afternoon, February 13, before the statue of General Kosciusko in Lafayette Park, Washington, D. C.

The address follows:

I am proud to join in these ceremonies commemorating the birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko. The name Kosciusko stands as one of the solid blocks forming the foundation of our great American democracy. It was General Kosciusko, a skilled military leader and great fighter for human freedom and individual liberty, who joined with the American patriots of 1776 in support of the great moral and political principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence. Gen. George Washington, commander in chief of our Army, recognized in Kosciusko that great spark of unwavering devotion for the cause of human freedom and accordingly made a place for the use of his great military talents and inspiring leadership in our struggle for national independence.

You and I know the tremendous contribution made by Kosciusko to the American way of life with all its wonderful benefits which we today enjoy. We also know that the name Kosciusko is close to the hearts of the Polish people everywhere in the world because he has stood as one of the great symbols of Poland's historic struggles for freedom and national independence. Indeed, the name Kosciusko has earned a place in the hearts of all freedom-loving people.

We Americans have always revered the name of Kosciusko and have each year on the occasion of his birthday, held appropriate ceremonies in order to reemphasize the great principles for which he fought and died. It is sad to recall how the revered name of Kosciusko has been used for evil and treasonous purposes. During World War II the Russians established a propaganda organ called Kosciusko station. This radio station, using the Polish language, beamed programs into occupied Poland. As the Russian Army reached the gates of Warsaw and was encamped on the opposite side of the Vistula River, this so-called Kosciusko station beamed this appeal to the Polish people:

"People of Warsaw, to arms. The whole population should gather round the national council and the underground army. Attack the Germans * * * assist the Red army in crossing the Vistula. Give information and show the best roads. The more than a million inhabitants ought to become an army of a million men fighting for liberation and destroying the German invaders."

The Polish people, led by the home army, rose to a man and although poorly equipped and in short supply, openly attacked the Nazi occupier of Warsaw. The valiant Poles drove the Nazi occupier out of Warsaw and set up a Polish administration, but strangely, as soon as the Poles had this military victory, the Red army withdrew from the outskirts of the city, retreated to the opposite side of the Vistula River. The Russians invited the well-equipped Nazis to return and destroy the backbone of the Polish Army and its heroic resistance forces. The struggle for

Warsaw lasted for 63 days, until on October 2 there was not a drop of water left to drink in Warsaw, nothing to eat and no ammunition for the patriotic fighters. Over 250,000 Poles died in this struggle. By this device the Russians used the well-equipped Nazis to destroy large numbers of the Polish intelligentsia, the leaders, and the patriots.

The people of the free world will never forget the manner in which the Russians have desecrated the name of Kosciusko. We, the American people, will surely never forget the manner in which the Russians used the name of a great American patriot, Kosciusko, in order to bring about the destruction of over 250,000 freedom-loving Poles.

There can be no peace until Poland is once again a free and independent nation.

Questionnaire on Issues Facing the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the Record my own remarks in the form of a letter-questionnaire, which I am sending to the folks in my district. These questionnaires are helpful in determining the views of my constituents on various problems facing Congress.

DEAR FRIENDS: This is the fifth time I have sent a questionnaire to every boxholder in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. I am seeking your opinion on issues facing the Congress. While I must make my own independent decision as to how I will finally vote on national issues, I do want to say that your answers to the questions listed below will assist me in understanding your views on these national problems.

You will remember that in the off-election years it is my custom to hold government clinics in each of the 38 courthouses in the Fourth District. The first hour is devoted to Youth Wants To Know. I hope to continue that practice this late summer and fall. Here again, I will have an opportunity to meet you personally and to have you ask questions in an open forum. These question-and-answer sessions are interesting and informative.

I trust you will return the questionnaire. You will be taking part in your Government. Your answers will assist me, as a Member of Congress, to do a better job.

Yours truly,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District
of Nebraska.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What type of farm program do you favor? Flexible ☐ 90 percent ☐ 100 percent ☐.
2. Would you favor a bushel quota on wheat? Yes ☐ no ☐.
3. Would you favor a two-price system on marketing wheat? Yes ☐ no ☐.
4. Should 18-year-olds vote? Yes ☐ no ☐.
5. Do you favor present social security for farmers? Yes ☐ no ☐.
6. Your choice for President in 1956—Eisenhower ☐ Stevenson ☐ others ☐.

7. Should tariffs be lowered ☐ raised ☐ or kept as they are ☐?
 8. Do you favor the present foreign policy? Yes ☐ no ☐.
9. Should we grant more foreign aid ☐ or less ☐?
 10. Should there be Federal aid to education? Yes ☐ no ☐.
11. Should there be Federal aid for school construction? Yes ☐ no ☐.
12. Do you favor universal military training? Yes ☐ no ☐.
13. Do you prefer the present Selective Service System? Yes ☐ no ☐.
14. Do you favor raising postal rates to meet the cost of service? Yes ☐ no ☐.
15. Should Communist China be admitted to the United Nations? Yes ☐ no ☐.
16. Should Alaska be made a new State? Yes ☐ no ☐.
17. Should Hawaii be made a new State? Yes ☐ no ☐.
18. Do you favor a State sales tax? Yes ☐ no ☐.

Now and Then

* EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John G. Bragaw from the Washington Daily News of Washington, N. C., of Friday, February 11, 1955:

Now AND THEN

(By John G. Bragaw)

A man whose writings I like to follow was expressing himself the other day on the great American habit of blaming the other fellow for our own shortcomings—in business, in society, in government, and in the church. He quoted Will Rogers' assertion that there have been three periods of American history—the passing of the Indian, the passing of the buffalo, and the passing of the buck. Rogers added that we are living in the third period.

We can see evidences of the truth of the statement all around us. Probably 1 out of 5 people who discuss the country's affairs will say at some point in the conversation that there are too many crooks in Government positions and find other fault with everything done. Yet the likelihood is that 2, maybe 3, out of those 4 do not take the trouble to vote when there is an election.

All along the route we find the same thing. If a basketball or football team is winning, we will say, "We are playing great ball." But if they are losing "we" isn't the word used: "They just don't know how to play." It's "they," not "we."

This man I was reading says, "Certainly there is too much buck-passing among those in the church." And he doesn't mean any one church; he means all of them. "A considerable number of people try to shift their responsibility as Christians to other members of their own families. Parents who never attend church excuse themselves by explaining, 'We send our children to Sunday school.' They seem to think that this settles the whole matter. Husbands try to work their religion through their wives: 'I never go, but my wife is generally there.' A considerable number of young married people try to make their parents proxy for them: 'We don't go, but I think you'll find mother and father always in their places.'"

"Other members of the church try to shift their responsibilities to their neighbors. If they stay away from church today, they reason that they will not be missed because there will be so many others present. They need not take part in the men's club, because there are plenty of other men to do that job. They need not make a definite pledge to the church because there will be plenty of other pledges to take care of the budget."

A great orchestra director once stopped a concert before a large audience because one of his musicians was not performing. "As the music swept through the hall, with scores of instruments playing in perfect harmony, amid the sound of the flute, cello, cornet, and drum, the man playing the piccolo, away over in the corner, said to himself, 'With all these instruments playing, my one little piccolo will not be missed,' and so he stopped. Immediately the conductor lifted his hand signalled for quiet. When all was silent he called out, 'Where is the piccolo?' The whole performance was marred by the absence of the piccolo. The great Director of the universe has commissioned His church, like a large orchestra, to produce music for the healing of the world. If the work is to be done effectively, every individual must be in his place, playing his part."

School Construction by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials pertaining to President Eisenhower's message on the need for the Federal Government's granting aid to the States and local communities for school construction contain a great deal of sound commonsense, and they should receive careful attention on the part of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

[From the Stanton News-Leader]

LET UNCLE STAY OUT

What Mr. Eisenhower proposes is essentially another billion-plus spending program, in an era of deficit spending which threatens the fiscal soundness of the Nation. The place to meet school construction needs is at the local level, and with rare exceptions, the localities are capable of meeting such needs. Where they are not, or where they refuse to do so, the State and not the Federal Government should step in.

The best way for the Federal Government to help the schools is to ease the burden of taxation so as to encourage the localities to discharge their own responsibilities. This involves a curtailment of spending, which is possible both as to foreign aid and costly public works which could well be deferred. It would be unsafe to cut defense spending at this time, but the objective of economy in this field should always be kept in sight.

Experience has shown that every scheme of the Federal Government for dispensing aid to the States is extravagant, creates a new bureaucracy, and causes new demands on the taxpayers. The people pay in the end, so why look to Washington for aid which spells higher costs and more Federal taxation, and opens the door to Federal control of public education, with all the evils that could bring?

[From the Norfolk Ledger-Dispatch]

A DANGEROUS VENTURE

It is a delusion to believe that the Federal Government has some magical superiority over the States in producing money for these big undertakings. In those fields where State authority is supreme the States can raise the funds if they deem the need great enough and if the taxpayers are capable of assuming the new burden. Obtaining the money from the Federal Government is a roundabout, costly and possibly disastrous way of extracting money from the same taxpayers.

Although the President insists that the program would be carried forward without interference with the responsibility of State and local school systems, the tendency of Federal influence to follow Federal money is virtually indestructible. Despite the urgency of the classroom need and despite the appeal which this program may have for some hard-pressed communities, it would be a dangerous venture into a field which should remain the exclusive concern of the States.

Rob Peter To Pay Paul?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the President has called for a \$7 billion Federal-State emergency school-construction program. Several bills to provide aid in one form or another are present before the Congress. In connection with these proposals for Federal aid to school construction, I call attention to the following editorial from the January 25, 1955, edition of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier:

Tremendous pressure is building up in Congress to provide Federal aid for school construction. President Eisenhower has endorsed some kind of aid; and constituents whose children are going to school half days or attending classes in dark basements or firetraps are putting pressure on their Representatives.

Such Federal aid, however, presents a tremendous problem of fair distribution of funds. Communities like Waterloo have already bonded themselves heavily to meet their classroom needs and are paying heavy local taxes already. Why should Waterloo people pay Federal taxes to help a comparable community build its schools when that community has voted down school bond issues?

True, many school districts do not have the assessed valuation behind them to pay for new schools. In many, probably the majority of instances, however, this is because the school district involved is too small to be efficient. Many a school district with a high school of less than 100 students should receive no State or Federal aid because such help would be merely a subsidy for inefficiency.

We feel confident that the great majority of Iowans oppose Federal aid for school construction. Such aid means only that Iowans send their money to Washington, a portion is subtracted for administration expense and a lesser amount is then returned to us under conditions that limit our freedom of choice.

The one semivalid argument for Federal aid is the equalization plea, tax the wealthy areas to provide school facilities in the poor

areas. If this principle is adopted, however, the whole foundation of local government everywhere is undermined. Once Federal funds are provided for local government, local policies will inevitably be set in Washington rather than at home. Those who demand Federal aid today apparently have no conception of the vicious consequences of their acts.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting the following statement in opposition to H. R. 1 by Richard H. Anthony, executive secretary of the American Tariff League, Inc., before the House Ways and Means Committee on January 26, 1955:

Congress is being urged to pass H. R. 1 as an instrument of United States foreign policy. According to the Secretary of State, H. R. 1 "will promote the security and welfare of the United States," which "cannot be achieved without cooperative relations with other nations."

The passage of H. R. 1 is also being urged as a means of obtaining commercial advantage for certain segments of the United States economy. The Secretary of Commerce told your committee that "we should continue the trade-agreements legislation for the same reason as it was started, in the first place—as an important export-promotion measure."

Of course, there is no guaranty that the enactment of H. R. 1 would accomplish either of these cross purposes. It is not a direct, positive approach to the underlying economic problems of other countries, and it would not, of itself, promote our exports. It permits the further lowering of our tariffs on the theory that other countries will take advantage of our markets and will ease their manifold restrictions against our goods. The theory cannot be proved to have worked that way before. Our tariff level has fallen 70 percent since 1934, and there are now more restrictions raised against us abroad than when the trade-agreements program started.

The only certainty ahead if H. R. 1 is enacted is that United States tariffs will be cut. The American Tariff League represents industrial and agricultural producers some of whom are claiming injury due to past reductions, many of whom are extremely apprehensive over the effect on them of the contemplated trade agreement with and for the benefit of Japan, and all of whom see potential danger to them in the provisions of H. R. 1.

Their fears are justified by the earlier testimony on this bill. The Secretary of State said "the bill is drafted so as to cushion our economy against undue shock by reason of competitive imports." But, apparently, shock is due in some degree. Most witnesses who minimized the danger of injury from further tariff cutting pointed out that the trade-agreements and escape-clause provisions of the trade-agreements laws were not repealed by H. R. 1. They neglected to say that the peril-point provision has yet to be tested in multilateral tariff negotiations and that the escape clause has been invoked only five times since it was first included in the 1943 agreement with Mexico.

In view of the doubtful advantages to be gained abroad from the bill and the prospect of disadvantages to producers at home, the league opposes the enactment of H. R. 1.

In outlining our specific objections we must point out that H. R. 1 is so complicated that it is difficult to envision all its ramifications. We have yet to see an official analysis of its provisions and their relationship to present law.

The bill appears to extend and enlarge the President's authority to enter into executive agreements which would become law without being referred to Congress for ratification, and to permit the President to cut certain tariffs on his own, regardless of any trade agreement, an entirely new grant of power.

H. R. 1 also provides authority for a new type of trade agreement, that is, the one about to be negotiated with Japan and other countries not yet named. Heretofore our agreements, bilateral or multilateral, have been negotiated on the basis that other countries would make tariff concessions for the benefit of the United States in return for tariff concessions we made to them. That was the kind of quid pro quo intended under the trade-agreements program, although in practice we often gave more than we received.

Under the contemplated agreement with Japan and third countries the announced objective is to provide export markets for Japan. That is, it is proposed that we reduce our tariffs on items of interest to Japan and to third countries, in return for which those third countries would reduce their tariffs on items of interest to Japan.

H. R. 1 expressly provides authority for the President to enter into this wholly new type of agreement after June 12, 1955.

The league has always maintained that the executive trade agreement method of setting tariffs is potentially irresponsible and undesirable. The new form of agreement with Japan and third countries is even more irresponsible and undesirable than earlier agreements because by design we intend to trade away our tariffs, and hence our bargaining power, without getting any comparable advantages for our exports in return.

While we do not favor the executive agreement method, if Congress should determine to extend the President's basic authority to enter into trade agreements we urge that it do so within the terms of the current 1954 extension and not embark upon these wholly new concepts of delegated powers.

The Secretary of State said the bill "will enable the United States to make a new start in promoting freer trade policies on the part of other nations," but he did not say just what program was contemplated. It seems to us that Congress ought to know what the executive branch intends to do with these broader powers before enacting them.

The Secretary also said, in answer to questioning, that it was hoped the current revision of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade would be completed in February, and that it would be sent to Congress. It seems to us that Congress ought to have a look at that revision before considering those provisions of H. R. 1 which appear to give the President authority to commit the United States to a revised GATT to a degree not entirely clear.

We refer to the language appearing on page 2, lines 21 to 25 and page 3, lines 1 to 8, which H. R. 1 would add to the President's current basic authority "to enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof." The new language would cover agreements "containing provisions with respect to international trade, including provisions relating to tariffs, to most-favored-nation standards and other standards of nondiscriminatory treatment affecting such trade, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and to other matters relating to such

trade designed to promote the purpose of this section similar to any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That, except as authorized by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, no such provision shall be given effect in the United States in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States."

The earlier part of the new language is descriptive of the commercial-policy section, that is, the substantive provisions, of GATT. The proviso is in the words of the protocol of provisional application of GATT which commits a signatory country to apply the commercial-policy provisions "to the fullest extent not inconsistent with existing legislation."

The President's authority, as broadened in H. R. 1, would thus apparently permit him to commit the United States either (1) to a new GATT protocol, or (2) to GATT definitively insofar as it does not conflict with existing United States law, in either case without having to refer the instrument to Congress for ratification.

The President has promised to refer to Congress the organizational provisions of the revised GATT, but not its substantive provisions, that is, not its commercial-policy section. In the revisions of GATT, now going on behind closed doors at Geneva, the two parts may be separated. Only the organizational part may be sent to Congress. The United States could be committed to the substantive part by executive agreement under the broad powers of H. R. 1.

The proviso that appears to safeguard existing United States law is illusory. If Congress subsequently passed laws at variance with GATT provisions the United States would be in the position of having breached the agreement. The attention of your committee has already been drawn to the possibility that H. R. 1 might permit an agreement ending United States quotas on agricultural products under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or otherwise. These quotas constitute one of the bones of contention at Geneva, according to recent press reports.

Another way in which the intent of Congress could be circumvented under the powers of H. R. 1 is in connection with the escape clause. Existing law states, as a principle, that the United States may withdraw concessions if an American producer is injured, and it provides for the mechanics of processing escape-clause applications within the United States. Our law does not state how the escape clause may be invoked in GATT, nor whether the United States will submit to GATT rulings and accept as final retaliatory measures of other countries, or penalties, should we withdraw a concession.

The GATT escape-clause machinery is part of the substantive GATT provisions, now being revised. Suppose the revision provided or permitted, for example, when one country invokes the escape clause and withdraws a concession, that GATT could impose monetary damages on that country for the benefit of other countries interested, or simply as a penalty. Under H. R. 1 the United States seemingly could be committed to such a policy by executive agreement, since it does not conflict with our existing law. If Congress later refused to appropriate for such damages, the United States would be in the position of breaching the agreement.

This is illustrative of possible situations that ought to be explored by Congress before the broad powers of H. R. 1 are bestowed on the executive branch.

It may be thought that the peril-point provisions of United States law will prevent injury to American producers and workers, but we again remind your committee that the peril point has yet to be fully tested in multilateral negotiations. We believe Congress should see how the peril-point procedure works in the Japanese negotiations before considering H. R. 1, which permits addi-

tional rate reductions and so increases the risk of injury to American producers and workers.

Congress last year set the United States Tariff Commission the task of studying all the tariff schedules with a view to their modernization and simplification, without changing the rates, if possible. Being aware that the task might be formidable, Congress directed the Commission to file an interim report with your committee and the Senate Finance Committee by March 15, 1955, on the progress made, the difficulties encountered, and on suggested standards and methods for proceeding further. We believe your committee should have the benefit of that interim report before acting on H. R. 1 which would permit a further proliferation of rates and categories of commodities for customs purposes.

In short, there are compelling reasons for postponing consideration of H. R. 1.

It has been suggested that the passage of H. R. 1 would give a psychological boost to the morale of our friends abroad. We think that point debatable. However, we know that its passage will depress the morale of a considerable portion of American labor, American agriculture, and American industry.

Under its alternative approaches H. R. 1 permits the reduction of every single United States tariff rate, whether or not it has been reduced before, and whether or not it is adequate to safeguard domestic workers and producers.

The 15-percent reduction provision has its genesis in the so-called French plan presented to GATT a few years ago as an across-the-board tariff-cutting scheme. It could be used to reduce again rates already reduced partially or fully under previous extensions of the Trade Agreements Act.

The provision for reducing by 50 percent rates on items being imported in negligible quantities has no definitions or criteria so that the extent of its use cannot be foreseen. This is the provision the President may invoke on his own, without any relation to a trade agreement and without submission to Congress, a new concept of delegated tariff-making power.

The provision for reducing rates above 50 percent to that figure permits lopping off any rate above an arbitrary level, based on a representative period not otherwise defined. This provision is obviously based on the erroneous assumption that all rates above a certain level can be characterized as undesirable. It is our view that each tariff rate must be judged on its own merits, considering the purpose for which it is set.

This three-pronged attack on tariff rates, after the single approach in all the extensions to date, suggests to league members that a mopping-up operation is intended on our tariff structure. They are understandably apprehensive.

The bill is being offered to advance our national interest, and we recognize that our national interest has its international aspects. We agree with President Eisenhower's concise description of the underlying basis for a foreign trade policy, as set forth in his special message of January 10, as follows:

"For every country in the free world economic strength is dependent upon high levels of economic activity internally and high levels of international trade. No nation can be economically self-sufficient. Nations must buy from other nations, and in order to pay for what they buy they must sell."

Measured by that formula the United States has done its share and more. Our tariff level is low. We have a high level of foreign trade, even on commercial account. We have a dynamic economy and a growing population. For the long term our external trade will continue to increase no matter what we do with our tariffs, because—in the President's words—we must buy from other

nations, and in order to pay for what we buy we must sell.

The program envisioned in H. R. 1 has been labeled a moderate one. It is certainly a feeble attack on such knotty problems of foreign countries as balance-of-payments difficulties, currency convertibility, and economic development.

It may seem a paradox that a law which is ineffective as an attack on basic foreign economic problems may have a damaging effect on American industry and labor, but it is true. Small quantities of imports of a commodity, particularly from such low-wage countries as Japan, can disrupt the price structure, the merchandising channels, the production schedules, and hence the employment and prosperity in the American industry producing a competitive commodity.

When uncertainty over tariff action permeates American agriculture and industry, and when unemployment, loss of production, and curbing of capital expansion are spotted here and there throughout the country, there will be present the ingredients of general economic distress. Added to any setbacks due to purely domestic causes, injury from tariff cuts may set off a downward trend in the national level of prosperity.

Yet, while the wholesale tariff cutting which H. R. 1 invites might imperil our economy, it will not create the American supermarket for foreign goods which our friends abroad have been led to expect. The American market cannot be a substitute for the natural, traditional outlets for such exporting countries as Japan, unless we are willing to disband whole industries here, rearrange the population, and bid farewell to certain worker and management skills important to a diversified economy and national security.

By intimating that further cutting our already low tariffs is going to ease the problems of other countries, we give them false hopes and lay up ill will for ourselves.

Because H. R. 1 is an ineffective instrument of our foreign policy, because it bestows on the executive branch unprecedented authority and broader powers than Congress has heretofore seen fit to delegate, because it invites a wholesale reduction of our tariffs, with ever greater risk of injury to American workers, farmers, and producers, and because the hurry to push this bill through Congress prevents a careful study of its relationship to many pending proposals yet unrevealed, we urge that H. R. 1 not be enacted.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I stood with my four children at the foot of the monument in Lafayette Park which commemorates Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, whose birthday was February 12 and whom the Nation's capital paid tribute to yesterday.

General Kosciusko was an early battler for American freedom. He came to our shores when this Nation was in infancy to take part in the American Revolutionary War.

Under Kosciusko's leadership in 1777 the fortifications at West Point were completed, and he served gallantly in the campaigns at Saratoga and the Carolinas.

After his return to Poland, General Kosciusko continued to fight for liberty in his homeland. He led the Polish people in their struggles against Prussian and Russian oppression.

In Milwaukee, as in many other American cities, there is a monument to the great General Kosciusko which I have often visited with my family. These Kosciusko monuments serve as an inspiration to the children of this generation.

Here was a Polish patriot with a restless hatred of tyranny. He threw himself into the cause of liberty here in the New World, earning the gratitude of countless citizens who have flourished in the freedom he helped to establish.

What practical things can we do to commemorate Kosciusko and the Polish people who have suffered so much for the cause of human freedom?

First, we should liberalize our immigration laws to permit more persons of Polish descent to enter this Nation.

Second, we must wage a vigorous program to keep alive the hopes for a democratic government among the Polish people by expanding our Voice of America.

And third, we should promptly ratify the world genocide convention making it a crime against humanity and international law for any dictator to exterminate whole nations, races, or religions.

These are but a few of the steps our Nation can take now to commemorate General Kosciusko.

Age Discrimination in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, there are indications that provisions of law, approved by Congress in 1952, supposedly abolishing all age limits for Federal employment except those essential to performance of the work, are being ignored by the United States Civil Service Commission.

This disregard for employment policy established by Congress on the part of the Commission has come to my attention because of the experience of a constituent, Mr. Nick Milnarich, of East St. Louis, Ill.

Mr. Milnarich applied for a position as tax collector for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. His application was rejected by the United States Civil Service Commission with a notation that the age limit for this position has been set at 35 years.

There is no question about Mr. Milnarich's physical capability to perform this particular type of work. It was to take care of just such cases that Congress itself abolished age limits on hiring of personnel for Government positions.

While it is true that the law does not totally eliminate maximum age limits, it states the principle that age limits should not be imposed generally, and implies that the Civil Service Commission should exercise sound judgment to apply age limits on a practical basis. In my opinion, rejecting applicants at the age of 35 for the position of a tax collector within the Bureau of Internal Revenue indicates that the Commission is not applying the principle of the law in a practical way.

It is ironical that the United States Civil Service Commission has approved age limits as low as 35 years on the hiring for Government positions at the same time the United States Department of Labor has been campaigning against age discrimination by private employers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following article on this subject which appeared in the February 17 issue of the *Machinist*, the official weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists:

IAM INVESTIGATION REVEALS 35-YEAR HIRING AGE LIMIT FOR MANY FEDERAL POSTS

The United States Civil Service Commission has approved age limits, many as low as 35 years on hiring for thousands of Government jobs during the past 2 years, the *Machinist* learned this week. This age discrimination in Government employment policies has occurred despite a law adopted by Congress in 1952 supposedly abolishing all age limits except those essential to performance of the work. At the same time, the United States Department of Labor has been campaigning against age discrimination by private employers.

The inquiry into the age-limit policies of the United States Civil Service Commission was touched off by an IAM member, Nick Milnarich of IAM Lodge, No. 121, East St. Louis, Ill.

Temporarily laid off his job, Milnarich sought work elsewhere. One of the jobs he applied for was that of tax collector for the Treasury's Bureau of Internal Revenue. Milnarich is 36 and a bowler and softball player. He was stunned when his application card was returned from the United States Civil Service Commission office at Chicago recently with a notation in red pencil that the top age limit for applicants is 35 years. The job pays \$3,410 a year, about \$65.50 a week.

Milnarich has since been rehired at his old job, but is still interested in seeing that other over-35 jobhunters aren't discriminated against as he was. He wrote *The Machinist*:

"The Government has been preaching antidiscrimination in employing people and has requested that employers hire handicapped and older people and the like. Unless my conception of a tax collector's job is all wrong, I can't see what age would have to do with fulfilling the requirements. If 36 is too old for job hunting, maybe I should apply for my old-age pension." The inquiry touched off by this IAM member's complaint reveals that, despite the 1952 act of Congress, the Civil Service Commission has chosen to set top age limits on applicants who will be considered for scores of different categories of jobs. These limits are waived only in the case of veterans.

GENERAL RESTRICTIONS

These top limits range from 35 and 40 up to 62 years, which was the general Government age limit for all United States job

applicants before Congress passed the 1952 act.

A Civil Service Commission official at Washington told the *Machinist* that the lower age restrictions were justified from two points of view:

Where the job is hazardous or requires special physical strength or condition, such as various types of Government police work, guard duty, aerial work, and the like.

Where the job is considered to be a trainee-type position in which the individual selected is expected to work up through the service as a career employee.

The tax-collector post which Milnarich sought falls in the latter category, the Civil Service Commission claims. However, the training period for a career as tax collector is only 6 months.

THIRTY-FIVE OR UNDER

The records show that many other jobs are also restricted to applicants 35 or under, if they are not veterans. These include almost all the so-called GS-5 professional positions including such jobs as agronomist, soil conservationist, physicist, engineer, and historian.

There is also a lower paid category of aids, such as agricultural aid, engineering aid, range management and conservation aid, and similar posts which have the 35-year limit for applicants.

A field assistant trainee in the Social Security Survivors Insurance Division also must be 35 or under to qualify.

Many of the entering jobs in the category of guards, agents, inspectors, and other police-type work have 35-year limits.

OTHER CATEGORIES

Post Office substitute carriers, clerks, and garagemen-drivers are under a 50-year age limit.

At the top of the age scale, the former 62-year-old limit for applicants for a great number of Government clerical positions has been removed. These employees can be hired up to 70, with the possibility of 1-year temporary appointments from year to year thereafter.

However, civil-service records show that this is not true for many of the craft positions—including machinists, still under a 62-year hiring limit. Here are some other categories where jobs are still under the 62-year limit for nonveteran applicants:

Blacksmith, boilermaker, bulldozer operator, carpenter, electrician, laborer, mason, painter, plasterer, plumber, truck driver, welder, sheet metal worker, and many others.

Many jobs, including bookkeepers and typists, in the Panama Canal Zone have a 45-year limit for applicants who are not veterans.

Civil service records show that ever since the law went into effect in early 1953 there has been a steady increase in the number of jobs to which discriminatory age limits have been applied.

NOT CONSISTENT

As frequently happens, the left hand doesn't know what the right is doing. While the United States Civil Service Commission has been placing new age limits on job applicants, the United States Department of Labor is campaigning for the hiring of more older workers. United States Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell has said:

"By 1975, according to the Census Bureau, the number of persons 45 and over will total more than 63 million, an increase of 40 percent over 1953. This group will constitute one-half the population over 20 years of age.

"Unless something is done to give them job opportunities, an estimated half of our adult population will be condemned to a life of economic uselessness."

Joblessness in a Boom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the joblessness in many areas of the United States is rising to haunt the Nation, and no positive means are being taken to relieve it.

With permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article from *Labor's Daily* by Sylvia Porter. This article is very clear and understandable. It follows:

JOBLESSNESS IN A BOOM

(By Sylvia Porter)

Right now, there are probably more than 3,500,000 American men and women looking for jobs, but unable to find them in our land—and when the Government's official tally of unemployment in the February-March period is released, it may show the total above 4 million.

A 4-million total of jobless would admittedly be an economic "red flag" and be politically explosive.

Yet there unquestionably is a "rosy glow" throughout our economy in this second month of 1955.

There is no doubt that we have been in a rising business trend since the fall of 1954. It well may be that this year our output of goods and services will hit an all-time high.

This is it, the economic paradox of our times; a hard core of unemployment and at certain seasons a steeply rising total of jobless in a period of overall good times.

To date all official statements from the administration have soft-pedaled or ignored this.

In his economic report, for instance, President Eisenhower said "developments hold out promise that we shall achieve a high and satisfactory level of employment within the current year."

Yet, the puzzle remains: In today's good times, millions can't find jobs, and in some areas unemployment is critical.

Why this paradox? Let's rip apart the economists' technical jargon, put it into our language. Here are the two reasons why:

1. Every year more people are coming into our labor force than are leaving it, and at today's pace of advance, industry is not creating enough new jobs to absorb the extra workers.

The official estimate is that a full million additional workers will be seeking jobs in 1955. To absorb all of these our economy would have to be expanding at a much faster rate than it is.

2. Every year our workers and machines are becoming more efficient—meaning it is taking fewer workers to turn out the same total of goods.

In November 1954, industry turned out the same total of goods as in November 1953—but with 850,000 fewer workers. That tells the tale. To offset the increasing "productivity" of workers and machines, industry would have to be expanding at a much faster rate than it is.

The considered forecast of top experts is that our economy will expand by \$10 to \$12 billion this year. But to slash unemployment to 1953's good-times level, the judgment is that our growth in 1955 would have to reach \$25 billion to \$30 billion. Mighty few think this is in the cards.

thority would seriously limit the trade-controlling powers of the Congress.

In this event, present judgments of H. R. 1 as appropriate legislation would no doubt undergo radical change. In fact, the possibility of further tariff legislation of any kind might be ended, at least, for the duration of GATT.

The negotiation of new tariff concessions, beginning at Geneva in February, we refer to as operation No. 3 to maintain the distinction between the renegotiation of previous multilateral concessions and the negotiation of new concessions. In the case of many articles, as we shall show later, these new concessions could amount to as much as 50 percent.

In view of this situation, impending tariff changes promise to be vastly greater than those provided for in H. R. 1.

It would be well for Congress to know the extent of these changes before authorizing new reductions.

The fourth operation is the announced negotiation of a bilateral trade agreement with Japan and, if possible, the admittance of Japan into GATT. H. R. 1 breaks precedent with previous trade-agreements acts by singling out a particular country for a trade agreement. The action is all the more unique in that the Government already has the power under existing legislation to negotiate such an agreement. Moreover, the bill provides that in the agreement with Japan no duty shall be reduced by more than 50 percent of the 1945 level. The stipulation merely reaffirms the minimum limits authorized by existing legislation. Why this legislation redundancy?

The reasons for this particularistic action are precautionary and self-revealing. By incorporating the terms of the Japanese agreement in H. R. 1: The Government is enabled to prolong the period of Japanese negotiation to July 1 instead of ending it on June 12 when present legislation expires. July 1 is made the target date because it is currently the terminating date of firm commitments under article 28 of GATT. This year, the termination date is especially important because of disaffection occasioned by renegotiation and impending Japanese trade agreements either within or without GATT.

The Government anticipates this contingency by tying in the beginning date of the Japanese agreement with the final date of firm commitments, thus more nearly assuring that the agreement with Japan, if need be, can play in part the role of successor agreement, so preventing the lapse of many concessions previously granted to other countries. The strategy would seem to have additional precautionary value in that the United States will probably not wish to run the risk of undue strain on its GATT commitments. Hence, in the event GATT refuses admittance to Japan, or is denied congressional approval, or undergoes a substantial loss of its own membership, necessitating the renegotiation of previously granted GATT concessions, a concurrent trade negotiation with Japan might have to be a wholly separate and distinct proceeding. Accordingly, direct authorization of Congress is sought as the means of lessening both political and legal questionings.

The great care with which the way has been prepared for the Japanese agreement would indicate the expectation of very substantial results by way of tariff reductions. One would expect that Congress would wish to know the extent of these reductions before authorizing additional ones on the basis of July 1955 levels.

Taking the above operations as a whole, the status of the American tariff structure as of next June 12 or July 1 is unpredictable. We can only be sure that it will be far lower than at present.

Against this background of multiple activities, H. R. 1 is revealed as a dangerous and illogical document lacking every important criterion of sound tariff legislation. The authorized 15 percent reductions over the next 3 years through trade agreements would begin with the rates existing on July 1, 1955. These are completely unknown quantities. Hence the 15 percent reduction authorized in the bill may, in effect, turn out to be two or three times that figure as compared with present rates.

The special authorization of a bilateral trade agreement with Japan means that Japan can exhaust concession possibilities based on 1945 rates and then be in line for new concessions based on 1955 rates.

In summary, Japan would get her benefits in three baskets: (a) her own bilateral agreement, (b) the generalization of concessions to be made to other countries through GATT, (c) new concessions after July 1, either direct or by generalization. These are in addition to the concessions previously granted to Japan through generalization of all tariff reductions made by the United States since the beginning of the trade-agreement program.

The power to make unilateral tariff reductions on goods "not imported or imported in negligible quantities may be exercised either unilaterally or other wise. The reductions permitted are 50 percent of the 1945 rates, and on a wide range of articles this percentage can still be fully applied.

The value of the criterion negligible is wholly negligible.

In the determination of goods not imported, the President is not required to relate the condition of nonimport to any representative period or to any special circumstances, or any reason whatsoever. In view of the many items involved, this provision may be the most dangerous feature of the bill.

The power to reduce all rates above the 50-percent ad valorem equivalent down to 50 percent is the only tariff-making power, the meaning of which is clear and definite. It is to be exercised unilaterally and without reference to trade agreements. In conjunction with his tariff-making powers, the President is instructed to make his rate changes applicable insofar as possible to entire categories. In this way the tariff cuts would be accomplished in wide swaths.

The devious and multiple routes which the administration is simultaneously following in the promotion of its tariff policy, when viewed all together, are utterly confusing and to our industry completely terrifying.

Because over 90 percent of the cotton-textile industry's production is represented by the items subject to negotiation at Geneva, we are being forced to appraise the possible effects of H. R. 1 on our industry without having the information vital to such appraisal: namely, starting from what level of tariff do the new tariff-cutting powers apply?

The United States Tariff Commission in September 1953 published a study entitled "Effect of Trade Agreement Concessions on United States Tariff Levels Based on Imports for 1952." Table 3 of this study gives the average ad valorem equivalent of rates of duty in effect on various dates on United States dutiable imports for consumption in the year 1952. With respect to Tariff Schedule 9—Cotton Manufacturers—this official table indicates that the average ad valorem equivalent based on rates in effect before any trade agreements were made was 36.8 percent; that on January 1, 1945, it was 30 percent; and that on January 1, 1953, it was 21.8 percent. Thus it appears that the reduction in rates on cotton manufactures from the pretrade agreement period until January 1, 1953, was 41 percent and that the

reduction from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1953, has been 27 percent.

Under existing authority, the President has the power to cut tariff rates in effect on January 1, 1945, by 50 percent. However, the Tariff Commission figures quoted above do not mean that 27 of these 50 percentage points have already been used in previous tariff-cutting actions on cotton manufacturers. The Tariff Commission table is based on dutiable imports in 1952 and, of course, many cotton textile items were imported in 1952 only in negligible quantities or not at all. Thus the indicated 27 percent reduction in rates simply means that the particular bundle of cotton manufacture imports in 1952 was such that had that particular bundle of cotton goods been imported in 1944 the average ad valorem rate equivalent would have been higher; indeed, would have been at such a level that the actual ad valorem equivalent in 1952 represented a 27-percent reduction.

However, while very serious tariff reductions have been made since January 1, 1945—the base date for existing tariff-cutting authority—on various important cotton textile items, the great bulk of staple cotton goods have had no tariff reductions since that date.

But many cotton textile tariff rates have already been effectively cut by the process of inflation. Existing tariff schedules provide for lower percentage rates on higher priced cloth. In the case of unbleached cotton cloth the lower rates take effect on values of over 70 cents per pound; on bleached cotton cloth the lower rates take effect on values over 80 cents per pound; and on printed, dyed, or colored cotton cloth, these lower rates take effect at values over 90 cents per pound. Because the whole level of prices has moved upward sharply since these rate-determining price points were set in prewar days, far more of the potential imports would qualify under the lower rates for high-value items.

Furthermore, cotton textile tariff rates were sharply reduced in several prewar trade agreements, the most important being those with the United Kingdom and Switzerland. It is the rates then established which still obtained on January 1, 1945—the base date for existing tariff-cutting authority. Indeed, as compared with rates established by the Tariff Act of 1930, trade agreements previously negotiated have already imposed tariff reductions on about 91 percent of the cotton textile industry's production. These cuts have averaged about 37 percent. For many individual items they have amounted to as much as 50 percent, and on a limited number of items the rates have already been reduced by the permissible maximum of 75 percent of the 1930 level.

Cotton textile items representing about 90 percent of the total yardage output of the United States industry can conceivably suffer tariff reductions of 50 percent at Geneva and under the provisions of H. R. 1 the authority to cut those resulting tariffs by another 15 percent is proposed. Specifically, as an example, the current tariff rate on unbleached cotton cloth of yarn No. 34 and valued at not over 70 cents per pound is 21.90 percent ad valorem. This could be cut at Geneva to 10.95 percent and then under H. R. 1 could be further reduced in a 3-year period down to 9.31 percent.

The Tariff Commission table previously referred to, when analyzed in conjunction with the fact that on most countable cotton cloths the President still has his full 50 percent tariff-cutting powers under existing law, means that most countable cotton cloths are now being imported in what might be considered negligible quantities under section 5 (a) of H. R. 1. That section of the bill before you would authorize the President to cut existing rates on those cotton textile items by 50 percent by simple proclamation. Thus, even should the President

at Geneva not avail himself of his entire tariff-cutting authority relative to cotton textiles under existing law, H. R. 1 in section 5 (a) would, in effect, continue all of his tariff-cutting powers. This may well be the most dangerous provision of H. R. 1 from the standpoint of the United States cotton-textile industry.

Also scheduled for possible tariff reductions in the Geneva negotiations are the products of this industry's chief customers, including, for example, cotton clothing, chenille rugs, knitted gloves, etc. Practically all apparel items manufactured from either woven or knitted cotton fabrics are on the list. While cotton yarns are not directly included, the list does include a great majority of the products manufactured from cotton yarns.

It is particularly significant that the Japanese have found it profitable, at existing tariff rates, to expand cotton textile exports to the United States in a year like 1954 when American textile prices have been depressed. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, United States cotton mill margins in late 1954 were the lowest since July 1952 when the post-Korean price collapse was taking place.

The United States Census Bureau reports that since the crop year 1952-53, domestic cotton consumption has declined by about 1 million bales on an annual basis.

For every dollar the industry earned after taxes in the third quarter of 1953, it made but 40 cents profits in the comparable period of 1954.

In the last few weeks there has been a modest improvement in the cotton textile markets. The present revival will, however, surely be reversed should the threat of substantial additional Japanese imports materialize.

The United States Government has apparently made the decision that the textile industry is available for sacrifice on the high altar of foreign trade policy.

There are in fact three bits of evidence which, when fitted together, make possible no other conclusion:

1. The list of items scheduled for tariff concessions at Geneva includes more than 90 percent of the output of the United States cotton textile industry;

2. H. R. 1 proposes to compound the tariff concessions to Japan by taking as points of departure for further tariff cuts under its authority those new lower rates which will result from the Geneva negotiations;

3. The list of items scheduled for possible tariff concessions at Geneva and H. R. 1 have been drafted by persons who have access to readily available public information indicating that (a) the cotton-textile industry, almost alone among major United States industries, has been in a depressed condition despite the general economic boom of the last 2 years and that (b) the cotton-textile industry, on the record, suffered substantial injury from Japanese imports in the last previous peacetime period (the late 1930's) despite the fact that in those years United States textile tariff rates were higher than at present.

One aspect of the proposed tariff concessions on cotton textiles which the proponents of H. R. 1 have tried to sweep under the table is the intimate connection between the economic health of domestic textile manufacturing industry and the prosperity of cotton agriculture. This relationship can be put very simply: 2 out of every 3 bales of cotton grown by American farmers are sold to United States cotton textile mills. Thus a reduction in the output of those mills would be immediately reflected in a reduction of domestic mill consumption.

Moreover, those officials who drew up the list of items to be considered at Geneva for possible tariff concessions compounded the threat to United States cotton agriculture by including on that list synthetic fibers.

Clearly enough, a reduction of the United States tariff on synthetic fibers would reduce the price of synthetic fibers to United States textile mills and would mean—because mills can process cotton or synthetics depending on relative prices—the loss of additional portions of cotton's current market to synthetic fibers.

Besides cotton agriculture, other important segments of the United States economy depend upon the continued health of the United States cotton-textile industry. The cotton-textile industry, being one of the largest American industries as measured by output, employment, etc., is a major customer of many other industries. Chief among these are the textile-machinery industry and the chemical industry, the latter supplying many hundreds of different products used by the cotton mills. Clearly, any reduction in productive activity of the United States cotton-textile industry would reduce the markets of the United States machinery, chemical, and other supplier industries.

We call to the particular attention of the committee the threat to small business implicit in H. R. 1 when read in conjunction with the list of items subject to tariff concessions at Geneva: the apparel industry is made up almost entirely of small firms; 75 percent of the cotton-manufacturing industry consists of small independent units, none of which has as much as 1 percent of the total business; and cotton agriculture is made up of hundreds of thousands of small farms.

What does the United States Government hope to accomplish through encouraging additional cotton-textile imports? We have given this problem much earnest study and have concluded that there are two basic reasons for the Government's attitude toward our industry. The first reason is, we believe, blind reliance upon the economic theory of free trade in the State Department.

The economic theory of free trade is part of a wider theory of free movements of prices and wages. We cannot practice the theory in one part of our economy alone. A moment's thought is sufficient to remind us that in the United States economy of 1955 we have put firm floors under wages through the Wages and Hours Act and under prices through the agricultural price support program.

The cotton-textile industry is proud of the fact that over the last 20 years it has succeeded in raising the average wage rate paid its employees by roughly 500 percent—a much more rapid rise than the increase in the cost of living during that period. We do not want our employees to have to compete with the low wage levels which reflect living standards of the Orient. In any event, employers and employees in the industry would be prevented from competing in such manner by the Federal minimum wage law. The only adjustment possible for the industry to make, if it is forced to compete with oriental wage scales, would be made through the unemployment of its workers and the bankruptcy of its firms.

A good deal of callous comment has been bandied about on the problem of unemployment as related to tariff policy. Advocates of further tariff cuts, when confronted with the fact that these cuts will mean additional imports and that these additional imports will mean reduced production of those items in United States domestic plants, frequently take refuge in that aspect of free trade theory which holds that such unemployment is but a short-run problem and that those people who lose their jobs as a result of import competition will find jobs in other industries.

One or two comments on this aspect of free trade theory seem appropriate. In the first place, the unemployed are not statistical ciphers. They are real live people who have to eat every day, whose children outgrow shoes every other week, and who are attached by habit if not by mortgage to a

particular geographic locality. Furthermore, they possess special skills which, in many instances, required years of apprenticeship to acquire and they are frequently above the age at which, because of pension cost problems, new employers will hire them.

To say that if we import unemployment by cutting tariffs, it will all work out in the long run, sounds very noble indeed but the fact is that the people involved have to live in the short run and in the long run all of us are dead anyhow.

Nor can the impact of this unemployment problem be limited to those persons who are without work because their employer has lost his market to foreign competition. The economic structure of whole communities is involved. In the textile industry, for example, it is quite a typical situation that the cotton mill is located in a small town and its payroll is the economic lifeblood of the entire community. For every 100 civilian jobs in manufacturing in the United States there are 260 jobs not in manufacturing that are related thereto.

For a long period the American proponents of lower tariffs have declared as part of their propaganda that lower wages in foreign countries were offset here by correspondingly higher efficiencies of operation.

The fact is that Japan now has a cotton textile manufacturing industry whose efficiency is equal to or above that of the textile industries of Europe and which compares favorably with the average efficiency of the American industry. The Japanese industry is new. More than three-fourths of their existing capacity has been built since 1945. Their average wages are in the neighborhood of 13 cents an hour, which is one-tenth of the average cotton textile wage in the United States. Raw cotton costs, because of the low cost of ocean transport, are essentially the same in Japan and the United States. Of the remaining costs, about one-half consists of wages. With a wage cost one-tenth of that in the United States, Japan has a tremendous competitive advantage.

The other major reason that our Government is encouraging additional cotton textile imports into the United States is, in our opinion, excessive timidity in meeting the real problems of the world economy. One would hardly expect to cure the problems of the world coal industry through the device of taking more coals to Newcastle. It is equally foolish to expect to cure the world textile problem by shipping additional cloth into an American market which is already more than amply supplied by a domestic industry characterized by excess capacity. Half the people on the face of the globe are in rags today. The real solution lies in increasing textile consumption in the textile-short areas of the world where textile imports are restricted by all sorts of ingenious quantitative and currency control devices.

We propose that the problem of world trade be met directly. We suggest that our Government demand reciprocal performance by other nations on their previous trade and tariff commitments to this country, including a return to convertible currencies. Let us exert our influence in the world toward that end. Thank you.

We Pushed Chiang Into Tachens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an interesting article written by Joseph Alsop

So? So this is our choice:

We can settle for a steady but moderate expansion in our economy this year and in the years to come. And we can argue that in this sort of business climate prices will be stable, inflation will remain under control, the dollars' value will hold, and, in the end, America will be stronger and the majority will be better off.

But if we settle for this, we also accept the likelihood that millions of jobless families will find chatter of prosperity a bitter mockery and unemployment will be our key problem.

Or we can insist on a much bigger and faster expansion this year and in the years to come and we can demand Government actions—immediate tax cuts, speeded-up spending, etc., to impel the growth.

But if we insist on this, we also accept the risks of a rising price level, a renewed inflation, and the danger that the dollar's value will shrink year after year.

Application of H. R. 1 to Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following text of the statement filed by the Textile Workers Union of America with the House Committee on Ways and Means which has been furnished me by Mr. John W. Edelman, Washington representative, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO:

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., January 24, 1955.

The Honorable JERE COOPER,
The House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOPER: We herewith wish to express our position concerning H. R. 1, concerning which you are now conducting hearings. Basically, our position relates to the application of H. R. 1 to the textile industry. It is that such industries should be exempt and excluded from the application of the provisions of the proposed bill, so that further reductions in rates of the appropriate schedules be prohibited.

We are, therefore, proposing that a further provision be included, providing such exemption, which would read:

"No foreign trade agreement entered into by the President after January 1, 1955, under section 350 of the Tariff Act, as amended and extended (19 U. S. C., sec. 1351), shall operate to reduce, for any period on or after the effective date of this act, the rates of duty which were applicable on January 1, 1955, with respect to any of the articles listed in sections 901-918, 921-923 of schedule 9; sections 1002-1023 of schedule 10; sections 1105-1122 of schedule 11; sections 1202-1211 of schedule 12; sections 1301-1312 of schedule 13."

We hope that the committee further resolves that this exemption shall be equally binding upon the President of the United States in his further negotiations with the Government of Japan.

We wish to make evident one basic fact to you and the members of your committee. The industry likely to be primarily affected by reductions in tariff rates is the textile industry. Current estimates by Dr. Howard Piquet indicate that one-half of the estimated increase in imports likely to result

from such reductions would consist of textiles. A movement for more extensive imports at the expense of domestic industry would, therefore, primarily affect the textile industry.

We are determined to stop this movement, designed to make the textile industry the sacrificial lamb for the aggressive large-scale American industries promoting foreign exports. The present bill is clearly an attempt to sacrifice some American industries for the purpose of promoting immediate exports by others.

The present bill is being promoted behind a barrage of claims which cannot stand up under careful and close scrutiny. The main accomplishment will be a gesture to the export interests of some foreign countries and of the United States. They have exaggerated the possible economic advantages which would result from the present bill or even from a sweeping removal of tariff restrictions. There will be individual beneficiaries among the foreign countries, but the absolute value of increased imports would be rather minimal. The primary result would be the injuries to established American industries, rather than assistance to the whole of the foreign economies. The impact on specific groups of American employees will be immense, but the benefits to the balance of payments of foreign countries will be of small order.

It is important to record the important fact that the ratio of imports to American production has been reduced over the last few decades, not because of import barriers but because of the ability of the American economy to produce more cheaply and economically, and to substitute synthetic products for former imports. We eliminated more opportunities for foreign earnings through the production of nylon, synthetic rubber, dacron, orlon, and similar products, than we have ever stopped through our tariff rates. To contend otherwise is to overlook the facts of history.

The major impact, therefore, is the destruction of or severe injury to some American industries.

One of the major defects of the current bill is that it permits the indiscriminate application of lower rates without providing the President of the United States any guidance as to the type of industries which should be protected and what guide posts might properly be used in determining the size and range of injury which may be permissible. It is a reckless delegation of power. It appears to us that it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to itemize such restrictions and concerns and to enumerate the areas where injury may not be done.

We believe, for reasons we have previously enumerated, that no such injury should be perpetrated upon the American textile industry. These may be summarized as follows:

1. A high level of unemployment prevails in many divisions of the textile industry. Alternative employments are limited in textile areas.

2. Current technological changes, inter-fiber, interprocess, and interproduct competition are threatening many more jobs.

3. In view of the prevalence of unemployment, this is an inopportune time for further concessions which would complicate the adjustment process.

4. Certain branches of the textile industry included in the current negotiations are the branches of the traditional industries which have the best chance for continued survival in inter-fiber competition and therefore should not be threatened by a new increase in the volume of imports.

5. The industry has lost many foreign markets and export volume has been sharply reduced and is further threatened.

6. Textile imports should not be conceived as primary sources of international trade for

countries involved in the proposed negotiations.

7. The maintenance of an adequate American textile industry is essential to our national standard of living, position, and defense.

8. The American textile industry is one of the largest of all textile industries and its position must be maintained.

9. Protection of the American industry has had few unfavorable effects upon the American or world textile economy.

10. The tariff mechanism is a faulty determinant of the flow of textiles and is complicated by current raw-material price policies.

11. Concessions should not be negotiated for products which are primarily supplied by countries other than those with whom negotiations are contemplated.

12. Limited types of imports of textile products can contribute to new ideas, developments, fabrics, and designs, but they should not come in such volume as to destroy segments of the American industry.

13. We urge the promotion of international fair-labor standards in the world textile industry to avoid competition on the basis of exploited labor.

We have reiterated on several occasions our conviction that textile imports into this country can only have a destructive effect upon our domestic industry which is now suffering from widespread disorganization and in which hundreds of thousands of unemployed may be found. The benefits resulting to the foreign producers will be limited. They will disorganize the markets temporarily, accelerate the closing of mills, and aggravate the unemployment conditions, but in the long run they will be unable to match the efficiency, designing, and merchandising qualities of the American market. The rising efficiency in the American industry has enabled the American textile industry to meet foreign exports with considerable success. Current developments promise to increase this capacity to meet the foreign exporter in the American market. But during this transition the increased volume of imports can only be harmful to us, and ultimately, to the foreign producer, for it will be creating the false illusion that he will be able to get a permanent foothold in this country when as a matter of fact he will not.

The internal competitive forces in the textile industry are so virulent and destructive of existing interests within our country, that they are displacing tens of thousands of workers and rendering the adjustments difficult and staggering. We urge that these problems not be intensified through imports which, within a short period of time, will be unable to hurdle even our most modest tariff rates because of the rising productivity, merchandising and designing skill of our American industry.

Therefore, we request the enactment of an exemption of the textile industry from the above bill and the Tariff Act of 1930 as the most fitting declaration of public policy.

Among the most doctrinaire free-traders, there are many who are willing to concede that a special exemption should be granted to the textile industry. We herewith appeal to you and members of your committee that this prevailing sentiment among the free-traders should be reflected in the current legislation.

For a more extensive presentation of fact, I am enclosing our statement before the United States Tariff Commission and a further statement before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

Please have this letter and the enclosures inserted in the record of your hearings. We have not appeared personally because of the short time you made available and your crowded schedule. We, nevertheless, believe that this written communication will receive the same attention as an oral presentation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CHUPKA,
General Secretary-Treasurer.

The Helena Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to insert an excellent editorial from the February 12 issue of the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal relative to the proposed bridge at Helena, Ark., across the Mississippi River.

This bridge has been a 30-year dream of progressive and civic-minded citizens not only of Helena and Clarksdale, Miss., but of good far-sighted citizens throughout the Midsouth.

This is another milestone in the work that has seen the creation of the Helena-Friars Point Bridge Commission with such fine men on the commission as W. K. Anderson, R. N. Baltser, Clarence Thomas, E. K. Brewer, Jr., and M. D. Brett, of Clarksdale, Miss.; R. L. Brooks, J. B. Lambert, John C. Sheffield, and J. B. Lasswell, of Helena, Ark.; Grady Cooke, of Pontotoc, Miss.; Ballard Deane, of St. Charles, Ark.; Jack Dunlap, of Batesville, Ark.; Sol Hersberg, of Friars Point, Miss.; Neil Hodge, of Oxford, Miss.; C. N. Houck, of Mariann, Ark.; DeWitt Poe, of McGhee, Ark.; and William Campbell, of Forrest City, Ark.

These commissioners were joined some 2½ years ago by a group of good Helena citizens who created a nonprofit citizens committee to secure this bridge. C. L. Harris, of Helena, Ark., was elected president, and W. G. Dinning, Jr., was made secretary-treasurer. J. D. Molitor, of Marvell, Ark., was named vice president. This group established a steering committee to handle the actual work of the committee. This committee consists of Judge John C. Sheffield, ex-Gov. Ben Laney, C. L. Harris, Sam Anderson, Walter Morris, J. B. Lambert, J. J. White, and Wayne Stone.

This is the background of hard work and civic enterprise that has resulted in this favorable action toward securing a much-needed bridge across the Mississippi River at this point.

Such a bridge will be of great value to the economy of the great Midsouth area and will result in even greater growth. It will provide an excellent artery of travel for all the citizens of our Nation. But—of equal importance—it will furnish a needed bridge to fit into the great program of defense in the linking of military installations throughout the Nation.

The editorial from the Commercial Appeal reads as follows:

THE HELENA BRIDGE

Reports that a bridge can be built across the Mississippi near Helena, Ark., on a businesslike plan, is good news for the entire Midsouth. It also demands warm congratulation and commendation for the civic-minded and farsighted citizens of Arkansas and Mississippi who have cherished and fought for the realization of a dream for nearly 3 decades.

The enthusiasm of the proponents of the bridge has been of the hard-headed, realistic sort, which is all to the good, and it is a fact typical of the spirit of sound progress that now animates the entire Midsouth area. It has resulted in the careful formulation of a program that will mean a cooperative enterprise that will benefit all the people of this area and pay for itself through tolls no higher than charges now made for inadequate ferry service.

Present circumstances and the experience of comparable communities in the Midsouth indicate that the bridge at Helena can be financed on a sound basis, and that it will pay out in from 12 to 14 years. Such an estimate is, we think, conservative, as it should be. Unless all signs fail, however, revenues may easily be considerably larger than current planning envisions.

The fact that another bridge over the Mississippi is so needed is another proof of the consistent growth and prospering of the region. The structure will be so designed that it will be capable of meeting demands sure to be made by the future importance of this section. While the best interests of the communities closest to the bridge may seem to be most directly served, it will actually be an asset of comparable value to all of us in the Midsouth.

Nothing could better justify confidence in our future than such a demonstration of resolution in behalf of progress.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, why destroy the jobs of 2,250,000 workers in the American textile mills by enacting H. R. 1?

Under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD the statement of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, presented by Claudius T. Murchison, economic adviser, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to H. R. 1, the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act extension, as follows:

The textile products industry is one of the great industries of America and about three-fourths of it is composed of the cotton-textile industry. To give it exact ranking is difficult because of the technical and sometimes arbitrary nature of industry definitions. But it is enough to know that by the usual measurements it is one of the top six of the manufacturing industries of the United States, the others being food, chemicals and allied products, motor vehicles, iron and steel, and machinery manufacture.

Stockholders equity and borrowed capital of the textile products industry are reported by the Federal Trade Commission as being \$8.3 billion, which is about 5 percent of the total for all American industry. If we add the apparel and finished goods industry, which is merely an advanced stage of the textile products industry, the total of invested capital or assets, however we wish to term it, becomes \$11 billion, or about 6.5 percent of overall total of American industries.

This giant activity employs roughly 2¼ million people who are about evenly divided between the 2 major divisions. In a num-

ber of States and in many localities and areas textile employment is the most important single source of income, and in several States such employment exceeds that of all other manufacturing activities combined.

In our appearance here today we propose to show that textile-mill-products industry and the closely related apparel-manufacturing industry are seriously threatened by the administration of tariff policy under existing legislation, and that the effect of H. R. 1 would be greatly to intensify the threat of damage or even destruction which already confronts us. We would like to emphasize this statement without impairing its meaning by stating that H. R. 1, if enacted, would complete the process of entrusting the jobs and the well-being of 2¼ million textile workers to the executive division of Government, more specifically the State Department, as an incident of our foreign economic policy.

We propose to show that no effective criteria are provided either to guide or to limit the State Department in the exercise of this great responsibility. Even more important is the absence of any effective recourse or defense against whatever course of action the executive division of Government might choose to follow.

We propose to show that, in fact, H. R. 1 would represent the final installment of power to destroy the textile industry of the United States. We do not say that this power will be fully exercised, but its incorporation in the hands of an agency whose function is normally and rightfully restricted to international affairs is a violation of our concept of constitutional government and a danger of the first magnitude.

While H. R. 1 is being debated in terms of its specific provisions, the Government has under way 4 other foreign trade operations whose completion will completely transform the significance of those provisions.

The effects of the bill, therefore, cannot be judged by relating its provisions to the current trade and tariff structure, or to the current tariff powers of Congress. Before its effective date, if enacted, important portions of the tariff structure, as we now have it, will be dismantled and the tariff-making responsibilities of the Congress may be seriously impaired, if not abrogated.

These impending events are the goals of the following scheduled operations:

1. The renegotiation of GATT as an international agency of trade and tariff control;
2. The announced intention of the Chief Executive to seek congressional ratification of GATT;

3. The scheduling of another round of multilateral tariff concessions among GATT members beginning in February;

4. Intention to negotiate a bilateral trade agreement with Japan, and to press for the admittance of Japan into GATT.

The first of these, the renegotiation of GATT, has been in process for some weeks. The outcome is uncertain, the conflicts of interest are bitter. Certain members may resign, others may withdraw concessions as permitted by article 28. Large-scale revisions of the over-all tariff structure may, in consequence, have to be made, involving previous concessions in addition to the long list of articles to be newly negotiated. Also up for renegotiation are the policy provisions of GATT relating to such vital matters as, quotas, subsidies, exchange restrictions, trade discriminations and internal economic programs.

How can Congress or the industry judge H. R. 1 as to its ultimate effects without first knowing the outcome of these negotiations?

The second tariff operation aims at the congressional ratification of GATT. It is possible that Congress may be requested to impart treaty status to this organization. Such action could transform GATT into a supranational instrumentality whose au-

and appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 13, 1955:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

WE PUSHED CHIANG INTO TACHENS

TACHEN ISLANDS.—If you want the real measure of what has happened to the Eisenhower administration and American foreign policy in the last 2 years, consider the story of those barren, controversial rocks, the Tachen Islands. If it were not so serious, it would be a cosmic joke.

The background of the drama of the evacuation of the Tachens was simple enough. It is no secret that for 10 days or so Chiang Kai-shek balked bitterly at making a present of the Tachens to the Communists. The Eisenhower administration had to press Chiang very hard indeed to take his troops off the Tachens before the Chinese Communists attacked them.

The joke lies in the fact that just 2 years ago the shoe was on exactly the other foot.

Those were the brave early days of Eisenhower policymaking. There was no talk then of cease-fires and peaceful coexistence and the like. Instead, the watchwords were liberation, dynamic new foreign policy, recaptured initiative, and the "unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek."

President Eisenhower's dramatic announcement that, after being wickedly held in check by the Truman administration, the generalissimo had now been boldly unleashed by the Republicans, caused a wave of reaction that reached all the way to the rocky Tachens.

At that time the islands were held by light guerrilla forces, hardly more important than those which fought for Yikiangshan through close to three bloody days. The Formosa government considered the Tachens too distant from the main island to be covered by air or supplied by sea. The generalissimo and his military advisers did not wish, therefore, to commit either their prestige or large components of their regular forces to the defense of the Tachens. In short, the islands were then being treated as expendable.

But President Eisenhower had given the watchword. Chiang Kai-shek was unleashed. The Tachens were doubly valuable, as a base for irregular guerrilla operations on the mainland and as a forward radar warning point for both Formosa and Okinawa. So the American military advisory group on Formosa began pressing Chiang very hard to put regulars on the Tachens. This was one of the measures devised in Washington to give a little reality to the famous unleashing.

The Americans did not win their point with ease. The generalissimo was extremely reluctant to put regulars on the Tachens. Certain key Chinese military leaders, particularly the chief of staff of that period, Gen. Chou Chi-jo, resisted the American project to the end. Nonetheless, as usually happens on Formosa, the American advisers triumphed in the end.

The 46th Division was specially chosen to be sent to the islands. Even after the 46th had been installed and the defense positions had been organized, however, the American advisers of the Chinese Government were still dissatisfied.

The commander on the Tachens, Gen. Hu Tsung-nan was one of the old boys of the Chinese Nationalist army, with a record that did not inspire confidence.

Once again heavy American pressure was put on the generalissimo to replace the Tachen commander. When this reporter was in Formosa last year, the Americans had just won their second victory for the defense of the Tachens. Gen. Hu Tsung-nan had been recalled and the able Gen. Liu Nien-li has just been given the Tachen command, which he still holds.

In those days, too, one of the real wonders of Formosa was the world's most uncovered covert operation, the American-financed Western Enterprises. Western Enterprises combined the claim to invisibility with a private housing development, special PX's, social clubs and other rather conspicuous amenities. The whole town of Taipei knew that the Spooks, as they were locally called, were helping the guerrilla operations based on the Tachens.

But now the Spooks are folding their bedsheets and packing to go home. Western Enterprises, as any pedicab driver will tell you, is soon to be no more, and its assets, whatever they may be, are to be transferred to the Navy. This is in fact a significant move in the direction of a cease-fire down the middle of the Formosa Strait and general acceptance of two Chinas, which are now the real aims of the Eisenhower administration's Asian policymakers.

All of which is important for two reasons. In the first place, what are the unfortunate Chinese Nationalists to think when they are first powerfully pressured to defend the essential Tachens at all costs, and then told that the Tachens are not essential after all, and please to evacuate at once? This reporter has never shared the Knowland-Robertson-Radford view of the unvarying rightness of Formosa. But in view of the record the generalissimo and his advisers certainly seem to deserve some sympathy at this time.

In the second place, might we not be better off in Asia today if there had not been so much loud, empty talk at the beginning, and if there were a bit more boldness, spirit and determination in our policymaking today? Maybe it is impolite to ask the question, but the facts demand that it should be asked.

Address by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, on Occasion of Lincoln's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, February 12, 1955, Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, addressed the largest dinner in the United States in honor of the memory of Abraham Lincoln. It was held in the largest ballroom in the Greater New York area at the Hotel St. George in Brooklyn. Over 2,000 people attended the affair which was sponsored by the Kings County (N. Y.) Republican County Committee of which Commissioner John R. Crews is chairman. Governor McKeldin's speech was most enthusiastically received by all, and I believe all my colleagues would be interested in what he had to say. The following is his speech:

In the heart of the capital city of each of the two super powers that bestride the world today stands a monumental structure dedicated to the memory of a great man. In Moscow's Red Square, and at the foot of the Mall in Washington they stand, two masses of stone, silent, yet each clamoring for the attention of a vast nation. These structures of stone are dumb, yet each voices the

aspirations of a people dominating half the world.

They are symbolical, but it is precisely in its symbols that one may see most clearly displayed the heart and mind of a civilization. The Parthenon in Athens, the Forum in Rome, Westminster Abbey in London, and Napoleon's arch in Paris speak to us more eloquently of their epochs than do the rhetoric of orators and the tomes of historians. So may the two symbols of our own time, if we will pause long enough to study them and to understand.

In certain respects they are similar. Both are massive. Both stand foursquare, planted solidly on the solid earth, built not for the uses of the moment but for all time. Both are focal points of history and patriotic shrines. But beyond these superficialities they are as widely different as the men they memorialize and as the civilizations that erected them.

The memorial in Red Square is secret, shut in, and without doors, fortified at every point to resist vandals and containing two mummified corpses. Like the Egyptian pyramids, it is eloquent of the most futile, yet most persistent, of human delusions, the idea that men can be erected into gods, eternal and unchanging. Scornful of life, because the law of life is change, it is, indeed, a tomb in which are buried not only the remains of two mortals, but also freedom of the mind and spirit. It is a reminder that although Lenin and Stalin are dead, yet they claim rulership of the future, dominion over the souls of the Russian people, and it is blasphemy to dispute the claim. It is in reality a monument to what the law calls mortmain, the grip of the dead hand upon the living spirit.

The Lincoln Memorial in Washington is doorless, too, but because it is wide open, the light may enter, storm and sunshine may enter, the winds of heaven may sweep through it, and the people may enter. High or low, rich or poor, venerable patriarch or babe in arms, none is shut out for race or color or creed, and the only price of admission is humanity. Save for a marble statue, it is physically empty; but it seems to me that its emptiness might well be described in the phrase that the Arabian storytellers often applied to deserts and mountain heights—"filled with nothing but the presence of God."

For the walls are covered with certain great truths that I believe Abraham Lincoln was inspired of God to utter. His dead body lies elsewhere, but the living truth is in the memorial; and it is our faith that "man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live." He who has put into unforgettable words the truth of the living God, lives in that truth and nothing that happens to his mortal frame can extinguish that life. It is to this principle as exemplified in the man that the American people have erected a memorial to the living Lincoln who, although he suffered the common fate, still lives in the truth that shall never die.

From the walls of the memorial I take some words spoken, shall I say on March 4, 1865, or this morning? For when words apply to a situation the precise moment in time when they were first uttered is not important; they are living words at the moment when their wisdom and utility become apparent. Consider the situation in which our country finds itself in 1955, 90 years later; and then imagine, if you can, that you read in today's newspapers this counsel: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work that we are in . . . to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Abraham Lincoln did not face the problem of coexistence with a world half of which is dominated by communism, but it is my belief that if he had done so he would have altered not one word of that carefully studied utterance. He was, in fact, facing an enemy whose armies had come closer to inflicting final defeat upon this Republic than any other armed force has come, before or since. British, Mexican, Spanish, German, Austrian, Italian, and Japanese foes we had, or we have since dealt with effectively, and without ruinous strain; but when Americans rose against us we almost went under. It was to a badly shaken and almost exhausted nation that Lincoln addressed his words; it is unthinkable that he would be less insistent upon justice and moderation were he addressing a nation superbly armed and possessing economic power that towers over the world.

When enemy tanks, the modern substitute for cavalry, have penetrated the suburbs of Baltimore and circled within sight of the Washington monument, then we may begin to feel what Lincoln's hearers were feeling when he urged upon them "malice toward none and charity for all," and dismissed victory in favor of "a just and lasting peace." If his counsel was wise and good then, it is wiser and better now; his body was consigned to the earth long ago, but "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord doth man live," and words of wisdom and righteousness proceed from the Lord. The living Lincoln is still our counselor and guide.

His profound fear is implicit in every word of that passage. It was not fear of the Confederacy. "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right" he was ready to face any armed foe steadily and calmly. But he knew that more dangerous enemies were advancing upon the Nation as he spoke. He knew that hatred in our own hearts is a willier and more elusive foe than Stonewall Jackson and that prejudice and vengeance can crush a nation that the military genius of Robert E. Lee could not overcome. If that was true in 1865, it is not a whit less true in 1955.

Let us, as St. Paul advised, "think on these things" in a day when it is bodily proclaimed that "there is no substitute for victory" not even a just and lasting peace. Let us remember them when a President's efforts to restrain the hasty and proceed in accordance with the law of nations are denounced as "shrinking weakness." Let us bear them in mind when the merchants of hate are asserting that any attitude toward an opponent save one of blind fury is a betrayal of the Nation. For if the day ever comes when Americans reading the second inaugural react with nothing but incredulous scorn, then indeed Lincoln will be dead—and the greatness of our country will be dead with him.

Our position is difficult and perilous, but this is not the Nation's darkest hour. That came when Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States and nothing since has approached it. We shall do well now to remember that in the most fearful crisis through which the country has passed the most steadfast man in America was none of the fire-eaters who had passionately demanded war to the death. It was the man who valued a just and lasting peace far more than victory. It was the man whom they accused of worse than shrinking weakness. It was the man whom they called trimmer, time-server and coward but who, when the war had grown red hot, and the braggarts and swashbucklers had fled in panic, stood undaunted "with firmness in the right."

Lincoln saved the Union, not with his muscular, but with his spiritual strength; and he was spiritually powerful precisely because he lived "with malice toward none, with charity for all." Lincoln will save the

Union again, will save it whenever it is threatened if we allow his spirit to govern our thoughts and deeds.

For he understood as only our greatest men have understood how the destiny of America is oriented toward the rising, not the setting sun, toward the future struggling to be born, not toward the dead past. His mind was large enough to comprehend all the implications of Jefferson's dictum that the earth belongs to the living. One of those implications is that government is a living organism that must assume new shapes if it is to flourish under new conditions.

Lincoln would have been distressed and alarmed at the suggestion that his words were to be received as the law of the Medes and Persians, that altereth not. In this famous letter to Greeley he expressed his readiness to adopt any policy that would assure preservation of the Union, and because he was always ready to shape his policy according to the facts he was accused of wavering and inconstancy.

Of course we know today that Lincoln was the steadfast figure and it was those men who were willing to subvert the truth rather than surrender one of their pet theories who were inconstant. We know it of Lincoln, but it is hard for us to realize that those men of our own generation who adhere to the standards of reason and justice, even if it means a shift in policy every day, are more steadfast than those who quote, but misapply the words of Lincoln, or Washington, or Jefferson to justify measures that are neither reasonable nor right.

There are among us, of course, men so obsessed by the love of novelty that they will approve any change merely because it is a change. These are men who have never come fully alive, just as those who would subvert truth to tradition are already half dead. Neither immature minds, nor senile minds can comprehend the mind of the living Lincoln which is neither for nor against change, neither scornful of nor dedicated to tradition, but committed to the search for truth and to nothing else.

This is the essence of that much-abused word "liberalism." The liberal believes that the American form of government is not like the Statue of Liberty, finished and complete, but is like a tree, a living and growing thing. Normally, the liberal looks toward the future, but this does not mean that he never glances at the past. Truth is one and immortal; but it has more shapes than Proteus and he who would hold it firmly must turn now this way, now that. Yet if his grip upon it is never broken, he is the most consistent of men for he steers a true course, although the shortsighted will call him today a radical and tomorrow a reactionary.

No man is today striving with more might for the peace that justice brings, or with more realization of the overwhelming necessity for the achievement of this goal, than our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. By his actions and by his words he is seeking to do in our day what Lincoln sought to do in his.

Only last month, in his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower named as first among the purposes of our Federal Government its obligation "to maintain justice and freedom among ourselves and, to champion them for others so that we may work effectively for enduring peace." He further placed particular stress on our national obligation, "to labor earnestly, patiently, prayerfully, for peace, for freedom, for justice, throughout the world." Many times has President Eisenhower reiterated, since his inauguration, that we cannot hope to achieve these goals unless our Government in all its dealings acts with "integrity and decency and dignity." Just as Lincoln recognized the importance of spiritual strength, so has President Eisenhower, who recently summarized

his philosophy of government in the striking phrase: "To keep America strong, our Government must have a heart as well as a head."

Thus, President Eisenhower follows the path which the living Lincoln continues to illuminate.

The man whose only policy is to do what seems to be reasonable and right in any situation that may arise is a follower and spiritual heir of Abraham Lincoln, although he may never parrot Lincoln's words or imitate any of his deeds. The ways and means that any great man uses to attain his ends are, like his physical body, part of the time, adapted to the time, and passing with the time. It is the goal at which he aims that endures through generations, and all who aim at the same goal are his successors, although their ways and means may be different.

"To achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations" was Abraham Lincoln's goal. Note well the qualifications—it was not merely peace that he sought, it was the kind of peace that should be just and lasting. A man who is for peace at any price is a stranger to Lincoln, for justice is more important than peace, and stability and order cannot be maintained without justice. But whenever an American strives with all his might for the peace that justice brings, in that man Lincoln lives again, speaks again, labors again.

So we have left the Lincoln Memorial wide open, knowing that no tomb, however stately, could contain his living spirit. "The whole earth," said Pericles, "is the sepulcher of famous men, not only are they commemorated by columns and inscriptions in their own country, but in foreign lands there dwells also an unwritten memorial of them, graven not on stone but in the hearts of men."

It is true of this man. In all the world there is no country so remote that it has not heard some whisper of his fame and been illumined by the radiance of his character. The work that we, his fellow countrymen are in, and that we should strive on to finish, is to make all men in all lands realize that he is not dead, but lives in the Nation that he saved; for its lordly ambition is today what it was yesterday and will be tomorrow and forever—not empire, not dominion, not the power of arms or of gold but "to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

The Subversive Activities Control Board and Communist Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the high-ranking status of the Georgetown University TV and Radio Forum as a medium of analysis and thoughtful interpretation of the numerous major issues confronting this Nation is well known to many of our Members. On January 16 a highly informative program was broadcast on the subject of the Subversive Activities Control Board and the Communist Fronts. The significance of the role of the Subversive Activities Control Board was developed against a full

background of Russian Communism by the participants, the Honorable Thomas J. Herbert, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University; and Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, staff director of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression, and authority on communism. Under unanimous consent, I include this transcription in the RECORD:

Now, Mr. Herbert, first, would you describe the SACB for us?

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Warren, it is difficult to describe it very comprehensively in a brief manner, but in short, this act, called the Internal Security Act of 1950, of which the Subversive Activities Control Act is a chapter, provides for orderly and proper procedure for the Attorney General of the United States to bring petitions before the Subversive Activities Control Board against what are classified in two categories, either alleged Communist action organizations or Communist front organizations. The only action brought against a so-called Communist-action organization is this suit which was commenced back in 1950, in November, shortly after the Board was organized, against the Communist Party of the United States. That the Board finally, after lengthy hearings, extending over about a year and a half, found the Communist Party of the United States of America to be a Communist-action organization as provided in this act. And then that was appealed by the Communist Party to the United States Court of Appeals, another one of the procedures provided in the act. Only last Friday the Court of Appeals denied an application for rehearing following their previously made ruling, to the effect of upholding in all major points the finding and report of the Board against the Communist Party. They now under the law have the right to appeal that to the United States Supreme Court, and they have 90 days in which to do that.

That shows you how the due process provisions of the Constitution are followed in giving all review rights directly from our Board findings to the court of appeals of this United States for the District of Columbia, and from there to the Supreme Court. It is a five-man board. The proceedings are initiated by a petition filed by the Attorney General, which is sworn to, and then after all the motions are ruled on, in exactly the same manner as they would be in a court proceeding, the thing is finally brought to issue by a petition and an answer by the respondent organization. Then long hearings are held and both parties are, that is, the Attorney General's department and the respondent organization, given a full chance to present all their evidence in open hearings, a record is made of that; they may introduce exhibits that are pertinent, and both sides are given full opportunity to cross-examine the other's witnesses. At the conclusion of that the recommendation is made for a finding. Then the full board considers it, and then eventually an order is written by the full board directed to the organization. If the Attorney General's case is sustained by the evidence, they find it to be a Communist front or Communist action organization, whichever the case may be, and then they take it on up from there.

There were 12 cases filed against so-called Communist-front organizations shortly before I became a member of the board in May 1953. We are in the process of hearing quite a number of these dozen cases now. I just recently concluded and rendered my recommended report and decision in the case of the Attorney General versus the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York City. That, in brief, is the way our board operates.

Mr. WARREN. I am sure we will be hearing more about that Jefferson School problem a little bit later in the program. That gives us a very good idea of the operation of the SACB. Mr. O'Connor, as staff director of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, what did your committee discover?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Warren, our committee devoted over 1 year of intensive inquiry into the subject of Communist aggression. We heard 335 witnesses, and took over 1,500 individual sworn depositions from actual eye-witnesses of Communist aggression and the victims of that tyranny. And the committee in a report rendered to the Congress as a whole during the month of December just past made this as their first conclusion, and now I quote: "That communism is a criminal conspiracy purposely designed for and deliberately directed at the enslavement of all mankind and the establishment of a world colonial empire."

I believe that statement on the part of a truly bipartisan committee, made up of very distinguished Americans, sets the record clear so far as just exactly what communism is and what communism intends to do to the world.

Mr. WARREN. Now, I think it is time we heard from Dr. Dobriansky. What are your observations, sir?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Concerning this particular question, I must say my observations are many. We have two matters here. Here is a governmental organization, the SACB, and just a moment ago Mr. O'Connor mentioned one of the main conclusions or recommendations of what has been called the Kersten Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression. In looking over some of the parts of the law and also the findings of the SACB I notice time and time again reference made to the world Communist movement, and in fact anyone scanning these findings and also parts of the Internal Security Act, can't but be impressed by the fact that some relationship must be established between any organization that calls itself American and this world Communist movement in order to predicate a charge against that organization or to compel it to register.

Now, when one looks at the political field one can see that this law and the activities of the SACB are in a sense a response to definite political necessities that have arisen in our time. For one thing one knows, looking through the political literature of the times, that many members of the Communist parties that one finds in countries outside of the Soviet Union are sent to Moscow for instruction; some for months, some for years. You have leaders of political parties, Communist parties, like Togliatti in Italy and others who frequently go to Moscow for consultations.

We have on the basis of the findings of the Kersten committee numerous Ukrainian Communists, Byelorussian Communists and Communists in the Baltic States and elsewhere who have played a conspicuously traitorous role. Not only that, I might say this, that the world Communist movement is not simply a political projection, if you will, of any ideology called Marxism but in fact has even deeper roots I would say in totalitarian Russian politics under the czar and even prior to that time.

I think the listening audience would be very much interested in knowing just how, let us say, that Moscow or St. Petersburg operated prior to the coming of the Communists, to give us an idea as to this matter of a world movement of one sort or another.

My contention here is that communism is an ideology which is used as an instrument to bedevil, dupe and subvert individuals in the free world in order to prepare for subsequent Communist aggression.

I have a few quotes here from none other than the masters of communism themselves. Take Engels, for example. Writing in about the eighties, Engels says this concerning totalitarian Russian politics:

"On the matter of pan-Slavism the idea is more than 100 years old and Russia uses it now every day. What is pan-Slavism but the application by Russia and Russian interests of the principle of nationality to the Serbians, Croats, Ruthenes, Slovaks, Czechs and other remnants of bygone Slavonian peoples in Turkey, Hungary and Germany. Even at this present moment the Russian Government has agents traveling among the Lapponians in northern Norway and Sweden trying to agitate among these nomadic savages the idea of a great Finnic which is to be restored in the extreme north of Europe under Russian protection, of course."

In a letter, for example, to Karl Kautsky, Engels said, "But in truth, pan-Slavism is a smoke screen for world dominion appearing in the cloak of a nonexistent Slavic nationality and therefore our worst enemy."

We can also find this in Karl Marx, who is oftentimes referred to by our contemporary Communists on the matter of conspiracy—this is taken from an article in the New York Tribune of April 19, 1853: "Hundreds of Russian agents perambulated Turkey, pointing out to the Greek Christians the Orthodox Emperor as the head, the natural protector, and the ultimate liberator of the oppressed eastern church, and to the south Slavonians especially, pointing out that same Emperor as the almighty Czar who is sooner or later to unite all the branches of the great Slav race under one scepter, and to make them the ruling race of Europe."

Those are their particular expressions of the past, but I might say here that in Moscow or at the Jefferson School of Science up in New York, or even among the various cells of the Communist Party, these particular abstracts that I have just rendered are not used. These words of Engels and Marx are banned. But my point is this, that Moscow today is using communism Marxism as an ideological instrument to serve its own ends, in the same way that the Russian Government in the past used pan-Slavism, and even going further back, used orthodoxy as a weapon to render other people in a subjugated state and to hold them captives.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Dr. Dobriansky makes some excellent points, that the conspiracy of communism has many roots that go back 100 or more years, even before the days of Karl Marx.

Now, I think, Doctor, you would agree with me that the conspiracy of communism, because of the many forms of camouflage that it has been able to develop and, moreover, the use of scientific methods in its propaganda program, in its programs of the Trojan horse, and in its other means of infiltrating free societies, such as ours, that the operators of the past are not to be compared with the present. They weren't as clever. It is far more devious today than it was then; would you agree with that?

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. I agree wholly. I may say the difference is one in degree rather than in substantial kind. The reason I brought this up, in looking over the position taken by the Communist Party in the case of a year or so ago, you will find that witnesses would, time and time again, bring up the fact that, "After all, this is simply a matter of difference in philosophy and ideology, and we have every right to espouse this ideology just as any other group would theirs."

My point here is that it isn't simply a matter of difference in social system, a difference in philosophy, but, on the contrary, that you have Marxism as a system of theoretic thought being subverted, exploited, if you please, into an ideological instrument to serve the expansionist aims of the Moscow government that has been for some time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Governor, I wonder in terms of what Dr. Dobriansky has said and what I added to it, to wit, the devious methods that have been developed by the Communist Central Authority in Moscow, particularly, if you will, the scientific approach they use to confusing and dividing and misleading free peoples has caused special problems for your Board? For example, you cited to us the Communist action organization, the Communist front organizations, and is there a third category called "Communist infiltrated organizations"?

Mr. HERBERT. That is correct, Mr. O'Connor. That was the result of an enactment by the outgoing 83d Congress. It is called the Communist Control Act, and it was intended to bring within the scope of our Board's proceedings any actions which the Attorney General of the United States might want to commence against organizations which in his judgment are Communist infiltrated. That includes both labor organizations and employer organizations. It also extends a prima facie assumption of noninfiltration to any labor organization which is a part of a recognized established big union, such as the CIO, A. F. of L., or UMW.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is some indication of the devious methods that they use when we have to have the three categories here.

Mr. HERBERT. In my judgment, it is the American way to try to approach a new peril which never confronted the country before. I think, if I may go back to Dr. Dobriansky's brief summary, that the teachings of Marxism and Engels is really now being taught as interpreted by Lenin and Stalin. Those books, taken all together, constitute what even the Communists refer to as the "Communist classics." If anyone wants to read that mess of material, believe me, first, I think they will find themselves in terrible confusion trying to even correlate all of the teachings that one finds in there, but emerging from it I definitely got the impression that what they are trying to say is that they want to have the domination and control by the proletariat. Their interpretation of the proletariat means that they want all the workers to do what they tell them to do. They are the so-called vanguard and they are the ones that are going to say, and you can't question what they direct you to do. Their whole philosophy is based on two things; first, the teachings, and second, putting those teachings into execution by action. That is the phase of it that constitutes the real threat not only to the liberty of this country but to every democratic people on the whole globe.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Governor, if I might interrupt at this point. My main point in connection with this ideology I made in the light of a background of study of the various countries, the captive non-Russian countries behind the Iron Curtain, who likewise were exposed to this so-called new ideology. You recall during the thirties in many of these countries of central Europe, as indeed the United States and others, since that time, the general impression that this is a sort of great experiment, some new social undertaking that should be given the opportunity to work. In fact, they even applied the concept of peaceful coexistence, let us see this new system get into operation. All this time, and especially on the basis of evidence that has been presented to the Kersten committee, take the non-Russian areas in the Soviet Union who as far back as 1918 and 1920 saw that this was not simply a matter of economic difference, of philosophical difference, but rather a weapon in the hands of a group in Moscow that sought to even surpass the imperialist ambitions of the Czar. Then, of course, we saw the evidence of it in connection with the central European states. Now they continue. They continue with this matter of Marxism and the like, as an ideological instrument, a teaching, if you will, of a new society coming into being. My conten-

tion here again is simply that that is a matter of Babbity, more so than one of scientific credibility. Actually, it is a deceptive tool. Take these organizations that you speak of. You take what you call Communist action groups. The Communist Party, I take it, is an example of a Communist actionist group. That group, therefore, is subservient to whom? Moscow. You take a Communist front group, that group may be, let us say, immediately dominated by a Communist action group, as perhaps the Jefferson School up in New York, to the Communist Party, but ultimately it is subservient to whom? Moscow. You take a Communist infiltrated union. Now, there it is not completely dominated as yet. It may in turn be, let us say, again immediately dominated by a Communist actionist group, but ultimately subservient to whom? Moscow. So it all points to Moscow, and as a result here—

Mr. O'CONNOR. Excuse me. In pointing to Moscow I think the Governor made a point about the proletariat. I think it is a matter of the interpretation of what they mean by the proletariat. The proletariat, as they have applied it, or at least all the evidence I have seen adds up to this, that a handful of men in the Kremlin are indeed the dictatorship of the proletariat. You can call them the Politburo, if you will. They were known as the Comintern. They are known as a lot of things, but the hard and bare cold fact remains that it is a handful of men who are indeed the dictatorship of the conspiracy. There is no more proletariat revolution in communism that there is democracy.

Mr. WARREN. In view of what we might consider a better understanding of communism and its effects, let's tie it a little more to the SACB. Mr. Herbert, as the presiding Board member in the case of the Jefferson School of Social Science of New York City, would you tell us what you found about that institution?

Mr. HERBERT. If I may make one preliminary statement. I omitted completely in my earlier discussion of the SACB act the penalties provided in the law. You see, Congress was confronted with this terrific problem of how to meet communism and still not impose limitations on our own liberties that we constantly recognize every American citizen is entitled to. So they went at it very carefully, to not forbid these activities but merely to put a label on them. That is the whole purpose of the Internal Security Act and the Subversive Activities Control Act. When the Board finds an organization to be a Communist action or Communist-front organization, as the case may be, then certain sanctions are imposed when that is concluded. For example, they are not run out of existence, but they must label their publications as issued by a Communist organization. They are denied free employment in government or in defense plants. They are denied passports. Certain of those sanctions go to these individuals, but they are never at any point denied their liberty. The Jefferson school, for instance, has pleaded and argued all through this proceeding that they cannot exist if they are forced to wear the label indicated by the provisions of the act.

Mr. WARREN. This institution was found to be a Communist front?

Mr. HERBERT. That was my recommendation. It will have to be acted upon by the whole board after exceptions have been filed by the parties after full hearing on the exceptions by the board. The board will pass on my recommended report and ultimately the board will issue its board order, and that is what either side may appeal to the United States court of appeals.

Mr. WARREN. This is a school. As a school it would teach. This wouldn't be a violation of any academic freedom?

Mr. HERBERT. It is their contention they are perfectly free to teach anything they choose. Of course, they contend that the question of liberty to teach, freedom of education is involved. I tried to make it clear in my report that actually they do not have that liberty of education there now. They don't have true freedom of education. They teach the philosophies and doctrines of Marx as interpreted by Lenin and as finally interpreted by Stalin. Underlying all of that is this basic factor that with their teachings must go action to implement those teachings. That is the threat that they confront us with.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Governor, in this case are you suggesting that this Thomas Jefferson School of Social Science is in a sense comparable to the Marx-Lenin-Stalin Institute in Moscow, as a sort of school for revolutionary tactics, a training school?

Mr. HERBERT. That is the part they disclaim, Dr. Dobriansky. They contend that they are merely teaching Marxism and Leninism slanted to what they believe Marxism and Leninism to mean. But there is evidence in the testimony, in the record in our case, that they teach not only that but that they teach, and their students at the school appeared on the witness stand, who testified to what their teachings were. This program isn't long enough for me to go into it.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. I think it would be significant to know in this case the composition of the student body at this school. Has the board any material or data as to who frequents the classes at this school?

Mr. HERBERT. Around 1050 they stopped their open registration. They issued to each student only a card indicating that he was entitled to take that particular course.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Governor, isn't it rather well established that the Communists use every facet of civilization to their ends? I would like to cite for you here something that the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression found under the heading of how the Communists use education to further their purposes, "That the principal purpose of education under Communist rule is to propagate Communism and to eliminate the distinctive culture of the victim state. Teachers and students are placed in an intellectual straitjacket." That is precisely your point. There is no academic freedom in a school of this type.

Mr. HERBERT. It is not indicated in our record.

Dr. DOBRIANSKY. Certainly looking over the roster of the faculty at the Thomas Jefferson School you don't find any person who may be critical of Marxism as interpreted by them on that roster.

Mr. HERBERT. He wouldn't have a chance to teach there.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the Record the following:

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 1 SUBMITTED TO HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE BY W. RAY BELL, PRESIDENT, THE ASSOCIATION OF COTTON TEXTILE MERCHANTS OF NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1955

I am W. Ray Bell, representing the Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New

York, which I serve as president. Our members are large, medium, and small firms engaged in the marketing and distribution of textiles and textile products made by the mills of this country which are located chiefly in southern and New England communities. Beside these areas of concentration, the cotton-manufacturing industry is of high importance in the Middle Atlantic States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and New York. Its marketing and merchandising activities are largely centered in New York.

In recent months we have appeared twice before the Government's Committee for Reciprocity Information, first to oppose binding the present United States concessions on textile tariffs for a fixed period beyond July 1, 1955, and in the second instance to advise against additional concessions to Japan on tariff rates for textile commodities. Upon each occasion the viewpoint was identical in its expressed fear of Japanese ravages on our domestic markets and, as a consequence, the potential disaster to the United States in terms of curtailed mill activity and enlarged textile unemployment.

We do not believe the threat was exaggerated nor that the potential peril to American institutions and our national welfare can be lightly regarded by the Congress. For the essence of the pending programs, now inherent in the proposed new legislation, is a frantic drive to bolster the advantages of import competition and force on the United States an unnatural dependence upon foreign resources whose interests are not concerned with creating American employment or maintaining our standard of living. Yet those objectives are the basic foundation of practically all the social and labor legislation written into our statutes during the past 22 years and cannot be ignored in your decision as to the propriety of further abandonment of our greatly reduced measure of protection to American industry and labor. So far as textiles are concerned, we believe that the proposed bill and the related Japanese negotiations pose a complete contradiction in national policy to the long-established principles and statutes that have guided the Nation on the domestic front. Our farm policy is unchanged in its adamant protection and price supports to domestic crops. Our labor policy still favors mounting wage scales and ever-higher standards of living for American workers. How can these realities of domestic competition be reconciled with a foreign policy which invites and promotes the overrunning of our markets by identical and similar textile products made under the low-wage standards of far eastern production?

The clamor for increased imports through additional reductions in our tariff rates is not founded on any realistic need for increased supplies of textiles in this country or any burden of inflated price levels for domestic goods. It is ironic that the issue should arise at a time when wholesale prices on cotton broad woven goods, according to Bureau of Labor statistics, are approximately 10 percent below the 1947-49 averages, whereas other commodities, excepting farm products and foods, are about 15 percent above the 1947 to 1949 levels. Synthetic fabrics are even more depressed and average but 73.7 percent of prices in the base period. This statistical evidence of depressed values emphasizes not only the relative bargains offered in American textiles to the consuming public, but reflects the overabundance of American production in a peacetime period of great national prosperity. We are now just beginning to emerge from the most serious textile depression of the postwar period. Although marked by temporary situations of curtailment and unemployment plus some plant liquidation, there are other scars in the form of meager earnings and heavy financial losses which can best be summarized by citing consolidated

profit margins for the past year of less than 1 percent return on total sales.

Admittedly, this is an unhealthy situation and must be corrected in the near future if the textile industry is to continue its functions for the benefit of the Nation. We believe these are of vital and indispensable nature especially in three major directions. First in importance is the collective responsibility of a large employer of labor. In December of last year total United States employees in the manufacture of textile-mill products were listed at 1,089,400 and in the related group of apparel and other finished textile products, another 1,182,100 employees were included. Together these represent more than 1 out of every 8 employees in all manufacturing industry whose total in December was 16,102,000 employees.

Of greater significance even than numbers is the fact that textile mills are the lifeblood and often the sole economic reliance of hundreds of communities in many States, ranging from hamlets or villages to towns and cities. Upon the maintenance of textile activity in these many widespread communities depend the well-being of countless other citizens in trade and serves supplying the particular localities. These communities make up a large part of American life. They are vital to our economy, and it is pure nonsense to propose that they can be uprooted and dislocated or that their inhabitants can be put on the dole in wholesale fashion.

In cotton textiles alone, the State of Alabama has at least 52 separate textile communities and at the present time about 50,000 workers engaged in their textile plants. This is roughly 1 out of every 4 industrial workers in the State of Alabama, making it that State's largest industry. In Georgia the record shows 92 separate textile communities and in June of last year textile employment was 101,000 workers out of 294,000 in all its manufacturing. The ratio here is 34½ percent. South Carolina, in 1953, had 83 textile communities with textile workers numbering 154,000 out of 193,000 workers in all industries. Here the percentage is 80 percent. Figures for North Carolina, also for 1953, show 152 communities of textile location, and 234,000 textile workers or more than 50 percent of manufacturing employment totaling 464,000.

These are 4 States in which textiles are predominant, but similar situations different only in degree exist in New England, Middle Atlantic, Southern, and Southwestern textile-producing areas. Since apparel commodities are likewise involved in the contemplated expansion of imports, the list of affected communities could be enlarged through all this eastern and southern area and extended throughout the mid-West and to the Pacific coast. Hardly any region of the United States can escape the danger of accelerated foreign competition which is grounded in superior cost advantages and does not have to reckon with the restrictions imposed by statute and custom on operations in the United States. Workers in these American textile and apparel plants enjoy the highest wages and a highest living standards of any textile producers in the world, but if they can't get work or must work on short time it is small consolation for them to know that their markets have been sacrificed by our State Department on the altar of international expediency and benefits to foreign nations.

Beside the inherent values to industrial activity and employment in the United States, there are impelling considerations of national security which can be assured by no other nation around the negotiating table at Geneva or elsewhere. In two world wars and in the Korean struggle, the textile industry was always among the first to be called into mobilization. To make the thousands

of items in apparel and equipment required by our Armed Forces, from heavy duck and webbing to the finest of fabrics for parachutes, powder bags, bandages, and other imperative needs, the industry literally turned itself inside out and accomplished miracles of productive achievement, so much so that high officers of the Army and Navy publicly stated that textiles were second to steel in the winning of World War II. Later, in the Korean mobilization, private business was deliberately sacrificed without Government compulsion to give preference to orders for Government military requirements. With war clouds again on the horizon and an emergency always around the corner, it would be a grave risk to endorse measures which could have the effect of crippling both our capacity and will to produce the essential needs of our forces. The potential in cotton textiles, since the beginning of World War II, has been reduced by approximately 2 million spindles, or 8 percent of installed capacity in December 1941. Further contraction that could result from an overload of foreign competition might seriously handicap our basic strength when most needed.

The third major function of the cotton textile industry, as we see it, is to consume the bulk of the American cotton crop and by so doing, provide the main pillar for the price supports of our cotton farm policy. As this committee knows, quota restrictions and tariffs effectually prevent the domestic textile industry from using more than a negligible amount of foreign growth cotton. In the 9 post-war years, on a calendar basis, domestic cotton consumption has averaged 9,231,000 bales, with only 1949 and 1954 falling below 9 million. We exceeded 10 million bales in 1951. Without such faithful activity I venture to say that the whole structure of our farm support policy, as related to cotton, would fall flat on its face. If Secretary Benson really wants trouble, let him transfer this dependence to foreign textile mills, especially in those countries which seek the lowest priced fiber obtainable in the world's markets.

There are varying opinions on the adequacy of present farm supports and their future course, but few people today have the temerity to advocate their abandonment. In some form they are viewed by most as a necessary balance to the high wages and price levels of American industrial products. Is there any appreciable difference between this situation and that of the large bulk of cotton woven cloth production? This too is produced primarily as a raw material for hundreds of industries and thousands of common items. American growth cotton must be used if for no other reason than that the United States fixes quota limitations by countries on imports of foreign cotton, totalling to a mere 29,000 bales of the staple lengths commonly used by the vast majority of American cotton mills. In addition the quota permits about 91,000 bales of high grade cotton, chiefly Egyptian, and 140,000 bales of short, rough cotton, not grown here, and chiefly from India. This policy of stringent limitation of the supplies of raw materials used by cotton mills is in striking contrast to the liberal climate arranged for competitive imports of basic cotton cloth, where quotas do not exist and tariffs are the only safeguard against the devastating effect of identical goods made under the cheap labor standards of Japan and India.

We do not advocate changes in the measures through which the Congress has insured the stability of farm income. But the tenacious preservation of home markets for raw cotton, with most liberal aids provided for its export distribution, is justified in the national interest by the same Government officials who have been unconcerned by the loss of export markets for American textiles

and would cheerfully trade our home markets to the lowest bidder.

At the present time this lowest bidder is Japan, which has become the chief beneficiary of many tariff reductions in textile schedules already brought about through various trade-agreement negotiations. Although not yet a member of the international circle of GATT, Japan has been favored by our policy of generalizing these concessions. After a relatively minor role in 1951 and 1952 as a supplier of cotton piece goods to this country, Japan emerged in 1953 with nearly half of the total imports in the major category of countable cotton cloths, having 30,665,000 square yards out of total imports amounting to 64,251,000 square yards. Comparable figures are not yet available for 1954 but the evidence from cargo manifests and Japanese news sources indicate at least a doubling of these quantities last year.

According to Japanese mill statistics, shipments to this country in the third quarter advanced from 4,771,000 square yards in 1953 to 16,456,000 in the like period of 1954. News reports from Tokyo have claimed monthly quantities of 12 to 13 million yards each for October and November. This present experience of a four- or fivefold jump in volume follows the same pattern of progressive market invasion as we underwent in the depression years of 1934 to 1937 with respect to Japanese bleached goods. These grew from negligible quantities in 1932 and 1933 to 6 million yards in 1934, to 30 million in 1935, to 65 million in 1936, and to 89 million in 1937. Long before the latter figure was reached, the harmful effects on our economy became of national concern and by resolution of Congress an investigation was ordered. Upon finding by the Tariff Commission that on certain fabrics the original duties fixed by the Tariff Act of 1930 were not adequate to equalize the cost of production between Japan and the United States, President Roosevelt issued a proclamation on May 21, 1936, which established increases of between 42 and 43 percent over the 1930 rates applying to these particular goods. The fact that these increased amounts of duty had no appreciable effect in limiting the volume of imports from Japan up to the outbreak of war only lends weight to our strong conviction that the Japanese industry doesn't require tariff concessions in order to do business in our textile markets. On many textile commodities present rates are far below those of 1936 which proved no barrier in prewar experience. Since that time our wage rates have advanced from around 36 cents an hour to approximately \$1.25, and while Japanese wages have risen in the postwar years, by comparison they remain infinitesimally low.

We fear greatly that the trend of administrative policies, as indicated in the proposed legislation of H. R. 1, leads directly to a repetition of the unfortunate developments which occurred in the late thirties and intensified our years of depression. The threat is even more serious now because it is not confined to bleached goods but extends to practically all areas of cotton goods production. Already the Japanese have gained a virtual monopoly in the low-end price ranges of such varied products as kitchen and dish towels, damask tablecloths, pillowcases, plain back velveteens, and many other types of fabricated products which are not included in the woven cloth statistics of yardage. Domestic producers of such articles have been forced out by reason of costs which are sometimes higher than the retail selling price of the imported goods. During the past 5 months a similar situation has originated in articles of wearing apparel—men's and boys' shirts, ladies' blouses and housecoats, cotton gloves, and brasieres. Fabrics used in these articles of apparel include gingham, corduroy, printed

cloth, flannel, and suede. Here the great advantages in labor costs are pyramided and our customers in the apparel industry must compete with fabricated merchandise sold below their costs of production.

More immediate concern has to do with the entry of large and increasing quantities of staple grey cloth, in standard American constructions and good quality at prices that take business away from our most efficient manufacturers. Grey cloth is not ordinarily wearable but a raw material for countless other industries. The same applies largely to its finished state, which serves as raw material for factories making all kinds of apparel. As such, most cotton textiles are bulk commodities, sold in volume quantities in one of the Nation's most highly competitive markets, where a difference of even 1/2 cent a yard may be the difference between profit and loss. Competing in this market, the low-cost Japanese goods are similarly raw material which loses its identity when converted into finished cloth or made into garments which move into domestic consumption or export as American products. In this primary market, a sale of even 500,000 yards at cut prices can have a demoralizing effect on the values of many millions of yards in American production. For that reason the ability of the Japanese to consistently undersell American values is probably more injurious than the actual amount of yards brought in to date.

We have no optimism about a favorable change in this competitive situation for Japan has overdeveloped its textile industry since the war and still has the superior advantage of an abundant supply of cheap juvenile labor, industrious and contented to live on a diet of fish and rice. Measured by spindleage, their productive facilities have been doubled in the past 5 years, with approximately 8 million now in place, most of which are of modern and automatic type. There is a high degree of technical efficiency and their traders are all over the world. Last year Japanese exports of cotton cloth reached approximately 1,277,000,000 square yards, or more than those of the United Kingdom and the United States combined.

This is a large share of the shrunken world market and points up the inability of other textile producing countries, outside of India, to compete on the cheap qualities of peace goods used by the native millions of people in Asia and Africa. Extension of the market conquests to the United States is entirely feasible if our Government pursues a policy of eliminating by degrees the already weakened measure of protection accorded to its own people. We have grown to have no faith in the processes of international bargaining. Around the negotiation table sit some 10 or 12 nations with a vested interest in exporting surplus textiles. All of them have an eye on the American market and complain about our tariffs, which are innocuous compared to their own quantitative or other restrictions. We feel that American representatives have consistently used textile tariff schedules as bait to hook some fancied political advantage.

The American textile industry is highly competitive and we believe it can compete with any form of fair competition. But it is an industry grounded in American standards of good wages and high standards of living. Its technologies and product naturally cannot offset the unfair competition of imports from countries of similar high technical standing whose wage levels are but a tenth or less than a tenth of our wage levels. It is a large, widespread, and vital industry whose health is essential to the American economy in peace and whose wartime capacities are indispensable. For such industries, adequate tariffs must be maintained as the essential safeguards of our basic national welfare.

What Nonfarmers Should Know About the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a copy of an article which I wrote for the magazine *Successful Farming* and which appeared in the February 1955 issue of that publication:

WHAT NONFARMERS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE FARM PROGRAM

The title of this article assumes that nonfarmers are not well informed about the problems of farmers and the various Government programs which deal with those problems. I believe this is a valid assumption.

This is a situation of comparatively recent origin. As late as 1910, a third of our population was directly engaged in agriculture. Many more lived in small rural communities. Under these circumstances, most of our people had a pretty good idea of farming and its problems.

But now, less than 14 percent of our people are farmers. Furthermore, farming itself has changed so much that people who were born and grew up on farms even a few years ago know nothing of modern farming problems.

I am convinced that today perhaps 75 percent of our people have little or no understanding of agriculture as an industry. And worse than that, 50 percent or more have a poor opinion of farmers—to state it in the mildest terms.

Aside from the fact that we don't want people thinking badly of farmers without justification, there is a most important reason at this time why city people should understand farmers and their problems. That is because, like every other industry, agriculture is affected by Government policies more than ever before.

This applies not only to policies dealing with prices but to such questions as export markets, credit policies, conservation, rural electrification and telephones, and research and education programs. And with less than 14 percent of our people on farms, it is obvious that Government policies which fit the needs of agriculture must receive the support of other segments of our population.

I would like to suggest some things which I think you should tell your nonfarmer friends about farming.

What should we tell them? Frankly, the only thing we need to tell them is the truth—the plain, simple truth—about what farmers are up against in these times.

While it isn't the most important point, the first thing that ought to be told is that farmers as a class are not getting rich.

Then there are people who feel that farm prices and food prices are too high and criticize farmers for that reason. These people are obviously mistaken, because no one who has made a fair study of farm prices or food prices can complain that they are out of line with the prices of other commodities.

First, it ought to be pointed out that as far as food prices are concerned, the farmer now gets only 43 percent of the consumer's dollar. The other 57 percent goes for processing, transportation, and distribution costs.

Furthermore, in the case of many commodities, there is little connection between farm prices and prices which consumers pay. In a loaf of bread selling at from 17 to 20 cents, there is 2 3/4 cents worth of wheat. A

cotton shirt selling for \$3.95 and up contains about 30 cents worth of cotton.

A study made by the House Committee on Agriculture last July showed that while farm prices had fallen 19 percent since 1951, retail food prices remained right at the postwar peak.

Then there are people who tell me they think farm programs have worked to the disadvantage of consumers. Figures don't bear this out either.

Our first price-support program began in 1929, and if these charges were true, it would mean that consumers were worse off now than they were at that time. Yet the figures prepared by the Department of Agriculture show just the opposite.

In 1929 the average factory worker could buy 6.4 pounds of bread with an hour's earnings. Today these earnings will buy 10.3 pounds. For an hour's wages he could buy 1 pound of butter in 1929 and 2.6 pounds today; 3.9 quarts of milk in 1929 and 7.9 quarts today; 17.4 pounds of potatoes in 1929 and around 30 pounds today; 1.2 pounds of round steak in 1929 and 2 pounds today, and so on.

In other words, consumers have gotten real reductions in food prices during the time price supports have been in effect.

Another complaint which keeps popping up is that agriculture is being subsidized in vast amounts by the Federal Government and to a greater extent than other industries. It is true that agriculture has received subsidies. But I think we should point out to our friends in the cities that subsidies began when our Government was first set up in 1789—and that only in fairly recent years have they been used to any appreciable extent to protect agriculture.

The first Congress set up a subsidy to encourage the development of an American merchant fleet. Since that time many billions in subsidies—both direct and indirect—have gone to business and industry, as well as to labor and consumers. Among other things, these subsidies covered portions of the postal deficit, aids to the shipping industry, various aids to air navigation, flood control, electric-power projects, housing construction, unemployment insurance, public-assistance grants, and many others, including indirect subsidies like tariffs.

The House Appropriations Committee in 1954 published figures indicating subsidies amounting to about \$45 billion were paid to business and consumers since World War II. It is fair to say that a part of this was in business reconversion payments following the war, but nevertheless, it was a subsidy.

As compared with this \$45 billion of subsidies to business and consumers, farm-price supports and surplus removal, operations for the 20 years up through 1953 cost only \$3½ billion, or 1 percent of the value of crops and livestock marketed.

In order to fairly inform our urban friends of the problems of agriculture and the need for remedial measures, we must point out the tremendous changes that have taken place in farming in recent years.

There was a time when farmers were very largely self-sufficient; and under those circumstances, the prices received for commodities were not particularly important. Today this situation is entirely changed. In 1953 the total assets of agriculture in this country totaled almost exactly the same as the total assets of all manufacturing corporations.

Even more significant is the fact that in 1953 the average investment per agricultural worker was \$16,480. That is almost twice as much as the average investment per industrial worker.

Today even the small farmer must make a heavy investment in land and equipment, and in addition requires a large amount of working capital to pay for fuel, fertilizer,

labor, insurance, taxes, and other expenses which must be paid in cash. These expenses are constant, and there is little the farmer can do to reduce them. If he is to meet them, he must have a dependable cash income.

But consider the risks that the farmer must take in getting this income. Drought and floods take their toll somewhere each year. He is subject to the ravages of insect pests, and crop and livestock diseases. And when he finally produces a crop, he has nothing to say about the price he will receive for it. If he ships his cattle to Kansas City or Chicago, he takes what the buyers offer. His alternative is to ship them back home again.

Much of the farm legislation of recent years has been for the purpose of adding to the stability of farming. Crop insurance has been tried to partially eliminate the risks of weather and disease. Cooperative marketing has been developed to give farmers more to say about the price of their products. And price-support programs through Government loans have been set up to bring about more orderly marketing. This prevents farmers from having to dump their crops on the market in such quantities as to depress prices.

And that brings us to the question of surpluses and how they affect prices. "Surplus" is a comparatively new term. We did not hear much about surpluses until after the First World War. But we have always had them—that is, except when we had distress and famine.

In past years, surpluses were in the form of reserves which people kept in their storehouses and cellars. Individual surpluses and reserves now are a thing of the past—but for our own safety and protection we must have on hand more food than can currently be used. And yet these surpluses, so destructive to farmers' prices when we do not have farm programs are simply the reserve people used to have in their cellars.

It doesn't seem right that when this surplus is for the protection of all of our people, the farmer should have to bear the whole expense and loss of carrying it. And yet that is our situation when we do not have farm programs.

Nonfarmers also ought to be told that the fact that less than 14 percent of our people can furnish the food and fiber required for all the rest of us is the principal reason why we have what we refer to as our American way of life and high standards of living.

The energies of the other 86 percent of our people can be released to build our automobiles, radios and television sets, our great highway systems, to maintain our educational facilities and our progress in the arts and sciences, as well as our churches and cultural institutions. In some countries it takes 80 to 85 percent of the people to produce enough food for themselves and the remaining 15 or 20 percent.

Certainly one of the greatest problems confronting the country today is the conservation of our soil and water. That is a responsibility that is very largely in the farmer's hands—and yet there is no way on earth the farmer can carry it out unless he, as a businessman, has sufficient income to do like other businessmen and maintain his plant by conserving and rebuilding the soil.

There is one other point. I don't know that farmers can say very much about it because it would sound too much like bragging. That is that here in this country we have always regarded the family-type farm and the people who live on it as our greatest reservoir of social and moral values. There is no way that we can maintain the family-type farm unless farming is at least profitable enough that people who love the land and want to farm can afford to do so.

These are some of the things that nonfarmers ought to know about farming. You

can think of others. But that will not do any good unless in some way we get the story told. I think it is up to the farmer to do it one way or another. Perhaps the big part of the work will have to be done through organized effort—that is through farm organizations, the agricultural press, or farm-minded commentators over radio and television.

But every farmer and farmer's wife has some opportunity to dispel the fog of misunderstanding and misinformation that exists in such a large measure among so many of our people. In your own interest and the Nation's interest, you ought to make use of that opportunity.

Leave Our Judges on Olympus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond News Leader of Friday, February 11, 1955:

LEAVE OUR JUDGES ON OLYMPUS

File away as needless legislation a proposal that the Chief Justice of the United States be formally requested to report to Congress from time to time on "the state of the Federal Judiciary." Nothing would be achieved by such a report that cannot be gained already through regular channels, and much would be endangered. The practice would inject our Judges into politics and threaten the strict constitutional separation of the judiciary from the congressional and executive arms of the Government.

The measure was sponsored by the Deputy Attorney General, William P. Rogers, and presented by Tennessee's Senator Estes Kefauver and New York's Representative Kenneth B. Keating. Its advocates assert that it would dramatize the needs of the Federal courts, which are so jammed in some jurisdictions that it takes 3 or 4 years for final settlement of a case.

Our view is that the Chief Justice of the United States need not debase the office by going before Congress in the role of a huckster seeking more money, more judges, more secretaries, more facilities. The regular avenues of budget hearings are sufficient to acquaint President Eisenhower and the Congress with the Court's physical problems. Indeed, Brooklyn's Representative EMANUEL Celler, head of the House Judiciary Committee, points out that Mr. Eisenhower himself could improve conditions without congressional action by filling some 20 vacancies that exist on the Federal bench.

One doubts exceedingly that the dignified office of Chief Justice would be given over to a mere statistical account of cases in district courts across the country, delivered before a sleepy, uncomfortable Congress. Any clerk—or adding machine—could accomplish that purpose.

Our suspicion is that as time went on a Chief Justice would not confine himself to a presentation of physical problems but would stray into comment on the Court's decisions, might even feel impelled to defend certain judgments. Whatever elaboration might be needed on the Court's decisions can be found—and ought to be found—solely in the written opinions of the justices.

That this fear of a discussion of decisions is not so far-fetched was shown clearly by

the recent address at William and Mary College of Judge Bolitha J. Laws, of the United States District Court for Washington, D. C. Judge Laws apparently approves the idea of such a report to make known the affairs of the judiciary of our Nation. He observed that we of the law have no established plan to make known that laws . . . must be well interpreted and well enforced in order to preserve our Nation. Further, he described judges as living detached lives, catapulting to favorable attention on occasion but usually having their virtues hidden as a candle beneath a bushel.

In our view an air of detachment is precisely what is to be prized in the men who run our courts. Let us leave our Chief Justice on the cool heights of Olympus or, if you prefer the figure, under the homely bushel basket.

Irrigation Offers Solution to Farmers' Big Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Irrigation Offers Solution to Farmers' Big Worry," which appeared in the February 10, 1955, issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

IRRIGATION OFFERS SOLUTION TO FARMERS' BIG WORRY

More stress is being placed every year upon irrigation as a means of insuring crops in Kentucky as well as other States in this area of relatively heavy rainfall. The past 3 dry seasons have given impetus to this trend among more progressive farmers who almost uniformly report that saving one crop pays for installation of irrigation systems.

Not many farms have terrain suitable for gravity flow irrigation, but pumping techniques have been improved to the point where crops could be given ample water during periods of greatest need when usually rainfall is lightest. Most farms have areas that could be dammed up and used as storage for the abundant rainfall which unfortunately does not come regularly when needed yet amounts to about 50 inches a year—more than enough for any of our crops.

Weather observers have said there is a possibility we are in for a long period of short rainfall that may grow worse. If this is true, irrigation may become necessary to exist because it is practically impossible to follow "dry farming" practices successfully on land that is as thin and rolling as that found in this area.

Since adequate water is the most important need of any crop, drying out of the soil retards growth and cuts the value of production. Even in years of abundant rain there may be several times when money is lost because the soil becomes too dry to support a vigorous and continuous normal growth. Besides insuring steady growth, irrigation would remove the uncertainty now accompanying farming operations where expressions of worry about rainfall are common topics during the growing season.

In the West, where water is much more inaccessible than it is here, fortunes have been made by irrigation which requires more work and planning as well as capital outlay but has paid off handsomely. The Govern-

ment advanced money for establishment of many irrigation districts in the West, and this money was repaid by farmers through crops made possible by the water.

As water is available here for a fraction of its cost in the semiarid States of the West, it should not be necessary to depend upon Government funds to finance individual irrigation plans. Reliable farmers should have little trouble finding financial backing for installing systems that would insure crops regardless of the weather.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD the statement of O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, before the House Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to H. R. 1, the trade agreements extension bill of 1955, on January 26, 1955:

The Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, of which I am chairman, is composed of some 65 organizations and groups of industries, agriculture, and labor. A list of members and associates is attached.

These organizations have banded together because of their common concern over the effects of import competition. The competition that gives them concern is the kind that derives its advantages from lower wage payments than those our own producers pay.

This is a type of competition that we regard as unfair because to meet it all along the line, unless it is properly regulated, it would be necessary to reduce wages, to impose inferior working conditions upon workers, to reduce social security and to strip away price supports for agriculture or as an alternative permit the afflicted industries and branches of agriculture to be killed off.

Not only would such a trend be heavily opposed by labor and farm organizations but it would, if left alone, lead to a lower national income and would undermine the purchasing power of our workers and farmers.

Minimum wage laws have been established in this country with the specific objective of preventing low-wage employers from gaining a competitive advantage over those who pay higher wages and driving the latter to lower wage levels or putting them out of business.

Price supports for farm products under the parity principle have been adopted to give agriculture what is regarded as a fair price in relation to prices on manufactured goods.

The obligations imposed upon industry and agriculture by law as described above result in high fixed costs and these create a competitive handicap in the face of many imports that are not produced under the same high standards.

Parity prices for agricultural products and price supports no less than collective bargaining and social security thus make for high domestic market prices. All who favor this system must recognize the competitive disadvantage that in many instances results from its operation in the field of import competition.

In the case of farm products the handicap is readily apparent. In the case of industrial products it is no less real even if not so obvious. By these various laws we interfere with the free market. Restrictive immigration laws fall into the same class.

This is not a plea for abolition of price supports or for repeal of our minimum wage laws or for abandonment of collective bargaining or social security. It is a call for recognition of the simple fact that it is not fair to place cost-raising burdens upon our producers on the one hand, no matter how desirable the objective, and on the other, to expose them progressively to sharper import competition by stripping away the tariff or by banning the use of import quotas except for the benefit of a few agricultural products such as wheat, cotton, sugar, peanuts, etc.

It is not very logical to help the farm and labor groups in one way and then to go in the opposite direction in our tariff policy.

To maintain the high level of national income that is necessary to meet our extremely high national obligations as reflected in the Federal budget, we must uphold the conditions that make possible continued high production and high employment levels throughout the economy. In the seller's market that we enjoyed for nearly a decade after the war, it was possible to uphold these high levels; but great care will be required under increasing surplus conditions to avoid the onset of widespread deflationary forces.

It is highly questionable economic policy to proceed along the import front with further tariff cutting as if prosperity would continue at the same level regardless of increased import competition. The constant minimizing of the effects of imports on employment, repeated by Secretary of Labor Mitchell before this committee, is shortsighted and dangerous.

That competition, it should be kept in mind, is not spread evenly over all industry and agriculture. It strikes with great severity in some sectors while others are free of it. Even cotton and wheat producers, who are highly protected by import quotas, would feel a sharp impact if their protection were stripped away as these groups would strip it away from other products and as this bill would permit stripping it from cotton and wheat growers themselves.

If the agricultural quotas that limit imports of these products are unnecessary, they should be taken off. If they are necessary, it should be clear that for similar good reasons protection is also necessary for many manufactured and other agricultural products.

The present bill, H. R. 1, however, is much more than a tariff bill. It contains provisions that would go far to deprive Congress of its authority and responsibility to regulate our foreign commerce. It would lodge this power in the hands of the Executive. From there it would soon pass to an international organization and thus destroy the responsiveness of Congress to the electorate in this field.

That is the intent behind the bill and confirms the purpose long harbored in the Department of State. That was the purpose of the ill-fated charter for an international trade organization which died in 1950, before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The present bill would pave the way for its revival.

We would have no objection to membership in an international trade organization that confined itself to consultative and advisory functions. Great service might come from such an organization. We do object most strenuously against a shift of congressional powers over our foreign commerce to such an international organization. That would require a constitutional amendment.

We should not forget that the industry and agriculture of this country were built under the protective system. Some seg-

ments have presumably grown beyond the need of further protection. Just as surely others have not. Those that have not cannot, however, properly be described simply as marginal or inefficient and unworthy of protection. This is a common error subscribed to by academicians and enthusiasts who hold no direct stakes to be dissipated. It is repeated by those who seek gains from exports whether these gains would hurt someone else or not.

It is also repeated by those who are deeply concerned over the international struggle and the course of the Communist threat to the world. These good people must be accorded the highest consideration for their sincere concern. They may be excused for grasping at what has been pictured as a sure path to world pacification.

The Communist threat has been turned into an overriding consideration and liberalized trade has been tapped as the best way to fight communism.

If it were only that easy. Yet there is nothing in the history of commerce and trade that will sustain such a view.

It is true that under Communist theory commercial rivalry among the capitalistic nations leads to war. If the whole world were absorbed to communism war would end, that theory holds. There would be free trade, free access to raw materials, and no competition or rivalry for markets. War would vanish.

This is a superficial concept belied by religious wars, by conquests for personal glory, and much else in the past. Yet it is true that a great part of trade does make for international rivalry.

Competitive trade is of this kind. It does not make for friendship as does complementary or noncompetitive trade. It makes for ill will rather than good will. Unless it is regulated to assure fairness it can indeed lead to violence.

Our noncompetitive imports by and large are already conducted without tariff or other barriers. The hitch comes in the competitive field, where we make the imported goods very well ourselves. That is where the character of the competition becomes important. The question of fairness is of the highest concern. Fairness does much to draw the sting from the rivalry of competition. That is where regulation comes in. This regulatory function resides in Congress. It was placed there because policy must determine the shape of regulation; and in a republic the electorate is the policymaker. Elected representatives are held responsive to the electorate. The executive's function is that of carrying out the law.

If the Constitutionmakers were wrong in lodging the power to regulate commerce and to control the tariff in Congress, the Constitution itself prescribes a method of changing the lines of authority and responsibility.

This bill would place certain powers in the hand of the Executive by which Congress itself could be shorn of its trade regulatory function without first amending the Constitution. The Executive could further alienate this function, as already indicated, by passing certain powers to an international organization, providing only that Congress consented to our entrance into such an organization.

He could impair the power of Congress, for example, by entering into a trade agreement containing a provision to ban import quotas. We are already, indeed, a party to an agreement (the general agreement on tariffs and trade) that does so, with certain exceptions, most of which do not apply to the United States. Seeing how far the State Department has gone without authority, we may well wonder how far it would go with authority, as proposed in this bill.

Import quotas are a means of regulating foreign commerce. Can any Congress then properly empower the President to enter an

international agreement that would tie the hands of Congress? If a given Congress were willing to be thus bound, would any future Congress be bound? Does not each new Congress have a right to legislate for itself? Does it not have a right to amend or repeal any previous law?

If so, what would a trade agreement be worth if it contained a ban on import quotas? What would it be worth in any case if extended beyond 2 years, i. e., beyond the tenure of the existing Congress?

Certainly it would not help our international standing to enter an agreement that any succeeding Congress, or the existing Congress for that matter, had not only a perfect right but good reason to upset.

In the course of time damage to the international reputation of this country as a responsible nation would be risked unnecessarily.

A foretaste of this was provided by the passage of section 104 of the Defense Production Act of several years ago. This was held by GATT to be a violation of our obligations under the general agreement. Why did the State Department agree to such an obligation in the first place?

Under the present bill the President, meaning the State Department, would have full power to remove or to enlarge existing import quotas on cotton, wheat flour, peanuts, etc., in the course of a trade agreement. This could be done without consulting Congress. An offer to abolish or liberalize quotas on farm products could be used, in negotiating with other countries, as a means of obtaining concessions from them that would expand the exports of our automobiles, office machines, apples, or anything else.

It is true that the bill provides that in applying section 3 (A) existing legislation is not to be violated; but section 3 (B) is excepted. What happens if there is no existing legislation? Cannot an agreement then be made that would forestall legislation? There is, for example, no law that there shall be no ban on import quotas or that the Executive may not use quotas as he sees fit in a trade agreement.

A trade agreement outlawing import quotas would therefore upset no existing legislation with the possible exception of the Sugar Act; nor would an agreement lifting existing quotas do so, with the exception noted.

The same goes for customs formalities. The bill would empower the President to make agreements relating to customs formalities. Aside from being extremely general in character and granting unlimited discretion, this power could be used to run ahead of Congress and close certain premises to future legislation.

Then comes the broadest proposed grant of all, i. e., entry into a trade agreement containing provisions on other matters relating to trade. This would simply give free play to the State Department to use our home market as a pawn in the moves of power politics.

To all this we object most strenuously. We have seen enough of the State Department maneuvers to forewarn us against any such grant of power.

Indeed we have seen enough of it to call for a complete reversal of the system under which the remedy spelled out under the escape clause by Congress in 1951 has been nullified. We are thoroughly convinced that the escape clause remedy will continue to be thwarted by the State Department if the veto power is not taken away and given to Congress where it belongs.

Our greatest quarrel with the trade-agreements system is precisely this denial of a remedy; and we will not easily be fooled by assurances. These were offered to us when the escape clause first made its appearance in 1943 in the form of an Executive order.

We learned from repeated experience that the assurances were designed merely to lull opposition and were, as judged by the results, completely insincere.

Then in 1951 the escape clause was written into law. We counted this as a distinct gain; but since that time we have seen the law frustrated by executive disinclination and refusal to accept Tariff Commission recommendations.

This long experience has fully convinced us that administration of the clause must be removed from the Executive power. Otherwise the remedy will remain a nullity and worse yet, a cynical farce.

Objection to the escape clause comes from other countries on the grounds that its use creates uncertainty in the marketing of their products here. Overlooked is the fact that GATT itself contains an escape clause similar to our own; that the need for a remedy against import injury is recognized in the general agreement. Was it contemplated that this clause be mere window dressing? If not, what is the outcry about?

Actually a great degree of stability in our tariff could be assured if the present trade-agreement rates were adopted as the tariff of the United States by law. Provision should then be made for only such changes in rates as could be demonstrated to be necessary, one item at a time, either to avoid injury, by increasing given rates, or to increase imports, by reducing given rates that were shown to be higher than necessary.

Considerations of foreign relations should not be ignored, but neither should they be given top and overriding priority as is now the case. The Department of State should be given full opportunity to make known its views to Congress in each case of recommended duty restoration.

There are other objectionable provisions in this bill. One is the provision that would empower the Executive to cut all rates down to a level of 50 percent if they are above that level. This would be an arbitrary action and has no economic justification. It is surprising that such a suggestion should be made. Evidently the idea was adopted without reflection.

Another provision would limit any rate restoration to the level existing on January 1, 1945. This represents a direct attempt at legislative crippling of the escape clause, and we object to it. Nineteen hundred and forty-five was a war year and is not a satisfactory base for measuring the suitability of tariff rates.

It is to be observed also that the provision that would permit a 50-percent cut in the rates on items not now being imported, or imported only in negligible quantities, provides for no remedy, since such cuts would not be in the nature of concessions in a trade agreement.

The theory underlying this provision seems to be that if we do not now have an import problem the thing to do is to create one.

The nationwide committee last year supported a bill that we believe to be far superior to the present bill, both in the moderate protection it would offer to domestic industry, agriculture, and labor, and in creating the conditions that are essential to maximum trade.

It would adopt the present rates in trade agreements as the statutory tariff of the United States, thus offering a higher degree of stability than H. R. 1. These rates could only be changed by individual applications to the Tariff Commission in order to assure fairness of import competition. There would not and could not occur any general tariff increase under that system, but also no general tariff cut. Neither is justified under present economic conditions.

One highly important change would be made. The Tariff Commission would send its recommendations to Congress rather

than to the Executive. This change is necessary if Executive nullification is to be overcome as it should be in the interest of fair treatment and good government. The present situation of Executive debasement of the Tariff Commission, now in its fourth or fifth year of practice, is inexcusable and intolerable. As an example of high-handed disregard of basic rights and division of powers, it merits the severest condemnation and should be stopped.

LIST OF MEMBERS AND ASSOCIATES OF NATION-WIDE COMMITTEE OF INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, AND LABOR, ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY

American National Cattlemen's Association.
National Coal Association.
United Mine Workers of America (Ind.).
National Wool Growers Association.
American Tung Oil Association, AAL.
Seafarers International Union of North America (AFL).
Wine Institute.
American Flint Glass Workers' Union of North America (AFL).
Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association.
Tuna Research Foundation.
The Hat Institute, Inc.
Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc.
Bicycle Institute of America, Inc.
Cordage Institute.
The United States Potters Association.
Atlantic Fishermen's Union (AFL).
American Lace Manufacturers Association, Inc.
Soft Fibre Manufacturers' Institute.
International Photo-Engravers' Union of North America (AFL).
California Walnut Growers Association.
California Almond Growers Exchange.
Pin, Clip and Fastener Association.
Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America (Ind.).
Sunkist Growers.
National Association Greenhouse Vegetable Growers.
United Wall Paper Craftsmen & Workers of North America (AFL).
United States Wood Screw Service Bureau.
National Renderers Association.
Oregon Filbert Commission.
Basic Vegetable Products, Inc.
American Knit Handwear Association, Inc.
Pacific Coast Fish Producers Institute.
Cannery Workers Union of the Pacific (AFL).
Cannery Workers & Fishermen's Union (AFL).
Wyoming Wool Growers Association.
Carpet Institute, Inc.
Harley-Davidson Motor Co.
The Dow Chemical Co.
Forstmann Woolen Co.
John B. Stetson Co.
Shenango Pottery Co.
Onondaga Pottery Co.
Puccinelli Packing Co.
Dairy Industry Committee: National Cheese Institute, American Butter Institute, National Creameries Association, Milk Industry Foundation.
Tariff committee, Band Instrument Manufacturers Association.
National Shrimp Cannery & Packers Association.
The Wall Paper Institute, Inc.
Reynolds Metals Co., Inc.
Hardwood Plywood Institute.
American Glassware Association.
Hardboard Association.
Wm. Ainsworth & Sons, Inc.
Scientific Apparatus Makers' Association.
The Associated Fishing Tackle Manufacturers.
The Wool Hat Manufacturers' Association.
Tile Council of America.
Insulation Board Institute.
Air Products, Inc., Emmaus, Pa.
Cooke Bausman, Jr., Pittsburgh.
Winchester Arms Co., New Haven.

Industrial Fasteners Institute.
American Tunaboat Association, San Diego, Calif.
International Handbag, Luggage, Belt and Novelty Workers Union (AFL).
International Brotherhood of Operative Potters (AFL).
The Diamond Match Co.
Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc.
Seafood Producers Association of New Bedford.
California Fish Cannery Association.
Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association of Pennsylvania.
Samuel Lenher.
D. C. Newman.
International Brotherhood of Bookbinders (AFL).
National Authority for the Ladies' Handbag Industry.
American Cyanamid Co.
American Cutlery Manufacturers Association.
Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association.
United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union (AFL).

Another Man's Poison?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. George Sokolsky, well-known columnist and radio commentator, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Thursday, February 10, entitled "Another Man's Poison."

The article is as follows:

ANOTHER MAN'S POISON?

(By George Sokolsky)

Most people know as little about fluoridation as I do. Most of those who favor it and oppose it are and are littered with propaganda on both sides would find it difficult to explain why anyone should get all hot and bothered about this business of pouring another poison into our water. For our health, our water has already been chlorinated and the real effect is to give it so horrible a taste that alcoholism is on the increase. Whenever I taste water that has been manhandled by a chlorinator, I understand why the late Heywood Brown preferred gin.

So now they are to put fluorides into our water to save our teeth. My suspicions are naturally aroused because so many dentists are for it. They must have grown eleemosynary of late to favor something that they claim will put them out of business. As I have no teeth of my own, perfect teeth are of small moment to me personally, but I, too, can be eleemosynary and favor something that benefits someone else, if it does.

The question that arises in my mind is, Suppose 10 or 20 years from now, the professors change their minds about fluoridation. Suppose they say that instead of saving teeth, it harms something else. So I read an article in the Scientific American, entitled "A Study of the Anti-scientific Attitude," and discovered that the authors, Bernard and Judith Mausner, agree with Senator FULBRIGHT that there is a "swinish blight of anti-intellectualism," and that whoever says that if you want to use fluorides for the teeth, get it in a bottle at the

drugstore instead of in the waterworks, is an aforesaid swinish anti-intellectual. This broad generalization reminds me of the anti-Fascists who denounced everyone who despised Stalin as pro-Fascist, and the anti-Communists who believe that everyone who reads the Daily Worker is a Communist.

In a word, here is supposed to be learned writing on a technical subject which I pick up to inform myself and find in the first paragraph a polemic on the distrust of intellectuals, which has nothing to do with the subject. I am sure that the Mausners, whoever they may be, regard themselves as intellectuals but I doubt whether they can write learnedly on the moral systems of Maimonides, Thomas Aquinas, Spinoza, and Kant and, if they cannot, I shall everlastingly deny them the title of "intellectuals." Also, unless they can write several thousand words on the romantic period in music and unless they can speak authoritatively on the influence of Wagner on Verdi's Otello, I shall mark them down as having no right to wear the sign of the egghead.

The trouble with a fellow who becomes fanatical about such a subject as fluoridation is that while he can explain why poison, if taken in small doses, might do no damage, or might even be beneficial, like opium, if one has a bellyache, he does not explain why it should not be sold in a drugstore so that the fellow who does not care for the stuff is not obliged to have it in his coffee. The answer, of course, is that it is a poison.

In a free society, no one ought to be forced to do what he chooses not to do, just as a Christian Scientist may eschew a physician, or a Jew, pork. These choices are made on religious grounds and therefore are protected by the Constitution, but fluoridation is advocated by dentists and social workers and therefore the Constitution may not be invoked to protect them.

The Customs Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an interesting and informative editorial entitled "The Customs Budget" that appeared in the January 28, 1955, issue of the Journal of Commerce of New York City:

THE CUSTOMS BUDGET

This piece is intended primarily for the House Appropriations Committee which shortly will take under consideration the Budget Bureau's recommendation that \$41,200,000 be allocated for the 1956 fiscal year for the United States Customs Service.

This sum is about 3 percent higher than approved for fiscal 1955, but is still short of what is needed, since it will just about cover certain minor employee expenses now allowable, and the automatic pay increases.

The basic problem still remains unsolved. This is the steady decline that has taken place in the number of employees doing customs work, while the workload of this service has constantly moved higher. Expressed another way, employees retiring or leaving the service have not been replaced in recent years by collectors forced to trim costs to the bone, while the volume of our imports that are dutiable and the paper work in processing both imports and exports for reasons of security have steadily mounted.

Also, there are the airports which now handle as many incoming passengers as the steamship lines, and the liberalized provisions governing imports by mail, both of which require customs inspection.

Now economy in Government is something with which few people can quibble. Also it is difficult at a time when balanced budgets are prime objectives to make exceptions without opening the gates to others.

Nevertheless some good arguments can be advanced for considering the customs service as a hardship case, because we are inevitably approaching the time when, through lack of manpower alone, we are endangered with a breakdown of proper import inspection, narcotics control, and strategic materials supervision. When this happens the smugglers, dope peddlers, and subversives will have a field day.

In seeking to explain this extraordinary condition there appears to be only one answer—the customs service has not been articulate over the years in its applications for funds so that its modest requests have been drowned out by the multimillion demands of other agencies.

The time is here to correct this situation before it is too late. Responsible importers are concerned because they cannot compete with the smuggler, and the public must be concerned if made aware of the facts, since the best place to stop narcotics is at the shoreline.

Thus we have a collection and enforcement agency whose activities touch many people, but whose position as a responsible Government bureau is being steadily and dangerously weakened.

Let us look at the situation at the port of New York where we were able to gather some figures to implement the above statements.

In 1940 there were approximately 3,000 customs employees here who collected some \$173 million in receipts.

Last year 2,600 workers collected \$350 million in receipts. This represented an even greater increase in actual handlings, since tariffs have been substantially reduced during the postwar period on about half our imports.

Import mail entries at New York in 1941 came to 3 million packets; last year the volume was 9 million.

Pier guards, which numbered 800 at the war and postwar peak and normally numbered 500, are now down to 280.

Passenger entries by airline and steamship is at an all-time high and bid fair to set new records this year.

To handle this increased work with less people and still insure some supervision, it has been necessary to resort to spot inspection of baggage, accept invoice weights on many dutiable imports, and eliminate review of final acceptance of certain duties by the Comptroller.

All these moves were expedients resorted to by New York officials in a desperate effort to utilize available forces to the best possible advantage in collection and enforcement work.

New York, which normally collects about 40 percent of customs revenues, has been held to a budget of approximately \$9 million a year, or about 23 percent of the total. It employs about 30 percent of the total customs force, so that on the basis of both personnel and collections it has been curtailed below what should normally be expected. In fact, further cuts in the ranks appear inevitable here unless Congress does something about budget funds for fiscal 1956.

This is the outlook, and it is not a pleasant picture. We urge careful review of the entire problem by the House Appropriations Committee before any attempt is made to accept the Budget Bureau recommendations.

The situation is serious enough to call for some facts. They can be obtained without too great effort and should be studied by

Congress to find out if our customs service needs strengthening and to what extent to preserve one of our basic national interests.

Yes; We Can Abolish War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe Members of the House will be interested in reading a timely editorial by the well-known columnist, David Lawrence, in a recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report. It is entitled "Yes; We Can Abolish War":

General MacArthur says war must be abolished. Here is a great soldier speaking, a veteran of three wars, a hero who won the adulation of his people for military achievement but who, ironically enough, became the main target of the European press as a "warmonger" because Communist propaganda falsely portrayed him as wanting to send American troops to the Chinese mainland.

What paradox is this which brings from the lips of a military man of such wide experience the most stirring plea for the abolition of war that has been heard in our times?

What fantastic suggestion, what dream of impracticality is this, ask the skeptics, as they fling at him the facts of practicality in an age of aggression.

But the idea is not to be rejected so readily. It is neither fantastic nor impractical. It is real and it is practical. It is the liveliest issue of our day—if we will but examine it as carefully as we do the power of a new bomb of destruction.

For here is a concept that challenges the imagination of man. It is intangible now, yet it is something the human mind can make tangible whenever there is a determined effort to do so.

Let us examine the words of General MacArthur as he spoke at Los Angeles on January 26 last on the occasion of his 75th birthday:

"It is a sad truth that human character has never reached the theological development which would permit the application of pure idealism. In the last 2,000 years its rate of change has been deplorably slow compared to that of the arts and the sciences. But now the tremendous and present evolution of nuclear and other potentials of destruction has suddenly taken the problem away from its primary consideration as a moral and spiritual question and brought it abreast of scientific realism. It is no longer an ethical equation to be pondered solely by learned philosophers and ecclesiastics but a hard-core one for the decision of the masses whose survival is the issue."

That phrase, "the decision of the masses," epitomizes the whole problem and points to its solution.

But how? Where is the blueprint? Where is the mechanism that can accomplish this worthy object? Have not men always preached the doctrines of peace? And have not wars come anyhow?

True enough, we have asked but we have never answered the real question. For we have always sought the solution through governments—when it is the governments themselves which have assumed the power to impose slavery and by their discipline to create armies.

Governments, of course, can be the honest servants and spokesmen of free peoples, but

too often they are the masters of enslaved peoples. The problem is to find a way to divest rulers of their despotic power.

We shall not make peace by attending conferences or writing treaties with cliques of evil men. We cannot win them by exhortation. We can unhorse them only by reaching to the sources of their power. Anything which enhances the prestige of bad rulers helps to deceive and discourage the peoples who have been enslaved.

Our moral power should be strong enough to refrain from all contacts with evil men. The maintenance of our armament is essential only to protect us against the caprice of these evil rulers. This we must make clear to other peoples—that it is their government which threatens the peace of mankind.

Does anybody doubt that if such a message could reach the people of Soviet Russia and the people of Red China that they would react against war any differently than we do? Of course not. All human beings are instinctively in favor of survival.

Then what are we waiting for? Only for the mechanism to implement the formula whereby peoples talk to peoples, and governments begin to do what peoples want them to do. The 200 million people in Soviet Russia and the 600 million in China can at any moment remove any clique or group which is usurping authority. Armies would crumble, because soldiers, too, wish to survive.

Inventive geniuses must bring forth an electronic device to make it possible for the words of a President or the words of our spiritual leaders everywhere on this side of the Iron Curtain actually to be heard by all the oppressed peoples.

We now can amplify the human voice so that it can be heard across huge public squares in our big cities. We must look forward to the day when science will transmit words spoken in the native tongue of enslaved peoples and, again and again, convey to them the biggest truth of today—that war can and must be abolished.

The voice of humanity, speaking the language of reason, inevitably will be heard in every home in every country. When that happens, tyrants will vanish, because the concerted will of millions of people will take from such rulers the power to make war. Therein lies the salvation of the world.

Congressmen Get Prayer Room

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Congressmen Get Prayer Room," which appeared in the February 8, 1955, issue of the Irvington Herald, of Irvington, Ky.

It is good to feel that the public as well as the Members of Congress realize how the prayer room has been needed and have some conception of what this place of quiet retreat and meditation will mean in the stress and strain of the present and the future.

The editorial is as follows:

CONGRESSMEN GET PRAYER ROOM

For the first time in more than 150 years, Members of Congress have been provided with a prayer room at this session of Congress. The prayer room, which was author-

ized last year, is open to Members of Congress only and is not to be used for any other persons or groups.

The idea is to provide the legislators with one room in the Capitol where they can find seclusion, peace, and quiet. The prayer room's special window was built by volunteer labor from California's 21st Congressional District.

Clergymen of all faiths were consulted about the furnishing of the prayer room, and a large plain oak altar was finally selected. The room is covered with green carpet and there are chairs along the walls, in front of which are wooden screens which furnish privacy. Adequate copies of prayer books, Bibles, and other literature are available in the room.

Anyone who ever worked in the Capitol, amid the tensions and pressures which are exerted on the legislative branch, knows there has long been a need for a prayer room such as this. We hope that on more than one occasion in the future this room of meditation and inspiration will be useful in helping to guide decisions made by the highest elected legislative officers of our country in these critical times.

Ten Years After Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Yalta Conference of February 1945 fashioned the Roosevelt peace, which now has tormented all of God's children for 10 long years. Some day, Yalta must be undone.

The principals in that tragic conference were Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill. Stalin and Churchill, though both older than Roosevelt, were in robust health. Roosevelt, as we now know from recent memories, was a dying man. Alger Hiss and Harry Hopkins were intimate, confidential advisers of Roosevelt at Yalta.

Official State Department publications has summarized the accomplishments at Yalta, so far as they are known; but these publications do not tell the story of Roosevelt's physical and mental disintegration during the 15 months immediately preceding the Conference.

Not until Rear Adm. Ross T. McIntire, United States Navy, retired, published *White House Physician*, in 1946, did the world learn that President Roosevelt's fatal illness first struck him in December 1943, almost a year before the historic fourth-term election of November 1944, and 15 months before the epochal Yalta Conference.

Churchill quickly recognized Roosevelt's tragic physical condition at Yalta and since has commented on that facet of the conference at some length. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt likewise wrote—in 1950—that everybody in the White House family knew that the President was far from well during the summer and fall of 1944. But nobody in the White House ever commented on the President's health because all under-

stood clearly that Mr. Roosevelt felt it his duty to continue in office and those around him could try only to make things as easy for him as possible.

This fixed policy of the court circle was spearheaded by Admiral McIntire, who issued five public statements during 1944 indicating that Mr. Roosevelt was in sound health. These statements by Admiral McIntire were published in the *New York Times* on March 6, May 8, June 9, September 26, and October 13, 1944.

With the Nation thus reassured on Mr. Roosevelt's robust health, the President was reelected triumphantly for a fourth term on November 7. Immediately after the inauguration, January 20, 1945, he took off on the cruiser *Quincy* from Norfolk, Va., for the fateful Yalta Conference, which saddled Germany with the savage Morgenthau plan for a pastoral economy, betrayed Poland, and delivered China to Kremlin communism. Yalta designed and erected the Iron Curtain.

In *The Roosevelt Myth*, published in July 1948, John T. Flynn, a competent and respected anti-Communist journalist, meticulously documented Roosevelt's last illness from its inception in December 1943 to the President's death at Warm Springs, Ga., April 12, 1945. Using Mr. Flynn's basic chronology as the framework, I now have buttressed the story with additional details since published in the Churchill memoirs, the Ickes diaries, Frazier Hunt's biography of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and Mrs. Roosevelt's *This I Remember*, published in 1950.

President Roosevelt returned from the Tehran Conference in December 1943, and after a brief season in Washington, moved on to Hyde Park for the Christmas holidays. There, Dr. McIntire relates, the President suffered a brief attack of influenza, which was followed by a persistent bronchial infection. From this point until his death in April 1945, the President never regained sound health and normal physical energy.

Flynn records that Mr. Roosevelt was away from the White House 175 days during 1944. Some 30 days were required for his junket to the Pacific to confer with MacArthur and Nimitz; he gave 2 weeks to the presidential campaign; about 10 days to the Quebec Conference with Churchill; and spent something more than 100 days at Bernard Baruch's secluded retreat at Hobcaw Sound, S. C., at Hyde Park, and at the sheltered Shangri La hideout in western Maryland. The true significance of these extended periods of presidential rest and recuperation was obscured by Admiral McIntire's periodic reassurances to the public throughout the year concerning Mr. Roosevelt's health.

Merriam Smith, veteran White House reporter for the United Press, comments in *Thank You, Mr. President—1946*—that Admiral McIntire never lied about Mr. Roosevelt's physical condition but, on occasion, has told the truth in language that easily could be misleading to the public.

At Hyde Park several celebrated specialists were called in during January

1944 for a consultation on the President's influenza. Their findings, documented through Admiral McIntire several years later, disclosed a moderate degree of arteriosclerosis—the infirmity which finally produced the fatal stroke at Warm Springs, April 12, 1945. While this Hyde Park consultation occurred in January 1944, the findings were not documented publicly until June of 1946.

History thus records that President Roosevelt's last illness began, and was correctly diagnosed, in December to January, 1943 to 1944, but was concealed from the public, to accommodate the urgent political stratagems of the fourth-term campaign in 1944, and further concealed during the critical days of the Yalta Conference with Stalin and Churchill—in February 1945—which gave us the Roosevelt peace, the United Nations, and the deliberate betrayal of China to communism after the carefully plotted Lattimore plan.

Under all the customs and usages of international law the question now arises whether, in the circumstances of President Roosevelt's then advanced infirmity in January 1945, his secret deliberations and vocal one-man commitments at Yalta impose in any degree the slightest moral obligation on the part of the United States Government or the American people?

After the January 1944 medical consultation at Hyde Park, McIntire notes, he placed the President on a regime which limited him to 4 hours work a day. With D-day in Europe only 6 months forward, and the fourth-term presidential campaign already well underway, this 4-hour-day regime—not documented for the public until 1946—marked Mr. Roosevelt as no longer physically fit to discharge the heavy duties of his high office. Nevertheless, 11 months later, he was reelected, in November 1944, for another term of 4 years.

Mrs. Roosevelt confirms Dr. McIntire's account of the limited presidential regime, noting that Mr. Roosevelt on June 6, 1944, had only one significant task on his calendar for the day—delivery of his D-day prayer over a worldwide radio network; after which for hours, all hearts in the White House were with the men on the beaches.

Precisely at this point, Mrs. Roosevelt continues, another election campaign lay immediately ahead. She knew, without asking, that since the war was not over, Mr. Roosevelt, if his health permitted, would run again. It was thereupon decided finally that if the President would agree to certain rules set down by the physicians, he could carry on as Chief Executive—*Washington Post*, February 1, 1950, page 13-B. Mrs. Roosevelt does not record, however, who made this momentous decision in the summer of 1944, nor why it was not disclosed to the American public until February of 1950, almost 5 years after Mr. Roosevelt's death.

About a month earlier, Dr. McIntire, in May 1944, had brought down from Boston a famous heart specialist, arranged his immediate induction into the United States Navy, and assigned him to President Roosevelt's side. Eleven months later, at the scene of the Presi-

dent's death, this heart specialist, Dr. Howard Bruenn, told newspapermen he had never let Mr. Roosevelt get out of his sight. These fundamental facts of 1944 White House history were not made known to the public until mid-1946.

En route to the Pacific in July 1944, Mr. Roosevelt stopped his special train long enough in the railyards at Chicago to issue his historic dictum, "Clear it with Sidney," to Senators Truman, Byrnes, and Barkley. This dictum related to the Democratic National Convention's then pending selection of a vice presidential nominee for the fourth-term ticket, the southern Democrats having earlier informed the President in Washington that Henry Agard Wallace would not be acceptable for another term. From this situation soon emerged the nomination of Harry Truman, the only other considerable candidate before the convention acceptable to the late Sidney Hillman.

From Chicago, Mr. Roosevelt moved on to San Diego, where he made his acceptance speech for the fourth-term nomination, thence by battleship to his war conference with MacArthur and Nimitz, which lasted only a few hours.

On this trip—

Flynn explains—

his appalling physical condition was revealed to the commanders in Honolulu. They were shocked at his appearance, despite the long, restful, sea trip. Here for the first time, we hear of his conversation falling into intervals of irrelevance.

As he was wheeled from his quarters, officers noted his head drooping forward, his jaw hanging loosely. Mr. Roosevelt did not return to Washington until August 18.

Campaigning in the rain in New York City late in October, he rode in a specially equipped heated limousine, with an electric heater under the seat, and another under the heavy fur blankets thrown over his lap. Three or four stuttering lapses in diction during his radio speech that night were attributed jovially by the newspapermen present to possibly a slight excess of before-dinner martinis.

One week later, on election night, Merriam Smith noted at Hyde Park that Mr. Roosevelt "looked older than I had ever seen him, and he made an irrelevant speech."

After the election, November 7, President Roosevelt dropped out of the news until November 28, then went to Warm Springs until December 23, then to Hyde Park for the Christmas holidays. Just 1 year had passed—as we now know—since his fatal illness had been discovered, diagnosed, and suppressed.

On January 19, 1945, the day before inauguration, Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins tarried after the Cabinet meeting to present her resignation and bid farewell.

The physical appearance of the President shocked her. His deep pallor, apoplectic hands, and sagging facial muscles suggested a man gravely ill. Distracted, she hastened to her office, called in her personal secretary, closed the door, and whispered in a frightened voice that the President appeared near death.

Forty-eight hours later, the inauguration over, Mr. Roosevelt left Washington for the Yalta Conference—the most appalling disaster in modern history.

Someday, somehow, Yalta must be undone. God's mankind will not continue forever in the toils and chains there spun by barbaric communism about the broken body and shattered mind of a President recently elected for a fourth term by the most gigantic and egregious public fraud in the history of the world.

Fallout—Another Dimension in Atomic Killing Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the New Republic for February 14, and was written originally for and appeared in the February Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists:

FALLOUT—ANOTHER DIMENSION IN ATOMIC KILLING POWER

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

The first A-bomb which shattered Hiroshima struck out at its victims over about 7 square miles. Compared with the TNT blockbuster this primitive nuclear weapon constituted a "quantum jump" in the instruments of war. On November 1, 1952, a much more powerful bomb spread its blast-heat punch over 300 square miles. This was quantum jump no. 2. The world did not have long to wait for no. 3. It came on March 1, 1954, with a fallout of radioactive particles over thousands of square miles of the Pacific Ocean.

The lethal radioactive fallout of quantum jump no. 3 is still too recent to appreciate fully. Indeed, most people have scarcely begun to comprehend the meaning of Hiroshima, let alone the more recent event which dwarfs it in significance. And dwarf it, it does. Fallout adds a new dimension to war. A single superbomb, exploded close to the ground, can now contaminate a State the size of Maryland with lethal radioactivity.

TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The November 1954 Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists stated that about 4,000 square miles could be contaminated with serious-to-lethal radioactivity by the March 1 explosion. It emphasized that this was a conservative estimate. Using more recent data, this calculation can be refined. When a bomb is dropped, the sequence of events is as follows:

1. The exploding superbomb produces a 3-to-4-mile diameter fireball, which, unless it is exploded as a very high air burst, will touch the earth's surface.

2. As the blast-heat of the explosion craters the surface below the bomb it dislodges millions of tons of surface earth and substratum.

3. The glowing fireball rises skyward and sucks up in its column debris from the crater. Massive chunks of debris fall back to earth promptly, but lighter particles are churned into the fireball and coated with prodigious quantities of radioactivity created by the fission process.

4. Split atoms of uranium or fission products adhere to the debris, the smaller parti-

cles carry less radioactivity than the more massive ones which have more surface area. The hot debris is swept upward to the stratosphere, where it is dispersed downwind by the high winds aloft.

5. As the bomb could sweeps downwind there is a continual fallout of the radioactive particles, the heavier ones falling first, while the lighter particles drift farther downwind.

6. The pattern of the fallout area is roughly elliptical.

Not all the radioactive particles come to earth in the fallout which concerns us. Some radioactive debris falls back into the crater area and much of it is carried on such tiny particles that they are wafted around the world without descending. Stratospheric winds of 50 knots are not uncommon over the United States, so that the hot cloud could travel 200 miles in several hours. Assuming an ellipse width of 50 miles and a length of 200 miles, this would correspond to an area of about 8,000 square miles.

Assume then that the bomb is of the general type as that detonated in the Castle series in March-April of last year. Assume further that the pertinent energy release is 8 megatons (8 million tons of TNT). The exposure one would receive if one stayed in the contaminated area for an infinite length of time is 2,500 roentgens, which corresponds to a 1-hour activity of 500 roentgens per hour. Roentgen, as used here, applies to the integrated exposure from 1 hour to eternity.

Naturally as time passes the intensity drops sharply. From 1 hour to 1 years there would be a 50,000-fold reduction in the level of contamination. Yet, even at the end of 1 year the rate would exceed that set as safe for laboratory workers today.

About one-half of the eternity dose of radioactivity is delivered in the first day—the time of maximum danger from fallout. Although the intensity then drops sharply, it does not drop to zero. At 50 years, 7½ percent of the eternity dose remains.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

Let us consider the fate of one person, call him Mr. A, who panics and attempts to flee from the fallout area. Assume that Mr. A seeks no shelter and flees on foot (perhaps having been caught in a traffic jam). Assume that he walks or runs all day, spending 9 hours in the hot area before finally reaching a noncontaminated place or before someone forces him to take shelter. At an intensity of 55 roentgens per hour, at the end of 1 hour he would have had a dose of 550 roentgens—the lethal dose is 400 to 500 roentgens. His panic or his ignorance would have cost him his life.

Consider now the case of Mr. B who is alerted by the thunderclap of the explosion and fortunately being out of immediate blast damage range seeks shelter. A prudent man, he has prepared a simple basement shelter to which he takes his family and food and water to last for 2 days. After 2 days he emerges, receives an advisory on his battery-powered radio, and then either stays put or travels to a safe area. He will have received very slight radiation while sheltered. In traversing the contaminated area after 2 days he could go a full day without radiation injury.

These two cases illustrate that the maximum peril from fallout is concentrated in the first day, or in the most heavily contaminated area, in the first 2 days. This does not mean that the danger has vanished after 2 days, for one still has to contend with the remaining half of the radiation. But since this is delivered more slowly over a period of weeks and months, it is not an acute hazard, although it cannot be disregarded.

Mr. B in our example was fortunate because he had a prepared shelter with sufficient shielding to protect against the penetrating rays in the fall-out. Very few peo-

ple today can claim to be Mr. B. This raises the question as to what people can do if there are no good shelters available. The question can be answered in a word: improvise. Dr. Willard F. Libby, in one of this first speeches as an Atomic Energy Commissioner, wisely pointed out: "The radiological hazard of atomic weapons is something one can do something about."

Doing something about the fall-out involves (a) action during the acute phase of the hazard, i. e., the first few days, and (b) measures applicable to the nonacute radioactive hazard.

Obviously, if one knows where to flee one can escape from the fall-out region. But this is rather a risky undertaking once the bomb has been detonated and fall-out has begun. People within the shadow of the H-cloud should seek emergency shelter as quickly as possible.

The fundamental rule of survival then is: Get below the surface of the earth—a basement under a multi-story house, the fruit cellar of a farmhouse, or simply any hole in the ground. When one gets his head below the earth's surface he ducks out of the "illumination" of the radioactive rays from the surrounding area and reduces his dose very greatly. Even a hastily scooped out foxhole affords good protection. It is true that some fall-out will descend upon the occupant but a coat stretched across the top for a few hours and then discarded will minimize later exposure.

If no emergency shelter is available and time does not permit digging a foxhole (or where soil and weather conditions deter such excavation) one may seek second-class protection in a structure like a barn. Radioactive particles falling on the roof still irradiate the individual but they are farther away and the distance is a substitute for solid shielding. Furthermore, the refugees in the barn can improvise shelters inside. Having a roof over your head, even though your head is not below the earth's surface, has the decided advantage that it protects from direct contamination by the particles themselves. By keeping the radioactive debris from touching the body, one eliminates the hazard of the short-range beta particles which would otherwise cause beta burns on the skin.

An analogy may prove useful in illustrating the fallout radiation. When a plane surface like an open field is covered with an invisible mantle of radioactivity, one has an infinite plane (so dear to physicists) as the source of radiation; which means that if you stand in the middle of the field you receive radiation from all parts of the field, more from close by and, of course, less from the more remote parts. Substitute for the invisible mantle a huge array of incandescent bulbs. Standing in the midst of this blazing field of illumination you will receive light from every part of the field. Now duck below the earth's surface into a foxhole and you will cut down your exposure enormously, although you will still receive some scattered light. In the case of gamma rays scattered in the air, the amount of penetrating radiation which looks in the foxhole should be small.

A simple calculation shows that a person standing in an open field, uniformly contaminated with the fallout, receives 50 percent of his radiation from the fallout which is over 25 feet away from him. Further calculation shows that a person in a normal basement (below the level of surrounding terrain) would be exposed to only less than one-third the above-the-ground hazard. The smaller the basement the better the protection will be for there will be less overhead illumination. On this basis a foxhole, with its small entrance for radiation is better protection than a basement. And a foxhole dug in the basement or a basement corner room extension would be even better protection.

Overhead protection with earth or concrete is desirable but it is surprising how much protection is afforded by the simple expedient of getting below the earth's surface.

Imagine that 1 hour after the fallout each electric lamp in our radiation field glows at a 100-watt level. At the end of 1 day the level will drop to 2.2 watts; in other words, the intensity will drop forty-five fold in the first day. With such a dropoff in intensity one can emerge from the shelter phase of civil defense and begin to do something more actively. If you were a farmer with a tractor and plow you could plow under the contamination. This would be equivalent to dimming the lights. One would not have to dim all the lights for those closest to you would be most important.

Take the case of a man who lives in a New England community. He is apt to be caught in a multiple fallout, that is, he may be in an area where fallout from more than one bomb occurs. To travel to a noncontaminated region—say Canada or the Adirondacks—might be unwise. Yet to stay put is most uncomfortable, especially in a foxhole. A homeowner could return to his house, if it survives, and begin decontamination. Sweeping down the roof would be the most urgent task. A good stiff sweep-down would remove much of the radioactivity. Then the surrounding hard surfaces like the street and driveway could be swept and the sweepings buried in the lawn or flushed into a sewer. The lawn should be thoroughly turned over with a spade. Even raking would help.

Care should be taken to minimize direct contamination of the body, especially when sweeping. Using a simple face mask and afterward discarding clothing will be effective measures. Inadequate unclassified information exists upon which to base a realistic evaluation of the inhalation hazard of fallout radioactivity. Entry of the particles into the lungs can undoubtedly be minimized with filters and masks.

The reason for decontaminating your immediate environment becomes clear if you think about the accumulated dose. Suppose you emerge after 2 days during which time you have received little, if any, radiation. The radiation level has dropped from its initial 1 hour rate of 500 radiation-hours to about 5 radiation-hours. Such a level is still respectable but one can work around the house for a few hours without serious injury. If one did not undertake decontamination measures to clean up the radioactive contamination, then a significant amount of radiation would be delivered to a person who lived in the house during the next week. One might receive as much as 250 roentgens during this time.

A community which is left untouched (i. e., no decontamination measures are undertaken) and which experienced a fall-out corresponding to our initial 1-hour rate of 500 radiation-hours would have a radiation level of about 1 radiation-hour at the end of 1 week and 0.2 radiation-hour at the end of a month. In the interval from the week to the first month the accumulated dosage would amount to 230 roentgens. From the first month to the end of the year would add 265 more roentgens. While such dosages would probably not cause death (since they are delivered over a long period of time and the body "forgets" some of the radiation it receives) they are very definitely unhealthy amounts of radiation.

Thus, unless a community is decontaminated, it might be uninhabitable for a considerable period of time, ranging up to several months. One cannot escape the conclusion that many metropolitan areas will become a kind of no man's land should they become heavily contaminated. People might enter them for limited periods of time but

they would not be habitable in the ordinary sense of the word.

A city, especially one smashed into rubble, would be almost impossible to decontaminate. It would seem that the wisest thing to do with the central city would be to level it with demolition charges and bulldozers and cover it with earth, converting it into a huge metropolitan park. Moreover, the doughnut nature of the restored city would serve as a grim reminder to city planners on how to design cities of the future. In some cases nature would solve the problem by creating lakes in the craters formed where the business centers once stood. One would expect such metropolitan lakes in low-lying areas like Detroit, Chicago, Baltimore, and in other seaboard cities with business districts close to sea level.

IF THE UNITED STATES IS ATTACKED

This then, is the nature of the radioactive fallout. Let us now examine the impact of a small-scale nuclear attack upon continental United States of America. Because Soviet military planners would probably be reluctant to abandon the traditional use of an explosive as a blast agent, the assumption is made that a bomb is dropped over the following target cities: On the eastern coast—Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston; inland—Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Indianapolis, Louisville, Cincinnati, Columbus, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Cleveland, Akron, Buffalo, and Syracuse. This would total 18 bombs. Then to maximize fallout and strike at a myriad of smaller targets, bombs would be dropped in the following areas: west of Chicago, over South Bend, over Grand Rapids, over Ft. Wayne, near Elmira, west of Washington, west of New York, over Springfield, near Albany, and over Allentown. These 10 additional bombs would be dropped in such a way as to have the prevailing winds blanket dense metropolitan areas in an unseen mist of radioactivity.

This small-scale attack with 28 bombs restricted to the industrial heart of America could produce an inverted L-shaped pattern over the Northeastern States and an irregular fallout bracketing much of Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania. The atomized area would normally be occupied by 50 million Americans. Over two-thirds of the United States industrial production centers in the same areas. This is the magnitude of the problem. This is what the third quantum jump in modern weaponry means.

Moreover, the time factor—the persistence of radioactivity—adds a new dimension to warfare. It adds a denial factor for many homes are denied the dispossessed. Many factories, even though intact and even though manpower might be summoned, utilities restarted, and feed material scrounged up, would be out of commission. That the United States industrial colossus could be so paralyzed is incredible but, unfortunately, true.

Confronted with the overwhelming magnitude of fall-out hazard, the Federal Civil Defense Administration must feel that it has been admitted to the anteroom of hell. Civil defense plans had no sooner been formulated to deal with Hiroshima situations than they were obsolete. Then as some FCDA planners struggled manfully to revise thinking to adjust to megaton-class weapons, along came fall-out. It is easy to understand why much of the civil defense in this country is of the world war 2½ type. Events have come too fast to adjust to quantum jumps.

Thus it is a good time for a thorough house-cleaning in the civil defense establishment. An inventory should be made to see what measures are in the hopeless or useless category. Since so much of the civil defense measures have focused upon disaster relief these should be carefully assessed. Should we plan elaborate fire-fighting de-

fenses if no one can venture into the area for 2 days? A host of other questions need realistic assessment.

Probably the greatest single question revolves about the principle of preattack evacuation of target areas. Is this still a valid program or has fall-out killed its chances of success? One does not need an electronic brain to answer this question. As pointed out in the article in the November Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists too much of our urban population is concentrated in such a few targets. One simply cannot expose these populations to the unavoidable primary effects of superbombs—in other words, staying put is the worst possible policy. To minimize destruction by blast and heat the central urban populations have to be dispersed to sites where they can survive being crushed or burned. Naturally, an evacuated population which escapes blast and heat is by no means safe. It has yet to hurdle the invisible barrier of radioactivity. In many communities those who are evacuated upwind will be out of the fall-out region and there is even hope that preferential evacuation may be possible, i. e., deployment of the people in an upwind direction. This will be more precarious in regions such as Ohio and New England where you might evacuate upwind of one target into the downwind region of another.

I believe that it has become mandatory that the Government begin construction of an extensive system of survival shelters on the periphery of every large city. While evacuees might improvise shelter, it is far more desirable to have reinforced concrete shelters built in a cordon 8 miles or more from the city center. These need not be plush or elaborate shelters. Simple flush-to-the-surface concrete shelters with additional earth shielding will provide real protection. These shelters can be built on public land in school playgrounds, under suburban parking areas, in between divided highways, on park property, and on golf courses. Such a shelter program together with minimal numbers of radiation measurement devices need not exceed a total investment of \$2 billion.

At the same time all new construction, whether for industry, for government, or for homes, should be scrutinized from the overall viewpoint of national vulnerability. New industrial plants must be dispersed—this has been obvious for 10 years—but, in addition, they must be equipped with adequate shelters for their workers. Each plant should be prepared to shelter all of its worker force for 1 week and should provide for this emergency.

It should be made mandatory that every new house outside the central city should be built with a special shelter room in the basement, just as was done in Germany before the Allied air blitz began. Sanity would dictate that any new construction within the central city should be undertaken only if it reduces population density in that region.

Both the policies of evacuation and of dispersion are still valid, although they have to be coupled to a realistic shelter program.

But most of all, the Government has to conduct the most carefully planned and thoroughly implemented program of nuclear education on the facts of survival. Radioactivity is a kind of mystic subject understood by less than 0.1 percent of our population. It must be translated into the language of the layman in films, demonstrations, and test drills. The scientist with his dispassionate comprehension of the atom can scarcely begin to understand what terror the "invisible killer" holds for the nonscientist. Education is the only antidote for this new terror.

Civil defense faces a task as formidable and as important as that traditionally as-

signed to the Department of Defense. Fall-out makes it imperative that this Nation have an effective civil defense. Unless we are prepared to meet this awesome radioactive threat the military may well have little left to defend.

Dr. Willard Libby broke the ice in his informative speech of December 2, 1954, so far as official information about fall-out is concerned. There is reason to believe that the Atomic Energy Commission will release authentic data about radioactive effects as a basis for strengthening our national security. There is also reason to believe that these facts will confirm the conclusions presented here and that, in fact, they will, if candid, verify that the author's calculations have been conservative.

Keep Your Fingers Crossed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Keep Your Fingers Crossed," which appeared in the February 10, 1955, issue of the Franklin Favorite, of Franklin, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

KEEP YOUR FINGERS CROSSED

One cannot help but feel apprehension that the evacuation around Tachens Islands has brought the United States perilously close to a shooting war. It is a touch-and-go operation where any triggerhappy Chinese Communist could set off the fireworks. Or Chou En-lai, the Chinese dictator, might get up feeling bad one morning and blow his hat to save his face.

A brief glance in recent history of United States policy on Formosa is very enlightening. In the first place, the idea of drawing a line around Formosa and the Pescadores is not new. Since the Korean War, the territory the United States has been pledged to defend includes Formosa and its immediate waters and islands.

The new thing about this crisis is ordering the 7th Fleet into waters only a few miles off the coast of China, yet 200 miles north of Formosa. This policy is definitely a change. It is much like sticking your toe in a mousetrap and seeing how much pressure you can apply without springing the trap.

It is a dangerous but bold policy. Actual fighting between Red Communists and Nationalists has been going on in the Tachens area. The United States in helping Nationalist forces off a trouble spot—which obviously they could not hold—is thrusting its forces right into the Chinese civil war.

Of course, the evacuation is a retreat for Chiang Kai-shek forces. But the bold action of the 7th Fleet is no backdown on the part of the United States. The very boldness of the move may convince the Red Chinese they have grabbed all they are going to get by bluff and loud talk.

While it is a dangerous operation, and there may be several exciting and provocative events and threats, there is a little likelihood a United States-Red China war will start. But let's all keep our fingers crossed.

Once this dangerous evacuation is over we believe that the United States should clearly define what is out-of-bounds territory for Red China.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at \$1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

The State of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, a very fine appraisal of Minnesota and its people in the light of nearly a century of development since the State was admitted to the Union has been made by Dr. Theodore C. Blegen, dean of the graduate school of the University of Minnesota and one of our State's most distinguished historians and writers.

This appraisal is contained in an address on the subject *This Minnesota* which Dr. Blegen delivered at a meeting of the Minnesota Historical Society on January 27.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this fine address, because of its universal interest, be published in the *Appendix of the Record*.

In accordance with the rules of the Senate, I have requested the Public Printer to estimate the number of pages this manuscript would require, and I have been informed that it would occupy 2½ pages of the *Record*, at a cost of \$200.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THIS MINNESOTA

(By Theodore C. Blegen)

A memorable passage in Richard II comes to its climax in these words: "This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England." Tonight I wish to apply this phrase to Minnesota, and, in particular, I should like to point to some sources of strength and hope and courage that have been built up by the history and traditions of our own plot, earth, and realm.

In an age of anxiety and fear, when problems are many and complex, it is fair to look at our past and to examine our traditions, not in a mood of pessimism or defeatism, but in a mood of courage and hopeful anticipation. We may be able to identify and locate some poles of confidence and stability by which we can steady ourselves for whatever the future may bring. Perhaps, by seeing our past and ourselves with perspective, we can gain in strength. To look through, to see through—that is perspective, and that, also, is the heart of history.

The first thing I note about "this Minnesota" is that our whole history is marked by a stubborn curiosity to know, to solve problems, to open new paths—paths to trade, paths to development, and paths to human advance along a thousand lines.

In that brave tradition we can view a long and glamorous line of explorers who faced nearly every hazard to reduce European and American ignorance of our geography and resources. Take Radisson, for example, a fur trader, fighter, woodsman, adventurer—but, among the first Europeans to see these lands, he was primarily curious and eager to know.

This Caesar of the wilderness came to a tangle of lands and streams and lakes, with no map to guide him, and when he saw what he saw, he had a kind of dream of what this area, "so pleasant, so beautiful and fruitful," might mean to an old world that, as he said, started wars over some sterile rock in the sea. And so with scores of other explorers: they were determined to know and understand the physical world not yet mapped by man. What were these vast inland freshwater lakes of America? Where did the country's greatest river take its rise? Were there paths to the shining sea of the west and to the dominions of the Great Khan of Cathay? How chart this region with its meandering streams and myriad lakes? What could these fruitful lands mean to the world? So the good company of explorers did their job—Radisson and Groselliers, Hennepin and Duluth, Le Sueur, Verendrye, Carver, Thompson, Pike, Cass, Schoolcraft, Nicollet, Beltrami, and many another. For them all, a motion picture would have lines running here and there and everywhere through this western country, each one representing the will and courage and curiosity of a man. The map took shape, the curtain of mystery lifted; the kind of ignorance that caused our diplomats in 1783 to try to run a boundary west from Lake of the Woods to intersect the Mississippi was replaced by tested knowledge. All this took time: we had the flags of France and England, of Spain and the United States, over this region in whole or in part, but through it all the stubborn search for truth and understanding went on. Cathay proved to be very far away, but men of will broke through the continent to the Pacific coast, and in doing so they found, and told the world about, an inland empire better than Cathay. Sometimes they let themselves soar into prophecies that time has made good, as when Jonathan Carver, after seeing Minnesota before the American Revolution, wrote, "There is no doubt that at some future period, mighty kingdoms will emerge from these wildernesses, and stately and solemn temples, with gilded spires reaching the sky, supplant the Indian huts, whose only decorations are the barbarous trophies of their vanquished enemies."

I shall return to the tradition of curiosity and the will to solve problems, for these found outlets in many areas other than the physical world, but before I do so I want to look at a few other traditions that were woven into the fabric of Minnesota life.

In one of my books I have suggested that Minnesota has had three ages: ancient, medieval, and modern; that the ancient age is that of the pioneer and fur trader, the medieval that of settlement and the pioneer, and the modern that of our growing up—our advance from youth to maturity. In many aspects, as in transportation, they overlap, but by and large they stand out as identifiable. We can talk all we want to about ages, but when we ask their meaning and character, we come to people, for every age caught its character from the people who did its work, grappled with its problems, and held what faiths they had. A great deal has been said and written about the second of our ages, that of the pioneer, and I cannot try to analyze for you the scores of forces and actions and achievements that mark the age—the fur and lumber industries, the building of farms and towns and cities, the beginnings of industries and institutions, the dotting of the land with churches and

schools, the creation of government in all its range, the development of transportation from steamboats and sleds and carts to roads and railroads, and the hard ordeals people met in transforming Carver's wilderness into a garden.

But certain things of enduring interest for the interpretation of the state claim the historian's attention and deserve to be said—not in the spirit of adulation for the pioneers, but in sober appraisal. Of course we know that some people knuckled under, some gave up and went back; we know also that the bad went along with the good, and there were dark and ignoble as well as bright and noble sides in the pioneer experience. But we are not drawing an idealized picture when we point to a few traits or characteristics or traditions that, alongside material achievements, are a part of our pioneering heritage.

One is simply the tradition of work. Minnesota, like Rome, was not built in a day—nor was it built by lazy people. This is perhaps too obvious, like the barn on the landscape that people fail to see, and so it needs to be emphasized. The European thinks of Americans as strenuous, and I think we are. The strenuous President who glorified the strenuous life voiced American doctrine and habit. American strenuousness is rooted in the pioneer experience. There was so incredibly much to do in telescoping into decades the building job that the Old World spent centuries in doing that we had to be strenuous. Historians have not given sufficient attention to our tradition of strenuousness or to the work contributions of thousands upon thousands of mostly unknown people. Elsewhere I have spoken of them as "the wilderness Marthas who sustained the men of the frontier, the farmers and workers who did the job of their day quietly and efficiently, the men of trades and professions and business and enterprise, the men and women of faith and of dreams, the builders of homes and of the web of our social life, the sustaining folk at the roots of our existence." One could perhaps argue that there was not enough leisure or that leisure was much too restricted to a Vebelian privileged class; and one could differentiate kinds of work done—unskilled, skilled, professional. But the major point I want to make is that the pioneer age, an unspecialized age, set a tradition of hard work, of determination, to get both big and little jobs done.

Closely allied to this is the tradition of hope and opportunity—the pioneer awareness of the potentiality of better days. Hard work had its satisfactions and solace, but it was a means, not an end. People knew they were building foundations for a great state and society to come, and thousands of them saw that state and society as widened and enriched opportunities, opened doorways for their children, economic advantage, education, a fuller and more rewarding kind of life. Here again we are dealing with a fundamental thing that could be spelled out with thousands of illustrations. Perhaps the tradition widens into the larger American trait of optimism which so often has interested European observers, an optimism that, looking beyond triumph to the future, would not and will not settle for defeat. I have seen its spirit reflected in hundreds of immigrant pioneer letters that I have read—a kind of patience and moral standard that could meet just about every kind of ordeal,

including loneliness and back-bending work, privation and suffering, setbacks, even Indian wars, because courage was buoyed up by hope for the future. Some writers have suggested that the American frontier, in terms of the fulfillment of hopes, was pretty much a myth, but this is a failure to grasp the realities of American life in the span of more than one generation. There were individual disappointments, frustrations, failures; there were exaggerated claims; there were blasted speculations; but no one can survey the broader immigrant story that includes native Americans and Europeans alike without understanding that substantially the pioneer hopes were realized. Myths blossomed in the verdant literature of the frontier, but the frontier was no more a myth than America was a myth.

Some years ago, while exploring the beginnings of the University of Minnesota, I came upon the report of a territorial legislative committee in 1851 calling for the establishment of a university. The Territory was only 2 years old, its population only a few thousand, and yet the legislature took action to found a university. The committee said that "the cause of education in the Territory demands the early establishment of an institution of learning, which shall afford to the youth of the Territory an opportunity of obtaining a liberal, scientific, and classical education. . . . Men do not 'gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles,' neither does society grow virtuous citizens from the haunts of vice, or exalted minds from the abodes of ignorance and stupidity." The committee offered the opinion that to govern and restrain the ignorant is far more difficult than to educate and fit men to govern themselves, and then it went on to say that the children of that pioneer day were the citizens and rulers of the future, upon whose education depended the character and destiny of the infant commonwealth. The great immigration of folk to Minnesota had not then taken place, but the leaders who wrote that document spoke the faith and standards of thousands to come. They illustrated the trait of frontier hope coupled with planning and work. They also blended into Minnesota traditions, other traditions that went back to 17th century New England. And however one may describe these traditions, they merge with that of the stubborn drive for enlightenment and the fight against ignorance.

The episode from the birth of the university could be accompanied by illustrations touching all the colleges and the schools of the State as well as the many churches of different, but usually related, faiths—and indeed all our institutions, including this society of history, which began with hopes of service through an expanding future. I have always thought that the founding of the historical society back in 1849 was less a bow to what Governor Ramsey called "history in a land of yesterday" than it was a confident and brave approach to the land of tomorrow. The pioneers created this society because they believed in the promise of Minnesota. They believed that Minnesota would have a great history, the records of which would deserve to be kept and cherished. This institution was an act of faith done in harmony with the faith of Minnesota in its own future.

Today we are hard bitten by the ordeal of war and the problems of an atomic age. Talk about faith may fall on cynical or frightened ears, but I think we should realize that there is such a thing as faith in good purposes and in the human integrity behind such purposes. Unless we have faith and back it by resolute action, we may have to resign ourselves to the fate of a static society—a society driven by fear and cowardice instead of confidence and courage.

This brings me to another aspect of our history. Mighty forces in agriculture, indus-

try, and the transition from a general to a specialized society compelled the state to adapt its ways and methods as it moved into the machine age. Transfers of ideas from the East and from Europe had, indeed, gone hand in hand with experiment in the pioneering days, but as the need for modern transition came our people developed more and more the practice of experimentation, coupled with advancing research as specialization equipped itself to solve new problems. Here we must recall some of the big things that happened as we grew to maturity. Our population jumped from about 6,000 to 1,750,000 in 1900. The frontier was pushed westward toward the Pacific. The railroad age came, with giants like James J. Hill; and lumbering, with other giants like Frederick Weyerhaeuser, arrived at its golden age. Minneapolis emerged as the milling center of the world. Seven iron men disturbed the sleeping giant Mesabi, and Minnesota became a producing partner in the American steel age. Articulate labor lengthened its stride, while agriculture, after serving King Wheat, struggled with the change to new and diversified crops. At the same time its protests gave vigor to political reform movements in the agrarian crusade. Inevitably government expanded its interests and activities and moved toward its present complex and wide-spreading range.

But in all this great change, it is evident that things did not just happen. We did not just grow, like Topsy. There was leadership. There was planning. There was experiment. There was courage. There were people in league with the future. Business and industry had an alert eye to new needs and opportunities and adapted its techniques and operations, sometimes with ruthless efficiency. Education met new needs in an age of specialization and research, and it embarked upon the universal education of our people, with opportunities for the gifted to carry their training to a high point. And the State proved that it was not afraid of experimentation and widened responsibility, though often it was conservatively slow to turn sound ideas and proposals into practical action.

Many examples of the new pioneering could be presented—and in all this, people again occupy the stage—the whole people in one sense, but also leaders of intelligence, vision, and courage. Conservation, once a dim idea, became a movement, and its prophet and explorer bore the fitting name, Christopher Columbus Andrews. But we were slow to act. He preached his doctrines for 2 decades until they were reinforced by calamity, the tragic Hinkley Fire, and then we acted. Sometimes great results flowed, outside governmental action, from the ideas and will of men of "hope and forward looking minds," to use a phrase applied to the Doctors Mayo. There is one of the memorable sagas of the State—that of imaginative surgeons who kept pace, and more than pace, with the age of transition, pioneering medical cooperation and a vast medical practice, employing research in every part of their enterprise, and blazing trails to high training in clinical medicine. In public health Dr. Charles N. Hewitt of Red Wing was a quarter century ahead of his time, but his ideas gradually took hold. A village minister, Hastings H. Hart, laid the foundations of our advances in social welfare and public institutions, while a social pioneer, LeGrand Powers, stirred the people, with his painstaking reports, to State intervention in behalf of better conditions for labor and industry. So we could find leaders in parks and playgrounds, the cooperative movement, State regulation of railroads and warehouses, education, and many other fields, rallying the people to achieve better conditions of life. We have a tradition of research and experiment, and today in scores of fields Minnesota knows well that research is no remote ivory

tower, but a dedicated service to State and people, as is most recently illustrated in the story of a modern scientific explorer who, like Radisson, wanted to know, and whose researches have helped to open up the new taconite industry of the north country.

When our State saga is written as one day it should be, it will catch up and interpret such factors as our mobility, our age-long interrelations with nation and world, and the special flavor of a people who have interwoven many cultural and national strands and combined cultural transfers from Europe and the American East with the newer ways and ideas that are American and mid-western and Minnesotan.

Each one of these themes is an unwritten book of interpretation. Our historians are too afraid of interpretation, but I think we need interpretation as one of our roads to understanding. Look, for example, at this business of mobility. Here we share in and reflect the national character. An essayist in the Yale Review has described the American as "the moving American." We played leapfrog with our lands, as even a colonial American observed. We moved from frontier to frontier. We moved from country to town. We moved from crop to crop, from job to job, from level to level; we moved from cabin to house and house to house or apartment. Our story is migration. It is search for freedom and for advance; it is pursuit of happiness. Land frontiers disappeared, but we continued to move. We moved socially, economically, and politically; Henry Ford widened our front yard; and if we couldn't go away on wheels, we moved vicariously with the aid of radio and television and all the arts of communication. Perhaps the reflective life suffered, and it is true that we gained more stability as the frontier ended, but we have never stayed put. So a poet tells us that "America is west and the winds blowing," and another says that "Americans are always moving on." The tradition of migration finds a thousand illustrations in Minnesota. We move from somewhere or something to somewhere or something else. The tradition merges with those of space and freedom, of opportunity and democratic choice. Is it in our blood—this moving on?

The other two themes I have mentioned are very closely connected. We cannot understand Minnesota unless we understand that from the dim days when the flags of France and England and Spain flew figuratively over our lands, we have been part of the currents of world history. We have never been an isolated island, cut off from the world, as some commentators on isolationism have suggested. The wars and turbulence, ambitions and hopes, ideas and aims of Nation and world have, through all our history, left their marks upon this state and its people. Frenchmen sang their songs on our rivers; Scotsmen ran our fur-trading posts; our furs went out to London and Leipzig and Russia and even Canton, China; our northern boundary was set by international treaties; we have been caught up in national and international wars; and our people, only a generation after the state itself was founded, were two-thirds of European blood in the first and second generations. We have known a good deal about our organic connection with the world. Incidentally our once extensive immigrant press gave a better and more detailed picture of the affairs of the European world than did our English-language newspapers. We had a better schooling in international relations than some critics have known, though it is true enough that we shared the traditional American skepticism about foreign entanglements. We had a lot of work to do and we have not been too happy about being diverted from it. But it is no unexplainable phenomenon that a son of Minnesota in recent years was a leading American

voice in advocating world cooperation and control for justice and peace.

Meanwhile, we have been a merging cosmopolitan people, with bridges facing not only New England and the East but the many peoples and cultures of the Old World. Professor Krey once suggested that if Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam came alive and visited Minnesota today, he would find many things here that would be quite familiar to him. We have had and have pulsating links with the Old World from which we sprang. In the long run the Zangwill melting pot theory may come true, but the processes are slower than people once thought, and no one traveling about this State or studying its history can fail to realize that, to change the figure, our cultural streams, slowly merging, have identity enough to help stamp Minnesota with a certain individuality. Look about you and you see its signs everywhere—the leadership of New England and other native American forces in the launching of our professional life, our newspapers and banks and schools and commerce—the tough strain that Oscar Firkins caught when he praised a great teacher, Maria Sanford, “travel-soiled and dusty, vehement and gusty, kinked and knurled and crusty, leonine and hale and lusty, oaken-ribbed and trusty.” But alongside this wiry heritage, we should remember that many other elements in the making of the State have left their impress on its leadership and its everyday life. Our history must take account of a host of institutions, traditions, and practices that might be suggested by recalling our schools and colleges, Catholic and Protestant; the thousands of churches that enfold age-old faiths; the St. Olaf Choir and the sacred songs of hundreds of congregations; the sokol of the Bohemians; the kantele and sauna of the Finns; the Scandinavian and German singing and other musical societies; skiing and other sports; the German Turners, the Danish cooperatives and folk schools; our symphony orchestra and various institutes of arts; our creative literature and arts in wide range; and newer streams of trained and imaginative leadership. As Esther Jerabek has written, “Each nationality, bearing with it its own special heritage, has woven strands in the web of Minnesota’s cultural life, helping to make a rich fabric of unique design.” So we have had a schooling in tolerance and in the amenities of intercultural living as well as in the democratic spirit of the frontier, in which a man’s demonstration of worth, and not his pedigree or claims, give him status. This twin schooling may have helped Minnesota to weather with balance and fair sense some storms of intolerance, of hate, and the nasty fears and suspicions that feed on ignorance—though our record cannot be said to be without blemish.

As I near the end of this little excursion, I come back to the tradition of curiosity—to the will and courage to know and understand. It is characteristic both of our maturity and of the persistence of this tradition that we seem now to be in a period of self-appraisal. Lengthening perspective, the rich resources of the Minnesota Historical Society and of other institutions, and a sense of important decisions to come contribute to critical self-scrutiny. Much remains to be done, but historians are supplementing the earlier work of Dr. Folwell and others. Novelists, in their creative work, are going on from where Sinclair Lewis, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and O. E. Rølvaag left off. Historical appraisals are being made of schools and artistic institutions as well as of banks, mills, our iron industry, and other business organizations and forces. Imaginative leadership in our past is being recognized through biographies of the Drs. Mayo, Governors Johnson and Olson, and not a few others. Artists are joining in the task of interpreting Minnesota life and scenes. And the drive for appraisal is reaching into government. How far it will go in our social, cultural, intel-

lectual, educational, and political affairs I am not wise enough to say, but the impulse to know ourselves springs from an old tradition and it fits in with the spirit of an adult State that soon will celebrate its 100th State birthday.

However deep our concern with problems as we face the future, we should also recall some imponderables that are not too easy to put into words. The people of Minnesota have an affection for and a pride in the State which, if not quite so vocal as the rhapsodies of a Texan or Californian, are real and have substance. Who can analyze the deeper sources of affection and pride? Perhaps they are related to the sum total of our State heritage. Perhaps they are rooted in an awareness of things accomplished—things that, taken all around, have made this portion of the good earth a good place in which to live, notwithstanding worries and anxieties. I think that in part the emotion of affection flows from the fact that, with all the work and problems and crises and troubles and battles of people, they have been human and resilient enough to find joy and happiness and fun and reward here. This is not unique to Minnesota, but it remains true that the harshness of struggle has been abated by the genialities of community living and by the sense of progress toward better days. And the setting has been and is a State not denied a beauty and charm of its own, alongside the resources developed from earth and water and human effort. If we are moving Americans, we can move out from the confines of town to areas that still have a touch of the wilderness Radisson once saw. There are lakes of beauty; there are bending rivers, including the one the Indians termed the “Great River”; and there are waterfalls that inspired legends among our aboriginal redmen. There are cherished valleys and hills, deep woods and wide prairies, and red earth and black earth, all encrusted with natural and historic lore. And there are the material monuments of man’s dreaming and man’s industry.

It is only to superficial eyes that the gopher prairies are alike. There is both natural and man-created diversity in the State. Both for local and for State scenes, as indeed for the national scene, we need to remember that we are not just land and people and buildings and institutions, but that these, plus a world of ideas and practices, are bound together and given meaning by a past that stretches through all our ages and comes up to the ever-shifting line of the present. And we who are on that line could increase in wisdom by remembering with Shakespeare that “what’s past is prologue,” and that the prologue always merges into the ongoing drama.

Fewer Jobs, the Same Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a comment about the sharp decline in employment in manufacturing industries revealed by figures from the Department of Labor and by Federal Reserve Board data. These figures show a loss of more than a million jobs among production workers in manufacturing employment alone in the past 14 months.

There being no objection, the state-

ment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McNAMARA

The Federal Reserve Board index of manufacturing production for January of this year was the same as in November 1953, 14 months before. The index number was 132.

The dramatic and challenging thing about this figure is not alone the evidence that manufacturing production is in the doldrums. When this index is placed beside the Department of Labor employment figures for the same 2 months, the data show that this level of production has been maintained with a loss of more than a million jobs among the production workers in these industries. In January 1955, about 12½ million workers were able to produce as much as 13½ million produced 14 months before.

Employment drops while production is maintained, manufacturing industries

Date	Index of production ¹	Production worker employment ²	Index of man-hours ³	Indicated output per man-hour
November 1953.....	132	13,534,000	110	120
January 1955.....	132	12,528,000	102	129
Change.....	0	1,006,000	(7)	(9)

¹ Federal Reserve Board of Governors; monthly releases.

² Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; monthly report on employment and earnings.

³ Minus 7 percent.

⁴ Plus 8 percent.

Taking into account the number of hours worked, we find that the number of man-hours put into the job has declined by 7 percent. Those who prefer to talk in terms of man-hour output will find that there has been an increase of about 8 percent during this short time.

I think these figures show very dramatically how fast our technological revolution is moving.

I would like to see evidence that the administration is conscious of what this means, and has the plans to turn this technological progress into higher living standards for all people, instead of for only those lucky enough to keep their jobs. I hope there are plans for protecting the workers whose jobs are melting away, so that they and their children are not forced to pay a heavy price in unemployment and the destruction of their living standards. So far, I have seen no such plans.

The job is not an easy one. If the administration takes it on, it will have the sympathy and help of all of us. If the administration continues to fiddle with optimistic forecasts about increasing production while unemployment continues to grow in our major industries, the cost to all of us will be great.

Tariff Reductions Authorized by H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the so-called gradual tariff reductions authorized by H. R. 1.

I have had a list prepared concerning a few items, such as textiles, which shows the maximum rate reductions permissible under H. R. 1.

The list follows:

Extent to which existing rates of duty on specified products could be reduced under the authority that would be given to the President by H. R. 1

Commodity	Ad valorem equivalent ¹ of present rate of duty	Ad valorem equivalent ¹ of lowest rate of duty permissible under H. R. 1	Extent of reduction which is permissible under H. R. 1 in present rate of duty
	Percent ad valorem	Percent ad valorem	Percent
Soybean oil.....	45	23	50
Flavoring extracts, fruit flavors, esters, oils, and essences, containing alcohol.....	67	50	25
Certain lead pigments.....	20	10	50
Chrome brick.....	25	12½	50
Block mica.....	27	13½	50
Earthenware table and kitchen articles.....	63	50	20
Decorated china table and kitchen articles.....	88	44	50
Certain glass containers for toilet preparations.....	75	37½	50
Lenses with ground or beveled edges (for spectacles).....	40	20	50
Certain scientific or laboratory instruments and parts.....	50	30	40
Thermostatic metal.....	50	25	50
Power-transmission chains and parts (low-value).....	30	20	33
Steel trouser buttons.....	12	6½	46
Pocket knives (low value).....	85	50	41
Hypodermic syringes (dental).....	60	30	50
Slide fasteners (zippers), metal (low value).....	66	33	50
Tennis-racket frames.....	45	22½	50
Scrap tobacco (other than Cuban product).....	103	50	51
Cigars and cheroots (other than Cuban product).....	116	50	57
Lard compounds and lard substitutes.....	32	16	50
Turkeys, dressed or undressed.....	23	11	50
Rosefish, fresh or frozen.....	49	25	49
Fish, in oil:			
Sardines.....	40	15	63
Tuna.....	45	38	15
Barley flour.....	23	11	50
Rice, cleaned or milled.....	25	12½	50
Cherries, dried or evaporated.....	39	19½	50
Candied citrons or citron peel.....	33	25	24
Fresh or dried dates in packages.....	60	30	50
Raisins.....	16	7	56
Prunes, etc.....	14	7	50
Almonds, unshelled.....	18	9	50
Lemon juice, concentrated.....	85	50	41
Countable cotton cloth (low value).....	40	20	50
Cotton corduroys (high value).....	30	15	50
Cotton blankets, Jacquard-figured.....	30	22½	25
Cotton sheets and pillow cases.....	20	10	50
Gloves and mittens of cotton knit fabric (low value).....	60	30	50
Cotton handkerchiefs and woven mufflers.....	30	20	33½
Friction or insulating tape.....	40	20	50
Cotton rag rugs.....	75	40	33½
Fine clothing wools.....	30	20	33½
Worsted and woolens (low value).....	60	50	16½
Wool blankets, plain or embroidered (low value):			
Hand-woven.....	64	21	67
Other.....	63	50	21
Wool felt hats, blocked, trimmed, etc. (low value).....	60	42	30
Certain wool tapestries and upholstery goods.....	48	37	23
Broad silks (wide), Jacquard-figured, bleached, printed, piece-dyed (low value).....	65	32½	50
Silk handkerchiefs, hemmed or hemstitched (low value).....	60	50	17
Rayon knit underwear (high value).....	36	18	50
Copying paper (high value).....	29	14½	50
Envelopes, filled or unfilled, lithographed, made from various kinds of paper.....	35	12	66
Wrapping paper, sulfite, machine-finished.....	20	12½	38
Imitation solid pearls (low value).....	60	30	50
Tooth brushes (with handles or backs of materials other than cellulose, etc.) (high value).....	31	15½	50
Hair and other toilet brushes (with cellulose handles or backs).....	60	30	50
Pearl or shell buttons.....	83	50	40
Cork insulation pipe coverings, etc.....	22½	11	50
Certain plastic dolls.....	90	50	45
Certain abrasives.....	60	30	50
Dressed furs.....	12½	7	44
Silver, black, or platinum fox wearing apparel.....	37½	25	33
Men's and boys' fur or fur-felt hats.....	50	30	40
Women's and girls' fur hats.....	45	30	33½
Metal articles, such as compacts, vanity cases, cigarette cases, etc. (low value).....	65	50	23
Various kinds of articles (except wearing apparel) in part of machine-made lace.....	65	45	31
Lace window curtains (except cotton Nottingham lace curtains).....	90	45	50
Hat brads (except of straw, paper, grass, ramie, etc.).....	90	45	50
Leather footwear (various types).....	20	10	50
Leather gloves (various kinds).....	30	20	33½
Tobacco pouches (except of leather).....	60	30	50
Tobacco pipes with bowls of briar wood or other root, partly finished (medium value).....	85	40	27

¹ Based on imports in 1932.

² About.

³ Value bracket established in 1930. Since then, values have increased about threefold, consequently cloth of this value does not exist in normal trade channels.

Why VEPCO Wants TVA Sold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I issued discussing the action of Virginia Electric & Power Co. in circulating Dean Clarence Manion's proposal that TVA be sold.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

A shareholder of the Virginia Electric & Power Co.—known as VEPCO—has sent me a piece of literature being circulated by the company among its shareholders.

It consists of a printed copy of an address delivered by Dean Clarence E. Manion on last November 28, in which he urges the immediate sale of TVA, recalls that he once before proposed this before he was fired as Chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Commission, after which President Eisenhower said he was "shooting from the hip," and stated that if this "be treason to the TVA brand of socialism, then Senator KEFAUVER can once more make the most of it."

In their letters to the shareholders J. G. Holtzclaw, president, and D. C. Barner, chairman of the board of VEPCO, refer to Dr. Manion's address as a "forthright statement of facts," and a statement of "the fundamentals of the American way of life."

The statement is not a statement of facts by any means, but I believe the shareholders of VEPCO, and even more the ratepayers of VEPCO, would be interested in why this utility wants the TVA sold.

One can get an inkling of why by examining their rate structure. VEPCO users in Alexandria, for instance, pay \$7.25 per 250 kilowatt-hours, while right across the Potomac River in Washington—an actual stone's throw for George Washington according to legend—ratepayers of another private utility pay \$5.84 for the same amount.

At the other end of the VEPCO system, the TVA end, the same bill for TVA users is \$5. Naturally, along with their allies on the western side of TVA—the Dixon-Yates combination—VEPCO is set on destroying this example of what is a fair bill for power.

Prior to merger of the two companies which formed VEPCO—and took over substantial domination of power in Virginia—the Federal Power Commission required them to write off more than \$28 million of inflationary items—mostly water—on their books. "Inflationary items" is another way of saying items used for the purpose of building up a high-rate structure and milking the public.

That the day of inflationary items is not entirely over would be indicated by the fact, which also should be called to the ratepayers' attention, that they pay for the printing and mailing of the misleading and non-

factual propaganda which I am talking about when they pay their power bills. It all becomes a part of the expense of operation.

It might also be mentioned in passing that this propaganda being circulated by VEPCO, while so many of our friends are out making speeches eulogizing Abraham Lincoln, is the statement of a man who says he doesn't agree with Lincoln.

On the broadcast at which Dean Manion proposed sale of the TVA, he was asked by Mr. William Wise, one of the panel: "Dr. Manion, I wonder if you agree with my favorite Republican of all times that the Government should do for the people that which they cannot do for themselves or that which they cannot do so well for themselves; I refer, of course, to Abraham Lincoln."

And Dr. Manion's reply was: "No. I do not agree with Abraham Lincoln."

Apparently VEPCO doesn't either.

It is highly important that the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee, which did such fine work in this field under the chairmanship of Senator WILLIAM LANGER last year, move rapidly ahead with the investigation under Senator HARLEY KILGORE's chairmanship this year, and I am confident it will.

A thoroughgoing inquiry should be made into possible savings of hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the ratepayers of the Nation.

Bill of Rights Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered at Chicago, Ill., on December 5, 1954, by Irving Breakstone, State commander of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, on the occasion of the 163d anniversary of the establishment of the Bill of Rights.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

(By Irving Breakstone, State commander, the American Legion, Department of Illinois)

On the 163d anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America, it is altogether fitting that we pause in tribute to the memory of the great men of our Nation who drafted the original document to which the Bill of Rights was made a constituent part. Under our Constitution, this Nation has enjoyed, and still continues to enjoy, the highest standard of living ever attained in history. We are an orderly society, with liberty and freedom for every citizen, in a measure seldom, if ever, equaled, and never eclipsed, on this earth.

Only 22 amendments have been attached to the Constitution. Of these, the first 10 constitute the Bill of Rights, which we celebrate today. These 10 were added because the conventions of several States refused to ratify the Constitution in its original form until they had been assured that the Bill of Rights would be made part of it.

The fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution give us a clue to the genesis of the Bill of Rights. It is a reference to the ancient right expressed in the phrase, "Every

man's house is his castle." Lord Coke expressed this principle nearly 400 years ago when he stated: "The house of every man is to him as his castle and fortress, as well as for his defense against injury and violence as for his repose." At that time this principle had been the law of the land for more than a thousand years.

The makers of our Constitution and the framers of the first 10 amendments were never tired of quoting these immortal words of the elder Pitt:

"The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter; the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter. All his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

When ratification of our Constitution was pending before the Virginia convention, the eloquent patriot, Patrick Henry, declared that he was "most awfully alarmed," that the document threatened the liberties of his country, among other reasons because it lacked a Bill of Rights. Henry challenged the view of James Madison, the so-called father of the Constitution. He challenged the views of the galaxy of scholars and statesmen who had drafted the Constitution and even that of the eminent George Washington, who had presided over the Constitutional Convention.

The Virginia convention, after prolonged debate, ratified the Constitution by a bare majority of 10 votes, but only after James Madison had pledged his word that, at the earliest opportunity, he would use his energy toward placing in the Constitution the requisite amendments guaranteeing each citizen's rights, privileges, and immunities.

As soon as the Virginia convention had finished the work of ratification, it adopted resolutions for the addition of a Bill of Rights as demanded by Patrick Henry, and these resolutions were forwarded to the governors of the various States.

The first measure considered by the First Congress of the United States of America under the new Constitution was a bill to raise revenue to pay the expenses of government. On July 21, 1789, James Madison, then a Member of the House of Representatives, introduced the second measure. This was a resolution to consider amendments to the Constitution in accordance with the pledges of faith and honor which had been made by public men everywhere in securing ratification of the Constitution.

The Bill of Rights amendments were ratified by the States within 2 years and 3 months. Thereafter, as far as Americans are concerned, and as far as the Constitution itself is concerned, they became as much a part of the original Constitution as if they had been signed on the 17th of September 1787, when the main instrument itself was signed.

The 10 amendments constituting the Bill of Rights are restrictions upon national power. All the rights and immunities enumerated were already in existence. They did not owe their origin to the Bill of Rights. As had been stated in the immortal Declaration of Independence, these rights were inalienable and had come from the Creator. The Constitution was established, among other purposes, to make these God-given rights secure against oppression, secure against oppression even from the Government which the Founding Fathers were setting up.

The Bill of Rights amendments deal with 13 points covered by the opening words, "Congress shall make no law." The first 4 points view the citizen as a soul, or mind. Religion, speech, the press, public assembly—all reflecting man as a spiritual being—shall be forever free from interference by Congress. The next 3 points protect the

citizen's person, home, and effects from high-handed, star-chamber methods of government, such as are practiced in every totalitarian country today. The next 4 define the citizen's rights when involved with the criminal law.

These 11 points are double-clinched by the last 2—the 1, warning that failure to mention a particular right in the bill must not be construed as denying that right's existence; the other, warning that a power not granted to the Federal Government is not thereby left ownerless but is reserved in full to the States or to the people.

The Bill of Rights is the law the people lay on their Government, but—notice—not on themselves. They themselves violate it with impunity. They constantly deprive others of what they will not permit Congress to deprive them. Does religious persecution exist in this country? Certainly, both public and private. Is free speech ever restricted by force and violence and boycott? Why, peaceable public assembly has been at the mercy of the mob in any number of our communities. Have you ever heard of the forcible invasion and destruction of private property in this country? Many times. And other rights also have been violated or denied. The law is written in the Constitution, but not on our hearts—which alone makes a law effective. Otherwise, all of us would know what some of us do not know, that to keep our own rights, we must respect the rights of others.

This great charter of the American—the American as a soul, as a citizen, as a political sovereign—has come to its 163d anniversary in circumstances emphatic with warning that rights entail duties. Evade the duty and you lose the right. May this anniversary serve to engrave sharply the meanings of both in the deep places of our minds.

The faith of our forefathers gave them the strength to plan for the ages. May we, with equal faith, guard our birthright and hand it down to posterity so that this heritage of liberty and this Nation, under God's will, may long endure.

Fifty-seventh Anniversary of the Sinking of the Battleship "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared on the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine*, in Habana Harbor.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAYNE ON THE 57TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SINKING OF THE BATTLESHIP "MAINE"

Today is the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in Habana Harbor. It was a peaceful Sunday evening when an explosion tore that great ship apart as it lay peacefully at anchor. Two hundred and sixty-six officers and men died in that tragic event.

The *Maine* was in Habana on a friendly visit to protect American interests while the people of Cuba struggled for independence against tyranny.

A great wave of patriotic fervor swept the country. The sinking of the *Maine* aroused and united the Nation to intervene and help the Cubans gain their freedom and independence. The cry "Remember the *Maine*" echoed across the land.

The Spanish-American War was our first overseas war in the cause of freedom. In the past 57 years Americans have fought and given their lives for the cause of freedom in the fields of Flanders and on far off Pacific Isles in world wars and police actions.

Today, four veterans of the Spanish-American War still serve in the Congress of the United States. Three are Members of the Senate—the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. One is a Member of the House—Representative BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois.

It is particularly fitting today that we pay tribute to those who lost their lives on the valiant *Maine* and to all those who served in our Volunteer Army in the Spanish-American War. They served the cause of freedom well. Oppressed people everywhere can take courage from the fact that the spirit of the *Maine* lives on in America today.

Florida Vacation Season Flourishes Without Vice and Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the best answers to the contention that a resort area must have vice and crime. The Senate Crime Subcommittee, in its investigation in Florida a number of years ago, was met with that argument. The answer lies in the resort and vacation experience of Florida, and is contained in an article written by Frank Eidge, Jr., published in the Fort Worth Press of February 3.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLORIDA'S "GOLD COAST" EXPECTS RECORD SEASON MINUS VICE, CRIME
(By Frank Eidge, Jr.)

MIAMI, February 3.—The Florida Gold Coast is on the threshold of a record season but with gangsters, gambling casinos, call girls, and big-time bookies in short supply.

This may be the biggest winter ever and the swarm of visitors make the conceivers of the Florida boom 30 years ago appear short-sighted pessimists.

Officials of the rich sun-strip, running between the ocean and the Everglades from Palm Beach south to the Florida Keys, now have the more difficult job of providing enough roads, bridges, parking places, jobs, and land to handle the tide of vacationers and permanent new citizens.

The tourist season won't reach its height until mid-February but already airlines have reported passenger flow up as much as 47 percent over last year. Railroads said their trains were 6 percent fuller and U. S. 1, the east coast highway artery into Miami, is carrying 50 percent more cars than last season.

Miami hotels are about 90 percent full, according to J. J. Shephard, president of the Greater Miami Hotel Association.

On Miami Beach, most top-flight ocean-front hostleries are nearly full and the occupancy over-all is about 70 percent despite a big increase in the number of lodgings available.

The miles of glittering hotels (more than 400) and fancy motels represent a \$200-million-a-year business. And by the middle of February, they will be crowded.

One of the season's barometers is the horse parks. Tropical Park closed a near-record season recently and Hialeah's first week showed a 7-percent gain in betting and 4.6-percent rise in attendance. Dog tracks and jai alai games showed similar surges.

Some second-class night clubs are having rough sledding to meet the competition of the big-name spots and the growing list of hotels offering star performers for after-dinner entertainment.

Long lines form nightly at eating places and even at the movies. Miami Beach is about the only place that can televise a prizefight locally and still draw nearly 4,000 persons to its auditorium.

Prices are high—about the same as last year. But Miami Beach remains the place where you can hunt out a night's lodging for \$3 or take over the wing of an ocean-front hotel, like the Shah of Iran, for nearly \$1,000 a day.

Daniel P. Sullivan, director of the Greater Miami Crime Commission, says the gold coast isn't anything like the old days.

"There are a few small-time floating crap games, a lot of loose girls willing to be picked up for money, sneak bookies, and like, but none of the organized, wide-open vice like we had just after the war," Sullivan said.

The real-estate boom is in full surge, with developers building whole cities of 10,000 homes on reclaimed Everglades land and beach hotels going up at a unit cost of \$26,000 a room. Luxury-hotel building won't last long, however, for south Florida is running out of beach space.

Even the old boom-time dodge of selling lots by mail has sprung up again and penants of the land-office promoters dot the sandy scrub and pine woods of Florida's coastline.

The Foreign Operations Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "World's Costliest Baloney," published in the New York Daily News of February 7.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD'S COSTLIEST BALONEY

Since 1948, United States taxpayers have handed over \$40 billion to foreign countries. In that period, also, we have anted up half a billion dollars (that's just 500 millions) for overseas propaganda, to induce our charity beneficiaries to appreciate us and love us dearly.

Strangely, despite these unprecedented giveaways, we don't seem to have any more international friends and sincere allies than we had in 1948. Maybe not as many. And

lots of people, at long last, are beginning to ask why.

As it happens, one highly qualified American has just come up with some interesting answers to this one. Eugene W. Castle has been a leading producer of documentary films. During World War II he distributed training films and other movies for the Army, Navy, and Red Cross. He is a real pro who knows his public relations onions.

UNPOPULAR PROPAGANDA

Mr. Castle recently completed a 3-year, 75,000-mile trip around the globe, at his own expense. He looked carefully into our multi-million charity and propaganda setups. He's fit to be tied. His angry and revealing findings have just been made available in book form: *Billions, Blunders, and Baloney*; Devin-Adair; 278 pages, \$3.50.

How much good has our half-billion bucks' worth of movies and printed propaganda done us in Europe, Asia, and Latin America? Almost none, this expert snorts. Perhaps the 10,000 well-meaning press agents, psychological warriors, and drooling dogooders on our United States Information Agency payroll have even netted us some real harm. Most overseas people resent and are bored by anybody's propaganda, including ours.

These same folks will gladly stand in line for a look at a nonpropaganda Hollywood movie, or to pick up a copy of a genuine United States magazine or newspaper. They're delighted to read the objective, unsalted news of our Associated Press (which operates its global day-and-night wire services with a mere 3,000 employees). But movies and writings produced by USIA's 10,000 tax-supported geniuses are seldom seen or read, and wouldn't be believed, anyway.

"NEVER HAD IT SO GOOD"

Mr. Castle works up an even higher head of steam, if possible, when he gets around to discussing Childe Harold Stassen's fantastic Foreign Operations Administration (FOA), which "picks the pockets of Americans in billions," instead of just millions.

Stassen's sprawling, almost unbelievable outfit, Castle reports first-hand, shovels out astronomical quantities of cash and goods to such unpredictable nations as Yugoslavia, Italy, Egypt, Indonesia, and India, but never is so rude as to ask what Uncle Sam's getting in return. Chief beneficiaries, says Mr. Castle unkindly, are the FOA bureaucrats who are determined to stay glued to the Washington payroll, with fine, envy-provoking overseas homes and at salaries "in excess of what most of them ever earned in private stations or can ever hope to earn again."

On the strength of what his horrified eyes have seen, Castle recommends that those costly FOA and USIA circuses either be dumped or carved to the bone. We'd say those sensible reforms can't start too soon.

The Merchant Marine and Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address entitled "The Merchant Marine and Our Foreign Policy," which was delivered by Mr. Alexander Purdon, executive director of the Committee of

American Steamship Lines, before a joint meeting of the national security and foreign relations commissions of the American Legion on January 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MERCHANT MARINE AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(By Alexander Purdon, executive director, Committee of American Steamship Lines, before a joint meeting of the national security and foreign relations commissions of the American Legion, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 27, 1955)

I have been asked to speak today on An Arm of Diplomacy, and I am grateful to the person who conjured up that title for giving me a fresh slant and a new reason for an American merchant marine.

But I would ask your indulgence if I expand the topic slightly and discuss our merchant marine as an instrument of national policy.

Although I sometimes think that the trouble with our diplomacy is that it is too diplomatic, this is not my sole reason for enlarging the topic.

Nor do I propose to attach more importance to our merchant marine than is its proper due in our total transportation system. Yet, since our merchant fleet is an international link, it has a particular significance.

I honestly believe that the United States has erred in not considering its merchant marine as an instrument of national policy.

To be sure, it is national policy that we must have an American merchant marine for our commerce and our defense, but this is quite different from considering it as an instrument of our total national policy and particularly of our foreign policy. On the contrary, it has sometimes appeared that the necessity for a merchant marine was an unwelcome consideration to our foreign policy planners.

While our foreign policy is always fluid and at times, perhaps, difficult to define, it surely divides most easily into trade policy and defense policy. There are many other facets to it, but these, you will agree, are the most important.

Mr. Dulles will probably not appreciate my help, but at the risk of incurring his displeasure, I would venture that our trade policy is basically directed at maintaining an expanding American economy and promoting increased world trade. But the reasons are not entirely selfish. It is not trade merely for trade's sake or for our own economic advantage. Our trade policy, I believe, has a broader, a firmer foundation in the realization that improved opportunity for the peoples of the world is a powerful antidote for communism.

Thus, our trade policy is inextricably mixed up with our defense policy, because the economic strength of our Nation and of all free nations is, in itself, a very important defense consideration, and our ability to out-produce a potential enemy may be our greatest advantage still if the race for atomic superiority results in a stalemate.

Foreign-trade policy is going to be a major topic for debate in this session of Congress. It will be a battle royal between the protectionists and those who favor liberalization. The chances are there will be no clear-cut victory. Nevertheless, when the tumult and the shouting die, we will probably have edged a little further in the direction of more liberal foreign-trade policies.

But whatever the outcome, it is crystal clear that a merchant marine is essential to any sound foreign-trade program. How can you sell if you cannot guarantee delivery?

Oddly enough, some have considered our merchant marine as expendable—something

to be bartered away in return for a trading advantage elsewhere.

Those who hold that view fail to see that without our own merchant fleet our foreign-trade policy could be controlled by those nations with the foresight to use their merchant fleets as instruments of national policy.

It isn't just sentiment that suggests the desirability of having American goods transported under the American flag. It's good sense as well as sentiment. I think it is good diplomacy, too, and it makes no difference whether it is aid cargo or commercial cargo. We gain a great psychological advantage when peoples in other countries can identify, whether as gifts or purchases, the products of the American economy and of the democratic system which makes it possible.

Since the end of World War II, we have practiced a new kind of dollar diplomacy. In fact, we have poured some \$50 billion into the restoration of the free nations. This is a kind of dollar diplomacy of which we need not be ashamed. While there has been criticism, and some with good reason, it has nevertheless produced rewarding results. One has only to look at the tremendous strides that have been made toward economic self-sufficiency in Europe to appraise the merits of our various aid programs. Economic aid has proved so effective that it is becoming a major offensive weapon in the world struggle against the force of communism. It is indicated that this may be one of the chief weapons we will use in southeast Asia. I venture to say that we will continue to improve the effectiveness of our economic aid. No, this is not dollar diplomacy of the old type. This is diplomacy with a high moral purpose yet based upon sound and practicable considerations. This type of program would be impossible without merchant shipping, and so our merchant marine must be considered an instrument of our foreign economic policy.

In addition to furnishing aid, we also want to increase our trade with other nations. As a matter of fact, we hope that trade will supplant aid and make it unnecessary, or at least reduce it. Here, again, a healthy merchant marine is essential to an expanding foreign trade. The United States is the world's biggest market and the world's biggest supplier, but increasingly other nations, as they restore their economies are entering world markets and giving us healthy and effective competition. We simply cannot depend upon our competitors to carry our products. That doesn't make sense.

Our expanding economy requires that we sell more and more of our products abroad, and the advocates of the more liberal trade policy tell us that to sell more we must buy more. Here again, in the expansion of two-way trade with other nations, the merchant marine is an indispensable instrument of trade policy. The American ship operator is the partner of the American producer in selling our goods abroad, and he is the partner of the American importer in obtaining raw materials from foreign sources. He is aggressive and alert to the opportunities that exist in foreign markets. He is a roving ambassador for American business.

However, despite its commercial utility, it is perhaps in the field of defense that we have the most dramatic evidence that our merchant marine is an instrument of national policy. In the headlines of this week, there is now proof that we have world responsibilities on which our own freedom ultimately depends. We cannot fulfill these commitments—we cannot draw defense perimeters—we cannot guarantee the security of friendly nations, far across the seas, unless we can reach them and supply them with the men and the materials necessary to our mutual defense.

There is, perhaps, no more eloquent testimony to the role of our merchant marine as an instrument of our national defense policy than the words of Admiral Carney. Let me quote them for you:

"With amazing speed Russia is emerging from her land-locked situation and today must be counted as a nation of great maritime potential."

"Perhaps the strangest aspect of this ever-widening air age in which we are living is that rather than the air lessening the strategic importance of the sea, actually the truth is that airpower has made the sea more important than ever. For airpower has increased the load on our maritime forces; increased the requirements of our Nation for overseas bases as well as raw materials, many of which must be brought in from overseas. Most of the world's commerce, as in the past, is still seaborne; nor is there any anticipated change in this situation for the foreseeable future. The vast bulk of the supplies transported in time of war must be moved by sea. The sea is still the main highway between allies when it comes to the transport of the millions of tons of commodities which must be moved and exchanged to keep alive the economies of the countries of the world. As long as this holds true, control of the sea for our own uses and its denial to any enemy will remain a vital factor in security and defense."

I know that aviation is making rapid strides, and we have heard of great new air cargo carriers being planned, but nothing we have now or nothing that would appear available in the foreseeable future can replace the merchant ship as a floating pipeline joining the vast industrial and military potential of this Nation to our farflung bases and allies overseas. Those who have thought of this as an age when air transport would completely supplant ocean transport would do well to remember the dramatic message from the *Nautilus* under way on nuclear power. Ocean transport will gear itself to the atomic age. Effective transportation is the very core of our defense, and that means transportation of all kinds, but it is when we speak of transportation overseas that we recognize the merchant marine as an indispensable instrument of our defense policy.

There is no escaping the fact that it costs money to maintain an American merchant marine just as it costs money to maintain our Defense Department. Actually, the cost of maintaining the merchant fleet is a little more than one-half of 1 percent of the defense budget.

For the next fiscal year, the Maritime Administration has requested \$103 million for ship construction and \$115 million for operating subsidies. A substantial portion of this latter amount is to pay for past-due Government obligations.

These operating subsidies are the Government's share of the cost of having a privately owned and operated American merchant fleet of over 280 modern vessels servicing 29 essential world-trade routes. This fleet completed almost 1,500 voyages last year to provide American business and agriculture with a global network of regularly scheduled American-flag transportation service.

This is by no means a haphazard operation. The essential trade routes served by this fleet are established by the Government after careful investigation and constant review to link our economy with world markets.

These operating subsidies based on parity are in a sense an investment in our foreign trade. They are insurance that we will have access to world markets and world sources of supply. They enable us to maintain a hard-core nucleus merchant fleet in being for emergency use.

The construction subsidy enables us to keep an active shipbuilding industry going

as part of our mobilization planning. This is a partnership arrangement between American business and the United States Government. Both make a contribution, both assume obligations and responsibilities, and the end result is a sound investment to the American taxpayer.

Each American pays a small proportionate share of support to the American merchant marine. He is entitled to know the personal benefits he gets from that expenditure. He ought to know, too, how much we paid in the past because we neglected to adopt a prudent and long-range maritime policy.

Thirty-four Presidents of the United States have acclaimed the merchant marine as essential to our national defense, which convinces me that it is also invaluable to my personal security.

The United States is now stockpiling 75 different materials, 50 of which are metals and minerals. We are self-sufficient in only 5 strategic metals and minerals.

American industry depends upon imports for current production requirements of such necessary metals as aluminum, antimony, bauxite, cobalt, copper, lead, zinc, tin, nickel, platinum, manganese, mercury, and tungsten. Copper, lead, and zinc are three of the most important metals in our industrial economy. This convinces me that our employment, our economy, our security and living standards as we know them, are closely tied to imports made possible by ocean shipping.

It has been estimated by the President's Materials Supply Commission that the output of goods and services in the United States by 1975 will be double that of 1950, resulting in an increase of about 90 percent in our requirements for minerals. This points toward increased dependence upon ocean trade lanes.

Studies conducted by the Committee of American Steamship Lines, to determine the importance of ocean shipping on inland States, indicate that no man can prudently disassociate himself from the importance of the world trade carried on by ocean ships.

If he is a farmer 1 acre in 10 on his farm is raising crops for export.

If he works in the industrial or commercial field, chances are very high that the product he helps manufacture or merchandise depends upon imports for raw materials or foreign markets for production volume. There is no person in this Nation whose daily life and whose personal security is not in some way affected by the presence of a merchant fleet under the United States flag.

But it is easy to forget that the American merchant marine directly benefits the American economy. While it is available to serve as an auxiliary to our Armed Forces in time of war, the American merchant marine is also a substantial customer of American business. The operation of a single ship, the *United States*, contributed more than \$18 million in 1 year to the domestic economy, but despite the fact that we have to appropriate money to maintain the merchant marine, there are very tangible benefits in return. I venture to say that when all the benefits, including its availability for defense are balanced against all the expenditures, the merchant marine will prove to be a dividend producing investment.

We cannot maintain our economy without ships. We cannot trade without ships. We cannot obtain the many raw materials we need without ships. We cannot defend ourselves without ships. We cannot help defend our allies without ships. The solvency and security of the United States require a better understanding of the vital role which the American merchant marine plays as an instrument of our foreign policy—as an arm of our diplomacy.

A strong America is a safe America.

The Situation in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful and interesting article entitled "The Risks War," written by Chalmers M. Roberts and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RISKS WAR

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

STILL SEEKS PEACE IN ASIA

President Eisenhower seeks peace in Asia and a live-and-let-live arrangement with Communist China. But the American position today entails the most serious risks of war.

These risks arise from the protective American military umbrella which the United States has thrown over the Nationalist-held Quemoy and Matsu Islands just off the Red China coast.

To be sure, the commitment is unilateral on our part. We have given Chiang Kai-shek no pledge and we are willing to withdraw the protective military umbrella if Peiping will undertake not to attack Formosa and the Pescadores.

But Red China has been intransigent. The United Nations cease-fire discussions have gotten nowhere. Efforts to arrange a peace conference outside the U. N. thus far are likewise unsuccessful.

Therefore, if Red China decides to assault the offshore islands, the United States may be committed to war which would be most difficult to limit to the immediate area.

The United States Government appears determined to stand and fight if challenged. In that case, these are some important considerations:

The United States can expect to have allies if Formosa is attacked but many nations would be reluctant to join in fighting confined at the start to the offshore islands.

It would be just about impossible for the United States to rate any Red assault on Quemoy or Matsu as a local action rather than as a move preparatory to an assault on Formosa itself. Hence the unilateral commitment must be honored.

Any assault on Quemoy or Matsu would certainly mean air clashes between Communist and American planes since control of the air over a battlefield is vital. If Chiang's manpower is to win the ground fighting we would have to control the air.

Chiang has about one-third of his 300,000 or more men committed to the offshore islands. Their loss would seriously affect his ability to defend Formosa itself from assault.

As of today, the Communists probably have sufficient air power not only to control the air over Quemoy and Matsu, but also to prevent the reinforcement of the islands by ship from Formosa. Reinforcements of men and supplies for Chiang would be necessary if Peiping were to throw a big part of its massive army at the offshore islands.

For the United States to gain air supremacy, both to protect the immediate battlefield and to permit reinforcements, immobility

of Communist bases would be necessary. That is, air strikes would be necessary at Red bases on the mainland. The United States is determined that there will be no "Yalu sanctuary" if fighting starts. Once strikes began on the mainland, pressure for striking deeper into China would mount with the intensity of battle.

If there should be serious American reverses or casualties, there would be both pressures and temptations to use nuclear weapons.

All of this illuminates the choice which would face the President, who has said he alone would give the orders for any American action beyond self-defense or against an immediate threat to Formosa and the Pescadores.

Why should Peiping assault the offshore islands? Success would seriously damage the political and military power of the Communists' hated enemy, Chiang. Success probably would end the threat of Nationalist manpower if there should be war later in Korea or southeast Asia. Success would seriously weaken the resolve of America's other allies in Free Asia—the Filipinos, the Japanese, the Siamese, the Vietnamese. And success would remove a military block to the "liberation" of Formosa itself.

For exactly these reasons the Government of the United States feels compelled to resist an attack on the offshore islands under the present set of circumstances.

Washington officials, both in the administration and at the Capitol, generally expect Communist "probing" actions to test America's determination.

What the President is trying to get is a peaceful solution in the Formosa Strait that could lead to diminution of tension throughout Asia. To get it, the United States is taking a gamble that, in the event of failure, could lead to war of unlimited scope and uncertain outcome.

Eisenhower's Crusade Compared to Lincoln's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful article written by Mr. Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER'S CRUSADE COMPARED TO LINCOLN'S—ARE HAD TO FIGHT FOR UNION; IKE MAY FIGHT FOR PEACE

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Republicans today pay tribute to Abraham Lincoln, the man who more than any other saved the Union. He had to fight for it.

Another Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, is now engaged in a crusade to keep this Nation and the world at peace—even if he has to fight for it. Lincoln was the target of bitter partisan political attacks. In far less measure—to date—Mr. Eisenhower has become a target of the Democratic opposition. The President has had, however, strong support from the Democrats

on vital decisions regarding the Far East situation.

The Democratic-controlled Congress voted overwhelming support of a resolution giving the President authority to use the country's Armed Forces if the Chinese Communists attack Formosa.

The Democratic-controlled Senate, under the leadership of Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, put through the Formosa defense treaty between the United States and the Chinese Nationalist Government.

PRESIDENT TAKES LEAD

Mr. Eisenhower has taken a lead in the tribute to Abraham Lincoln. The President, however, has not at this time undertaken to beat the political tomtoms. His statement praised the first Republican President, but made no partisan attack on the Democrats. Further, the President is taking no part in the hundreds of Lincoln Day dinners which the Republicans are staging from coast to coast. A year ago Mr. Eisenhower attended the great box-supper celebration of the Republicans in the national capital. He made a Lincoln Day film, too, distributed throughout the country. It is noteworthy, also, that Vice President NIXON is not making political speeches in this period usually dedicated to politics by the Republicans. The Vice President is on a good-will tour of the Central American and Caribbean nations.

The Republicans, however, are staging the usual number of Lincoln Day dinners from Maryland to California and from Minnesota to Texas. Speakers have been provided for 225 of these celebrations through the Republican National Committee. Three members of the Cabinet, Attorney General Brownell, Secretary of the Interior McKay, and Secretary of Labor Mitchell; several Governors, and a large number of Republican Members of Congress were included in the speakers' list. These speakers have not pulled their punches in the past. Their aim has been to convince the people of America they have had better and cleaner government under the Eisenhower administration, that the Republicans have reduced by billions Government expenditures and taxes, and that the Republicans are doing their utmost to call a halt to big Government in Washington and return to the States their proper responsibilities.

EISENHOWER PRAISED

With a view to the Presidential campaign, which is to grip the country next year, the Republican speakers are extolling Mr. Eisenhower, although here and there dissidents raise their voices. Senator DUFF, of Pennsylvania, always a plain-speaking man, gave voice to the vast majority opinion when he told an audience in Oyster Bay, home of the late President Theodore Roosevelt, that this country "is fortunate beyond measure" in having such a man as Mr. Eisenhower as Chief Executive at this critical time. Senator DUFF declared that Mr. Eisenhower did not undertake his great responsibilities out of personal ambition, but solely from a devoted sense of duty. A like sense of devotion to duty, the Pennsylvania Senator predicted, will cause the President to stand for reelection when a call from the people reaches him.

This, indeed, is the growing belief and hope of Republicans and many other voters in many parts of the country. Like Lincoln, Senator DUFF pointed out, Mr. Eisenhower "came from the common people" and has kept himself in touch with their aspirations and problems. Senator DUFF concluded: "Today, as in the days of Lincoln, and in the words of Lincoln, 'Let us have faith that right makes might and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it.'" That, Senator DUFF said, "is our obligation under the magnificent leadership of the President."

When Oregon Wasn't Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 96th birthday of the State of Oregon, which was marked on February 14, 1955, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating editorial about Oregon history entitled "When Oregon Wasn't Wanted," published in the newspaper Greater Oregon, of Albany, in my State. The editorial was written by Francyl Howard, editor of the publication.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEN OREGON WASN'T WANTED

Last week Dr. Nix-It received a letter from a rural subscriber asking how Oregon got its name. Now there are some questions that the good doctor can answer. He is an authority on preventing divorces, finding wives for lonely bachelors and husbands for lonesome widows and maidens and he always has a spare coat, dress, shoes or overalls for needy souls, but he rightly decided that this question did not belong in his department. He lost no time in giving the letter to the editor, breathing a sigh of relief as he turned away.

Now just how did Oregon get its name?

Following the Louisiana Purchase from France for \$15 million the Rocky Mountains was deemed the western boundary line of these United States. There were just 24 States then and the Senators and Representatives said that the country on the other side of the Rocky Mountains would be apt to trade with the Orient instead of with the United States which was 1,500 miles away through an unexplored wilderness.

Early Indian tribes in that part of Mexico which is now California told of a great river in the north which they called the Auragon.

The name Oregon was first given to the territory west of the Rocky Mountains 133 years ago on Tuesday of this week by Dr. John Floyd. On January 18, 1822, Dr. Floyd introduced a bill in Congress authorizing the President of the United States to take over and occupy all the territory lying west of the United States from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. The bill by Dr. Floyd provided that when the population in the territory west of the Rockies and north of the 42d parallel of latitude totaled 2,000 persons it should be occupied along the Columbia River as a territory of the United States under the name of Oregon.

Since 1765 the great river in Oregon now called the Columbia after Gray's ship of that name had been called the Origon.

Dr. Floyd worked hard to get the bill passed but it was defeated by a 100 to 61 vote.

It was not until 26 years later in 1848 that Congress voted to give Oregon a territorial government. An effort was made by William Mallory, one of Vermont's representatives, to have the territory called Columbia but Dr. Floyd had enough votes promised to defeat this effort. This time his bill passed and the spelling of the territory name Origon was changed to Oregon.

Helping to get the bill passed were Senators Linn and Benton, and the boundary line of Linn County at first extended from the Rocky Mountains to the Columbia River and south to California.

Later when Lincoln County was divided and Benton County was created it was for Senator Benton that it was named.

It is written in the diary of John Quincy Adams while he was Secretary of State that President Monroe told him Dr. Floyd's brother had been caught in using some of the State of Virginia's money as his own while he was State treasurer and that as he was anxious to get a job for his brother in a place as far away from Virginia as possible he thought the new territory of Oregon should be a good safe place for him. Dr. Floyd served two terms as governor of Virginia and no one seems to know what happened to his brother or whether he actually got some of the State of Virginia's money mixed up with his salary. It may have just been political scandal or character assassination as to Dr. Floyd's reasons, but whatever they were they furthered development of the territory.

Just 133 years ago, Oregon was not wanted as a State and no one had the remotest idea that 133 years later the election of a Senator in Oregon would change control from the Republicans to the Democrats in Congress.

Oregon has come a long way since 1822 and now it is fitting and proper that 133 years and 3 days later you should know how Oregon got its name.

The Foreign Operations Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the Foreign Operations Administration, written by John O'Donnell, and published under the headline "Capitol Stuff," in the New York Daily News of February 7, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—This is all about money—your money, my fellow taxpayers—and how the deal is shaping up so that more billions of our economic lifeblood will continue to be syphoned off to foreign nations in the vain hope that we can buy their everlasting loyalty and firm affection.

Of course, the fantastic idea never worked regardless of what label we stuck on the one-world giveaway plan. It began with lend-lease and UNRRA, then was labeled the Marshall plan, and currently dishes out the billions as the Foreign Operations Administration run by the perpetual GOP presidential aspirant, Harold Stassen.

FOA winds up its legislative life come June 30, but the boys will be operating on the old stand—but under another title and, if present plans go through, will be buying international love with United States hand-outs.

The new firm name has not yet been selected—some setup in the State Department probably. Louisiana's Senator ELLENDER, of the Appropriations Committee, who has made a careful survey of the new giveaway program, figures that next year we'll be handing out in the nonmilitary assistance program alone \$2 billion, a \$700 million jump over the present economic aid and defense

support program which ELLENDER scornfully describes as "just a new and fancy name for the Marshall plan which should have terminated long ago."

The fall of the Mendes-France government last week gives further proof (if such could possibly be needed) that the French juicy slice of the \$67 billion which we've handed out to foreign nations since World War II shooting stopped, never bought the trusting love of La Belle France.

And now come more headaches from sunny Italy. Over in Rome, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce has done the best possible job as our Ambassador under the circumstances—far better than most critics thought could be done, under all the handicaps the charming and alert lady had to surmount. Last week Mrs. Luce returned to her Rome post after reporting to the State Department. What's important is that before the month is out, the charming lady will be back here in the capital and with her, for consultation with President Eisenhower and the State Department and Treasury and the Stassen organization, Italy's Prime Minister Mario Scelba.

A TOUCH IN THE GRAND MANNER

Now the mere arrival of Prime Minister Scelba in this capital isn't of itself so important. In fact, the Italian chief of state will be only a file closer in the big parade of foreign heads of state who have arrived here in the last 6 months and been welcomed and entertained by official Washington. And it has been a big parade. Time was when parades were estimated by the time they took to pass a given point. In this case the estimates would be wrong because they all passed the United States Treasury.

The importance of Prime Minister Scelba's visit rests in the so-called Vanoni plan which he will bring with him for presentation to the White House, State Department, the Treasury, and Harold Stassen. Yes; you guessed it, it's another touch—but this time in the grand manner.

The new Italian proposal is named after Scelba's budget minister, Ezio Vanoni. It is a 10-year economic blueprint for Italy, designed to create 4 million new jobs, put, as they express it, "Italy firmly on its financial feet" and—here's the important note for the United States taxpayer to watch—"calls for new public and private investments of \$40 billion in the next decade."

Without being brought into the consultations, this reporter has a rough idea, based on past experiences, that Uncle Sam is going to be asked to pick up most of this sizable tab or go as comaker on the notes of the borrowers.

Of course, the plan does have an international touch. Nine top Italian experts worked with Vanoni on preparing the broad outline. They in turn consulted with British, Dutch, and American economists. A Cambridge University professor put the text in English. Vanoni, a soft-spoken financier, has already explained in Rome that his plan calls for the imposition in carefree Italy of "a policy of extreme austerity for 10 years."

ITALY'S FLAT WARNING TO WASHINGTON

In his private talks in Rome, Vanoni emphasized that this plan which Scelba brings to the White House this month, means the ultimate salvation of Italy. If it's not adopted, Italy must collapse. It was a flat warning to Washington and the Italian budget director frankly declared: "Only through substantial foreign aid and extensive foreign capital investment can the objective of this program be achieved without endangering monetary stability."

A reliable Italian source in Rome, in connection with Scelba's forthcoming Washington visit, bears down on argument that the present Prime Minister is merely "continuing

the same policy and approach of the late Alcide de Gasperi.

He pointed out the similarity between the two men, saying: "Like de Gasperi, Minister Scelba is a Liberal-Catholic, anti-Fascist, and staunch enemy of Communists."

Referring to the latter, he said, Scelba wants it known that he is anti-Communist not in words but in fact.

One important thing the fiery Scelba is proud of since taking over the Government is the fact that he has brought relations between Italy and the United States to the highest point since the war.

This relationship remains the cornerstone of Italian foreign policy.

But, different from all former governments, is the breakaway from the day-to-day solution to Italian economic problems, by the presentation of the Vanoni plan.

"How can our friends help us? That's easy. We need international aid in commerce. Our industries are working at only a percentage of their capacities. Italy needs orders, lots of them, for her factories."

Drilling for Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRICE DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, all too often we read about the few fortunate individuals who have good luck in drilling for oil. Many times we forget that 9 out of every 10 wells turn out to be dry holes, and it costs just as much to drill these as it does to drill producers.

A recent article in the Houston Post, Houston, Tex., entitled "Meet the Champ Dry-Hole Driller," relates the experiences of 1 Texan who is reported to have drilled 196 wells without finding production. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEET THE CHAMP DRY-HOLE DRILLER (By Harold LeBourgeois)

This might be called Can You Top It? Week.

We recall that a man named James A. Clark once wrote about some people who made themselves distinctive by going out and drilling a bunch of dry holes.

There are Jack Frazier (of recent Mykawa fame), John Mayo, and Harold Boysen, all of Houston, of course.

Mr. Frazier has drilled something like 200 projects that didn't turn up anything except bills.

Mr. Boysen drilled 81 consecutive wells before he finally hit.

And Mr. Clark refers to Mr. Mayo as "maybe the champion consecutive dry-hole driller of all time." The latter sank 116 straight dusters.

Today we are introducing Morris K. Womack as the champ among champions.

In a conversation recently about the lumber business in east Texas, Mr. Womack wryly mentioned that So-and-so had worse luck than he did, that luck being 196 consecutive dry holes.

"I beg your pardon; you mean 96?" Mr. Womack was asked.

"No; 196, not 96," he countered; "196."

He mouthed the numerals as if there was some succulence in them.

"How can this be?" was the next question aimed at the attorney (he's listed as an attorney, not an oilman).

"Well," Mr. Womack said, "because there wasn't any oil in those 196 holes."

He started playing around with deals about 20 years ago and is still enthusiastic.

And the reason he doesn't quit is twofold: 1. Mr. Womack likes to put together deals and drill wells.

2. He figures one of these days he's going to hit.

It is understandable that the attorney scoffs at the statistics which show that 1 out of every 9 wildcats is successful.

A 196-0 score is pretty awesome.

Mr. Womack does recall hitting oil, actually.

But the producer turned out to be worse than a dry hole.

It yielded crude oil for only 30 days.

The return on 30 days' production didn't make a dent in the expense involved in setting casing and completing the thing.

For all practical purposes, we will consider a 30-day producer as a duster.

Mr. Womack, like the other top-notch dry-hole drillers, never has a lot of his own money tied up in wildcats these days.

He works with a handful of friends, farm-owners and major companies.

It is almost a certainty at this time that there will be reason soon to print the details of a Womack well.

The story of a drilling deal can be an amazing one, even if it does turn up a dry hole.

Anyway, that's the record for Attorney Womack.

But he isn't a failure by any means.

In the first place, he has several businesses that yield returns.

In the second place, Mr. Womack enjoys hunting for oil.

What else do you want?

A Lincoln Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent poem entitled "A Lincoln Memorial," written by Robert Serrell Wood Walker.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LINCOLN MEMORIAL

(Tribute to a man)

Whose visage chiseled out of stone
To sit in temple white
The peopled millions call their own
In countless streets tonight!
And whose yon monumental head
That broods upon the land
O, Great Republic, once he lead
With his own magic hand!

Sprung from a breed of humble mold
Yet sired to walk with fame
He kept "the common touch" to hold
A nation's heart a-flame;
O, 'graven image 'bove the sod
A-top the hallowed earth
What noble man fashioned from God
Has left his priceless worth!

And tho' the years have found it stilled—
The heart that loved mankind—
Forever will the ages build
Their steeples to his mind;
O, blessed land! revere this day
By Roman temple fair
That they who travel by its way
May pause in tribute there!
—Robert Serrell Wood Walker.

The Challenge in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, from my experience on my trips to foreign countries, and especially to the Far East during the past few years, I have come to the conclusion that a new and somewhat different approach should be taken in preparing our foreign-aid program, aside from military assistance, as it affects what may be designated as the underdeveloped countries of the world, and particularly the Middle East and Far East.

In the New York Times magazine section for February 13, the well-known writer, Barbara Ward, a former editor of the Economist of London, has an article entitled "The Challenge We Neglect in Asia." Miss Ward points out that in the yearning of these peoples for freedom, independence, and self-determination there is beneath the whole revolutionary movement a psychological upheaval in the world's backward areas which we have failed adequately to comprehend and deal with.

Because of the importance of this subject, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Ward's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE WE NEGLECT IN ASIA

(By Barbara Ward)

The attention of the free world these days is fixed upon the Strait of Formosa. Yet while this is the most sensational danger facing the West, it is well to recognize another type of aggression in Asia that may, in the long run, prove disastrous to the security of the free world.

As communism's propaganda is carried to the towns and villages, it finds its opportunity in the scale of the social revolution from which no nation is exempt—a revolution rooted in the desires and expectations of the people.

We in the West are reasonably familiar with that revolution. In simplest terms, it represents the desire of the peoples of Asia to escape from the static poverty of the past and share in the dynamic growth already achieved in the West—and, in part at least, in Russia. But perhaps the implications of this desire are less clearly understood.

The revolution in Asia has two aspects. One is economic; the other is psychological and social. So far the Western Powers have at least taken some note of the economic problem and have considered some marginal policies for dealing with it. But they have taken virtually no account at all of the psychological aspect. The Communists, on the

other hand, have a program—crude, certainly, and evil—but, nevertheless, a program for dealing with both the economic and psychological upheaval in the world's backward areas. This fact gives them a head start over the West.

The starting point is the fact that there is only one road to the achievement of a dynamic economy—the road of capital accumulation and the building of industry. "Industrialization" is a magic word in the world's backward areas; a spell; a philosopher's stone of future prosperity. But the precondition of industrializing an economy is to transform rural life, to do away with subsistence farming in closed village units, and to introduce an economy based upon the commercial exchange of goods.

This exchange enables the villages to become purchasers of manufactured goods—of what use is a local consumer industry which commands no market? It gives inducements to the farmer to increase his productivity and supply an urban population. And this margin of productivity is—short of foreign aid and investment—the chief source of saving and the means whereby laborers, now underemployed or merely idle in the village subsistence economy, are released to the towns and factories of the growing industrial sector.

Whether the process is carried on in the free enterprise economies of 19th-century Britain and America or under total dictatorship in 20th-century Russia and China, the underlying shift is the same—the decay of the village, the rise of the town, the decline of static incomes derived from land, the growth of a vast wage and salary earning class. If Asia and Africa are ever to reach western standards of health and consumption, their road must be the same. There is no other.

But the village is far more than an economic unit. The village community is usually made up of families who, if not actually related, are all known to each other, and in more primitive tribal areas are actually part of the same kinship group. Collectively they farm their share of the village's communal land. They provide aid, security, backing, and any necessary subsistence to any member of the group.

Village families in turn are ruled by a headman whose authority is almost parental as well as social, and they are guided by the priest, whose performance of ceremonies and rites marks the rhythm of the agricultural year, insures rain and fertility, provides the social order in the community, and puts sanctions behind its social discipline.

Indeed, in more primitive communities headman and priest are one. In short, the village is a complete society and one in which there is a high degree of those social attributes upon which the modern world tends to lay great stress—solidarity, interdependence, mutual aid, stability in the family unit, emotional security.

Just because village life is so all-inclusive, the impact upon it of an evolving industrial system is cataclysmic. The young Asian villager who goes away to the seaport or city tends to lose in one move the economic and emotional security of the family system and the social disciplines of local religion. Like the dazed rural workers of Britain in the 1830's, he finds himself in the featureless, friendless city, among a majority who, like him, seek feverishly for material advancement and change and who are uprooted from the traditional faith and sanctions of village life. The big cities of Asia—or Africa—today are fringed around with lawless shanty towns where the uprooted first-generation worker turns hooligan or fanatic under the pressure of bewilderment and despair.

So great is the upheaval and so devastating its potential consequences that there are those who argue that it must be prevented and village life preserved in its original soli-

darly. But not only does this approach run counter to the economic aspirations of backward peoples; it also ignores the darker side of village life. Subsistence is never more than a bare living. In times of dearth, it is a living death.

Mutual aid and family security can be fetters which bind the enterprising and adventurous youth to a small but total collectivity. The "extended family" implies slavery and a degraded status for the many wives. The concentration of social and religious power makes for tyranny as complete when exercised over a group of huts as over a whole nation. With or without the West, the young people in Asia and Africa wish to escape to self-determination, to disciplines accepted voluntarily, to a wider choice of profession, to marriage which can be a partnership; in a word, to the personal freedom and responsibility of western man.

But here is the dilemma. In pressing forward to Western types of urban life and factory organization, in abandoning the security and interdependence, however tyrannous, of the old village, the new industrializing societies of Asia and Africa are entering an arena where, even in the most advanced Western nations, the conflicts between freedom and security are still unsolved. Take only four of the fundamental social dilemmas of emergent Asian and African communities—overcrowding and insecurity in industrial slums, restlessness at new factory discipline, the degradation of children in a marriage system that is breaking down, the collapse of moral standards under a weakening religion—and few will maintain that they bear no resemblance to the urban problems of the West.

It is at this point that the effectiveness of Communist propaganda in such areas as southeast Asia, India, or tribal Africa begins to become apparent.

That Communist propaganda exploits the poorer peoples' desire for modernization hardly needs to be repeated. That Communist governments ruthlessly modernize their own peoples is common knowledge. But what is perhaps insufficiently considered is the extent to which, in the short run, the Communist approach meets the underlying social and psychological dilemmas of modernization.

The Communists not only uproot the villages, build the towns, recruit factory labor and reinvest ruthlessly the "savings" extracted from the underconsumption of the masses. In their crude, rough way, they also recreate the security of the village life. The omniscient state organizes social security, the party imposes group action and solidarity. Marxist-Leninism, the infallible "word" of the bureaucrats, produces the old concentration of spiritual and social power.

Men and women only just emerging from the small collective tyranny of the primitive village fall—perhaps with relief—under the vast collective tyranny of the modern state. By canceling 3,000 years of striving after personal autonomy and self-discipline, communism makes easier the transition from a closed rural economy to modern industrialization, but it does so by creating a society which risks being primitive in everything but the machines and gadgets which it controls.

This formidable appeal of communism to backward peoples—or, indeed, to comparably bewildered and uprooted groups in the wilderness of Western urban society—will hardly be withstood unless some comparable effort of policy and insight is achieved on the Western side. So far, our contacts are curiously haphazard. Our own commercial interest, together with a little foreign aid and a fraction of private investment, make up our quite inadequate contribution to massive modernization.

On the side of social evolution, Britain, foremost among the colonial powers, has worked to graft Western institutions on to

primitive economies—but colonial authorities are necessarily suspect. The missionary churches make a great, though sometimes contradictory, contribution. Some private business firms have done pioneer work in the field of workers' housing and labor management. But of a major concerted Western effort to assist the backward areas over these perilous times of social readjustment, there is little trace.

There is, in fact, barely the realization that such an effort is necessary to counter the ceaseless confident pressure of Communist totalitarian faith. Materially and psychologically, the West is allowing the challenge of the backward areas to go largely by default.

Even with communism at the very door—as it is today in southeast Asia—there is little disposition in the West to make long-term strategy for world development the first priority, not the last afterthought, of Western diplomacy.

Yet the Communist inroad on Asia is already a fact, and the risks in many parts of Africa are increasing. And behind this advance lies the possibility that when at last the stirrings and ambitions in Asia and Africa result in a world which is united in standards and technology, as well as in aspiration, the stamp set upon it will be not the unforced unity of the free West, but the single collective straitjacket of communism.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, during the present month our Nation has been honoring the memory of a great President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. On February 11, 1955, there appeared in many newspapers throughout the country an article entitled "We Need a Lincoln." The article was written by George Sokolsky, and was published in his regular column which bears the heading "These Days." Mr. Sokolsky's article so well typifies the character of the great Abraham Lincoln, and so splendidly sets forth what, I am sure, Americans all over the Nation are most vitally interested in, that I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 11, 1955]

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

WE NEED A LINCOLN

As the years roll in the saga of America Abraham Lincoln grows in stature not because he was assassinated, nor even because he was President during our Civil War, but because he was a philosopher, a moralist, a rare figure among those who rise in our political system.

The American President has usually been a politician, not a statesman; an operator of techniques of manipulating the people's choice, not a thinker who leads his followers into the lofty realms of moral philosophy. Too often his speech has been of the earth

rather than inspired by revelation. How many of them could have thought, much less put into rhetoric, the grandeur of the second inaugural:

"With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Abraham Lincoln thought lyrically and his poetry was sunshine in a dark moment of national history. He required no ghost writer. He was not briefed by researchers. He called no conferences to decide what he was to think and say. His artistry came from his consciousness, and to it, no man add or detract. A man who could compose the Gettysburg Address on the back of an envelope while traveling on a railroad train is unusual among our politicians, who generally submit their major thoughts to associates for criticism, the associates taking out of it everything that is of sufficient potency to produce controversy.

Lincoln was never afraid of controversy. In fact, he started his national career as a controversialist, debating the little giant, Stephen Douglas, no mean man. The Lincoln-Douglas debates stirred a generation by the deftness of logic, by the fullness of the knowledge of both debaters, and by the courageous stance of each man on a public question. There was no pussyfooting in anything that Lincoln did and said, as the more popular Seward discovered to his discomfiture.

What a wonderful thing it would be in this age of television if two candidates for the Presidency—say Eisenhower and Stevenson in 1952—could have debated the issues before the Nation, face to face, with questions and answers and interpolations. Perhaps the Nation might have discovered that the eggheads are really behind the scenes.

Lincoln lives for us not so much in deeds as in ideas. One can pick and choose nuggets of thought, wisely and literally spoken, courageously phrased with no idea of advantage. Such men do not often appear in any country; they have rarely appeared in ours since that magnificent group of philosophers sat in Independence Hall to adopt the Declaration of Independence and later to write the Constitution. Lincoln might have been of that galaxy had he been born earlier; he was of their succession.

Our people in these days pray for the inspiration of a national ideal. We live in a period of excitement, of action, of motion, but we are a sad people because we are not at peace with ourselves or with the world. We need the wisdom of a great mind and the leadership of one who walks with God. We again need the gentle hand of Abraham Lincoln, who could be firm in the right without permitting himself the wickedness of hate.

Accomplishments of Savings and Loan Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRICE DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the outstanding record of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association in Paris, Tex., shows what can be accomplished through

such organizations without cost to the taxpayers.

For instance, 118 homes for veterans of World War II have been financed by this one organization. I ask unanimous consent that an article and an editorial from the Paris News, of Paris, Tex., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD SAVINGS AT FIRST FEDERAL

Savings placed in First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Paris during the year 1954 amounted to \$2,212,355.12, according to President O. W. Boswell. The net gain amounted to \$1,155,383.21. The dividends paid for the year 1954 amounted to \$194,216.19 of which \$100,352.57 was paid during the last half of the year.

A new high in homes financed during the year amounted to \$1,975,885.03 for 389 borrowers. Sixty-six new homes in the Paris area were financed amounting to \$415,725. One hundred eighteen homes were financed for World War II veterans amounting to \$789,128.27. A total of \$5,320,154.24 has been loaned to veterans since the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to buy or build homes. The total number of veterans' homes financed to December 31, 1954, was 1,048. No veteran has been denied a home loan if he could qualify under the terms of the act.

Net assets increased from \$6,662,468.18 on December 31, 1953, to \$7,763,302.25 on December 31, 1954, reflecting a gain of \$1,200,834.07. Savings increased from \$6,104,873.61 on December 31, 1953, to \$7,260,256.82 on December 31, 1954, reflecting a gain of \$1,155,383.21.

Reserves increased from \$421,497.31 to \$452,000.

With the aid of the new liberalized home loans under the terms of the National Housing Act of 1953 and the 1954 amendments permitting longer terms and smaller down payments should create a greater demand for the buying and building of homes, Mr. Boswell said.

While more than 1 million starts in home building in the Nation were made during 1954, forecasts are being made by some authorities that as many as \$1,200,000 starts probably will be made during 1955, Mr. Boswell concluded.

WHY FIRST FEDERAL'S STORY WAS PARIS NEWS FRONT PAGE MATERIAL

Some people may consider a story on the front page of the Paris News Monday an advertisement instead of a news story. It may be that so considering it is the right way, but it must not be classed with the ordinary paid advertisement, for it has a news value of an interesting nature.

The story was a condensed report of the operation of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Paris, made by its president, O. W. Boswell, the man who started the Paris Building & Loan Association thirty-odd years ago. Assisted by some citizens who believed Paris needed such an organization, Webb Boswell has seen his small financial institution grow year by year until today its transactions have grown into the millions of dollars.

The story said 118 homes for men who had been in the Second World War had been financed and since the enactment of the Servicemen's Act in 1944 loans to veterans for buying or building homes, total more than \$5 million. Total number of homes for veterans at the end of last year, financed by this association, is 1,043. Few, if any, of these homes would have been bought or built without the aid of First Federal. Sixty-six new

homes in the Paris area were financed during the year.

Stories like this may well cause folks to wonder why the Government feels it necessary to build houses at a cost to the taxpayers of billions of dollars, while the houses the First Federal finances cost the taxpayers nothing and the owners pay taxes to support their State, county, and city governments.

Webb Boswell is an outstanding home builder of national reputation, and has had the highest honors the national associations could confer. So the Paris News believes that any story of him or his building accomplishments is front page material.

Opponents of H. R. 1 Outnumber Proponents by 3 to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, during the public hearings on H. R. 1 held by the Committee on Ways and Means, the opponents of the legislation outnumbered the proponents by approximately 3 to 1.

In spite of this fact, the report of the committee on the bill makes specific reference only to the proponents.

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record clear and to avoid any possible distortion of the facts, representatives of the following industries, labor groups, and organizations testified in opposition to H. R. 1:

General Electric Co., qualified opposition.

California Fish Cannery Association.
American Manufacturers of Thermo-static Containers.

The Candle Manufacturers Association.

Collapsible Tube Manufacturers Association.

The Industrial Wire Cloth Institute.
The National Building Granite Quarries Association.

The Rubber Footwear Division of the Rubber Manufacturers Association.

The Toy Manufacturers of the U. S. A., Inc.

The Twisted Jute Packing and Oakum Institute.

United States Potters Association.
The American Manufacturers of Toy Balloons.

American Tariff League.
National Federation of Independent Business.

Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor.

American Coalition.
Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.

Voland & Sons, Inc.
R. Thomas & Sons, Inc.

California Pottery Guild.
Homer Laughlin China Co.

Vitrified China Association.
International Brotherhood of Operative Potters.

Westinghouse Electric Corp.
Monsanto Chemical Co.

Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc.

Dow Chemical Co.
Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association.

Otto B. May, Inc.
Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.

American Cyanamid Co.
American Glassware Association.

Kent Metal & Chemical Corp.
American Flint Glass Workers Union.

Ohio Glass and Pottery Workers Protective League.

Pennsylvania Glassworkers Protective League.

Indiana Glass Workers Protective League.

Seafarers International Union of North America.

American Tunaboat Association.
Seafood Producers Association.

Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc.

Northwest Horticultural Council.
Independent Petroleum Association of America.

National Stripper Well Association.
North Texas Oil & Gas Association.

Independent Petroleum Association of America.

Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil Association.

New York State Producers Association.
Bradford District Pennsylvania Producers Association.

Southwestern Pennsylvania Producers Association.

Oil Producers Agency of California.
San Joaquin Valley Oil Producers Association.

Independent Oil Producers Agency of California.

Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association.

West Central Texas Oil & Gas Association.

Lawton Oil Corp.
Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association.

Kentucky Oil & Gas Association.
Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association.

Ohio Oil & Gas Association.
Independent Oil Producers & Land Owners Association.

East Texas Oil Association.
National Coal Association.

Pennsylvania Railroad.
United Mine Workers of America.

American Retail Coal Association.
Foreign Oil Policy Committee.

Anthracite Institute.
Norfolk & Western Railroad.

Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.

Southern Coal Producers Association.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Women's Patriotic Conference.
American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.

Association of Cotton Textile Merchants of New York.

New England Textile Committee and six New England Governors.

National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Carpet Institute, Inc.
National Wool Growers Association.

Boston Wool Trade Association.
Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association.

National Wool Trade Association.
National Federation of Textiles.

Textile Fabric Association.
Tufted Textile Manufacturers Association.

Forstmann Woolen Co.
CIO Textile Workers.

Linen Thread Co., Inc.
United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union.

National Authority for the Ladies Handbag Industry.
S. Morgan Smith Co.

Pin, Clip, and Fastener Association.
Clothespin Manufacturers of America.

Western Condensing Co.
National Machine Tool Producers Association.

Amalgamated Lace Operatives of America.
American Lace Manufacturers Association.

American Fabric Glove Associates.
American Knit Handwear Association.

National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers.
Underwear Institute.

Work Glove Institute.
United Wallpaper Craftsmen and Workers of North America International Union.

Lapp Insulator Co.
American Fluorspar.

Mica Fabricators Association.
New England Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths Association.

Clock Manufacturers of America, Inc.
Cigarette Lighter Manufacturers Association, Inc.

Lead Pencil Manufacturers Association, Inc.
Tungsten Institute.

Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc.
Okonite Co.

Industrial Fasteners Institute.
American Optical Co.

Shears, Scissors & Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association.
American Manganese Producers Association.

White Sewing Machine Co.
Woven Wood Fabric Industry.

Hardwood Plywood Institute.
Hardboard Institute.

California Almond Growers Exchange.
California Walnut Growers Association.

Northwest Nut Growers.
Oregon Filbert Commission.

Sunkist Growers, Inc.
Cherry Growers & Industries Foundation.

Wine Institute.
Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association of Pennsylvania.

American National Cattlemen's Association.
National Milk Producers.

Cultivated Mushroom Institute of America, Inc.
National Cheese Institute, Inc.

American Dry Milk Institute.
National Creameries Association.

Texas Sheep & Goat Raisers Association.

Western States Meat Packers Association.
 California Fig Institute.
 National Independent Union Council.
 Argus Cameras.
 International Allied Printing Trades Association.
 Fur Dressers' Guild, Inc.
 National Knitted Outerwear Association.
 Eastern Metal Products Co.

The School Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, as far as the State of California is concerned, the administration proposal on education is completely inadequate. It will not give any material aid in the area where the schools desperately need emergency assistance.

I fear the plan lacks the imagination and boldness necessary to solve the problems of overcrowded and understaffed schools. The program has been publicized as one to aid schools; as far as California is concerned, the plan presented by the administration could only delay until too far in the future any important assistance for education.

I fear local school districts, under the impression they will get some adequate Federal aid, will delay approval of their own necessary bond issues. The program presented by the administration will call for a great deal of local financial participation—too much, I fear, to make the Federal program workable.

Congress should take the lead in proposing right now an aid-to-education program to provide real aid to local school districts—aid that will end the second-class education too many children are receiving.

At my request, Frank M. Wright, the head of the division of public school administration of California, analyzed the administration's proposal on education. His comments, which follow, point up the fact that the program is little more than a thin veneer on a ramshackle structure:

Members of my staff and I have reviewed the recommendations made by President Eisenhower in his proposal to aid in financing the construction of needed school buildings throughout the United States. His proposal is divided into three parts.

"Part 1, Bond Purchases by the Federal Government," seems to us to be absolutely unworkable in California due to the fact that we have no difficulty in selling bonds that districts authorize. The current district rate runs between 2½ and 3 percent, and I have never known of a single area in California that has had difficulty in disposing of its bonds.

"Part 2, State School Building Agencies," seems to contemplate a type of operation similar to the Pennsylvania plan which sets up a State school building authority. Under this proposal the districts would have the buildings built for them by some sort of

combination between the Federal and State governments and then would rent the buildings and be required to pay an amount equal to principal and interest out of their annual operating funds. In California the law would have to be materially changed to provide for special taxes for this purpose in lieu of bond taxes, or the bond authorization would have to be changed in order to permit bonds to be issued for that particular purpose. We do not believe that this is a workable plan at all. The State program which I have attempted to describe briefly in the enclosed statement covers that operation. We do not believe that there is anything in part 2 that would be of any benefit to California.

"Part 3, Grants for School Districts With Proved Need and Lack of Local Income," does not offer any help to our State. In the first place, we do not have a situation where a district has not reached its legal bonding capacity because it could not sell its bonds. If a California district has bonding capacity it naturally would sell its bonds and would be able to use that money. The second part of the proposal concerns a situation where a district has reached its legal bonding limit and is unable to pay rent and would need to obtain additional aid. That is about the only part of the proposal where it appears that California would receive any assistance. Then the degree of assistance would depend almost entirely upon the language of the act, as to whether or not a State building authority was provided which would provide for leasing and paying rent.

Coexistence and Commonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Lawrence Hunt, a prominent New York City attorney, who delivered it before the Canadian Club of London, Ontario, on December 8, 1954. The subject of the address was Coexistence and Commonsense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COEXISTENCE AND COMMONSENSE

(Address by Lawrence Hunt, of New York, before the Canadian Club of London, Ontario, December 8, 1954)

Mr. President, members of the Canadian Club of London, friends and neighbors of Canada, as an old and affectionate friend of Canada, I am glad as well as honored to be your guest today. An invitation to speak in Canada is always alluring to me, and when your invitation was extended, on your behalf, by the Honorable Ray Lawson, Canada's greatly esteemed and warmly liked Consul General in New York, it seemed irresistible.

My subject today is Coexistence and Commonsense.

There is nothing inherently wrong with the idea or the policy of coexistence or peaceful coexistence in the Anglo-American sense. It means, for us English-speaking people, neither surrender nor softness toward Communist imperialism. In the course of vigorous and free public debate, this policy, advocated by that wise and consistent foe

of communism, Sir Winston Churchill, has been doubted and distorted, misunderstood and maligned, by some sincere citizens on this side of the Atlantic, and especially in my own country. But many Americans are beginning to realize that peaceful coexistence, as we mean it, can be a positive, constructive policy for maintaining freedom and progress, peace and prosperity for ourselves and our children.

Coexistence is not a startling, new idea. Any foreigner, who did not understand our American ways, perhaps wondered during our election campaign 6 weeks ago, how Republicans like myself could possibly coexist with the Democrats. We cheerfully do, between elections. Canada is an inspiring example of how it is possible and sensible, though at times difficult, for two vigorous civilizations, British and French, with different backgrounds, customs, and language, to coexist as a strong, united, ever-growing people whose moral and material contributions to world stability are today greater than ever before. The long and successful coexistence, despite outspoken differences, between Canada and the United States is unsurpassed in modern history. And the cordial coexistence—more correctly, the unwritten partnership—between the British Commonwealth and America is our best reason to hope for our common future.

We English-speaking peoples should learn how to coexist more successfully with our allies, and, in this connection, I cannot refrain from expressing my belief that today we ought to understand more clearly the moral and political problems of France and to appreciate more warmly her best qualities. Three times invaded, with increasing savagery, by the same enemy in less than 90 years, victorious but frightfully weakened in the First World War with a million and a half dead in battle, conquered, occupied, and tormented, bodily and mentally, in the Second World War, and worst of all, with the French genius for lucid self-analysis, knowing that, with noble individual exceptions, she had failed, badly failed, when the going got rough, France has been very sick, and spiritually and politically ineffective since the end of the last war. But France is getting well. She is surely coming to herself. And soon again she will be not only the beautiful nation, both irritating and inspiring, of our memories but also a staunch and helpful ally.

We Americans hope that our allies will coexist cordially with us, and that they will try harder, despite healthy differences, to understand our deep feelings and great problems. You Canadians and most of our British friends know that the caricature of America as a well meaning by ignorant adolescent is out of date even as caricature. Of course, my country, like other countries, has made some bad mistakes and she has missed some splendid opportunities to do an even better job as the most powerful of all nations. There is room for improvement in our foreign economic policy. There are moments in my land when the strident voice of the demagogue is heard above the quiet prayers of the multitude. There is probably no other nation so enthusiastically addicted to washing its linen in public.

America seems to have been born to greatness. By her own efforts she achieved greatness. And in our time greatness has been trust upon her by friends and foes. But it's not all fun. As an international pastime, tweaking the eagle's feathers has largely, though of course not entirely, supplanted twisting the lion's tail.

You will agree, I think, that in recent years America has done her share to preserve Western civilization from the tyranny of Russian communism. And we Americans want peace, the only peace worth having, the peace of free men and women. Less than 2 months ago, as an American, my heart

was warmed as the hearts of Americans yet unborn will be warmed, by the genuine and graceful tribute to my country from the most magnificent statesman of the 20th century. Sir Winston said: "There is no other case of a nation arriving at the summit of world power, seeking no territorial gain, but earnestly resolved to use her strength and wealth in the cause of progress and freedom."

But what about Russia? The masters of the Kremlin don't mean what we mean by peaceful coexistence. They mean time enough to undermine and finally destroy us. Does that mean the end of man's life on this planet—an atomic war? We don't, we can't know for certain. We can try to make an intelligent guess. I prefer to guess on the side of the angels. There will be no such war.

There seems to have arisen recently a tacit understanding among all the peoples of the world, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, that to become radioactive corpses in a radioactive ruin is not a consummation devoutly to be wished. Although many of the masters of Communist Russia during the past 37 years have not been notably successful, under the Soviet system, in the art of personal survival, we can reasonably assume that even Russian Communists like to survive. Now that we have about reached the point where our and the Russian cataclysmic weapons apparently cancel themselves out, we and the Russians will not cancel each other out. World wars are out of date. There is no longer any possibility that they can settle anything.

Moreover, America and the British Commonwealth will never start a preventive war, not only because it would bring death and irreparable ruin to all peoples but also because our spiritual and religious heritage makes it morally impossible for us to do so. The Russian Communists cannot be expected to understand that spiritual fact. But we know it in our hearts and feel it in our bones.

Short of atomic war, however, the rulers of Soviet communism will use any means to gain their ends—espionage, infiltration, subversion, propaganda and, above all, day in and day out schemes to divide Britain and America. They will try and try and try.

So what? Let them try. Where they have failed by force, they may attempt to subjugate us by seduction. They may soften their offensive tactics, whisper sweet nothings to us and our allies, and meanwhile wait, patiently wait, watchfully wait until we let ourselves grow weak or until we destroy our free political and economic system through greed and fear. By all means, let us keep them waiting.

This is where commonsense comes in. There can be no coexistence without commonsense. Unfortunately, there are times when commonsense seems as rare as uranium; it is often hidden under great bogs of emotion or under the hard layers of domestic politics. But find it and use it, we must.

Commonsense in our policy toward Communist Russia means many things. It means that the free nations of the world shall remain united and progress in power and prosperity. It means that the unique, unwritten partnership between the United States and the British Commonwealth shall always grow in strength and in trust and in understanding. It means that our political and intellectual leaders shall never again, as some of them did near the end and shortly after the last world war, fail to recognize or delude themselves about the sinister nature and the imperialistic objectives of Russian communism. It means no more illusions, no day dreams which can turn so quickly into nightmares, no weakness, no lethargy, and no despair. It means vigilance within ourselves and toward our common foe. Vigilance without fear. It means that we pay

heed by day and by night to the stirring wisdom of Oliver Cromwell: "Put your trust in God but keep your powder dry."

And within the alliance of free nations, particularly within the Anglo-American partnership, commonsense means and requires faith in each other's purpose and charity toward each other's shortcomings.

Canada has been destined to be not only a strong, rich, and progressive nation on her own account but also to be the interpreter's house between Great Britain and the United States. When Britain and America get too far out on a limb, Canada can help them to climb back to safety, with a minimum of embarrassment. She understands the understandings of the one and the overstatements of the other. She can translate to each the different accents with which they speak a common language. She knows their sometimes different approach and different timing toward the same goals. She appreciates the best in both nations.

The policy of coexistence and commonsense will not be easy. At times it will be terribly difficult and exact all our patience and self-control. It's a challenge more tremendous to the spiritual and mental stamina than even to the physical endurance of free men and women. We shall meet that challenge. In one form or another, that challenge is as old as the human race. Five hundred years ago, the Augustinian monk, Thomas à Kempis wrote words which can help us today: "It is no great matter to associate with the good, and gentle. . . . But to be able to live peaceably with hard and perverse, or undisciplined persons, is a great grace, and an exceedingly commendable and manly deed."

Let's admit that an unpleasantly plausible case can be made for pessimism. Russia is mighty and ruthless. Russian communism is clever and insidious and persistent. In English-speaking nations, a few men in important positions have been seduced by its evil appeal and have betrayed their country. Soviet imperialism has several satellites, and, at present, Communist China is an ally. The leaders of Communist China, intoxicated with recent power and insolent in their ignorance of the vastly greater power of Western civilization, may attack Formosa or its neighboring islands, or some other spark will hasten the fiery doom of our world. For whom does the bell toll? It tolls for the whole human race.

So the pessimists tell us, with morbid embellishments. The horrors of the human imagination can multiply like locusts. Moreover, many intelligent Americans have yielded, at least in part and temporarily, to pessimism. But whatever our characteristic sins may be, pessimism is not one of them. Americans simply don't know how to act and think like polished pessimists in a profoundly thoughtful or gracefully melancholic manner. We just howl. But after a while we usually escape from the doubting castle of giant despair and we are again on our way in the pursuit of happiness. We know, deep down in our hearts, as do our friends and neighbors in the other English-speaking nations, that pessimism is a sullen denial of the grace of God.

We need more than armament, more than a policy of coexistence and commonsense, more than the unity of free nations; we need even more than faith and charity between Britain and America; we need hope.

Hope is the forgotten virtue of our age, and yet we have reasons to hope—good and sensible, true and triumphant reasons. Let's think about them and be of good cheer.

For all its power, Russian communism has no spiritual basis, no religious heritage, no moral tradition. Without them no civilization—no system of society—can long endure. The Soviet regime has existed less than 40 years—a long time for its victims, but a relatively brief period even in the recorded history of mankind. Not suddenly, but

rather slowly, I believe, bit by bit, not from force without but from forces within, Russian communism will change, breakdown, wither, and be cast away.

Let us devoutly believe and humbly pray that the spiritual, as well as the material, odds will always be on our side.

In the years ahead, we shall know disappointments, suffer checks and setbacks, make mistakes, wrestle with the honest differences among ourselves, and somehow live through crises, but the future belongs to the free.

The diplomatic events of the last few months give us reasons for hope. The lessening of tensions in the Middle East, the settlement of the Trieste dispute, and the promising results of the London and Paris conferences, under the inspired leadership of Sir Anthony Eden, have strengthened the free nations and have given a tremendous lift to everyone except the Communists and the pessimists. Greater triumphs beckon us forward.

What does all this add up to? What do these spiritual and material facts, these triumphs of patient and resourceful diplomacy mean for us and our children? They mean a better chance, a surer hope than we have known in nearly a half century for a relatively peaceful and prosperous era, for a certainly hard but possibly a golden age. They may mean the increase of trade between the Iron Curtain and the free countries. For us, the primary motive of trade has been profit, and I suppose that, once in a while, even the Communists like to make a little profit. But trade, in modern times, has also fostered and stimulated civilization, and more frequently than not, has provided the opportunity to preach the gospel of those ideas which are the birthright of our English-speaking family, the ideas of each man's dignity and every man's freedom.

We English speaking peoples have been slow to realize and at times reluctant to admit that the unwritten partnership between the United States and the British Commonwealth is the surest reason for hope. Two world wars, the events of the past decade, the obvious facts of the world we live in, and the uncompromising forces of destiny have created that unique partnership. No other partnership has had such vast power and such an inherent sense of responsibility in using it. No other partnership has had so many burdens and so many blessings. But what of the future?

The future is ours. We are united by more than common fears and a common foe. We are united by commonsense. We are united by a common heritage which we proudly cherish irrespective of the race or nation of our individual ancestors. We are united by common ideas of what is right and decent, of what is just and kind. We are united by our common vision of the future we want for ourselves and our children. Together, America and the British Commonwealth can dare to hope. Together, we can dare to make, and, with God's grace, we will surely make a fairer world.

Competence and Integrity of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, for the information of Senators who are concerned both about the competence and

integrity of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and about the justice and nonpolitical conduct of civil-service procedures, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the searching editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 8, 1955, entitled "The Firing of Major Estes." Those who are also concerned about justice to the person involved must share the editorial writer's hope that the Civil Service Commission and the new Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service will give this case a most careful review.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRING OF MAJOR ESTES

"Let me welcome you aboard. It is good to have you."

With these warm words President Eisenhower, on Monday, greeted Joseph P. Finnegan in a swearing-in ceremony at the White House. Mr. Finnegan, 50-year-old industrial relations lawyer from New York, is the second Eisenhower appointee to hold the office of director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

The President expects much from the Mediation Service and he is fully right in doing so. Speaking before the AFL, in the 1952 campaign, Mr. Eisenhower, in criticism of the Truman administration, said:

"It is time we got some responsible leadership in the Government. Consider how woefully inefficient is our Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. Federal mediation has fallen into such disrepute that our people have forgotten what it can do."

In view of the high hopes that Mr. Eisenhower has for personnel of the Federal Mediation Service, just about the first thing Mr. Finnegan, as its new Director, ought to do is to look searchingly into the case of Maj. Charles T. Estes. Major Estes is the highly regarded mediation officer who was dismissed last July 9, while stationed in St. Louis, by Director Finnegan's political predecessor, Whitley P. McCoy, of Alabama.

Major Estes is precisely the kind of man needed in the Government service. Born in Gainesville, Ga., he was graduated from the University of Georgia and then went into business in his home city. When World War I broke out he entered the Army and served with credit. After the armistice he decided to continue in uniform and served in China, Japan, and the Philippines, under General MacArthur.

After nearly 10 years in his country's service, by which time he had become a major, he returned to business from which he entered the NRA in 1935. His talents for conciliation and adjustment led him to the Conciliation Service 3 years later. From 1940 on he was liaison officer and special assistant to the director.

The value of Major Estes' work is attested by no less a person than Republican businessman Cyrus S. Ching, who was for nearly 30 years supervisor of industrial relations of the United States Rubber Co. Mr. Ching, director of the Mediation Service, 1947-52, swore to the following, November 17:

"One of Charlie Estes' outstanding characteristics was his complete, enthusiastic devotion to the Mediation Service. I frequently thought he took too much out of himself in endeavoring to carry out his assignments. I never had from Major Estes at any time anything but loyal and enthusiastic support."

This testimonial of a prominent Republican to Major Estes' loyalty is important because the basis for the Estes discharge is that he was "disloyal" to the service.

How was he disloyal? Well, he once referred to the fiscal office of the Mediation Service as "money bags." Once he spoke of his duty station as his "new salt mine."

Could charges possibly be more trivial? In any case, President Eisenhower on August 25, 1954—so the press reported—on facing "the prospect of reading and signing a mountain of bills on arrival at the summer White House in Denver quipped: 'Back to the salt mines.'"

So far as we can discover, no one who knows anything about this dismissal thinks that it was for any reason other than to create a job for one of GOP Chairman Hall's cohorts. For first the partisan director, Whitley McCoy, sent Major Estes to St. Louis. Presumably McCoy thought Major Estes would resign rather than leave Washington. Instead Major Estes came to St. Louis, did excellent work here and won the admiration of many businessmen and labor leaders. But somebody wanted Major Estes' job and wanted it enough to fire him—to fire a man who served under seven Directors and ranked 8th in seniority among more than 200 mediation personnel.

Fortunately Major Estes has the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission. Fortunately he is exercising his appeal. But he has this right only because he has worn his country's uniform. Without application of the veterans' preference clause, he would be out and that would end it.

Were the Civil Service Commission not currently so political, Major Estes could expect justice there. Surely a career official with his record ought to get justice anywhere. Thanks to the change in control of Congress, the Senate Civil Service Committee, under Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, has asked the Commission to grant a public hearing with Senate representatives sitting in.

Yes, it is good to have Director Finnegan aboard. If Mr. Finnegan has anything more important to do than go fully and fairly into the Estes case, we would like to know what it is. If the Estes ouster stands, on its present flimsy basis, the career personnel in the Mediation and Conciliation Service might as well disband now.

The President's School-Aid Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 15, 1955

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the Hartford Courant of February 12 appeared a leading editorial under the title "Posing a Challenge to Community Effort." This excellent editorial deals with the President's message on school construction aid and with Senate bill 968, of which I am one of the cosponsors, along with my distinguished colleague from Connecticut (Mr. PURTELL). I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSING A CHALLENGE TO COMMUNITY EFFORT

The past week's Eisenhower message on school aid proposes a program to arouse the American people to a community effort for schools and a community concern for education unparalleled in our history. At the

same time it breaks precedent by having the Federal Government, for the first time, give direct aid to public-school construction throughout the country. But it does not pretend to be the final answer. The President has encouraged local and State authorities and citizens to come together in meetings throughout the country to find, if possible, some long-range solution that can later be set into law.

There is one thing upon which everyone agrees. We are not doing well enough now in educating our children. With waves of young bearing down upon an inadequate plant in the future, to be met by insufficient numbers of trained teachers, the prospect calls for immediate action. But the program proposed by Mr. Eisenhower is already under fire. It is seen by Senator LISTER HILL as presenting an interminable delay on the one hand, or a meager dole on the other. Its financial provisions are sharply criticized by those who would have Washington spend large sums on education. In this it might be well to quote from the President's press conference:

"[The Senators] criticized your program rather strongly yesterday as being inadequate and said it merely loaded more debts on the States and communities, which could not afford to pay the debt. . . ."

The PRESIDENT. "Did they mention the debt of the United States?"

It is easy to look to Washington to solve problems. Just as it is easy to look to Hartford when the burden becomes heavy in smaller communities. But the political facts of life are that when the smaller governmental unit accepts financial aid from the larger, it leads to intervention and an inevitable measure of control. He who pays the piper calls the tune. If the Nation is to keep its independence, its variety in the face of pressure to conform, it must govern its affairs at the local level.

The Eisenhower program for Federal aid to education recognizes where the duties and responsibilities lie. It allows the purchase of bonds of districts where they are not readily marketable at a reasonable price; it assists the States in forming agencies outside the State government itself so that the difficulty of debt and other types of laws can be overcome; and finally, where clear need is shown, arranges for matching grants-in-aid.

The serious concern of the American people is that we provide continuing opportunities for the finest education possible to as many of our youngsters as possible. We want to encourage the talent and genius of our youth to flourish. We must if we are to survive and prosper. But fine education can't be measured in glossy schoolrooms. It can develop only from the effort and attention of the people of America who are directly concerned, the parents and citizens of the local communities. That is the challenge of the Eisenhower program.

Legislative Program of Veterans of Foreign Wars as It Pertains to Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1955, the national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Merton B. Tice, appeared before the

Committee on Veterans' Affairs to present the legislative program of that organization for the consideration of the committee. In order that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to examine this statement, it is included for the Record:

STATEMENT OF MERTON B. TICE, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, WITH RESPECT TO VFW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning to discuss our Nation's responsibility to those who have served in the Armed Forces in time of war or national emergency and to the dependents of those who gave their lives in that service. I am especially grateful that you have scheduled this hearing so that it can be witnessed by this fine group here assembled. The group includes most of our national officers, major national committees and department officers from nearly every State and Territory. They constitute, in large measure, the leadership of our great organization and have an abiding interest in the work of this committee.

May I also express our appreciation to the 11 members who have elected to remain with this committee in the 84th Congress. Your background and experience in veterans' affairs will be invaluable to the new members, who in turn will contribute a fresh viewpoint and varied experience to the full committee.

THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

For the benefit of the new members may I point out that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was founded in 1899 by returning overseas veterans of the Spanish-American War. It is now composed of a million and a quarter members in 10,000 posts in every State and Territory and some foreign countries. Membership in our organization is restricted to men who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States on foreign soil or in hostile waters during a war, military campaign or expedition and are native or naturalized American citizens. Many national figures have held high office in our organization and I am pleased to acknowledge one of our ablest past commanders in chief, Gen. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY, as a distinguished member of this committee. A former member of this committee and distinguished colleague of yours in the House, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, is also a past commander in chief of our organization. Our common purpose "to honor the dead by helping the living" is given expression through our home for orphans in Eaton Rapids, Mich., and our National Rehabilitation Service, which offers free representation and counsel in the presentation of claims to all veterans and their dependents irrespective of membership in the VFW. One of our contributions toward making America a better place to live is an extensive community service program which had the active participation last year of more than 8,000 posts and 4,000 auxiliaries embracing some 275,000 projects. This is only a part of the program of service which is continually conducted on a nationwide basis by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I mention it to establish understanding of the nature and purposes of our organization and because I take pride in these achievements.

I should like to proceed by discussing the questions raised by your letter of last December, Mr. Chairman; then I should like to comment on some major VFW legislative proposals and make some frank observations on general aspects of the veterans benefit program.

AMENDED FORM 10-P-10

The first question posed by your recent letter, Mr. Chairman, relates to the effect of the amended form 10-P-10, which requires applicants for hospital and/or medical care to list their assets and liabilities. Our 55th national encampment approved a resolution protesting the amended form and urging its discontinuance. Our opposition was not based on the fact that we favor free hospital and medical care for the nonservice disabled who can afford to pay for such treatment from private sources. In fact, for many years our service officers have been directed not to encourage hospital and medical care in non-service-connected cases for those who are able to pay. They have universally informed us that they have strictly adhered to this directive. Our opposition to the use of this form is based on the premise, first, that the applicant is already required to sign an affidavit that he cannot afford to pay, and second, that we consider abuses to be negligible. While we recognize that in such an extension program it is inevitable, regardless of the rules and regulations adopted, that there will be some isolated instances of hospitalization of persons who have the ability to pay. It is our belief, however, that the incidence of such violations will not be reduced by the amended form and, if our assumption in this respect is correct, the amended form serves no useful purpose. If it is not effective to reduce the abuses it seeks to correct, its continued use is not justified and we feel that in some cases it requires an unwarranted disclosure of personal information.

TERMINATION OF WARTIME BENEFITS

The second question submitted by your letter is in regard to the desirability of terminating wartime benefits for service during the Korean conflict. This has to some extent become a moot question by reason of the subsequent proclamation of the President terminating the emergency and benefits for service after that date. We supported your bill, Mr. Chairman, H. R. 587, to continue educational benefits for those in service prior to February 1, 1955, for the reason that simple justice required such action. It was not because of a conviction that compulsory peacetime service requires the continuation of wartime benefits. This broad question of the obligation of the Government to those who are required to perform service in peacetime is one that is under study in our organization. It is a very complex question and in the consideration of it we are not unmindful of the fact that in peacetime, military service is in some respects similar to Government service in positions which we generally characterize as civilian. The essential functions of Government engage the services of more than 2 million persons in positions which we commonly classify as civilian. It is significant that these positions in Government are filled by voluntary recruitment. In fact, the pay scales and working conditions are sufficiently attractive that people compete with each other through civil-service examinations for the privilege of obtaining them. National defense is at least an equally essential function of Government and employs even more citizens than is required to carry on governmental functions in so-called civilian capacities. Yet these defense positions in Government can only be entirely filled by using the police power of the state to compel performance of the duties required. In a limited mobilization many are excused from the compulsory service that some are required to perform. If this condition is to continue on a selective basis for an indefinite period, surely we will be required to give further consideration to this perplexing problem so that we may determine what,

if any, obligation is owed to the few upon whom we impose the duty of national defense. We believe that the obligation, if any, is affected by the universality of service. If peacetime service is made universal, then it seems that there is less discrepancy in the obligation imposed upon our citizens and, consequently, less obligation on our part to offset the inequity through any benefit system. Important as this question may be, we feel it is not presently urgent since those who have been deprived of benefits by the Executive order will not be affected, except in a few instances, until their release from service, in February 1957. In the meantime, world tension may erupt into a violent war and remove the necessity for determination of this question but bring in its wake others far more difficult and agonizing.

RENOVATION OR REPAIR OF VA HOSPITALS

Question 3 deals with the need for major renovation or repair of existing Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary homes. We recognize, of course, that there is no economy in postponing necessary repairs and in neglecting adequate maintenance. It is equally apparent that with the passage of time buildings acquire a certain degree of obsolescence, which raises the question of the desirability of remodeling older structures to conform to more modern requirements. Difficult problems arise in cases where temporary hospitals, while still in use, are to be replaced by new, modern structures. Some of the buildings that comprise the Winter General Hospital at Topeka, Kans., are not usable in their present condition, yet funds expended for extensive repairs will be of no benefit when the new hospital is completed and ready for use. The long time that elapses between the authorization for a new hospital in such cases and the date when such hospital is ready for use merely compounds the difficulty that arises in these instances. We believe that the expenditure of funds for the repair of temporary structures in such instances and the difficulties that attend the use of improperly maintained facilities can be greatly reduced by prompt action in the construction of replacement hospitals.

LOAN-GUARANTY DIFFERENCES

Question 4 relates to the operation of the VA loan-guaranty program, with particular reference to the difference in guaranty and entitlement under the guaranteed-loan program and the direct-loan program by the veterans purchasing residential property and certain classes of farm real estate to be used by the veteran for a home. We see no reason why the entitlement in the case of a home located on a farm should be \$4,000, while the entitlement in case of homes located in a city is \$7,500. I am pleased to say that we support legislation to extend the \$7,500 entitlement to farm homes.

SCHOLARSHIP ASSISTANCE

Question 5 refers to the desirability of a modest scholarship-assistance program for dependent children of servicemen who lost their lives in the service of their country during a period of war. The 55th national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars unanimously adopted a resolution approving the principle of such legislation and authorizing our national legislative committee to make appropriate recommendations to the Congress. If educational opportunities are to be denied children in such cases, the effect is to perpetuate and compound the hardships inflicted upon individuals by reason of their sacrifice to the Nation in time of war. We believe it is only fair to assume that one who has given his life in defense of the Nation could have provided educational opportunities for his children had he

lived. The cost of such a program is not prohibitive and we hope for early enactment of such legislation by this Congress.

FIVE-POINT PROGRAM

The 55th National Encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, meeting in Philadelphia, August 2-7, 1954, adopted numerous resolutions which established the official position of our organization. Our national legislative committee, working with our security committee and the chairmen of four other committees, has evaluated the resolutions adopted in Philadelphia and formulated a five-point program of top priority objectives, a copy of which is hereto attached for the information of the committee. The five-point program contains the following statement which succinctly sets forth our view as to the relationship of our objectives:

"Without adequate security all other American values, including representative government, individual freedom, social benefits, and economic resources would be jeopardized. Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as citizens and taxpayers, insist on intelligent economy in the operation of Government but oppose pinchpenny economy at the expense of security for the United States and care for those who have borne the brunt of battle, and their widows and orphans."

I wish to emphasize that we consider the security of the United States of paramount importance, and recognize our entire future and way of life depends upon it.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

As to matters which come within the jurisdiction of this committee, I wish to express our disappointment that compensation increases, as established by the 83d Congress, did not conform to the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions when it originally reported H. R. 9020 to the full committee. As reported by the subcommittee, H. R. 9020 would have restored the traditional balance in the disability compensation schedule so that compensation payments would be commensurate with evaluated disability. The 10-percent increase as recommended by the subcommittee would have established the rate for permanent total disability at \$190 per month, nearly equal to the increase in living costs since 1940. This was in accord with the recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of maintaining the same ratio between compensation and living costs as existed in 1940 when the Consumers Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was at 100, and the compensation rate for permanent total disability was \$100 per month. We hope that this Congress will see fit to revise the rates upward so as to remove the loss that has actually occurred in compensation rates by reason of the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar.

In addition to a general revision of compensation rates, we urge the committee to give consideration to H. R. 3808, recently introduced by the chairman at our request. This bill would grant a premium of 25 percent for disabilities incurred in combat with the enemy. It is a long-standing objective of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and is in accord with our view that a sound benefit system should consider the type of service rendered as in the case of active duty pay, bonuses, and mustering-out pay. While we recognize that a disability incurred in a stateside training camp is just as disabling as a similar disability incurred on the battlefield, we believe that the service rendered in the latter case is far more hazardous and merits an increased compensation rate.

We appreciate the conscientious and determined efforts of this committee which resulted in the 5-percent pension increase granted by Public Law 698, of the 83d Congress. However, in our view pension rates are still tragically inadequate. This is espe-

cially true in the case of the aging veterans of World War I, many of whom find it nearly impossible to exist with present high living costs. We must remember that World War I veterans did not receive educational aid and training benefits except for vocational handicaps. Thousands of veterans endured long and rigorous overseas service without proven service-incurred disability only to have disability catch up with them after discharge and, consequently, are now forced to exist upon the meager pension rate.

I would not be realistic if I did not recognize the increasing opposition to benefits for the nonservice disabled. Generally speaking, the public accepts benefits for service-connected disabilities and, of course, one could not reasonably take any other position in view of the widespread workmen's compensation laws which provide benefits for civilian workers who are injured in the course and scope of their employment. Compensation benefits have become so widespread that it is hardly exaggeration to say that the compensation program for veterans merely conforms to the program that has been established for the civilian population. If veterans are to be considered a special class deserving of benefits for wartime service—a view we support—the pension program for those whose disabilities occurred after discharge must be strengthened and continued. We are alarmed by the attacks on this program, which are exemplified by the following statement of the President, contained in his recent budget message:

"Our veterans' pension and compensation laws, in particular, are in need of constructive reconsideration. The non-service-connected pension system dates back to the Revolutionary War, and its principles require reexamination in the light of recent developments, including the nearly universal coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system."

We will resist the increasing clamor to place the nonservice disabled under the old-age and survivors insurance system on the same basis as those who have not rendered wartime service to their country. If considerations of economy are to prevent the establishment of an adequate pension rate under existing rules of eligibility, then we must suggest that consideration be given to basing pension eligibility on length or type of service—or both—so that the thousands of overseas veterans with nonservice disabilities may receive adequate care.

The false alarm that has been expressed about the cost of the benefit program for the nonservice disabled has also resulted in a tightening of eligibility requirements within the Veterans' Administration. Our national rehabilitation service reports many cases where pensions have been terminated or denied by the Veterans' Administration on the strange theory that earnings within the income limitations represent the pursuit of a substantially gainful occupation. It seems illogical to us that the Congress, under its power to regulate interstate commerce, should require private employers to pay wages of not less than 75 cents per hour, while another agency of the Government holds that wages at a lesser rate constitute a substantially gainful occupation and thereby prohibit payment of part III benefits. At our request the chairman of the committee has introduced House Resolution 3807, which is designated to correct this situation by providing that in no event shall a substantially gainful occupation be deemed to exist if the income therefrom does not exceed the minimum wage in interstate commerce.

PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is not unduly alarmed by the President's announcement of the appointment of a Commission on Veterans' Pensions "to study the entire structure, scope, and philosophy of our veterans' pension and compensation laws in

relation to each other and to other Government programs." We welcome any fair and impartial study since any sound program depends upon a true knowledge of the actual facts uncolored by exaggeration, distortion, or misrepresentation. Our chief concern comes from the possibility that such a Commission might approach its task with a preconceived idea that its principal purpose was to save money and, consequently, render a report which disregards many traditional American principles to which we subscribe. I do not wish to be understood as charging that the Presidential Commission will approach its task with that view. I merely recognize it as a possibility.

One other point of concern prompted by the President's action is the growing tendency of some public officials to express alarm over the cost of the veteran benefit program while remaining strangely silent on the costs of other Federal programs, such as foreign aid. Our 55th National Encampment in Philadelphia, concerned over administration opposition to compensation and pension increases, unanimously adopted a resolution on the opening day deploring the contrast in attitudes over veteran costs and foreign-aid costs. The resolution went on to point out that in less than 15 years United States taxpayers had shelled out some \$83 billion in foreign aid while the total cost of compensation and pensions to veterans and their dependents during the past 160 years has amounted to less than \$35 billion.

VETERANS' COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

We are especially pleased by the approval of House Resolution 63, which authorizes and directs this committee to conduct an investigation and study of specified benefit programs with the view to determining if they are being conducted economically, efficiently, and in the best interests of all concerned. I pledge to the President's Commission and your committee the full and complete cooperation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in the performance of these studies. We especially welcome an investigation into programs such as the home loan program, which necessarily depends upon the cooperation of persons outside of the Veterans' Administration, such as builders, lenders, and the real-estate industry. This is also true of the contract hospital and medical program, and we believe that your inquiry into these matters will be of real assistance in insuring compliance with the intent of Congress.

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL PROGRAM

Hospital and medical care for the sick and disabled is one of the most essential veteran benefits. For the information of the committee, I should like to read from a resolution of our 1954 national encampment, which states the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in regard to hospital and medical care:

(a) Unlimited hospitalization of veterans who have service-connected disabilities;
(b) Adequate hospitalization of veterans who have non-service-connected psychosis, tuberculosis, and other chronic diseases;
(c) Continued hospitalization of veterans who have other non-service-connected disabilities where beds are available and the veteran is unable to pay for private hospitalization; and the veteran's statement under oath that he is unable to pay shall be accepted as sufficient evidence of inability to pay;

(d) Continued construction of new hospitals and domiciliary facilities; and

(e) Vigorous opposition to programs of the American Medical Association and all other groups seeking to curtail the medical, hospital, and domiciliary program of the Veterans' administration.

It is a well-known fact that the high cost of hospital and medical care denies adequate treatment for all but the well-to-do. It is regrettable that notwithstanding this fact the spokesmen for the American Medical

Association continue their attacks on the Veterans' Administration hospital program. Sound statistical refutation of their charges by VA Medical Director Adm. Joel T. Boone and veterans' organizations have been ignored by AMA spokesmen and their irresponsible charges continue. We regret that a large segment of the press and public have been misled by their statements and in order to keep the record straight, I wish to reiterate that a bed census conducted from time to time by the Veterans' Administration reveals that less than 10 percent of the patients in VA hospitals on any given day come within the category of non-service-connected requiring hospitalization for 90 days or less. The exact number of these patients who could afford to pay is not known. We continue in our belief that the percentage is negligible and applaud the efforts of this committee to develop further information through your recent hospital questionnaire. I assure you that if the information thus developed indicates any significant abuse of the hospital and medical program that we will cooperate with you to the fullest extent in correcting those conditions.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I wish to again thank you for the privilege of appearing here today and remind you of our dinner tonight at the Statler Hotel honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces. I will yield to our national legislative director, Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, who, I am sure, is well and favorably known to the members of this committee. Mr. Ketchum is prepared at this time to offer for the record a more complete statement of our legislative objectives.

FIVE-POINT PROGRAM OF TOP PRIORITY OBJECTIVES OF THE 1954-55 VFW NATIONAL PROGRAM

The following VFW five-point program is themed to security for the United States. Without adequate security all other American values, including representative government, individual freedom, social benefits, and economic resources would be jeopardized. Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as citizens and taxpayers, insist on intelligent economy in the operation of Government but oppose pinchpeny economy at the expense of security for the United States and care for those who have borne the brunt of battle, and their widows and orphans. All points and all items under the VFW five-point program have equal force and effect notwithstanding the order and sequence of presentation.

1. Security for the United States—A free economy, social benefits, and economic resources are dependent upon security:

(a) To adopt a system of universal military training or, in lieu thereof, a workable reserve program by amendments to existing law.

(b) To maintain the most powerful offensive and defensive Air Force in the world, together with an adequate Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

(c) To promote stockpiling of strategic and critical materials.

(d) To support the National Guard plan of defense against sneak enemy air attacks.

(e) To enforce the Monroe Doctrine if and when any foreign nation intervenes in the internal affairs of any nation of the Western Hemisphere.

(f) To develop a strong merchant marine.

(g) Encourage participation in civil-defense programs.

2. Veterans' rights—recognition for service to security:

(a) To maintain and expand the VA hospital and medical program so as to insure to veterans of all wars adequate hospital care and medical treatment.

(b) To develop plans for educational and vocational training for dependent children of deceased veterans.

(c) To increase rates of compensation and pension; liberalize pension eligibility requirements, including VA regulations on unemployment; and reaffirm traditional VFW demand for liberalized World War I pension.

(d) To protect and strengthen veteran preference in Federal employment, together with a demand for sufficient funds, properly allocated, to be made available for public employment agencies.

(e) To establish a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the United States Senate.

(f) Liberalize and protect housing loan programs.

3. Armed Forces personnel—adequate and competent personnel, with good morale, promotes security:

(a) To renegotiate any treaty with a foreign nation under which members of the United States Armed Forces serving therein are subject to criminal laws and trial in foreign courts with respect to offenses committed against foreign citizens or foreign property.

(b) To restore fringe benefits previously granted members of the Armed Forces and to expand hospital and medical care for their dependents.

(c) To seek the release of all Americans held as prisoners of war by the Communists.

(d) To study benefits provided under Federal law for the surviving dependents of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces.

(e) To effectuate a program to fortify servicemen against enemy brainwashing.

4. Americanism—Promotes internal security:

(a) To maintain the sovereignty of the United States of America through opposition to all efforts to convert the United Nations into some form of World Government or Atlantic Union.

(b) To use vigilance in combating Communist infiltration and subversion in all phases of American life.

(c) To tighten Government regulations on security risks.

(d) To oppose admission of Red China to United Nations.

(e) To prevent international treaties and executive agreements from superseding the United States Constitution and domestic law unless implemented by legislation approved by both the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

(f) To designate, by Federal legislation, May 1 as Loyalty Day.

5. Domestic economy—A strong domestic economy depends upon and promotes security:

(a) To provide full productivity and employment through the construction of highways, schools, hospitals, and other projects in the public interest.

(b) To conserve and develop the natural resources of the United States.

(c) To provide for the creation of a self-liquidating Veterans' Employment and National Development Corporation, for the purpose of creating jobs and economic opportunities through broad lending powers and technical service to self-liquidating projects and businesses that will agree to employ veterans and to qualified veterans themselves.

(d) To provide adequate loan funds and personnel to enable a greater number of worthy and qualified veterans to become established on farms.

Reclassification of Postal Jobs and Increase in Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Tuesday, February 15, 1955:

I appear here today in support of H. R. 1592, a bill offered by Representative JAMES H. MORRISON. This bill provides for a reclassification of all postal jobs and sets up a 10-percent salary increase—or \$400 per annum, whichever is the greater—for all postal workers. It provides also that after salaries are increased they shall then be adjusted to the nearest multiple of \$100.

Let us take the case of letter carriers, for example: A letter carrier in 1939, claiming 3 exemptions, had a take-home pay of \$2,007.47. This same letter carrier in 1952 took home \$3,378.78. If we were to provide the equivalent purchasing power of 1939, the take-home pay should be \$3,927.60, or a gross average for letter carriers of \$4,800. The gross average, however, would be considerably less because the preponderating majority of letter carriers are not in the top longevity grade. This picture holds true not only for letter carriers but for postal clerks and others proportionately.

The administration takes the position that the Post Office Department should be self-supporting. I am in emphatic discord. Farmers receive from \$750 million to \$1 billion annually, depending upon the level of price supports. There are no questions asked with reference to farm parity supports and balancing anything. Business receives benefits totaling approximately \$900 million. These are subsidies for airline companies and shipowners and others. We don't ask the companies thus aided to balance the Federal budget or any other budget of any department. In the same manner, the Post Office deficit should be charged to business and the public generally, because the loss sustained arises primarily in the handling of second-, third-, and fourth-class business mail.

We have many departments in the Federal Government where no question of income exists. We do not set a policeman's salary on the basis of the income of the police department. We don't set the salary of men who work for the FBI on the basis of the income received through the FBI. The Post Office Department renders a general public service for which the public generally must pay. The Postmaster General seems obsessed with the idea that the Post Office Department must be self-sustaining. If it is to be self-sustaining, then I suggest that Mr. Summerfield speak to the owners of publications like Life, Time, the Saturday Evening Post, Look, and others. They are the ones who do a great deal to create the deficit. But neither they nor the Federal employees should be charged with making up the deficit.

In these last years, there has been a greatly increased productivity on the part of postal employees. Frequently, wages are kept down because of inadequate productivity. Commitantly, they should be raised where

increased productivity occurs. Postal employees have, in recent years, almost doubled their value and services in their workload and benefit to the public generally. It is estimated that a single employee handled 20 percent more mail per year in 1952 than in 1938.

One cannot exaggerate the importance of the work of our postal employees. They benefit immeasurably our industry, commerce, education, religions, politics, and our cultural development. We dare not be pinch-penny nor niggardly in our approach to an evaluation of the monetary value of their services.

Azusa, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, after years of ribbing by radio comedians and others, Azusa, Calif., has been recognized by the august New York Times.

I am proud to say that Azusa is in my congressional district and is one of the fastest growing cities in southern California.

Rich in historical lore, Azusa has passed through a transition from a Spanish rancho to an orange-growing area which is rapidly giving way to subdivisions of well-kept homes owned by the people who live in them. Azusa is also contributing to national defense with its mushrooming industrial plants.

The following is an article by Mr. Gladwin Hill, Los Angeles correspondent of the New York Times, which appeared in that newspaper on Sunday, February 13, 1955:

THE REAL AZUSA—TOWN EVEN OLDER THAN RADIO COMICS' JOKE
(By Gladwin Hill)

AZUSA, CALIF.—Tourists approaching Los Angeles on transcontinental U. S. 66 may be surprised to find themselves going through this town, which many people have thought must be a figment of radio comedians' imaginations. Actually, it is a flourishing community 25 miles east of Los Angeles.

Azusa boosters say their town has "everything from A to Z in the U. S. A." And in fact its activities range from that ancient pursuit of agriculture (it is a citrus center) to the plant of the Aerojet Engineering Corporation.

It is not true, however, that the town's name was concocted from this slogan by a fireball real estate promoter. The name far antedates real estate promoters.

There is one school of thought that the name came from an Indian dialect word variously spelled "Asuksumvit," "Asuksagna" and "Azuncsabit," but all meaning "place of skunks." It has no conspicuous concentration of skunks today. But the name Azusa Valley has been traced back as far as chronicles of the 1769 explorations of Gaspar de Portola.

LAND LITIGATION

Azusa is the gateway to beautiful San Gabriel Canyon, where gold was discovered in 1854. But the strike petered out within a

decade, and the prospectors hurried on to the Mother Lode country of northern California.

A community entitled Mound City was laid out on the site in 1857, but never got off the ground. The area languished pastorally until the 1880's, when an English immigrant, Henry Dalton, bought a 12,000-acre tract that was part of an old Spanish land grant.

Protracted litigation with the United States Government, however, concluded with the ruling that title to the land, as a result of the transition from Mexican to United States sovereignty, was not clear. The area was opened up to homesteading. Dalton, to pay his litigation expenses, had to give up all his holdings except one 55-acre tract. It looked picayune then, but is nothing to sneeze at today. (Dalton's grandson is one of Azusa's leading citizens.)

Meanwhile Jonathan S. Slauson, the Los Angeles banker who had backed Dalton and acquired the property, laid out the present town of Azusa. People stood in line all night to buy lots, and paid as much as \$15,000 for them—and express no regrets at having done so.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at \$1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

The United States Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are proudly congratulating a great conservation agency—the United States Forest Service—in celebrating, this month, its golden anniversary.

The accomplishments of this fine organization as it pioneered in improving, maintaining, and protecting our forests and streams have benefited our people from coast to coast. We are proud of this quiet, hard-working, competent group.

It is my pleasure here to throw a little light on one of the many outstanding groups in the Forest Service organization. The headquarters of the Forest Service's Southern Forest Experiment Station is located at my home, New Orleans. The southern station was established in 1921 when only a few visionary people looked upon timber as a replaceable resource. The station has been, and continues to be, a sturdy guidepost for good forestry in the loblolly- and shortleaf-pine forests of the mid-South, the hardwoods of the Arkansas and Tennessee uplands, the delta hardwoods, and the longleaf- and slash-pine lands of the lower South.

Research at the southern station has helped make possible the tremendous pine-planting program underway in the South. The contribution of the forest survey in determining the extent, volume, and condition of southern forest lands and in appraising probable future timber requirements has been of inestimable value to wood-using industries and in stabilizing communities. Research in the growth and economic possibilities of farm woodlands is showing the way toward an improved standard of living for thousands of small farm-forest landowners.

Yes; the foresters of the southern station are doing a great job—but they have an even greater job yet to do.

The census people say that as a nation we are now using more industrial wood and wood products than ever before. We sometimes forget that in addition to lumber, plywood, poles, crossties, and piling, many of our everyday commodities come from wood—paper, boxes, rayon, cellophane and plastics, to name just a few. And each year new products are added to the list. The census people further tell us there are 164 million people in the United States, and that in less than 20 years the figure will be raised to 210 million. Forty-six million

more Americans will be demanding more and more wood.

Where are we to get this wood? There is no doubt about it, our forests from Oregon down to Louisiana and up to Maine must be managed at their best to meet the demand. Within our Southland, the region with one of the greatest forest potentials is the Longleaf Slash Pine Belt. This region blessed with high rainfall and long growing season lies across the lower South from east Texas and Louisiana to Georgia and Florida—50 million acres of some of the best timberland in America, but 50 million acres growing trees at less than one-fourth capacity. These capable lands are growing 20 good trees where they should be growing 100.

America can no longer afford the luxury of idle, or even half-idle, land. America needs the wood and the people of the forest communities need the steady jobs—steady jobs that productive forests can offer.

The lower South supports a growing population of 10 million people—people who have lived on the land in the past—people who are inseparable from the land in the future. Yet, in this era of general prosperity there are still many unstable communities in the Longleaf Slash Pine Belt—communities with submarginal incomes.

Good forestry and forest research are making great strides. Much has been accomplished, but many tough problems remain. The extensive planting of southern pines has been a real help, but the problems go much deeper. For example, we need better ways of using or removing low-quality and worthless weed trees now encumbering southern forests. Important forest management research in the longleaf-slash pine forests of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Florida must be continued and strengthened to keep pace with the requirements of southern industrial development.

More and more people are becoming familiar with the many pine seedling nurseries throughout the South, with the tremendous job they are doing and have left to complete. Last year 60 million pine seedlings were grown in Louisiana alone, yet at the present rate of planting it will take more than 50 years to do the job. Research and industry together must find ways to speed the task of reforestation—perhaps by planting seeds directly on areas needing restocking instead of seedlings grown in nurseries and by finding ways of making our best trees produce more seed.

Another problem is the growth of longleaf pine—one of the finest timber trees in the world. Longleaf seedlings often grow less than a foot in height during their first 10 years. This delay costs the South colossal volumes of wood

annually—wood that could provide steady jobs for the people in the forests and in the mills. If research can solve the problem, the solution will be a spectacular achievement with Southwide application.

Most of the beef cattle in the lower South graze part or all of the year on forest ranges. Although these forest ranges produce tons of grass and good grazing, meat production per animal is too low. We need more efficient ways to convert this grass to beef, and we must also learn how to profitably raise timber and cattle simultaneously.

Forestry is not the mere growing of trees. If America is to remain strong, our forests must produce high-quality materials—both timber and forage, and in large volumes, in the shortest possible time. Pulp and paper mills are playing a greater and greater part in the southern forest economy. Less than 20 years ago, only 31 paper mills were operating in the South. Today there are 67 and more are under construction. What is the impact of these mills? We must learn how to grow and how to use our forests to supply the demands of both pulp mills and sawmills.

These are just a few of the problems that we are counting on the Forest Service to help solve. Forests mean jobs and payrolls. The history of the world has shown that depleted forests and depleted nations go hand in hand. But thanks to men of vision, America's forests are a renewable resource managed for permanency. We congratulate the Forest Service at its golden anniversary—and we expect even greater accomplishments during the next 50 years.

Residual Oil Versus Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Charles P. Taft, president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, testified before the Committee on Ways and Means and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, he took it upon himself to act as the champion for the entire foreign trade program, and in doing so belittled the effects which the importation of oil and glass in competition with domestic industry and labor was having upon our national economy.

Mr. Taft, in his appearance before these committees as president of the Committee for a National Trade Policy,

although he did not mention it, was not entirely unselfish in his presentation. Mr. Taft, if he is not now, has been in the past, registered as the agent for a foreign government representing the government of Venezuela and the Venezuelan Chamber of Commerce. Therefore, when, in Mr. Taft's statement, he devotes some very specific, pointed remarks to the efforts of the coal industry to obtain relief from the damaging imports of foreign oil which have greatly reduced coal's market on the east coast, he joins in a very well organized and highly financed campaign being conducted by some of the richest and most powerful oil companies, to destroy vital segments of our industry.

Mr. Taft, as well as other spokesmen for the major oil companies, seven of whom control the entire world petroleum market, attempt to belittle, discredit, and destroy an industry that supplies the Nation's biggest source of energy that keeps the electric power and steel industries operating, and which is the keystone of the prosperity of the railroad, chemical, and other related industries.

The coal industry, in an appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee which is now considering a proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, testified that the coal industry must have a quota limitation on residual fuel oil imports if it is to remain competitive in the large east coast energy market. The coal industry has not asked for absolute elimination of the imports of foreign oil. The request has been modest and only asks that the House committee write into the Trade Agreements Bill, and that Congress vote it, an amendment limiting foreign oil imports, including residual oil imports, to 10 percent of the domestic demand for petroleum products in the corresponding quarter of the previous year. Such a formula would mean only that the level of imports that would be permitted would be the same as the level of imports which prevailed during the post-war period from 1946 to 1951.

I support that request as reasonable—so do a growing number of my colleagues.

The reaction of the oil industry spokesmen, including Mr. Taft, has been one of hysterical denunciation of the coal industry. In addition, the oil industry spokesmen and Mr. Taft have made statements and quoted figures, in attempts to disparage the coal industry's contention, which are deliberately misleading.

In his statement before this committee, Mr. Taft asked for all the facts, "not the selected ones which coal spokesmen and their auxiliaries bring to this committee." Then Mr. Taft cited facts of his own which add up to half-truths and untruths. Mr. Taft asks for facts. Well, let us have the facts about the amount of coal displaced by oil imports. Coal producers and coal shippers, shipping to industries and public utilities on the east coast, know the reason for the discontinuance of these shipments to their East customers. As an example, a coal producer or shipper has an order with an industry for a certain tonnage of coal.

He is notified that shipments must be discontinued. He is given the reason; if not, he requests it. Now, by simple addition, the total number of tons of coal displaced, added up, totals approximately 32 million tons per year. It is just as simple as that, and it is accurate.

The coal industry does not need the juggling of figures as to railroads and natural gas and light fuels, and the tonnage lost to other industries. I do not know what "other industries" mean, nor do I know what he means by "light fuels." But the facts are as I have stated above about the loss of tonnage.

Does Mr. Taft think for one moment the amount of residual oil being shipped to the United States is not displacing coal at all? What is being done with it? What is the purpose of shipping it then?

He said that heavy residual fuel oil consumption increased by only 11 million tons coal equivalent in the United States between 1947 and 1953. Actually, the increase of foreign residual fuel oil—including that refined from foreign crudes—increased from 17 million tons coal equivalent in 1946 to 47 million tons coal equivalent in 1954, or an increase of 30 million tons.

The fact is that foreign fuel oil represents a type of competition without end or limit, with the capacity—through dump pricing and shifting the cost to other oil products—to drive coal completely off the east coast. Foreign oil has taken over approximately 50 percent of the coal competitive energy market on the east coast.

Mr. Taft said shutting out residual oil would definitely hurt American manufacturers in 30 States employing 30,000 people in manufacturing for export to Venezuela. But the damage already done to the coal industry has contributed to a decline of employment in American coal mining from 400,000 men in 1950 to 214,000 in 1954, has cost the coal miners \$81 million in wages or the equivalent of 25,000 jobs for 1 year, and cost railroad labor \$44 million in wages. Approximately 75,000 miners went off the payrolls in 1954 alone.

Mr. Taft said that the real employment problem in coal mining is the turn to strip mining which he said accounts for fully 25 percent of total bituminous production. Actually, strip mining production in 1953—the latest year for which statistics are available—represent only 23.1 percent of the total national production of bituminous coal. In 1947, strip-mine production represented 22.1 percent of the total national production—an increase of only 1 percent in 6 years. These facts are certainly far different from those presented by Mr. Taft in support of his misinformation that "the real employment problem in coal mining is the turn to strip mining."

The number of strip mines has declined from 1,750 in 1947 to 1,554 in 1953; production has declined from 139,395,000 tons in 1947 to 105,448,000 tons in 1953 and the number of men employed in strip mines has fallen from 43,338 in 1947 to 31,088 in 1953.

Mr. Taft says, "This is a technological change opposed as vigorously by the

United Mine Workers as is the importation of residual oil, but with less publicity."

The United Mine Workers do not oppose, never have, technological changes. Their vigorous opposition of strip mining has been against the nonunion strip miners. Historically the United Mine Workers have encouraged technological improvements in coal mining. It is exemplified by the fact in the United States the average production of coal per day is 8 tons. In England and on the Continent where these changes were opposed by the union, the average is 1½ tons per man per day.

At the mine the cost is lower than it is abroad.

Mr. Taft in his statement, implied that with a bituminous coal production of 400 million tons in 1954, the addition of only 70 million tons would be ample for this country's war needs. The actual facts do not support Mr. Taft's statement. In the first year of World War II, the requirements for coal rose 130 million tons and coal supplied 82 percent of the grand total added energy needs in the first year of the war. Likewise, Mr. Taft failed to mention that in World War II the supplies of foreign oil on the east coast received by tanker, dropped 93 percent as a result of submarine sinkings.

Seemingly, Mr. Taft attempts to present himself as a technical expert in coal production when he says "existing mines by going to a full week without overtime, could add 150 to 200 million tons a year." Mr. Taft assumes that the current production capacity of the bituminous coal industry is 670 million tons annually. That figure is for 1953 and it ignores completely the current availability of manpower and the condition of the necessary machinery and equipment to produce coal. Between October 1953 and October 1954, according to the Bureau of Mines, there was a reduction of 74,000 miners. The Bureau of Mines figure of capacity is directly related to days worked and number of employees. With the indicated reduction of employees by 27 percent, the potential capacity is cut proportionately. On that basis mine capacity as of October 1954 would have been more nearly at less than 500 million tons.

As a matter of fact, as of now the anticipated coal mine production for 1955 is much less than 500 million tons—more nearly 400 million tons.

Mr. Taft makes the categorical statement "that there is no evidence that shutting out residual oil helps coal," and then he continues with a personal observation that he personally found "that the mines in southern Kentucky and Tennessee on the Southern Railroad at least, had no competition from residual oil since the last reduction in freight rates down there." These statements are wholly untrue. In the first place, foreign oil today potentially displaces 32 million tons of coal equivalent, principally in the east coast energy markets. In fact, through operation of various price understandings and market agreements within the oil cartel, bituminous coal is now virtually wiped out of the

east coast energy market, and if the flood of imported oil continues, it will be wholly eliminated. The present coal displacement by foreign oil represents approximately 25 percent of the total production of coal in the principal coal mining States of West Virginia and Pennsylvania, and such a tonnage reduction sponsors a chain reaction which affects the entire coal producing areas.

Mr. Taft's statement regarding the mines in southern Kentucky and Tennessee is contradicted by the President of the Southern Appalachian Coal Operators Association, which is made up of the coal mine owners in southern Kentucky and Tennessee, who in a telegram to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, says:

Regarding Mr. Taft's testimony that coal mines Southern Appalachian area particularly those located on Southern Railway have been materially helped in competition with residual oil by reduction in freight rates. Reduced freight rates have helped a few cases in competition with natural gas but cannot find in any instance of help in competition with residual oil sufficient to regain or hold coal in these seaboard markets.

The record shows that residual fuel oil imports are being dumped primarily in one geographic area, namely the east coast, the heart of our industrial arsenal. This foreign residual oil originates in the main from Venezuela, which today is living on a level of prosperity unequalled by any section of the United States, principally because the majority of the income in Venezuela is derived from taxes amounting to 50 percent of the value of the petroleum products which it exports—90 percent to the United States.

It is time for the Congress to end the folly of destroying a major portion of our domestic industry, namely coal mining and domestic oil production, with unreasonable and excessive importations of foreign oils. Further, it is time for the oil industry spokesmen, including Mr. Taft, to temper presentations, such as that made before these committees, with some factual research and reasonableness so that the consideration of their own selfish interests might be leavened somewhat by a respect for American businessmen and workers, who today are being seriously and vitally affected economically by trade advantages granted to foreign nations.

The Brilliant and Beneficial 40-Year Record of Service of International Kiwanis, 1915 to 1955—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as an honorary member of the Southwest Los Angeles Kiwanis Club, I take pleasure in including in my remarks the 40-year record of service to mankind of the International Kiwanis Club.

It has been an unselfish service of the greatest good to the greatest number which has made life better for everyone it has touched.

I am proud to be associated with such a fine group of loyal Americans.

Part I of the record follows:

Nineteen hundred and fifteen was the sunrise period for Kiwanis, the year an exciting new idea entered the lives of a few business and professional men in Detroit and in Cleveland, Ohio. Allen S. Browne, a professional organizer, set about forming a mutual-interest club for Detroit businessmen. The first one he signed up was a merchant tailor named Joe France. Then, in swift succession, came Harry Cowden, Charles Young, Don Johnston, and George Haas. With over 100 other pioneers they set up the first club. Like ripples spreading outward in a still pond, Kiwanis expanded beyond the limits of the community where it was born. Later in that same eventful year, Cleveland businessmen found the Kiwanis idea had a magic appeal. They too set up a club and thus established the universality of what was soon to become an international movement. The mists of four decades obscure those formative months, and today we view our beginnings with a sense of awe. We must marvel at the thin thread of probability which held the whole proposition together in spite of certain personal difficulties that threatened more than once to capsize Kiwanis. Perhaps faith is a better word than probability. For it was faith in a broad ideal, as yet largely undefined, that guided those early Kiwanians.

Nineteen hundred and sixteen saw Kiwanis grow from 2 to 32 clubs. One of those was in Hamilton, Ontario, and its founding made Kiwanis International. Dimly aware of the implications of their birth, these new clubs were touched with human curiosity about the Kiwanis clubs and Kiwanians—some said "Keewaniisers"—in other cities. Out of this vague desire to know each other came the first convention, held in Cleveland. A constitution was drawn up and international officers were chosen.

Nineteen hundred and seventeen: The speed with which Kiwanis spread from community to community confounded even those who had given birth to the original idea. A second convention was held in Detroit. The delegates decided that their emblem would be the words "Kiwanis Club" enclosed in a double circle. The international president was reelected—the only such occurrence in Kiwanis history. A conflict was shaping up between those who believed Kiwanis should be materialistic and others who felt the urge to serve.

Nineteen hundred and eighteen: The official magazine described Kiwanis thus: "Its purpose is personal advantage. Its advantage is social advantage." The armistice came, and Kiwanis counted 353 casualties out of a total membership of 10,000. O. Sam Cummings was elected as the first full-time international secretary and a two-room headquarters was established in Chicago. The magazine was overhauled and Roe Fulkerson became editor. From this vantage point, he was to exert a powerful influence on Kiwanis thinking.

Nineteen hundred and nineteen: At the historic Birmingham convention, Kiwanis "bought itself" from Allen S. Browne who had, until that time, exercised much control. The price raised by pledges on the convention floor: \$17,500. Alert to the threat of communism, some Kiwanians conducted an "America for Americans" campaign which, according to one observer, "drove the Red agitators mad." A non-member observed: "Kiwanians are boosters of the most eloquent type. A pessimist cannot live long in their atmosphere."

Nineteen hundred and twenty: A decade of phenomenal expansion was beginning. There were 267 clubs and 28,500 members, and across the continent the new organization with an Indian name was capturing the fancy of business and professional men. A club-building tempo was begun which was to set an all-time record. At the Portland convention, Kiwanis adopted as its motto the meaningful phrase "We Build." The first Canadian international president held office during part of this year.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-one: The exciting concept of community service was sweeping the young organization. This found expression in certain broad policies which were beginning to emerge. Great emphasis was being placed on the development of rural-urban cooperation, public affairs and work with underprivileged children. A second international secretary, Fred C. W. Parker, began what was to be a 20-year period of service. Two hundred and sixty-nine new clubs, a record number, were built during 1921-22.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-two: The first observance of United States-Canada Day was held in April and this highlighted a growing Kiwanis emphasis on the need for international understanding. Toward this end the international convention was held in Toronto and a Canadian was elected international president. The present system of district organization was shaping up. Kiwanis adopted officially a set of administrative policies to guide clubs in their activities. In later years these became known as objectives and were to be used widely.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-three: Realizing the need for a revised set of rules and standards, Kiwanis issued the official call for a constitutional convention to be held the following year in Denver, Colo. Months ahead of the meeting ideas were simmering throughout Kiwanis. Clubs on both sides of the border were enthused about a memorial to Kiwanian Warren G. Harding, a charter member of the Marion, Ohio, club. Kiwanians in many clubs gave money to finance the project, which cost \$44,559.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-four: During this important year much of the growing organization's thought and energies were devoted to drafting a workable legal framework. Out of the 1924 constitutional convention came these lasting results: (1) The six unchanging objects; (2) the organization machinery through which Kiwanis International now operates. This included creation of the International Council and defining the functions of major committees. (3) Kiwanis International became the official name.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-five: The first Key Club was founded in Sacramento, Calif. Few realized the significance of this event, which was to burgeon into the largest single continuing Kiwanis activity after World War II. The International Council convened in Chicago, and for the first time governors-elect assembled to plan in advance for their administrations. Similar meetings subsequently developed on the club and district levels. The Harding international goodwill memorial was dedicated in Vancouver.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-six: The rapid growth of Kiwanis was emphasized by 2 things that happened during 1926: (1) Membership climbed to almost 100,000, which caused Kiwanians to realize the importance of their role in the service club movement. (2) The largest Kiwanis convention to date was held at Montreal. A total of 5,248 men and women registered, representing 1,546 clubs. For the first time the term "Objectives" was used to define those broad service categories to which clubs were directing their energies.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-seven: The end of prosperity seemed nowhere in sight, and the spirit of happy optimism prevailed.

Kiwanis clubs in the United States were helping the Dominion of Canada celebrate her diamond jubilee. Youth work, public affairs and rural-urban cooperation were assuming ever greater importance. The International Board authorized a system of field service contracts to determine the problems of existing clubs. This was to prove of great value during the depression.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight: The leaders of Kiwanis International saw increasing evidence of the need to help club and district officers bring the broad Kiwanis service program to focus in every Kiwanis community. For this reason the present comprehensive leadership training setup was established. As a result, Kiwanis has since paced the whole service club movement in leadership training. This ascendancy has been reflected, through the years, in the steadily increasing Kiwanis community services.

Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine: The degree of Kiwanis interest in underprivileged child work was revealed in a survey made public in 1929. It showed that 95 percent of all clubs were carrying on UPC projects. The stock market crash cast an ominous shadow over Kiwanis. For the first time the young organization faced the gloomy prospect of a membership loss as business conditions worsened. To survive, Kiwanis began trimming its sails—by strengthening leadership and service programs on club and district levels.

Nineteen hundred and thirty: Hard times halted the steady membership growth which had been registered every year since 1915. The actual loss of less than 1,000 men cut the Kiwanis roster to 102,811. As an antidote to the hard times, emphasis was placed upon the organization's widening service program. Administratively, it was a period of belt tightening. Officers were more conscious than ever of the need to reduce costs and at the same time increase service to clubs. This set a pattern which still prevails.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-one: Old man depression killed only one Kiwanis club this year, but he claimed as casualties some 5,000 Kiwanians. The general office moved to its present location in what was then the undeveloped outskirts of Chicago's main business district. In an effort to broaden their already widespread youth program, Kiwanians adopted a new objective dealing with both boys and girls work. This paved the way for Kiwanis activity in fields outside of the underprivileged category.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-two: "Back to the Birthplace—Forward in Kiwanis," was the convention theme as Kiwanians gathered in Detroit for the second time since the founding 17 years before. A serious but enthusiastic group of conventioners swung behind their leaders to launch a new and vigorous attack on the depression. This included programs of morale building, support to schools, stabilizing employment, economy in government, and furtherance of good citizenship.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-three: The President and Congress of the United States formally recognized "I Am an American Day," which Kiwanis had originated. Everyone was enthusiastic about the book titled "Outline for Citizenship," written by the international president. The appalling severity of the great depression was reflected in the membership figures, which reached a low point of 79,589 before resuming their traditional upward course. Kiwanis not only survived; the lean years prepared the way for a great expansion.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-four: "The dark clouds of doubt are scurrying away," declared the international president, viewing the national scene. "There is a stimulating freshness in the air. Membership is increasing by leaps and bounds." Indeed, the tide had turned. Membership jumped

4,000 and only 1 club was lost during this year. And at the 1934 Toronto convention, club delegates heard these inspiring words: "Kiwanis has been tested by these difficult times, and we are grateful that it has not been found wanting."

The Brilliant and Beneficial 40-Year Record of Service of International Kiwanis, 1915 to 1955—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the following is a continuation of the record of International Kiwanis during the past 40 years previously referred to:

Nineteen hundred and thirty-five: The increasing interest in churches began to take recognizable form. Kiwanians were talking about some sort of regular program for support of churches in their spiritual aims. Kiwanis observed its 20th anniversary with 1,858 clubs and some 86,000 members. Twelve Canadian clubs joined with New England Kiwanians in laying the first Kiwanis peace tablet on the United States-Canadian boundary. Since then 25 others have been dedicated, attesting to the friendship between our nations.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-six: The President of the United States made an appearance at the international convention in Washington, D. C., where he saluted 4,037 visitors for the active role Kiwanis was playing in the fight against the retreating depression. A prominent part of this vigorous program was the open forums Kiwanis was sponsoring to promote thought and action on public questions such as the use of leisure time, business stabilization, and administration of relief and other Government services brought about by the hard times.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-seven: Clubs reported more than 30,000 separate service projects, giving dramatic meaning to the annual theme: "Kiwanis builds better communities." The system for reporting club projects developed in this period was the foundation for the present method of tabulating activities by Kiwanis International. These carefully recorded totals serve as an index of current trends in club thought and action. Kiwanis began plans for a foundation to administer bequests made to international.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-eight: Kiwanis services continued expanding year after year. Nineteen hundred and thirty-eight saw an increase of 17 percent in club activities. The 2,000th club was formed. The international convention was held in San Francisco and delegates were voicing the theme "The Golden Gate in thirty-eight." The first key club district was established in Florida. Sixty-five affiliated key clubs were included in what was actually the beginning of the Kiwanis-type administrative pattern for key clubs.

Nineteen hundred and thirty-nine: Once again the world went to war. Canada stood with Britain in opposing Nazi aggression and thus cast aside the pursuits of peace to defend the principle of freedom. Under these conditions, Kiwanis appropriately began observing United States-Canada Good-Will Week every year instead of biennially, as in the past. On the verge of its silver anniversary, Kiwanis was also on the eve of a wartime renaissance which was to heighten its

vitality, broaden its horizons and win the organization public acclaim.

Nineteen hundred and forty: To celebrate its 25th anniversary, Kiwanis International laid a wreath on the grave of Joe Prance, the first Kiwanian, and put up a plaque at Detroit's Griswold Hotel, where the first club met. Twenty-five silver dollars adorned the huge birthday cake at the silver anniversary banquet in Detroit. Meanwhile, Canadian clubs were providing entertainment, food and other services for fighting men. There were 2,099 clubs and 109,856 Kiwanians.

Nineteen hundred and forty-one: Pearl Harbor brought the United States into the war to which she had been morally committed by her common bond with the freedom-loving peoples. The International president mobilized the vast resources of Kiwanis over a nationwide radio hookup, then arranged a meeting between heads of the major service clubs to see how all could make the utmost contribution. International Secretary Parker retired after 20 years of service. Kiwanis moved swiftly into a broad emergency program.

Nineteen hundred and forty-two: At its last full convention till the end of hostilities, Kiwanis pledged itself to "morale building for the war effort." More than morale was built by energetic Kiwanians on the home front, however. They started collecting scrap rubber and metal, sponsoring victory gardens, marshalling blood donations, entertaining troops and watching over the dependents of men who were fighting overseas. The new International secretary helped coordinate the swiftly growing Kiwanis victory effort.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three: Because of wartime travel restrictions, a limited convention was held in Chicago. Although the attendance was a fraction of normal, the spirit of Kiwanis burned at white heat. "Victory! By United Effort—By Individual Service" was a theme admirably suited to the present activities of Kiwanis. (By war's end, clubs had sold an average of more than \$70,000 war bonds each.) Kiwanis was sending a newsy, monthly bulletin called "Contact" to all of the 15,000 Kiwanians in service.

Nineteen hundred and forty-four: Membership climbed to an alltime high of 132,005 as Kiwanians labored for a common goal: "All Out for Victory." Kiwanis meetings became important community forums where wartime problems were discussed. With victory in sight, Kiwanians redoubled their efforts on the home front, performing an astounding number of vital services. Kiwanis was represented by official observers at the United Nations conference, which millions hoped would lead to never-ending world peace.

Nineteen hundred and forty-five: Kiwanis was keyed to victory with the theme: "Win the War—Build for Peace." The final totals for wartime service showed that Kiwanis clubs had sold over \$2 billion worth of war bonds and stamps, collected more than 3 million tons of valuable scrap and contacted over 6 million members of the Armed Forces by letter and other means. The Legion of Honor was established to recognize the contribution made by men who had served Kiwanis for 25 or more years.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six: Kiwanis clubs were formed in Alaska and the Yukon Territory, and membership increased by almost 15,000 during the first full year of peace. A record crowd of 9,346 came to Atlantic City for the gala victory convention. Kiwanis was protesting against the continuation of wartime controls which were widely considered as a barrier to recovery. Key club became a full-fledged part of the Kiwanis program, with its own international structure paralleling that of Kiwanis.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven: Kiwanis built more than 200 new clubs, 3 of

them in Hawaii. Sentiment was growing in favor of outlawing lotteries in connection with Kiwanis projects. International President Jay N. Emerson died on the eve of the great Chicago convention. He was the first president to pass away while in office. Some Kiwanians were considering the need for a Kiwanis-sponsored organization for college men. Called Circle K, the new idea was beginning to gather force and direction.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight: The longstanding Kiwanis interest in preservation of freedom found expression in the *It's Fun To Live in America* and *It's Great To Be a Canadian* pamphlet series produced by Kiwanis International. Clubs circulated more than 16,200,000 of these folders. Our awareness of the realities of world leadership was reflected in the growing number of public affairs activities. Much interest was shown in the United Nations, housing, universal military training, and other vital matters.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine: Kiwanis sponsored its first congressional dinner in Washington, D. C., honoring Kiwanians in the highest branches of Federal Government. Since then Kiwanis has sponsored similar meetings every 2 years. (Testimonials for Canadian legislators are held on alternate years.) The first Kids' Day was held, with 1,239 clubs participating. The 3,000th Kiwanis club was formed in the city of Lancaster, New Brunswick. The Freedoms Foundation cited our *It's Fun To Live in America* series.

Nineteen hundred and fifty: The International board adopted a long-range goal of 250,000 members and 4,000 clubs by the 40th anniversary in Cleveland. Floods inundated Canada's Red River Valley. In a spontaneous gesture of international good will, some 457 clubs on both sides of the border contributed money for flood relief. Newfoundland had recently joined the Dominion of Canada, and in 1950 the first Kiwanis club was built on this northern island.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one: Another war—this one in Korea—inspired a new degree of national and community service. For the third time in Kiwanis history, clubs were busy selling war bonds, conducting blood and conservation drives. The growing awareness of communism's menace was emphasized by the international president and reflected in the number of club services aimed at preserving and strengthening the established way of life. In this category, the *It's Fun To Live in America* series was adapted for radio.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two: The international convention in Seattle was highlighted by a vigorous assault on certain internal forces which "threatened the integrity of the Constitution of the United States." Kiwanis clubs joined together in a massive effort to get out the vote for a nationwide United States election. Under the banner of the ballot battalion, hundreds of clubs worked alone and with other local organizations to stimulate public awareness of the basic issues and then to bring voters to the polls.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three: The international convention in New York City set the alltime attendance record with 11,532 Kiwanis people registering. Sessions were held in Madison Square Garden. Delegates decided once more against extending Kiwanis into foreign countries. Circle K, the Kiwanis-sponsored organization for college men, was expanding steadily. Hundreds of clubs joined in supporting Radio Free Europe, a private anti-Communist network which broadcasts the truth to people behind the Iron Curtain.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-four: A historic development was the decision by an overwhelming majority of clubs to construct a permanent home office for Kiwanis International. Extension boomed, and more new clubs were built than in any 1-year period

since 1922. Membership moved steadily forward toward the quarter-million mark. A second series of pamphlets called the Minuteman enjoyed a circulation exceeding 6 million copies as part of the continuing Kiwanis program of strengthening the national heritage. Some 1,400 radio stations were using Kiwanis religious radio recordings. Hundreds of clubs were taking part in the nationwide crusade for traffic safety. Kiwanians were making an organized effort to understand the complex farm problems which affect farm and city. Kids' day was held under Kiwanis sponsorship with 2,000 clubs participating. Vocational guidance reasserted its importance as a Kiwanis program with many clubs emphasizing this type of service. As 1954 drew to a close, there was a growing awareness that the year ahead, while marking 40 years of growth, would also mark 40 years of preparation for tomorrow.

OBJECTIVES FOR 1955

1. Enhance the spiritual life of our people, giving active support to churches.
2. Champion human dignity, individual initiative, and free enterprise.
3. Help to make our schools the finest possible training grounds for responsible citizenship.
4. Sponsor community activities and strengthen homes to combat delinquency and guide our boys and girls to sound maturity.
5. Work for effective highway safety.
6. Elect, support, and recognize worthy public officials.
7. Provide leadership in the conservation and development of our natural resources.
8. Maintain and foster friendship, understanding, and cooperation between Canada and the United States.
9. Strive with all our power to promote world peace and strengthen the United Nations.
10. Make our 40th anniversary of service a challenge for greater achievement.

FORWARD IN KIWANIS

We have all been traveling down a road together. Arm in arm, we have moved from 1 milestone to the next until today we find ourselves at No. 40. Here the road forks. One branch is straight and level. It goes on and on until the road is lost in the mist.

The other fork winds upward over narrow ridges and chasms. The grade is steep. The way is sometimes clogged with boulders. But it leads to the summit of the towering mountain—this we can see.

Which road shall we take as we venture on beyond 40? The smooth pathway that leads to nowhere? Or the rough one which will, with God's grace, carry us to a commanding height of land?

This, my friends, is the choice before Kiwanis on our 40th birthday.

One path—the easy one—is tempting. But if we choose to tread its course, old age will have set in upon us. For the sake of our own ease and comfort, will we be content to jog along, enjoying a pleasant, placid journey to oblivion?

The other course then? Looking up this pathway, we know the climb will be rugged. But even from where we stand we can see that the goal—the snow-capped summit—will be worth attaining. The choice before us was also the choice of the pioneers who built our two nations. A century ago they were crossing the plains in lumbering Conestoga wagons laden with children, furniture, and courage. After weeks of endless prairie they saw the mountains shimmering in the distance. The land through which they passed was fertile. Game was plentiful. And the pioneers' bones ached from months of jarring travel.

The temptation was to take the easy course—to stop and avoid the trails that lay ahead. Some did unload their wagons, build their homes and break the virgin prairie sod.

But others—most of the others—kept on going. They took the rugged road that led through howling mountain passes, Indian ambushes, deep snows, and treacherous cliffs. Some faltered. Many died. But a thin stream of civilization trickled over the mountains and two new nations reached the outward limits of their destiny.

The lesson seems clear: The easy road, the way of least resistance, is not worth taking. By following the rugged path of challenge we continue to be worthy of those many men whose pioneering efforts have built our nations and our beloved Kiwanis.

The rugged road means ever-expanding service: More children saved from poor health and delinquency. More towns salvaged, by civic alertness, from strangulation. More religious faith established in the hearts of millions. More courageous citizenship that defies corruption. And more dynamic leadership for the free world.

This is the difficult road, but it leads straight to freedom, the shimmering goal of all men since time began.

This is the path for Kiwanis! After 40 years of climbing up the rugged trail we shall not turn away down the sluggard's road. They say that life begins at 40. My Kiwanis friends, our life is truly beginning if we, at 40, have the courage to choose the path of continued challenge.

DAN E. ENGDAHL,
President, Kiwanis International.

Peace Campaign and a War Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an article written by Marquis Childs appearing in the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* of February 16, 1953.

While I do not challenge or disagree with this observation the concluding sentence of Mr. Childs' article could well and correctly have been "That is, indeed, an extraordinary example of patriotism—particularly by the Democrats."

I feel confident Mr. Childs would not oppose this amendment.

The article follows:

PEACE CAMPAIGN AND A WAR PLEDGE
(By Marquis Childs)

The remarkable demonstration of American unity on foreign policy which preceded the successful evacuation of the Tachen Islands is, as American officials are well aware, in marked contrast to the internal troubles of America's allies. With only five votes in the entire Congress in opposition to President Eisenhower's Formosa resolution, the world was put on notice that defense of the Pacific island chain considered essential to America's security is above politics.

The contrast with Western Europe is striking. France is going through another prolonged governmental crisis as one politician after another undertakes to form what will be, at best, a dubious coalition cabinet.

The Socialist and neutralist opposition to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer in West Germany is conducting an intensive campaign with demagogic overtones aimed at preventing ratification of the armament accords. Adenauer still has a great popular hold in Germany but the effort to undermine his

policy is not discounted, particularly in view of the new tough-talking policy in Moscow.

In Great Britain the Labor Party is united in opposition to America's Formosa policy. Clement Attlee, the Labor Party's former Prime Minister, has repeatedly called for turning the island over to the Communists. The Conservative Foreign Minister, Sir Anthony Eden, put his whole political future, including his chances of succeeding Prime Minister Churchill, in jeopardy by agreeing to go along with the American stand. Britain must hold elections in 1956.

Here in this Capital even those Members of Congress most apprehensive over the possible consequences of the Formosa resolution and the mutual defense pact with Chiang Kai-shek felt compelled, with few exceptions, to demonstrate national unity and vote with the President. What makes this all the more remarkable is that Republican strategists injected foreign policy into the congressional campaign last fall with emotional appeals that stirred the anger of Democratic candidates.

In the closing days of the campaign in advertisements, in newspapers, and on radio and television the Democrats were called the war party and the Republicans the peace party. In Illinois small-town dailies and weeklies were flooded with advertisements that began, "Vote Republican—the life you save may be your son's."

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, running for reelection, believed this last-minute peace campaign, which coincided with President Eisenhower's intensive airplane tour in key States, reduced his majority by 200,000. It is believed to have been influential in Ohio, Iowa, and Colorado where Democrats were defeated by narrow majorities.

While the advertisements were paid for by local Republican organizations their similarity indicates they were part of a carefully planned national campaign. Some of this propaganda had a peace-at-any-price ring to it, which is in strange contrast to the stern language of the President's message on Formosa. One advertisement listing the achievements of the administration concluded: "And all this done without war in Indochina and the useless war in Korea ended."

"The life of your son sacrificed on some foreign battlefield is too high a price to pay for inflated prosperity," was another advertisement widely used.

Others quoted from the President's 1952 and 1954 campaign statements with respect to the futile sacrifices of the Korean war. One advertisement appearing in many papers was a box score listing the casualties of World War I, 360,000; World War II, 571,000; and Korea, 142,000, with the Democrats in power. This ad concluded: "1954—peace—the Republican Party in power."

Another advertisement showed a scene of disaster with ambulances and wounded and dying strewn about. The caption was "Remember Nagasaki—it may be Elgin or Aurora (two neighboring Illinois towns) next time and you."

Injected at the last minute, this was difficult to answer. Many Democrats feel that it was much more effective than the personal smear of being soft on communism. The irony, of course, was that at the same time Republican strategists were using the soft-on-communism accusation they were also accusing the Democrats of being warmongers because they went to war, as in Korea, to stop communism. Yet, despite this campaign of only 4 months ago not a word of it came into the debate on a critical foreign policy issue. That is, indeed, an extraordinary example of unity.

Remarks of Robert H. Shields, President and General Counsel, United States Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D. C., at Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., on Sugar Beet Day Program, February 8, 1955

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following remarks of Robert H. Shields, president and general counsel, United States Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D. C., at Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., on February 8, 1955:

Three years ago I had the pleasure of appearing on your Sugar Beet Day program and I am honored indeed to be invited to come again.

In this centennial year of your great Michigan State College—the first State agricultural college established in America—we are especially aware of the heritage left to us by the pioneers of long ago, pioneers who dared to dream of the future and, more importantly, gave substance to their dreams.

As people long interested in the agricultural economy of Michigan, we today salute this institution not only for what it has done for the sugar-beet industry in the last 100 years but also for what it has done for all agriculture in this State and throughout the land.

And special tribute should also be paid on this occasion to the sugar-beet industry of Michigan which, in fact, is nearly 20 years older than Michigan State College. In 1837—the year Michigan became a State—pioneers in St. Joseph County organized one of the very first beet sugar companies in the United States.

History records the hardships and disappointments these and other pioneers suffered in trying to establish our industry in this country. And the great progress of our industry in the last 50 years would not have been possible without the persistence and determination of the pioneers of 50 and more years ago, whose repeated disappointments and failures merely doubled their resolve to plan and build for the future.

When I was here 3 years ago, the question in everybody's mind was the same as it is today: "Where do we go from here?" All the discussions on your program today—such topics as chemical weed control, spring mechanization, better beet varieties, and, above all, Director Turk's stimulating talk on Our Next Hundred Years—demonstrate that you are still addressing yourselves to the challenging future of this industry. You are continuously seeking ways to make it even more efficient and to help it contribute still more effectively to the food needs of this Nation.

In Washington we are concerned with the administrative and legislative facets of these and all other industry problems. But certainly the industry problem that is uppermost in everybody's mind on the Washington scene today is the problem of prospective sugar legislation.

As you know, the present law—the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended in 1951—expires December 31, 1956. Obviously, it must be amended and extended either in 1955 or 1956. Domestic sugar producers, foreign sugar suppliers, and the American sugar consumers can all plan more intelligently and with more confidence for the future if the Sugar Act is amended and extended in 1955.

Legislation is necessary this year to enable the sugar industry to go ahead with its current operations and future plans with a minimum of uncertainty. If the act is not extended in 1955, sugar-beet and cane farmers will not know at planting time this fall or next spring what the provisions of the Sugar Act will be when the time comes to market their sugar. The need for farm-management planning and continued investments in plant-modernization programs and long-range scientific investigations—which in the past half century enabled our industry to more than double its beet yield per acre and triple its sugar yield per acre—make action now all the more imperative.

The Sugar Act must also be amended this year to give the domestic beet and mainland cane areas some immediate relief—in 1955—from the economically impossible positions with which they are faced. They have been placed in those positions by a combination of the increasing yields per acre which technological advances have brought about and a temporary waiver, for Cuba's benefit, of the domestic areas, just and historic share of the American market.

Although annual sugar consumption in the United States has increased about a million tons since the Sugar Act of 1948 was passed, not one ounce of this increase has been added to the rigid marketing quotas of the domestic beet or mainland cane-sugar areas. And yet under the act these areas have always been subject to acreage restrictions and marketing controls. During the last 2 years these restrictive measures have been sharply applied.

In the mainland cane area, for example, acreage cuts of 10 and 8 percent, respectively, have been imposed in the last 2 years. Unless legislative relief is forthcoming in 1955, a further acreage cut of 30 percent would be required in order to bring stocks in line with normal carryover. This, of course, is unthinkable and as a practical matter is not possible.

The domestic beet-sugar area is also faced with a most difficult situation, in view of its fixed marketing quota of 1,800,000 tons. Production in 1953 was almost 1,900,000 tons. In 1954, with planted acreage held to a level below that of 20 years ago and with adverse weather conditions prevailing in important producing areas, domestic beet-sugar production was almost 2 million tons. In Michigan historical acreage factors have temporarily minimized the amount of sacrifice, but for the rest of the country acreage cuts of 10 to 15 percent have been ordered for this year for established beet growers. Other farmers, including many veterans on reclamation lands, will not be allowed to grow sugar beets at all. In spite of this reduction in planted acres, present beet-sugar stocks are at such levels that less than 10 percent of the total 1955 production can be marketed in 1955, instead of a normal 20 to 25 percent. In fact, for some processors virtually none of their share of 1955 production can be marketed in 1955.

Farmers this year are faced with substantial curtailment of acreage of several export crops we produce in surplus. I find it hard to justify as being in the national interest for farmers to be required to make sharp curtailments also in acreages of a crop of

which we import nearly half our annual needs.

I have mentioned that improved farming methods, technological advances, and the application of scientific research have more than doubled the beet tonnage per acre and tripled the yield of sugar per acre in the last 50 years. Tremendous strides have been made even since 1948, when the present Sugar Act became effective. The average beet yield per acre has increased almost 20 percent in that period—from 13.5 tons to 16 tons per acre. In some of the heaviest producing areas, like California, Oregon, and Washington, yields of 30 and more tons of beets to the acre are common.

Along with increasing yields, American sugar beet production has become highly mechanized. American beet farmers now can supply the raw material for 100 pounds of sugar with less time in the field than the farmers of any other sugar-producing nation in the world.

This kind of progress cannot be stopped in America. And it should not be stopped. It is obvious that the domestic beet and mainland cane people need immediate quota increases to relieve the pressure resulting from the attempt to hold the clock still too long. And unless a recurrence of a similar situation in a few years is to be invited, the domestic industry needs also a restoration of its historic right continuously to share in the growth of the United States sugar market. It had this right in the past but voluntarily relinquished it on a temporary basis in 1948 to help our friends in Cuba with their serious postwar adjustment problems.

We all know that the various Sugar Acts, beginning in 1934, have been good for our Nation and have provided a stabilization in which the domestic industry and the American consumer have benefited. But I think any unbiased observer will also concede that American sugar legislation has greatly benefited foreign suppliers of sugar to the United States, especially Cuba. In looking at the record now, it is tempting to assert that Cuba has been the primary beneficiary of American sugar legislation.

Before the Sugar Act was first passed, the Cuban sugar industry was prostrate. For several years before, Cuban sugar was selling for less than a cent a pound. Cuba, without quota restrictions, sold only about a million and a half tons to the United States in 1933. The duty on Cuban sugar at that time was \$2 a hundred pounds.

Look at the changed situation today. Cubans sell their sugar in the United States market for more than 5 cents a pound. Today their basic quota, under which Cuba now benefits from most of the increase in the United States sugar market, is 2,668,000 tons—about 85 percent greater than their sales here in 1933. The duty on Cuban sugar entering the United States today is only one-fourth of what it was before 1934. Cuban dollar income from sugar sold in the United States in 1954 was approximately 10 times that of 1933. All these have been direct benefits to Cuba flowing from our sugar legislation.

But these facts tell only part of the story. American sugar quota legislation not only put Cuba back on her feet and maintained her welfare at an increasingly high level in the 1930's and early 1940's, but Cuba has enjoyed particular attention and additional benefits under the provisions of the 1948 Sugar Act.

When the Sugar Act of 1948 was being considered in 1947, sugar was still under rationing and price control. Because of the worldwide shortage of food, some sugar acreages in the United States were necessarily diverted by Government programs to other crops which could not be grown in other climates. The Philippine sugar industry had been practically put out of business by the

ravages of war. And this was clear: That situation would change. Production in those areas would some day be restored. And Cuba, whose industry had reached an all-time high level of production, would soon be faced with the need of bringing her production down to realistic postwar levels.

So that Cuba's adjustment downward could be gradual, the domestic industry agreed that the United States Congress make some concessions to Cuba, giving up temporarily some of the domestic industry's historic rights.

It was agreed that Cuba would be authorized to market 95 percent of the amount by which the Philippine Islands could not meet their quota. Domestic producers also agreed that Cuba should have the right to continue to share with other domestic areas any deficits that might occur in domestic production. And domestic producers further agreed to waive their rights temporarily to share in future increases in demand in this country.

These special provisions—these concessions—embodied in the Sugar Act of 1948 have been extremely beneficial to Cuba. The Philippine deficits were large in the early years of the 1948 act and have given Cuba more than 2 million extra tons of sugar marketings in the United States. The sharing of United States deficits during the early part of the act, when farmers were adjusting beet acreages back to normal, gave Cuba marketing privileges for an additional million and a quarter tons of sugar. And the temporary waiver by domestic producers of their right to share in the growth of the American sugar market has enabled Cuba to sell another 2 million tons of extra sugar in the United States. All in all, Cuba has marketed some 5½ million additional tons of sugar in the United States as a result of the special temporary concessions made to her in 1948 with the express purpose of helping make her adjustment downward a gradual process.

It was certainly plain by 1951 that additional sugar marketings arising out of Philippine and domestic deficits were coming to an end, and with sugar production in other parts of the world stimulated by abnormally high world prices, Cuba's world sugar sales would be dropping off.

However, the record shows that these and other similar warnings went unheeded. Instead, 1952 production was allowed to skyrocket to 8 million tons—about 1½ million tons more than she had produced in 1947, when the 1948 act was passed, and 2 million tons more than anyone could see any possible market for anywhere in the world. Cuba still has a 2-million-ton surplus on hand, and it is this 2-million-ton surplus which has plagued us, our Cuban friends, and the world sugar market ever since.

The attitude of some Cuban interests in vigorously opposing any change in the Sugar Act which would correct the present emergency situations in domestic-beet and mainland-cane-sugar areas and restore to all domestic producers their right to share continuously in the growth of the sugar market in the United States is very surprising. It certainly is not compatible with the spirit which domestic producers displayed toward Cuba when the 1948 act was passed, when the law was extended in 1951, and more recently when the International Sugar Agreement was negotiated.

Actually, of course, Cuba wants and needs a strong and effective Sugar Act. Her leaders know what it has done for Cuba in the past, and what it can contribute to her continued economic stability in the future. In the face of this obvious fact, it is hard to understand the reasons behind some extravagant statements which have recently been made about the act and possible revisions.

Many interests have to be considered when sugar legislation is being worked out. The

way to get the job done is to work for equity and fairness, with full consideration for all interests.

As a long-time friend of Cuba, I cannot bring myself to believe that the real leaders of the great Cuban sugar industry subscribe to certain ill-advised positions which some interests are taking in the name of Cuba. I fully understand Cuba's basic needs and real interests, and I will always consider them sympathetically.

We all know, for instance, that Cuba is one of the best customers for United States products, and we want to continue to be Cuba's best customer. We need good neighbors—strong neighbors—and we will continue to do our part to help our sugar friends—Cuba, the Republic of the Philippines, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, and other Latin American countries.

The Sugar Act is the only foreign-trade legislation I know of which not only encourages imports but actually guarantees them by reserving a definite and large part of our market for them.

At the same time, however, a road must run both ways. The domestic sugar industry also has its interests and its needs. We must have recognition of the basic factors in the overall situation and fair play all around. Intemperate charges and obviously unsound proposals serve no constructive purpose.

The changes which the domestic industry seeks in the act would continue all the features of the present law which have prompted many people to call the Sugar Act the most successful of all farm legislation. It has brought reasonable returns to domestic producers. It has assured a large, profitable market for Cuba and other foreign countries. It has cost the United States Treasury nothing; in fact, it has brought a profit to our Government. And above all, it has assured an ample supply of sugar to the American housewife and industrial sugar users at a most reasonable price. Throughout the life of the Sugar Act, sugar has been the housewife's best food buy. No other food gives so much energy for so few cents.

Thanks to the operations of the Sugar Act, sugar has resisted more than most other foods the tremendous upward pressure of food prices which has occurred in the last 20 years. In that period sugar prices have risen 30 percent less than the prices of all foods and only 40 percent as much as consumer purchasing power. In terms of wages, sugar is a 25-percent better buy now than it was before World War II. The average production worker now has to work only 3½ minutes to earn enough money to buy a pound of sugar. I challenge anyone to show a lower price for sugar—in terms of working time required to buy it—anywhere else in the world.

The Sugar Act has also conferred additional benefits on industrial users of sugar. Sometimes some of them are temporarily attracted by prices in today's world market—only temporarily attracted, of course, because they remember that the Sugar Act kept domestic prices well below world prices as recently as 1951. They also realize that the stability of prices and supplies which sugar-quota legislation has brought about in the United States market has freed them from the financial hazards and capital costs involved in carrying large sugar inventories. Finally, the Sugar Act has made sugar the cheapest of all ingredients industrial users require.

Immediate revision and extension of the Sugar Act will do more than anything else to assure a continuation of these many benefits to American housewives and industrial users of sugar.

In reviewing briefly with you today the sugar legislative situation as viewed from the Washington scene, I have merely been

going over in some detail the general problems and issues which are involved in this matter and which you already know about. After all, it is the Congress of the United States that makes the laws for this country and it is the Congress that must decide when the Sugar Act should be extended and what changes should be made in it.

However, as you know, at the request of responsible congressional leaders, the domestic sugar industry has been discussing for some time desirable changes that should be made in the act. In these discussions you Michigan people are always ably represented by your fine Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, through its representation on the American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee. This committee is the instrument through which farmers and processors from all areas work together on industry legislative matters.

As you also know, President Eisenhower only recently, at the request of a bipartisan delegation of Members of Congress vitally interested in our problems, agreed that the Department of Agriculture, which is in charge of our Government sugar program, should take the leadership in securing an industrywide accord with Government, as was done in 1948 and 1951, with respect to the basic changes which should be made in the Sugar Act this year.

As we look ahead to the development of a sugar program which will merit the support of the Congress, we would do well to renew within ourselves the courageous spirit of the pioneers who over a hundred years ago launched this great college and planted the first seeds of the beet-sugar industry in this State. Those pioneers have given us a rich heritage. Let us be worthy of it. Let us have the pioneer's supreme faith to plan and work together toward a great and dynamic future, for a great and dynamic industry.

The Walls Have (Federal) Ears

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis Star dated February 7.

I have introduced H. R. 3084 to correct this unnecessary Federal control of States and local communities. It is hoped that the House Administration Committee and the Congress will take favorable action to correct the Federal legislation that plagues all of the 48 States:

The editorial follows:

THE WALLS HAVE (FEDERAL) EARS

Did you know that a State employee who writes a letter of a political nature to a newspaper is likely to provoke a Federal Government order that he be fired for so doing? That, at any rate, is the way the United States Civil Service Commission interprets its powers and responsibilities.

The State of Vermont is in the process of fighting a Hatch Act charge similar to the one which has been brought against Indiana on the basis of the activities of four Indiana State employees. The Vermont case involves only one employee, a department head. There are two Federal charges against him. One is that he presided at a session of the

Republican State convention in 1950. The other is that he wrote a letter of a political nature to the editor of a Boston newspaper. The latter count is a striking revelation of the extent to which laws controlling the lives of citizens have been carried by Federal bureaucracy.

Vermont's reaction to this attempt of the Federal bureaucrats to interfere in the affairs of the State on the basis of the Hatch Act has been what we hope Indiana's will be. The Federal Commission ordered Vermont to dismiss the accused official, and Vermont flatly refused to do so. Thereupon the Federal Government informed the State that it would be penalized by withholding of an amount equal to the official's salary for 2 years from Federal aid funds for welfare purposes. Vermont has appealed to the Federal district court, challenging the validity of the Federal action.

It is reported that Indiana will join Vermont in making this court test. New Hampshire has already done so. This court suit gets to the heart of the matter—the constitutionality of the Hatch Act.

In their initial reaction Vermont officials took the wrong course, as did Indiana officials. In both cases the first official State reaction was an attempt to defend the actions of the officials involved. But this is not the essential issue. The thing the States must do is to challenge the power of the Federal Government to concern itself with the political activities of employees of a State.

This Vermont has now done in its court suit. And it goes farther, challenging the whole principle of the Hatch Act. The State's brief in the test case says:

"We are menaced by philosophies of Government hostile to the republican form of government and the democratic way of life. There should be, there can be, no abridgement of free speech guaranteed under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States so long as one does not advocate the overthrow of the Government."

The Vermont case shows that the Hatch Act can be interpreted—is being interpreted by the Eisenhower administration—to limit the simple freedom of a public servant to express his views on political matters. The newspaper letter bore merely the man's personal signature, not his signature as a State official. The letter merely expressed his personal opinion that the late Senator Robert A. Taft was not an isolationist. This, the Federal bureaucracy says, is cause to discharge him.

The right of the Federal Government to exercise such control over the personal expressions of its own employees is questionable enough. Its assertion of the right to extend such control to the employees of a State passes all bounds of reason. It is time for the States to stand and fight.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, this is the 37th year since the people of Lithuania declared their independence of Russia. Unhappily, once again they are in the grip of the savage Russian bear. But his grip is not mortal. Throughout her history Lithuania has known foreign tyranny, and she has survived. The

tenacity of her people, their devotion to their culture and way of life, has been truly remarkable.

In 1919, by their own efforts, the Lithuanians drove Russian invaders from their soil. The Soviet Government then recognized Lithuanian sovereignty and independence, and renounced all rights there. But in a pattern that was to become all too familiar they unscrupulously broke their word, invaded the country, and incorporated it into the Soviet Union as the 14th Soviet Republic. A short period of German rule then ensued, and then the Russians returned in 1944. Since that time the Soviets have confiscated private property, they have persecuted religion, they have deported thousands of Lithuanians to Siberia, and killed thousands more. But they have not broken the spirit of the Lithuanian people, nor their desire for freedom and independence. The people of Lithuania look with hope, and we join them in that hope, that the day will come when Lithuania will once again be free, and resume her rightful place among the nations of the world.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement in opposition to the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements:

TWELVE KEY FACTS ABOUT H. R. 1

H. R. 1, introduced by Representative JEROME COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, proposes to extend the Trade Agreements Act. In the process it would grant the State Department, via the President, broad new powers for lowering United States tariffs and firmly committing the United States to GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

This bill has unleashed an intense debate. For this debate to produce results in the national interest all the pertinent facts must be squarely considered. Herewith are summarized 12 facts which are compellingly pertinent.

NOTE.—The content of H. R. 1 may change or become entangled with other bills during the legislative process. The references here are current as of February 12, 1955.

I. RIGHT NOW UNITED STATES TARIFFS ARE AMONG THE LOWEST IN THE WORLD

United States tariffs, now at their lowest in history, average only 5.1 percent of the value of imports. This represents sharper reductions than have been made by most other industrial nations; a 68-percent reduction of the 1937 average.

By comparison, Switzerland's tariffs average 8.1 percent of imports, and have been reduced only 47 percent since 1937; France averages 10.6 percent, 43 percent of 1937; and Great Britain averages 25.6 percent, which is 20 percent above 1937.

Among the industrialized nations of the West only Denmark, Sweden, and Western Germany have reduced their average tariff level since 1937 by as large a percentage as the United States. However, even in 1937 the

United States had a lower average than Sweden and Germany. Denmark is the only one which was lower then and remains lower now.

NOTE.—Tariff comparisons tell only half the story. Import quotas, currency restrictions, monopolies, government trading, cartels, and other devices are far tighter barriers to free trade than tariffs. Because, except with respect to quotas on agricultural products subject to price supports, the United States does not engage in these practices; it actually permits freer trade than any other industrialized country in the world.

II. THE FULL IMPACT OF THE RECENT UNITED STATES TARIFF DECLINE HAS NOT YET BEEN FELT

The first cuts, following the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934, came while the world was still struggling with the effects of a worldwide depression. Since then World War II, the fighting in Korea and Indochina, the continuing cold war and repeated injections of economic aid by the United States have distorted the historical patterns of trade. Only now are other nations approaching full production.

But even during this disturbed period United States imports reached a sustained level of nearly \$11 billion—four times prewar value, twice prewar volume.

III. TARIFFS AFFECT LESS THAN ONE-THIRD OUR TOTAL IMPORTS

Foreign countries earn dollars, and the United States buys its needed imports, for the most part, without any tariff interference at all. In considering the effect of tariffs on imports it must always be remembered that tariffs affect less than a third—\$3 billion out of a total imports of \$10.8 billion. A pertinent section of the United States tariff policy statement by the Committee for Economic Development—November 1954—it follows:

"Only a part of our imports are subject to tariffs or other import restrictions. Of our total annual imports of approximately \$10.8 billion in 1951, some \$6 billion consisted of products which enter free of duty or quota restrictions. The rest—some \$4.8 billion annually—were subject to tariff duty or import quotas. This \$4.8 billion included some \$2.5 billion of finished and semifinished manufactures, \$1.8 billion of agricultural products and \$500 million of metals and minerals. Of this \$4.8 billion of imports, however, only about \$3 billion were subject to import quotas or to tariffs sufficiently high to have an appreciable effect on the volume of import. This \$3 billion consisted for the most part of agricultural products and finished manufactures."

IV. OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE NOT RECIPROCATED

Though foreign countries have made some nominal concessions American exporters still face such barriers as—

Automobiles, charged 63 percent duty in India, 30 percent to 40 percent in Japan, 15 percent to 33½ percent in the United Kingdom, and 15 percent to 30 percent in France.

Machinery, charged 10 percent to 25 percent duty in Britain, 6 percent to 30 percent in France, 15 percent to 30 percent in Japan, 5 percent to 40 percent in Italy.

Synthetic textiles (including rayon), charged 20 percent to 35 percent in France, 25 percent to 27 percent in Italy, 22 percent in Norway, 17 percent to 24 percent in Belgium, and 50 percent in India.

Cotton manufactures, charged 15 percent to 30 percent in the United Kingdom, 7 percent to 30 percent in Germany, 15 percent to 25 percent in Italy, 18 percent to 30 percent in Indonesia, and 15 percent to 27½ percent in Canada.

Grains, charged 15 percent to 30 percent in France, 15 percent to 20 percent in Germany, 25 percent to 30 percent in Italy, 10 percent to 15 percent in Sweden.

In addition, many countries employ side devices which effectively limit, or even ban, the import of United States goods into their markets.

These devices, perfected by the Nazi economist, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, include: Import quotas, currency restrictions, state trading, monopolies, barter deals, and cartels. The use of such devices has increased markedly during the so-called reciprocal trade period.

There has been much talk about relaxing such restrictions but little "do."

For example, Great Britain has at last agreed to admit a few United States cars on trial—650 to be exact—but subject to duties and taxes which bring the price of an American-made Chevrolet in the British market to about \$6,000.

France recently announced liberalization for certain selected items—e. g., cotton yarns (but not fabrics), threshing machines (but not tractors), and so on. But at the same moment France turned around and imposed a special import tax of 10 to 15 percent on the items thus liberalized. And even these concessions did not apply to imports from the United States, only to imports from other European countries.

NOTE.—Although Great Britain employs such devices freely, and in addition maintains tariffs at a level 20 percent above 1937, the New York Herald Tribune for January 3, 1955, quoted R. A. Butler, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, as saying:

"We expect some improvement in their (United States) trade practices before there is any question of lowering our barriers any further or indulging in any further non-discrimination."

V. OUR FREE WORLD ALLIES DO NOT NEED LOWER UNITED STATES TARIFFS TO PROSPER

Congress was told a year ago that further cuts in United States tariffs were needed then to foster world trade and bolster the economy of our allies.

Congress refused. Instead it obtained an agreement by the State Department to make no further cuts for a year.

Here are examples of what actually happened in 1954, without the benefit of additional tariff cuts by us:

1. Italy's national income rose 4 percent, and its exports 10 percent.

2. Austria's income rose 10 percent as a result of increased trade and production.

3. The Netherlands' prosperity lured capital from all over the world; securities on the Amsterdam Exchange are now at their highest point since World War II.

4. West Germany anticipates an 8 percent rise in the gross national product in 1955, and a continuing expansion of exports. Between 1949 and 1953 exports more than quadrupled, while imports doubled; credit not tariffs has been the exporters' main problem.

5. "Britain Is Tasting New Prosperity As Exports Spurt"—headline from New York Times, January 3, 1955.

6. "Persisting Boom Is Seen by Swiss"—"Prosperity Based on Demand for Manufactures, Credit and Domestic Building"—headline from New York Times, January 9, 1955.

7. "Rise in Finn's Timber, Paper Exports Helps Puncture Pessimistic Forecasts"—headline from New York Times, January 9, 1955.

8. A flourishing export trade gave Portugal an exceptionally prosperous year; as expressed in a New York Times headline—January 4, 1955—"Nation Goes on Buying Spree."

In contrast, the United States experienced a temporary falling off in 1954.

VI. LABOR RATES IN OTHER COUNTRIES REMAIN AT ONE-THIRD TO ONE-TENTH UNITED STATES SCALE

Here are comparative average hourly earnings for industrial workers in the United States and other countries (1952-53 figures):

United States	\$1.79
Switzerland	.57
United Kingdom	.47
France	.46
West Germany	.44
Italy	.35
Japan	.19

Notes.—At one time better machines and more skilled workers enabled the United States to compete with low labor costs imports. Now—largely due to United States aid and assistance programs—other industrial nations have machines as modern and efficient as any we own, and for the most part their workers are as skilled as ours. A recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board indicates that at the same time the real wage gap is spreading, not narrowing.

VII. IMPORTS FROM CHEAP LABOR AREAS DO HURT

Industries already affected include coal, textiles, footwear, glass pottery, and china, electrical equipment, lead and zinc, ship building, fishing, and dozens of others. In the textile industry alone, which has been severely affected by competition from Japan and other low wage countries, the number employed declined by 260,000 in 3 years. New England mills took the brunt of this loss; but even in the South, where the most modern mills are located, there was a loss of 40,000 jobs.

State Department negotiators not long ago cut the rate on watches. Last fall the President had to restore the old rate. Too many workers in the United States watch industry, whose precision skills are needed for defense, were losing their jobs—and skills—because of imports.

Workers in the following industries are also threatened: chemicals, radio, and electronic equipment, machine tools, synthetic fibers, plastic materials, and—looking at the list proposed for the next round of negotiations by the State Department—literally hundreds of others.

N. B.: H. R. 1, in fact, excepts nothing. It invites a reduction of from 15 to 50 percent in every single rate now in effect, no matter how often or how deeply cut in the past.

VIII. THE "PERIL POINT" AND THE "ESCAPE CLAUSE" ARE VIRTUALLY MEANINGLESS

Under the "peril point" the United States Tariff Commission is required to determine whether or not a proposed cut will injure domestic industry. But such a finding does not bind State Department negotiators. In the past the Commission's findings have been ignored in favor of a hoped for and often meaningless concession from foreign governments. H. R. 1 would make possible the continuation of this practice.

Similarly, the much talked of "escape clause" is no sure remedy for injury to American producers and workers. The Tariff Commission's recommendations of relief can be, and usually are, rejected on advice of the State Department which fears the resentment of other countries.

IX. GOVERNMENT HANDOUTS ARE NO SUBSTITUTE FOR JOBS

Some H. R. 1 supporters have introduced bills to provide Government aid, at the expense of the general taxpayer, for workers thrown out of their jobs by import competition—after the injury has been done. Even the Randall Commission, which originated the H. R. 1 plan, could not go along with this idea. It substitutes a Government dole for

a man's wage, or requires workers to move from their homes to strange areas—much as is done in totalitarian countries. There is no way to estimate the cost in advance—it could and probably would run into billions.

X. H. R. 1 WOULD ESTABLISH AN ENTIRELY NEW NATIONAL POLICY ON TRADE AGREEMENTS—THE UNITED STATES MAKES CONCESSIONS BUT GETS NONE IN RETURN

Heretofore our trade agreements have required foreign countries to make concessions to us, no matter how nominal, in return for any concessions we make. H. R. 1 abandons this principle.

Right now the State Department is rushing plans for round-robin negotiations with 33 other countries beginning in Geneva next month. It has openly announced its intention to offer wholesale concessions in United States tariffs as a means of inducing these other countries to open their markets to Japan. H. R. 1 expressly permits this one-sided deal.

XI. H. R. 1 CAN INVOLVE THE UNITED STATES IN GATT (GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE) WHICH SUBJECTS THE TRADE OF MEMBER NATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CONTROL, DESPITE OPPOSITION BY CONGRESS

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade provides for a new international organization empowered to sponsor and police a comprehensive code of trade practices among member nations. These rules would cover the whole range of trade, including farm products and minerals as well as manufactured goods.

The Constitution assigns responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce to Congress. By previous Trade Agreements Acts Congress has delegated a large part of this responsibility, via the President, to the State Department. It has always refused, however, to allow the State Department to redelegate such power to an international body, in which we would have only one vote.

H. R. 1, although amended by committee to appear neutral on GATT, still contains language which permits the State Department to commit the United States to GATT without congressional knowledge of that agreement's changing provisions.

XII. UNITED STATES TARIFFS DO NOT CONTROL UNITED STATES IMPORTS

The policies of foreign producers, much more than present United States tariff rates, determine when, what, and how much they export to the United States. Since the war, for example, British manufacturers have sent most of their exports to countries in the sterling area, where they are protected from outside competition by tariffs, import licensing systems, and currency restrictions.

In 1952, however, when some of the sterling area markets closed up following collapse of the Korean war boom, the British quickly shifted. England's exports to the dollar area jumped 50 percent almost overnight—without any United States tariff changes.

United States tariffs, in fact, are now the least obstacle to world trade. Changeable policies of other countries, reflected in changeable import quotas, changeable currency restrictions and the like, are the real difficulty.

NOTE.—More than a year ago Bernard Baruch said the agitation for lower tariffs in the United States is serving only to provide other nations "with an excuse for blaming their troubles on the United States and, by feeling sorry for themselves, to overlook what they must do on their own."

In his column on January 13, 1955, Walter Lippmann pointed out:

"I wonder whether this (the campaign for lower tariffs) puts the real problem in its proper focus. Perhaps we can reach a clearer definition of that problem by saying that the main trouble today is not the level of the tariff rates. In the United States they are

by and large not exorbitantly high any longer.

"The real problem is economic warfare. All the governments have armed themselves with legal powers which they use to interfere with the international markets for goods. They use them offensively and they use them defensively to cut down, to cut off, to divert, to penalize, to subsidize buying and selling so that the pattern of transactions is different from what it would be under the free operation of supply and demand. . . .

"The characteristics of these weapons of economic warfare is that that they are not fixed rules and laws of trade but are operated by administrative decisions made, often under political pressure, by bureaucracies. . . .

"The essential condition of economic peace is that trade among friendly nations should not be subject to the arbitrary acts of administrative and political officials, that trade should be subject to laws enacted deliberately and openly and after debate and not changeable except by equally careful deliberation."

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today while Americans of Lithuanian origin are enjoying the pleasures and rights of a free society, their relatives and friends still living in the nation of their native rootage suffer under the leash of tyrannical communism. Approximately 5,000 miles, or 10 hours by modern jet time, separate those who exist in the little Baltic nation from those with similar national backgrounds living in the climate of free America.

Yet this separation of so few hours as judged by modern speeds is minute compared to the wide crevasse in their freedom and rights to live as men should. These people bearing the same nationality backgrounds, the same pride, ambitions and abilities which enable one to carve out the best life for himself and those close to him are yet so far distant in opportunity and human liberty.

I think Lithuania, so small geographically yet so big in spiritual determination, symbolizes the struggle against oppressive bullies. This isn't the first time or the first nation so tenaciously picked on by one so drunk with power and ambitious with designs as Communist Russia. I hope and pray it will be the last.

Only the people of Lithuania know the burdens, the heartbreak and suffering which have been endured since Soviet Russia lowered the yoke of oppression on their shoulders. Their story is too long to forget and too solemn to lack inspiration. Let us hope that soon the great Lithuanian nation can again be restored to their rightful heritage of liberty and independence which was theirs 37 years ago.

I am happy to join those who today are sending their warmest regards and sincerest sympathy to those persons who

through no fault of their own are not able to enjoy the fruits of individualism and independence.

Pay Raise Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on Tuesday morning, February 15:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JAMES M. QUIGLEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 19TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 15, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you and express my views on legislation affecting the welfare of Federal employees.

I submit these propositions:

Postal employees deserve an increase in pay.

All other classified employees deserve an increase in pay.

Neither pay bill should be dependent upon the other; neither should be dependent upon an increase in postal rates; and neither should be dependent upon action relating to reclassification.

Employees of the Federal Government, who must give up their right to bargain collectively when they enter the service, are dependent upon special wage legislation. As a result Congress has frequently looked upon Federal salaries as largess, rather than upon experience and the laws of labor supply and demand.

As a result, the wages of Federal workers have lagged behind the wages paid in private industry. For instance, in the case of postal employees, their spendable income is more than \$600 a year behind the 1939 level.

I could cite similar examples regarding the classified employees.

Therefore, I believe that an adequate salary increase is in order for all postal employees. On the basis of my study of the matter and in the light of the increase in the cost of living since the last general wage increase was given in 1951, \$800 per annum in base pay would be proper. I recognize, however, certain immediate factors which might tend to delay any early readjustment of postal salaries, so I therefore support, as a bare minimum, provisions of H. R. 1826 by Mr. Moss, and companion bills by Mr. Rhodes, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Morrison and Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

I believe that bills now before the committee granting similar minimum 10 percent pay increases for classified employees should also be acted upon favorably.

In connection with the postal pay increases, I should like to state emphatically that it is my firm conviction that the right of postal employees and their families to a decent standard of living should not be contingent on what it costs me to mail a letter or upon any other political consideration. Much as we might desire to see the postal system operated on a business-like basis, we should not overlook the fact that this means of mass communication is a service of the Govern-

ment to the people, necessary to human welfare and to the national economy.

While I recognize the need for periodic review of and, if studies justify, reorganization of the functions of the various governmental agencies, I would oppose any scheme whereby, in the name of efficiency, the fate of every civil-service employee is placed in the hands of Mr. Summerfield or any other politician.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, and this does not directly bear upon the issue immediately before the committee, I would like to see a law enacted under which the properly designated representatives of the Federal employees will be given recognition at the bargaining table under a workable arbitration system for settling grievances concerning wages, hours, and working conditions. My Pennsylvania colleague, Mr. RHODES, has introduced such legislation, and I was pleased on yesterday to join his effort by introducing a companion bill.

The Late Robert Peter Tristram Coffin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay an all-too-brief tribute to Robert Peter Tristram Coffin, of Brunswick, Maine, who died suddenly on January 20.

Bob Coffin, as he was known to his friends, was born in Brunswick on March 18, 1892, and in Brunswick he was destined to spend in happiness the greater part of his life. He passed his youth on a salt-water farm on Sebascodegan Island in the town of Harpswell, which adjoins Brunswick. He commemorated his youth in *Lost Paradise*, published in 1934. He was graduated from Bowdoin College in 1915 with *summa cum laude* honors. After leaving Bowdoin he took a master of arts at Princeton; thence he went to Trinity College, Oxford, as a Rhodes scholar from Maine, where he spent the years 1916 to 1917 and 1919 to 1921. The intervening period he served in the American Army.

Life at the English university made a deep impression on him and his first books, *Christchurch and Crowns and Cottages*, reflect the influences of his English experience.

He taught in Wells College, Aurora, N. Y., from 1922 to 1934. Here he founded and carried on the Oxford idea of honor work in English literature. In 1934 he returned to Bowdoin College as professor of English literature. There he spent the remaining years of his life, though he lectured and taught from time to time in Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, and several other American universities. The academic year 1952-53 he spent as Fulbright special lecturer at the University of Athens, Greece.

In the interstices of his teaching career, Bob Coffin wrote and published more than 30 volumes of fiction, biography, autobiography, and verse. His *Strange Holiness* won the Pulitzer prize for poetry in 1935. It is as a poet that

he would doubtless choose to be remembered, and as such he will probably be best known. Like most poets, his work was uneven in merit. Had he been primarily concerned with his standing before posterity, he might have been more self-critical and published more sparingly. But he wrote incessantly whatever feeling prompted him to write and no one can fail to be moved by the sincerity of his feeling. His best poetry is not likely to be forgotten.

As with many other Maine writers, his creative faculties were shaped by the heritage of the country in which he was born. He was a son of Maine as Longfellow, Edwin Arlington Robinson, Edna Millay, and Sara Orne Jewett—to mention only a few—were the children of Maine. Like Caledonia, Maine has been a "meet nurse" for poetic children.

The odors of rockweed at half tide, bayberry, spruce, and fir spoke to Coffin in a various language, but a language constantly in praise of their Creator.

Some may compare Coffin to Carl Sandburg and the two men have a bardic quality in common, but Coffin couldn't have written the *Chicago Poems*, any more than Sandburg could have written *Kennebec and Saltwater Farm*. They were as different as New England is different from Illinois.

Bob Coffin was beloved by all who knew him and his death which follows closely on that of his close friend and fellow townsman, Kenneth Sills, is widely mourned in and out of Maine. He was a friend to me and I shall ever cherish his memory.

[From the Brunswick (Maine) Record]

BOWDOIN COLLEGE SUFFERS GREAT LOSS

Bowdoin College in particular, the State and all of New England in general, suffered a great loss this past week when Robert Peter Tristram Coffin, Pierce Professor of English at the college since 1934, died suddenly in Portland where he had gone to give a lecture at Westbrook Junior College, last Thursday evening. Born in Brunswick March 18, 1892, he had travelled extensively both here and abroad but his New England roots were deep—he was always a New Englander.

Professor Coffin was graduated from Bowdoin with the highest possible honors; he spent 3 years at Trinity College, Oxford University, England, receiving there the degrees of bachelor of arts and bachelor of letters (literature). His first book of poems was published in 1924.

This publication was followed by more than 35 others. In explaining his literary credo—whether it be poetry or prose—Professor Coffin once said, "The things that matter most, love, faith, babies, roses, pride, friendship, death, have not been submerged by science or the industrial revolution; they keep the old splendor like the stars. And we can still have the happiness of walking and being alone to think."

It was because of these beliefs, and his adherence to same in his writings, that he became so greatly beloved—his works having wide appeal. No one who had ever heard him read some of his poems could ever forget him. Professor Coffin was instructor of English at Wells College, N. Y., before his alma mater, Bowdoin, called him back in 1934; while there he was the recipient of numerous honors; in 1936 he won the Pulitzer prize for poetry; he was Phi Kappa Beta poet at many colleges including Harvard, the College of William and Mary, and Tufts.

Funeral services were held on Sunday in the First Parish Church in Brunswick.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Arvydas Kudirka, president, Waterbury chapter, of the Lithuanian Student Association:

LITHUANIAN STUDENT ASSOCIATION,

Waterbury, Conn., February 13, 1955.

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As you may know February 16, 1955, is the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

The people of Lithuania have been fighting communism since 1917, when they had to defeat its new forces to establish a free country.

Again this fight in blood against communism was renewed when Russia occupied Lithuania in 1940. For 15 years now Lithuanians have been fighting the Red demon with blood and word and will continue to do so until the Red aggressor is destroyed. We all know that Communist goals are to destroy the free world and establish despotism throughout it.

We, therefore, join forces with the free world so that together we can defeat the evils of communism and again restore peace and freedom of our native country, Lithuania, and the world.

The Lithuanian students of Waterbury, Conn., would like to take this opportunity to thank you for all your past considerations you have given us and our native country Lithuania.

We would be very grateful if you would continue to remember us and our cause in the future.

Respectfully yours,

ARVYDAS KUDIRKA.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this occasion to say that any nation that has withstood for more than a century and a quarter continued foreign domination and oppression from a ruthless and tyrannical neighbor and still survive, certainly deserves the praise of mankind. Such praise Lithuania deserves; for in spite of the fact that Lithuania has been occupied and ruthlessly dominated by Imperial Russia and Soviet Russia for periods totaling over 125 years this nation still lives.

In many respects the Lithuanian people today are ruled by a far more ruthless master than in the days prior to the foundation of the Lithuanian nationality when it was relegated to an inferior status in the days of czarist Russia; but the suppression exercised by the czar might well be termed moderate when compared to the suppression imposed by the Soviets.

In this 20th century our language has taken on a new word "genocide," which means the willful destruction of a nation and people. Genocide is the long-range objective of the Soviet rulers; it is to destroy the Lithuanian nation. Deportations of thousands of Lithuanian people and the resettlement of Russians and other Soviet peoples in Lithuania have thus far done much to change the ethnic

character not only of that country but also of the other Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia. As part of its scheme of communization Soviet Russia had laid down a plan calculated to eradicate the Lithuanian national consciousness. Along with their plan to destroy the idea of Lithuanian nationality, the Communists are seeking to remold this once free and happy country in the image of the Soviet State.

That Lithuania is going through an epoch of great trial goes without saying. But the Lithuanian nation is a virile nation. It is a nation with a glorious historical past and a sense of national destiny for the future. It is a nation which has survived other oppressions and shall survive this one.

On this occasion commemorating the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence the message of America is a message of hope that one day the Lithuanian people shall fulfill their national destiny and that they shall again enjoy the natural right of every nation to be free, as they once were, so that they can once more resume their tasks of development and progress, and pursue the happiness they once enjoyed as a free and independent people.

When I contemplate the friends I have of Lithuanian origin and their loyalty to the causes of freedom and justice in the United States, I know that by personal example they keep burning the flame of freedom in their native land.

Federal School Aid Limited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Doris Fleeson in the Washington Evening Star entitled "Federal School Aid Limited." I feel that this article warrants the attention of the Members of Congress regarding the national emergency in education.

The statement follows:

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID LIMITED—PROGRAM ASKS MILLIONS, BUT BILLIONS ARE NEEDED; CAN PRESIDENT SEE ITS EMERGENCY PROPORTIONS?

(By Doris Fleeson)

President Eisenhower's school-aid program does not represent a serious attempt to deal with the national emergency in education.

It is little more than a letter of condolence to the localities and school authorities which are struggling against an enormous and growing shortage of classrooms.

The President's own Commissioner of Education, Samuel Brownell, has placed the current need at 370,000 classrooms. Federal cost estimates indicate that the job well done would cost more than \$12 billion.

The President has suggested only \$200 million in direct aid for 3 years, which is about

\$65 million a year. Even if all went well and exactly as planned, it would build only a few thousand of the missing classrooms.

School authorities are equally skeptical about the proposed plans to help school districts and States. Twenty States are said to have constitutional debt limits which will prevent any new borrowing. In both Maine and Wisconsin, the courts have declared school construction authorities unconstitutional.

The school experts say also that it would be at least a year before any results would show from the Eisenhower plan. Meanwhile, school enrollment is going up at a rate of more than a million a year. This year it is 30.8 million—up 22 percent over 1950.

The President's philosophical approach provokes as much gloom in school circles as his practical suggestions. As they see it, he has dealt with what they regard as the gravest internal crisis in this democracy in the spirit of a Lady Bountiful who restricts her gifts to the worthy poor.

The reference is to the President's ban on outright grants except to communities too poor to build their own schools. There will be no States and few communities willing to take the pauper's oath on this or any other proposition. Actually, many of the wealthiest States which spend proportionately the largest share of their revenues on education are among the most hard-pressed.

The idea that some parts of this country should publicly admit to their poverty and throw themselves on the mercy of richer States or the Federal Government seems to have appeal in many quarters. It emerges regularly at the annual conference of the State governors and as regularly the overwhelming majority of the governors turn the cold shoulder.

This quarrel is basic. The original architects of the welfare state—most of which the President has accepted, at least in theory—believe in prompt and ample Federal action to meet national social emergencies like that confronting the schools. From their point of view the President's approach in the new message looks back—way back.

Perhaps one trouble with the present special school problem is that Washington draws to it for the most part the successful, the well-to-do, and the more mature citizens. Their children are not victims of the present cruel classroom shortage, and, as a French philosopher said, one bears with equanimity the misfortunes of others.

A Liberal Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if you have been thinking of a tax reduction, a balancing of the budget, a reduction in the national debt, the end of the broadcasting of your dollars abroad, forget it.

While my efforts to accomplish all of the above will not only be continued, but increase, the facts of life might just as well be recognized. Nothing will be gained by fooling ourselves as to what is happening here in Washington.

Postal employees have renewed their demand for an increase in compensa-

tion. Unless their union officers overreach themselves, they will get it. The only question is how much.

Other Federal employees have joined in the demand for an increase in wages or salaries. They will get it. Again, the only question is, how much. United States district attorneys, Federal judges, Senators, and Congressmen are insisting upon a pay raise. It will be given. How much, no one knows. The raise will be substantial.

Increases in industrial wages—and they are certain to be given—will be paid by consumers; and wage earners and salaried people—dirty overalls, white shirt, nylon waist, or silk-tie wearers—all will pay a part of all of the above.

The administration is asking for an increase in pay and special benefits for those in the armed services. That will go through. Again the only question is as to the number of dollars authorized.

Additional appropriations for the armed services will increase the total by billions.

The national debt will increase, as will the interest charge, which is now over 6 billion.

Russia has told us to get out of Formosa. Chou En-lai declares he intends to take it. President Eisenhower has said we will not get out, that Chou En-lai cannot have it. The situation makes easy another world war, which certainly no intelligent individual wants.

Will we all live better at less cost? Has everybody been taken care of?

No. Some have been forgotten. They are among the most worthy.

What is to happen to those past 45 who cannot get jobs in industry, who are barred from employment by the minimum wage, which is to be increased from 75 to 90 or additional cents per hour? What about those who have had no opportunity or are unable to provide for their own old age, who through no fault of their own are either unable or incapable of earning a living wage?

They have no politically powerful, well-financed lobby. Apparently they will find themselves taking what, if anything, is left.

The remedy? At home just a little more thrift on the part of the Federal and other governments. Just a little willingness on the part of each of us to, for a short time, do without nonessentials, no matter how enjoyable or desirable.

Abroad? The adoption of a foreign policy which will keep us out of wars in which we have no vital interest.

A little more willingness to give people in other countries the opportunity to "paddle their own canoes."

This, I think, is the greatest country on earth. We have more of everything, including leisure—spare time—than people throughout the world have ever desired, sought, or enjoyed.

Why thoughtlessly continue inflation—get a ruinous depression? There must be—there is—a way out of the trouble abroad other than through war.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement in opposition to the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements:

STATEMENT REGARDING H. R. 1 BY OTIE M. REED, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION AND THE AMERICAN BUTTER INSTITUTE, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 4, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this statement is submitted on behalf of the joint committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute and the Dairy Industry Committee, and is in opposition to certain provisions of H. R. 1.

The joint committee is composed of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, with Washington offices at 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

The National Creameries Association, with headquarters in St. Paul, Minn., is composed of some 950 dairy processing plants located in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska. About 85 percent of the membership of the National Creameries Association are locally owned and operated cooperative associations. These plants serve about 300,000 dairy farmers.

The American Butter Institute, with headquarters in Chicago, Ill., is composed of processors, both cooperative and private, with membership in 43 States. Taken together, these two organizations process and distribute most of the creamery butter produced in the United States.

This statement is made also on behalf of the Dairy Industry Committee, composed of the Milk Industry Foundation, American Butter Institute, National Creameries Association, International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, National Cheese Institute, American Dry Milk Institute, and the Evaporated Milk Association. Some of the members of the Dairy Industry Committee will also appear before your committee and deal more specifically with the products in which they have a direct interest.

This statement has been prepared in summary form for the convenience of the committee, as follows:

1. Prices of milk and butterfat to producers in the United States are supported pursuant to the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. In supporting these prices, butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids are purchased on the open market by the Commodity Credit Corporation at prices announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

2. During this last year, prices paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation for dairy products were calculated to return to producers 75 percent of parity for butterfat and for whole milk used for manufactured dairy products. Details as to the support prices that have been established since the end of the war are set forth in table 1 of the appendix.

3. On January 13, 1955, the Secretary of Agriculture announced the price support program for milk and butterfat for the coming marketing year, April 1, 1955, to March 31, 1956. The support prices announced by

the Secretary are the same as those prevailing for the marketing year ending March 31, 1955. Due to changes in methods of computing parity for manufacturing milk, however, the prices announced by the Secretary on January 13, 1955, probably will return to producers about 80 percent of parity for milk used in manufactured dairy products and about 77 percent for butterfat.

4. Prices under the support program are considerably above world prices even after making allowance for the tariff applicable on butter and the payment of transportation costs. Butter and other dairy products could be laid down in the United States at prices considerably below United States price support levels.

For a number of years and until quite recently, the price of most of the butter moving in international commerce has been governed by the government-to-government contracts entered into between the United Kingdom and Australia, New Zealand, and Denmark. Details of the prices specified in such contracts since 1948 are set forth in table 2. Such contracts have now been terminated. However, recent price quotations for butter at wholesale in New Zealand have averaged about 42 cents per pound. The wholesale price for comparable grade United States butter at seaboard cities in the United States has been averaging approximately 60 cents per pound.

The cost of importing butter into the United States from such areas as New Zealand is about 11 cents per pound, of which 7 cents represents the tariff applicable on the first 60 million pounds imported and 4 cents represents transportation and other shipping and handling costs. Thus, it is seen that butter could be laid down, all costs and duties paid, for 7 cents per pound less than the United States wholesale price based on our support price. Therefore, it would be very profitable for exporting countries to ship us the butter they would normally ship to their regular markets. Under our support program, the Commodity Credit Corporation would have to buy such butter, or an equivalent volume of domestic butter, in order to effectuate our support prices.

The volumes that would be imported under such circumstances could reach huge figures. On the average, about 900 million pounds of butter moves in interstate commerce each year, as well as huge volumes of cheese and nonfat dry milk solids, which also show a markedly lower price level in major exporting countries than under the price support program. For details as to the world trade in major dairy products, see table 3.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that any relaxation of our current system of import regulation under section 22, or any weakening of the basic law under which such import regulations are imposed, would result in the conversion of the price-support program for the American dairy farmer into a price-support program for the dairy farmer throughout the world.

The price-support program is costing vast sums of money, and may run as high as three fourths of a billion dollars (\$750,000,000) before the current heavy stocks in the hands of the CCC are liquidated. The purchase of additional large volumes of imported butter would increase the price-support program costs materially.

5. Since the war, imports of dairy products have been controlled first, under the Second War Powers Act; second, under section 104 of the Defense Production Act; and, since July 1, 1953, by Presidential proclamation issued June 8, 1953, pursuant to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. For details regarding the controls that have been in effect in recent years and are currently in effect under section 22. See table 4.

6. Imports have been controlled and are now subject to control for the simple reason that it is necessary to control these imports

in order to effectuate the dairy price-support program for American dairy farmers. If imports were not subject to quantitative restrictions, exporting countries would divert large volumes from their normal foreign markets to this country which would have to be purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to support prices to American producers at the announced levels. Thus, if unrestricted imports were permitted, the cost of the price-support program to the United States would be very greatly increased or its effectiveness nullified.

Reference is made again to the fact that large volumes of dairy products move in international trade. (See table 3.) No precise calculation can be given as to the volumes of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids that would be imported under our price-support program if quantitative import controls were removed. However, they would undoubtedly be quite large.

7. Nothing should be done in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to weaken section 22. As a matter of fact, it is our view that section 22 should be strengthened by providing for mandatory application of import controls whenever price-support programs are undertaken in this country. Further, the Congress should develop some rule in the control of imports which would be designed to correlate the goals of our domestic farm-price-support programs and our foreign trade program. We believe that this can be accomplished by developing the rule that imports should be limited to the average during some preceding base period until prices to American farmers reach parity levels after which import controls would be discontinued as long as prices to American producers remain at or above parity levels.

8. A rule such as is suggested in the preceding paragraph would have the tendency to maintain the average pattern of foreign trade until the goals of American domestic farm policy, namely, the development of conditions under which farmers will secure parity prices, are achieved. Once this domestic farm price goal is achieved imports would be permitted to come into this country in whatever volumes exporting countries desired to ship us as long as our domestic farm prices remained at parity or above.

As a suggestion for the committee's consideration, we have prepared a proposed amendment to section 22 and are including it in this statement as appendix A.

9. The United States has never been a very important factor in international trade except during wars and the unsettled conditions immediately following wars. Table 5 shows United States exports and imports of butter, cheese, condensed milk, evaporated milk, dried whole milk, and non-fat dry milk solids for the period 1939 through 1953. The very heavy exports during the war largely represented lend-lease shipments to our Allies, and in postwar years shipments of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and some shipments under the Marshall plan. Most of the war and post-war exports were financed by the United States Government, and in no sense represented normal commercial exports.

10. Although there have been some indications that a better balance between supply of and demand for dairy products may be developing, the outlook is for continued heavy production and surpluses in the American market.

Table 6 shows certain production trend factors such as milk cow numbers, total milk production on United States farms, production per capita of the population, and production per cow. Milk cow numbers are on an upward trend, and 1954 total production was the highest of record at 123.8 billion pounds. Production per capita of the population, however, is only slightly above the low 1952 rate of 733 pounds per capita.

11. Since the production per capita of the population is lower than many of the years since 1939, it might appear that there should be little, if any, surplus problem in the dairy field. This apparent inconsistency, however, is explained by the fact that there have been some serious declines in the per-capita consumption of some of the major dairy products. (See table 7.) Fluid milk and cream consumption per capita reached a high point of 399 pounds in 1945 but has slumped badly in recent years, being 352 pounds per capita in 1954.

Butter per capita consumption has decreased drastically from 16.8 pounds on the average during 1935-39 to 8.6 pounds in 1952 and 1953, with a slight increase to 9.0 pounds per capita indicated for 1954. Most of this loss is due to the rapid encroachment of oleomargarine on the table spread market due to wartime restrictions on butter, diversion of milk to other commodities used under the war food program, and legislation permitting oleo to imitate butter color and flavor.

Per capita consumption of cheese and nonfat dry milk solids is running considerably above prewar, but the surplus situation in these commodities remains serious due to the great expansion in production of these commodities that was brought about under Government auspices during the war.

12. The scope of price-support programs and disposition of commodities purchased thereunder is set forth in table 8 in summary form. Details as to purchase and disposition in 1953 and 1954 are shown in table 9.

In spite of markedly increased movement of dairy products from CCC stocks as compared to previous years, the CCC estimates that it had on hand as of December 31, 1954, 265.7 million pounds of butter, 334.8 million pounds of cheese, and 91.8 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids.

By far the greater portion of the disposition of CCC stocks of butter during 1954 were accounted for by donations through domestic and foreign relief channels and section 32 outlets. These outlets also were most important for cheese, although during the year 116.4 million pounds of cheese were disposed of through commercial domestic sales. The largest outlet for nonfat dry milk inventories was 578.3 million pounds disposed of for animal feed at from 3 to 4 cents per pound.

From the foregoing, it is clear that (1) CCC still holds very large inventories of dairy products purchased under the price-support program, and (2) the supply-and-demand outlook suggests the strong probability of additional purchases under the price-support program during the year ending March 31, 1956.

13. In section 3 of H. R. 1 it is proposed that subsection (a) of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be amended in such a fashion that the safeguards now provided in section 22 would be materially weakened if not in actual fact rescinded. Thus, as it is proposed to be amended, section (a) (1) (A) of the act of 1930 would authorize the President to enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof, except that it is provided "that, except as authorized by subparagraph (B) of the section, . . . no such provision shall be given effect in the United States in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States."

Subparagraph (B), however, authorizes the President "to proclaim such modification of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treat-

ment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder."

We submit that this language rather effectively vitiates subparagraph (g) of section 22, which states that "no trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section."

Subparagraph (g) definitely prohibits entering into trade agreements inconsistent with section 22, which is designed to permit regulation of imports if necessary to effectuate farm programs of the United States Government.

The proposed language of subparagraph (B), quoted above, would permit modifications in duties and other import controls in order to effectuate a trade agreement. Thus, under the proposed language, it would appear that, if the President enters any trade agreement under this proposed bill that would involve reductions in import restrictions on dairy products, he could then proceed, under subparagraph (B), to reduce or eliminate the restrictions he has promulgated under section 22. This broad language would also make many other provisions of law, such as the escape clause, countervailing duty, antidumping and pure food drug laws, vulnerable to modification or nullification by presidential proclamation under a trade agreement.

It will be recalled by the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture in his testimony before you January 18, 1955, took the position that subparagraph (B) was too broad. He stated that "We have noted the broad language of subsection B on page 3 of H. R. 1 could be applied in such a way as to render less effective many of the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 as amended. So long as the United States has a domestic farm price support program which maintains domestic prices above the world level, it is essential that authority be retained to restrict imports into the United States under the domestic price support program."

It is also significant that no other administration witness appearing before the committee has indicated a desire that the President be given authority to override or modify the safeguarding provisions of existing law such as section 22. I understand that even the drafters of the bill have professed no intention to impair the full and effective operation of section 22.

However, the language in subparagraph (A) of section 3 (a) (1) beginning at line 20 of page 2 leaves doubt on this point as the Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out. If, as contended by the proponents, there is no intent to impair the effective operation of section 22 and other safeguarding provisions of existing law there should be no objection to a clarifying amendment so there can be no misinterpretation of the language later on.

We would suggest that all of the new language in subparagraph (A) following the word "thereof" in line 21 on page 2 of the bill be deleted and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and". This would leave the language through subparagraph (B) ending on line 16 of page 3 the same as contained in the existing law and H. R. 1 would still give the President all of the authority that has been publicly requested or explained by administration witnesses supporting the bill. No administration witness has explained the intent behind the new language or expressed a desire for any new power that might be contained or later interpreted therein. Therefore it seems to us that there

can be no objection to deleting such new language. So amended, the bill would still give the President all the authority he has asked for.

Also, in order to avoid any subsequent interpretation that Congress has approved or ratified the general regulatory provisions of GATT or other trade agreements, many of which are contrary to existing safeguarding laws such as section 22, we strongly urge that any extension of the Trade Agreements Act again contain a saving clause to the effect that:

"The enactment of this act shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the Executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

This language is contained in section 3 of the Extension Act of 1954 (Public Law 464) and a similar section has been included in every extension for the past several years. We urge this Congress to follow the same procedure. Such an amendment to H. R. 1 would not impair any authority requested by the President and there should be no objection thereto.

TABLE 1.—Prices paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation under price-support program, Mar. 1, 1949, to date

[Cents per pound]	
Period and commodity	Price
Creamery butter:	Grade A Grade B
Mar. 1 to July 27, 1949.....	59 57
July 28 to Dec. 31, 1949.....	62 60
Jan. 1, 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951.....	60 58
Apr. 1, 1951, to Mar. 31, 1952.....	66 64
Apr. 1, 1952, to Mar. 31, 1953.....	67.75 65.75
Apr. 1, 1953, to Mar. 31, 1954.....	165.75 163.75
Apr. 1, 1954, to Mar. 31, 1955.....	157.5 155.5
Apr. 1, 1955, to Mar. 31, 1956.....	157.5 155.5
Cheddar cheese (U. S. Grade A):	
July 28 to Dec. 31, 1949.....	31.75
Jan. 1, 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951.....	31.00
Apr. 1, 1951, to Mar. 31, 1952.....	36.00
Apr. 1, 1952, to Mar. 31, 1953.....	38.25
Apr. 1, 1953, to Mar. 31, 1954.....	37.00
Apr. 1, 1954, to Mar. 31, 1955.....	32.25
Apr. 1, 1955, to Mar. 31, 1956.....	32.25
Nonfat dry milk solids:	Spray process Roller process
Apr. 1 to Aug. 31, 1949.....	12.25 11.00
Sept. 1 to Dec. 31, 1949.....	12.75 11.50
Jan. 1, 1950, to Mar. 31, 1951.....	12.60 10.50
Apr. 1, 1951, to Mar. 31, 1952.....	15.00 13.00
Apr. 1, 1952, to Mar. 31, 1953.....	17.00 15.00
Apr. 1, 1953, to Mar. 31, 1954.....	16.00 14.00
Apr. 1, 1954, to Mar. 31, 1955.....	16.00 14.25
Apr. 1, 1955, to Mar. 31, 1956.....	16.00 14.25

¹ Basis Chicago terminal market.

Source: Announcements of the Commodity Credit Corporation, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—Butter—Contract prices for butter per pound under United Kingdom purchase contracts with Australia, New Zealand, and Denmark, 1948-49 to date

[In terms of United States money]			
Year	Australia ¹ choice grade	New Zealand ² finest grade	Denmark ³
	Cents	Cents	Cents
1948 to 1949.....	42.1	42.3	33.9
1949 to 1950.....	31.4	31.5	36.5
1950 to 1951.....	33.9	33.9	39.2
1951 to 1952.....	36.5	36.5	42.2
1952 to 1953.....	39.2	39.2	43.1
1953 to 1954.....	40.8	40.8	

¹ July 1-June 30 contract year.

² Aug. 1-July 31 contract year.

³ Oct. 1-Sept. 30 contract year.

NOTE.—These contracts have now been terminated. Wholesale prices in New Zealand now are about 42.0 cents per pound of butter.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—World trade in specified dairy products, by major geographical areas, average 1946-50 and 1953

Area	Average 1946-50		1953	
	Exports		Imports	
	Exports	Imports	Exports	Imports
North America:				
Butter	7,221	11,818	553	3,049
Cheese	163,400	36,737	22,349	66,741
Dry milk	304,400	23,095	181,589	25,709
Canned milk	554,870	42,189	169,818	42,087
South America:				
Butter	21,569	6,555	33,583	4,295
Cheese	25,260	8,866	10,218	9,648
Dry milk	2,452	49,787	None	51,700
Canned milk	1,179	14,954	None	9,400
Europe:				
Butter	328,201	776,592	460,396	769,775
Cheese	294,369	597,531	490,917	601,721
Dry milk	82,815	153,263	139,998	189,443
Canned milk	307,654	333,570	611,891	145,135

TABLE 3.—Continued
[In thousands of pounds]

Area	Average 1946-50		1953	
	Exports	Imports	Exports	Imports
Asia:				
Butter	None	8,153	None	15,326
Cheese	34	16,376	1,156	8,594
Dry milk	None	119,019	None	91,353
Canned milk	None	303,654	None	259,503
Africa:				
Butter	501	14,759	433	18,021
Cheese	361	27,804	468	30,992
Dry milk	149	5,453	201	5,751
Canned milk	513	22,386	1,225	20,159
Oceania:				
Butter	455,518	None	443,108	None
Cheese	213,838	175	278,657	None
Dry milk	61,256	141	174,669	None
Canned milk	91,096	2	98,726	None

Source: Compiled from reports of the Foreign Agricultural Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 6.—Milk cows and milk production on farms, United States, 1940-54

Year	Number of milk cows on farms	Production per milk cow		Total milk production on farms ¹	
		Milk	Butterfat	Quantity	Amount per capita
		Thou- sands Pounds	Pounds	Million pounds	Pounds
1940	24,940	4,622	184	109,412	828
1941	25,453	4,738	188	115,088	853
1942	26,313	4,736	188	118,533	879
1943	27,138	4,588	183	117,017	856
1944	27,704	4,572	182	117,023	846
1945	27,770	4,787	190	119,828	855
1946	26,521	4,886	194	117,697	832
1947	25,842	5,007	199	116,814	810
1948	24,615	5,044	200	112,671	788
1949	23,892	5,272	209	116,103	778
1950	23,853	5,314	210	116,602	769
1951	23,722	5,313	210	114,841	744
1952	23,369	5,328	211	115,197	753
1953	24,094	5,447	213	121,219	759
1954 ²	24,735	5,500	217	123,796	762

¹ Excludes milk sucked by calves and milk produced by cows not on farms.² Preliminary.

Source: Reports of the Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 7.—Per capita consumption of major dairy products and oleomargarine, average—1935-39, and annual, 1943-54

Year	[In pounds]					
	Fluid milk and cream	Butter	Oleo	Cheese	Evaporated	Nonfat solids
Average, 1935-39	330	16.8	2.8	5.5	14.9	1.9
1943	371	11.7	3.8	4.9	16.9	2.1
1944	381	11.8	3.8	4.8	13.6	1.5
1945	399	10.8	4.0	6.6	16.1	1.9
1946	389	10.4	3.8	6.6	16.8	3.2
1947	369	11.1	4.9	6.8	17.9	2.9
1948	355	9.9	6.0	6.8	18.1	3.3
1949	352	10.4	5.7	7.2	17.6	3.2
1950	349	10.6	6.0	7.6	17.9	3.6
1951	352	9.5	6.5	7.1	16.0	4.2
1952	352	8.6	7.8	7.5	15.5	4.6
1953	350	8.6	7.9	7.4	15.2	4.1
1954	352	9.0	8.0	7.6	14.5	4.0

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service, The Dairy Situation, October 1954.

TABLE 8.—Status of dairy price-support purchases and utilizations, Apr. 1, 1952, through Dec. 31, 1954

Year	[In pounds]		
	Butter	Cheddar cheese	Nonfat dry milk solids
PURCHASES			
1952-53 (Apr. 1, 1952, to Mar. 31, 1953)	143,348,182	75,236,131	210,410,097
1953-54 (Apr. 1, 1953, to Mar. 31, 1954)	390,184,566	432,485,208	665,871,918
1954-55 (Apr. 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1954)	176,416,568	124,246,722	408,840,179
	690,949,316	631,968,061	1,285,122,194
USES			
Commercial sales	23,386,895	122,745,838	4,429,851
Animal and mixed feed sales			579,149,831
Sec. 32 outlets	107,008,703	37,236,449	21,146,130

TABLE 4.—Status of imports of dairy products under sec. 22

Commodity	Import status prior to July 1, 1953, under sec. 104	Quota status under sec. 22	Import authorization July 1, 1954 through Oct. 31, 1954
		Pounds	Pounds
Butter	Embargoed	707,000	707,000
Malted milk	High fat contents embargoed	6,000	6,000
Nonfat dry milk	Embargoed Aug. 9, 1951	1,807,000	1,807,000
Italian cow's milk cheese	Annual quota 9,200,000 pounds	9,200,100	6,047,000
Cheddar	Annual quota 9,775,000 pounds	2,780,109	1,842,000
Edam and Gouda	Annual quota 4,609,000 pounds	4,609,200	3,027,000
Blue mold	Annual quota 3,450,000 pounds	4,167,000	2,716,000
Dry whole milk	Embargoed Apr. 1, 1953	7,000	7,000
Dry buttermilk	do.	496,000	496,000
Dried cream	do.	500	500

Source: From reports of the Livestock Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 5.—Exports and imports of specified dairy products, United States, 1939-53

Year	Butter		Cheese		Condensed milk		Evaporated milk		Dried whole milk		Nonfat dry milk solids	
	Ex-ports ¹	Im-ports ²	Ex-ports ¹	Im-ports ²	Ex-ports ¹	Im-ports ²	Ex-ports ¹	Im-ports ²	Ex-ports ¹	Im-ports ²	Ex-ports ¹	Im-ports ²
1939	2.3	1.1	1.5	59.1	2.3	0.2	27.5	(9)	6.3	(9)	2.1	0.9
1940	2.9	1.4	2.3	32.6	27.4	(9)	118.7	(9)	7.5	(9)	8.7	(9)
1941	3.3	3.7	95.0	20.0	82.0	(9)	602.0	(9)	15.0	(9)	36.0	(9)
1942	15.2	20.1	308.0	24.2	15.0	(9)	381.0	(9)	14.0	(9)	134.0	(9)
1943	85.6	3.3	165.0	25.2	44.0	(9)	508.0	(9)	39.0	(9)	232.0	(9)
1944	87.6	1.7	295.0	9.0	52.0	(9)	591.0	0.1	47.0	(9)	237.0	(9)
1945	45.5	3.7	202.0	8.3	118.0	(9)	759.0	4.6	65.0	(9)	302.0	.1
1946	11.4	7.0	208.0	20.8	83.0	(9)	955.0	.6	152.0	(9)	230.0	(9)
1947	11.2	3.8	177.4	8.7	108.2	(9)	469.8	(9)	101.7	(9)	283.1	(9)
1948	5.8	.2	95.6	23.6	111.4	(9)	315.3	(9)	100.5	(9)	159.2	3.1
1949	4.2	.3	98.0	32.0	78.5	.1	249.5	(9)	81.4	(9)	213.7	5.3
1950	26.3	(9)	54.6	56.2	27.9	(9)	150.1	.4	62.6	(9)	331.1	2.5
1951	21.9	.1	81.0	52.3	28.9	(9)	203.4	(9)	59.5	9.0	224.1	1.0
1952	.9	.5	3.8	49.2	29.6	(9)	97.1	(9)	42.5	37.0	58.7	.6
1953	24.6	.1	20.1	56.2	18.0	(9)	134.3	(9)	46.1	5.9	182.5	.4

¹ Reexports included 1915-33.² General imports, 1915-33, beginning 1934, imports for consumption.³ Imports for consumption.⁴ Less than 50,000 pounds.⁵ Preliminary.

Source: The Dairy Situation, Agricultural Marketing Service, 1955 outlook issue, and reports of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

TABLE 8.—Continued

(In pounds)

	Butter	Cheddar cheese	Nonfat dry milk solids
USES—continued			
Sec. 416 donations:			
Domestic	76,990,100	57,951,304	52,500,335
Foreign	153,547,330	93,185,957	266,176,678
Commercial export sales	1,414,350	288,026	2,205,640
Noncommercial export sales ¹	11,362,500		245,149,760
U. S. Army transfers	43,336,871	1,174,288	6,833,765
FOA transfers	9,113,000	4,527,125	11,581,708
Other ²	3,116,213		80,000
Total	434,275,962	317,138,987	1,193,313,695
ESTIMATED SUPPLIES			
As of Dec. 31, 1954	265,673,354	334,829,074	91,808,496

¹ Butter converted to butter oil for foreign welfare use.² Other uses include butter salvage sale, cocoa butter extender sales, butter sales and donations to the Veterans' Administration, donations of dry milk for research, and butter sold for liquid milk recombining.

Source: Reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Report on loan program for whey products and dry buttermilk through Dec. 31, 1954

Products	Quantity placed under loan ^{1,2}	Total loan in dollars
Dry whey	35,431,071	\$2,125,864.24
Dry whey product	866,732	58,504.41
Condensed whey in packages	2,824,071	169,444.17
Condensed whey in tanks	25,901,531	1,070,000.86
Dry buttermilk		
Total	66,023,405	\$3,429,873.68

¹ Includes 40,600,632 pounds of dry whey taken over by CCC of which 14,862,300 pounds have been sold for commercial export, leaving 25,738,332 pounds in inventory.² Pounds of milk solids.

Source: Reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

TABLE 9.—Purchases and utilization of dairy products by CCC during 1953 and 1954

(In millions of pounds)

Purchases	Butter		Cheese		Nonfat dry milk	
	1953	1954	1953	1954	1953	1954
PURCHASES						
January	36.2	28.4	8.0	22.7	29.6	52.8
February	38.6	34.0	17.9	33.2	42.7	55.3
March	52.5	86.2	45.6	178.0	88.6	129.2
April	25.2	14.8	27.1	9.8	45.2	41.5
May	42.3	44.1	35.1	21.9	74.3	75.6
June	66.8	65.6	40.8	33.4	84.4	97.6
July	50.2	35.2	42.6	22.8	67.4	63.9
August	27.1	13.1	30.2	16.8	47.3	45.4
September	4.9	3.1	24.1	12.7	34.8	51.4
October	.9	.1	7.3	4.0	20.4	14.0
November	3.2	.4	4.6	1.7	17.1	8.2
December	11.0		6.9	1.3	36.6	11.2
Total	358.9	325.0	291.0	338.3	587.4	646.2
UTILIZATION						
Commercial domestic sales	3.7	19.7	5.3	116.4	.1	4.3
Animal and mixed feed sales					2.5	578.3
Sec. 32 outlets	71.0	36.0	17.4	19.8	7.5	4.2
Sec. 416 donations:						
Domestic		77.0		58.0		56.5
Foreign	28.1	130.5	14.3	78.9	79.9	186.3
Commercial export sales		1.4		.3		2.2
Noncommercial export sales		11.4			99.3	142.9
FOA transfers		9.1		4.1		11.6
U. S. Army transfers	15.1	28.3		1.2	6.8	.1
Other ¹	.3	3.0				
Total	118.2	316.4	37.5	278.7	196.2	986.4
Estimated supplies as of Dec. 31	256.9	265.7	255.2	334.8	432.3	91.8

¹ Other includes butter sold for salvage, for extending cocoa butter, for liquid milk recombining, transferred to the Veterans' Administration, and donation of nonfat dry milk for research use.

Source: Reports of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT, AS DEVELOPED BY THE DIC SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPORT CONTROL

SEC. 22. (a) It is the policy and the intent of the Congress that, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law and operations thereunder, imports of agricultural commodities or products thereof shall be controlled through import fees or quantitative limitations, to the extent necessary (1) to achieve the purposes of Titles I, II, and III of the Agricultural Act of 1949, or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or Section 32, Public Law 320—74th Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or any loan, purchase, or other program or operation undertaken by the Department of Agriculture or any Agency operating under its direction, and authorized by the laws enumerated in this paragraph (a), or (2) prevent any substantial reduction in the amount of any product processed in the United States from any agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken. In no event shall imports of any agricultural commodity or product thereof be permitted to exceed, during the marketing year for which a program to support prices to producers directly, or indirectly is in effect under any of the laws enumerated herein, average annual imports of such commodity or product thereof during the 5 year period immediately preceding the current program year, unless and until the United States farm price of such commodity or product, except for milk and butterfat and the products thereof, in which case the United States farm price of butterfat shall govern, reaches (a) parity prices as seasonally adjusted for such commodity or product and remains at such level for 3 consecutive calendar months, or (b) such higher levels as the Secretary may determine pursuant to Section 402 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, Provided, however, That the volume restriction set forth herein shall apply during any period when farm prices are below parity; Provided, further, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to impose such additional quantitative limitations of imports as the Secretary may find necessary, during the operation of any price support program for any agricultural commodity, to minimize the cost of such purchases, or losses that would be incurred in the disposition of any commodity in Government inventory; and, Provided further, That the procedure set forth in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) hereof shall be applicable to the establishment of import fees, but shall not be applicable to quantitative limitations except in case the Secretary deems it necessary to limit imports to levels below the level established pursuant to this paragraph (a).

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture deems it necessary to apply import fees, or quantitative limitations designed to limit imports to lower levels than those authorized in paragraph (a) of this section, he shall so advise the President, and, if the President agrees that there is reason for such belief, the President shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts. Such investigation shall be made after due notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, and shall be conducted subject to such regulations as the President shall specify.

(c) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees not in excess of 50 percent ad valorem or such quantitative limitations on any

article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption as he finds and declares shown by such investigation to be necessary in order that the entry of such article or articles will not render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or operation referred to in subsection (a) of this section, or reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any such agricultural commodity or product thereof with respect to which any such program or operation is being undertaken: *Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall impose any limitation on the total quantity of any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption which reduces such permissible total quantity to proportionately less than 50 percent of the total quantity of such article or articles which was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during a representative period as determined by the President: *And provided further*, That in designating any article or articles, the President may describe them by physical qualities, value, use, or upon such other bases as he shall determine.

(d) The fees and limitations imposed by the President by proclamation under this section and any revocation, suspension, or modification thereof, shall become effective on such date as shall be therein specified, and such fees shall be treated for administrative purposes and for the purposes of section 32 of Public Law 320, 74th Congress approved August 24, 1935, as amended, as duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1930, but such fees shall not be considered as duties for the purpose of granting any preferential concession under any international obligation of the United States.

(e) After investigation, report, finding, and declaration in the manner provided in the case of a proclamation issued pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, any proclamation or provision of such proclamation may be suspended or terminated by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that the circumstances requiring the proclamation or provision thereof no longer exist or may be modified by the President whenever he finds and proclaims that changed circumstances require such modification to carry out the purposes of this section.

(f) Any decision of the President as to facts under this section shall be final.

(g) No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section.

United States Should Pay All Channel Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial:

UNITED STATES SHOULD PAY ALL CHANNEL COSTS

To residents of Delaware Valley, United States of America, the most important single aspect of President Eisenhower's budget message is the shattering blow it deals to hopes dredging a 40-foot channel in the Delaware River.

In general, the budget contains few surprises. Most Americans will applaud the continuing emphasis on economy, reflected in a reduction of the spending total to \$62,400,000,000. They will welcome a further cut in the anticipated deficit and recognize the need to carry on present taxes for another year.

But the administration's approach to the pressing problem of dredging the Delaware up as far as Trenton is both surprising and difficult to understand. It involves provisions which are not only of questionable wisdom, but also have been rejected by Congress.

The Delaware is one of those navigable waters over which the Federal Government has traditionally exercised control. Thanks to the location of the Fairless works of the United States Steel Corp., near Morrisville, it has become more important than ever before as an artery of commerce. To accommodate heavier ore boats and other traffic, it should have a 40-foot channel from Trenton to the sea.

Since navigable waters are historically the responsibility of the Federal Government, it was perfectly proper for local interests to ask that money be given the United States Army engineers to pay for the dredging. The total cost—about \$91 million—amounts to only about 2 years' customs receipts in Philadelphia, paid into the Federal Treasury.

Against this background, spelled out time and again by delegations from this area visiting Congressmen and members of the White House staff, the treatment of the channel project in the new budget is downright shameful.

An appropriation of only \$6 million is suggested for the first year's work on the channel. And this has a big "if" attached. For the administration will not request even this plainly inadequate amount unless local interests put up \$18 million for the first year.

Presumably the chief local interest is United States Steel, which already has poured \$500 million into the construction of its new plant, to the benefit of the area—and of the Federal Treasury. Additional local interests expected to share in the cost might be other industries located in Delaware Valley—or even those which might come here later.

But, as a practical matter, the Government wouldn't save the \$18 million. More than half of that amount would come out of corporation taxes now paid by United States Steel or other concerns to the Government. There would be a further revenue loss in the reduction of amounts available for dividends, in many cases taxed at the top rates. The Government would lose still more in higher prices it paid for steel or other products.

If the practical objections to this scheme are strong, those based on traditional principles are even stronger. What sort of rights in the Delaware River would United States Steel be establishing by paying for the dredging? How would the public's right to use the river be affected by the Government's insistence that dredging is a private responsibility?

The Federal Government already is benefiting handsomely and directly from the development of this entire area, given such a tremendous boost by the location of the new steel works. It will continue to benefit, in tax receipts and in the prosperity of the people, if the Delaware River is utilized to its fullest potentials.

Last year Congress turned down a proposal to require private interests to pay for the dredging. In spite of that, the Budget Bureau has stubbornly returned with exactly the same proposal.

Let us hope that Congress continues to write the laws of the land and, if necessary, forces the Budget Bureau to stop blocking this project and provide enough Federal funds to assure a 40-foot channel.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is most appropriate to have in conjunction with the time set aside in the House today for tribute to Lithuania, an expression by two fine Americans of Lithuanian extraction who have made known their views to the Editor of the Hartford (Conn.) Times. The letter by Albina and Joseph Belazaras is as follows:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

To the Editor of the Times:

As the tide of communism continues its, thus far, successful progress toward world engulfment, let us pause in remembrance of Lithuania, one of the first victims of that scourge.

It is appropriate that on February 16, the 37th anniversary of the rebirth of the Lithuanian nation, we ask how long a nation must suffer for the wrongs of its oppressors?

On June 15, 1940, almost 15 years ago, Lithuania slipped beneath the sea of misery and death that is Soviet communism.

After the invasion of Soviet troops fake elections were held on July 14 and 15. E. J. Harrison, former British vice consul in Kaunas and Vilnius, in his book, "Lithuania's Fight for Freedom," describes what took place:

"It was announced that 95.51 percent of the electorate voted in favor of the Working People's Union candidates. It appears, however, that the votes were not actually counted and were destroyed immediately thereafter. This is supported by the fact that the results of the voting were announced in one of the London papers 24 hours before the polls were closed. Nor does the claim of 95.51 percent of the electorate voting appear to be true. As became known later, only some 16 to 18 percent of the electorate actually voted."

At the same time the United States State Department issued a statement in regard to the situation which remains in effect to this day:

"During the past few days devious processes, whereunder the political independence and territorial interests of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion. The people of the United States have watched the admirable progress of these Baltic republics with sympathy and interest and are opposed to predatory acts, no matter whether they are carried out by the use or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other, however weak."

On the 37th anniversary of the independence of this valiant nation, we extend our message of hope to the people of Lithuania. But we, the free, must do more than that.

It is our duty to keep before all nations of the world the tragic truth of Lithuania. It is not enough to offer them hope; we must show that we are resolute, as they are, in our fight against the scourge of communism.

The enslaved people of Lithuania can take heart in the policy of the American Government in continued recognition of the original legal government of Lithuania.

They can also find expression of our purpose in the work of the Baltic Committee of Congress which is seeking to find the truth behind the Soviet seizure of Lithuania.

As long as we keep alive the truth about Lithuania, we keep alive the hopes of the Lithuanian people for eventual freedom and independence.

A regime which is founded on lies and terror cannot last, for it bears the seeds of its own destruction.

In the same way, a democratic nation—whether as an idea or as a political expression—has inherent in it those qualities which insure its preservation.

As long as the Lithuanian people feel and think as a freedom-loving independent nation, Lithuania cannot and never will be destroyed.

ALBINA and JOSEPH BELAZARAS.
EAST HARTFORD.

Excerpts From Address by Frank A. Kemp, President, the Great Western Sugar Co., Denver, Colo., at Annual Meeting of California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, February 4, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the Record the following address by Mr. Frank A. Kemp, president of the Great Western Sugar Co., Denver, Colo., at the annual meeting of the California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., in San Francisco, Calif., on February 4, 1955:

With the possible exception of the capacity to raise hell, which appears not to be confined to any latitude, people or climate, the ability to raise sugar seems almost the world's most universal attribute. The fact is that the two plants involved, sugarcane in the tropics and the sugar beet in the temperate zones, are among nature's most efficient mechanisms. The student of sugar, if he is to understand its problems, must start with this fact. He must understand that over wide reaches of the tropics, an acre devoted to cane generally will bring in money enough to buy the staple foods that the same acre would produce if planted to them, and at the same time support a type of society, master and peon, which seems to be permanently imbedded in many Latin-American cane areas. The sugar beet, on its part, makes a significant contribution to solvent agriculture for which there is no substitute or replacement over wide areas, in bringing to the husbandman the benefits of an intensively cultivated crop, turning out a finished product on the one hand, with the byproducts making possible a farm-feeding, soil-fertilization cycle that produces an astonishing amount of meat and milk and restores to the soil most of the plant food used by the beet crop.

Except for the war period, there has not been a time in my sugar experience when it did not seem that the ability of the world to produce the commodity was greater than the demand. Therein lies both the seed and the fruit of a problem, that today in this year 1955, has been brought home to con-

front and perplex the operator of every present and potential sugar beet farm in this country, large and small.

If I talk about that problem this afternoon, you must understand that I do so with the knowledge that what I say is known to most of you, that many among you are equally or better acquainted with the facts. Nevertheless, every opportunity at which a group such as this can take time from other interests to talk and think about the sugar problem, should not be overlooked, and I shall not pass up the opportunity afforded me to speak about it.

What I shall say are largely my personal views. I submit them to you to stimulate thought and comment, to bring about a better understanding of some phases of the subject that often are hurried over, and to urge the industry in this great State to the continued earnest exercise of its good judgment and its potent influences. Beyond all that, someone in the domestic industry had better start talking or we will be judged by default.

The war ended with many of the participants in a state of near or total exhaustion. Nevertheless, experience after the First World War demonstrated that the recuperative power of the sugar industry, once set in motion, was very strong. Back in 1946 it seemed to many people that the situations, the experiences, and the needs of those most concerned in this market should be studied and an attempt made quickly to develop a pattern and a program that would make sense, that would be a reasonably fair and equitable compromise, that would call for what might be termed a real community of sacrifice, that would fairly protect the interests of consumers, and which would be in the national interest of the country.

You will note that I mentioned prominently in this list the need of compromise, of sacrifice by all. That need, of course, arose out of the readily recognizable fact that if the Philippine industry were to be rehabilitated, as seemed likely over a period of time, potential sugar production within the orbit of the American market was definitely greater than any total demand of that market up to that time.

Even then there arose in some quarters a hue and cry for foreign purchases. Cuba, it was said, had magnanimously increased during the war its sugar production at our request (there seemed then and now no willingness to credit Cuba's altruism to the great profits which she made out of the business), and it would be a shame, the same interests urged, not to allow Cuba time and opportunity gradually to recede from the peak of production that she had climbed.

The domestic sugar-producing areas took a look at the records of their own recent past, and without exception read from them too bearish a view of the future; with not enough weight given to the fact that in this country there had been a deliberate drive by the Government during the war by price support and other means to switch land from sugar into crops like cereals and beans; that land had been taken in Hawaii for military use; that our tractor men went off to ride Patton's tanks; that the rebound of demand from sugar rationing would be a very significant one.

At any rate, the domestic industry believed then, exactly as it should believe today, that part of the sugar demand of this country should be filled by imported sugar and part by sugar domestically produced. And to the everlasting credit of the domestic industry of that time, it participated and cooperated in a most generous and forthright fashion with other sugar interests and our Government in the measurement of the compromise and sacrifice that the facts and beliefs of the time suggested.

Unfortunately, the domestic people were not accorded in 1947 any share whatever in

the growth or progress of the country. We were given a fixed quantity. We accepted it, although we made it clear that if circumstances altered we would present the changed facts when the change took place. None realized the extent by which the country would grow, the percentage by which the population annually would increase. In the light of what has since transpired, it is incredible that no provision was made that we should grow as the country grew. After all, it is in part out of our own overall contribution as citizens that the country has grown as it has, yet we are denied any part of that which we ourselves have made possible. Foreign suppliers receive as an unexpected and unjustified windfall, every ounce of increased sugar demand.

From 1947, when the present quotas were enacted, to 1954, the annual sugar market in this country increased about 1,050,000 tons. Except for 176,000 tons, ceded to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in 1951, every ounce of that increase has gone to Cuba and other foreign suppliers, and unless the law be changed, every ounce of all future increase in demand will further swell the foreign share. At the same time, the domestic cane and beet areas, cut back in acreage, denied the right to improve yields except by further acreage restriction, plagued by above-normal stocks in warehouse, look timidly over the fence and wonder, if growth is good for Cuba, should it not also be recognized to be good for California, and Idaho, and Colorado, and Louisiana?

But make no mistake about it, we owe, and the country owes, sincere and determined allegiance to the broad principles of the existing sugar program. It has been, as President Eisenhower declared last year, one of the most successful agricultural statutes. With the successive reductions in the sugar tariff that have been decreed since the first sugar law was enacted, the modest tax still imposed upon its manufacture has been offset several times by tariff reduction. The payment to each producer is largely financed out of the tax paid by the sugar he himself produced, and is in fact what was once described as "a redistribution of return in the industry." The Treasury makes a net profit from the sugar program—a consideration not to be lightly regarded in these days of unbalanced national budgets.

The President said more than once that he puts first on his list the need to keep the United States strong. I am very confident that he does not intend to lose sight of this for any reason. If the United States is to be kept strong, its important industries must be kept strong. Its agriculture must be kept strong. Our people must be permitted to make the most of their opportunities. Men making homes on American land must have the right to grow the crop best adapted to the soil and climate. These facts must be recognized. And if they are, there must be some expansion of the presently restricted right to produce sugar in this country.

Let me make it clear again, I believe that our sugar need should be filled in part by foreign and in part by domestic suppliers. As domestic producers, vitally interested in what is best for the country along with what we would like in our own behalf, we should support a fair and proper allocation to foreign sugar. In the first meeting representatives of the beet industry had with Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, our spokesmen said that we had accepted a solemn duty to view our beliefs as to sugar in the light of the whole national interest as well as our own interest. I am proud to say that we have fulfilled that self-imposed obligation to the hilt and to this minute.

It is strikingly evident that there are many important influences at work behind the sugar scene and on the sugar stage. Unfortunately, close collaboration during the war between our Government and all sugar

groups, including the Cuban sugar industry, has prompted some of the Cubans to act as if they had acquired vested and preferential rights of citizens of the United States. The so-called Wall Street Cubans have a large publicity and propaganda staff actively at work. It is a new twist to the trade perspective that investment in a foreign country and the desire to enlarge profits on that investment would bring the investor into direct and open conflict with domestic interests.

A recent circular from Cuba addressed to every Rotary Club in this country requested consideration of a scurrilous propaganda piece containing this choice message from a foreigner:

"It does not appear sensible to hurt the countless concerns who have been able to make Cuba an excellent market for their wares and a solid source of money income, just in order to give additional advantages to a handful of already overprivileged sugar producers, artificially supported by a protective tariff plus subsidy payments."

That is an unprovoked aggression. The prejudice and falsity which it discloses would make any responsible propagandist hang his head. Naturally, it raised the gorge of a lot of people in the domestic sugar industry who more than once took Cuba's part—back in 1947, again in 1951, and again in the development and effectuation of the International Sugar Agreement.

Unfortunately, a recent circular addressed by the same Cuban interests to all county agents in this country in the same vein is an example, other publicity suggests that the quotation may be but a sample of the lengths some of the Cuban industry is prepared to go to refuse any sharing of the fortunate privilege that so accidentally fell into their laps.

The angry lament that rises in some quarters in Cuba on any suggestion of reconsideration of the situation in which the American domestic interests have been placed is intentionally misleading and unfair, among other reasons, because it gives the inference that Cuba has already suffered a grave loss of market because of increases in domestic production. That is not the fact. Let's look at the record: The production of the United States beet industry was 1,802,000 tons in 1938 and 1,872,000 tons in 1953—an increase of only 4 percent. But let's see what Cuba had done: Cuba produced 3,089,578 short tons in 1938 and 5,390,786 tons in 1953—an actual increase of over 74 percent.

And what happened elsewhere? Great Britain increased her beet-sugar production from 1938 to 1953, 148 percent; Holland, 111 percent; France, 90 percent; Mexico, between the same years, increased her cane-sugar production, 149 percent; the Dominican Republic, 45 percent; Brazil, 109 percent; Australia, 52 percent. The simple fact is that the rest of the world supported its domestic sugar industries, although as a consequence Cuba was deprived of some part of her so-called world market. Nothing is said by Cuba about these competitive increases by other countries, but cries arise to the high heavens at the slightest suggestion that some hope is to be held out to the American industry.

There is no clear view of what lies ahead of us. The mainland cane industry says it has been cut back 10 and then 8 percent in acreage; that in the light of the size of its inventory on January 1 last, it can market less than 20 percent of its 1955 production in 1955; that its last 3-year average yield of cane is nearly 13 percent higher than the 3-year average ending 4 years ago. It points to the reasonable conclusion from these facts that it faces a still further cut in acreage.

Our industry has increased its sugar yield per acre by around 20 percent since the pre-war period. We have been cut back in acreage from 1954 plantings 10 percent for the area as a whole, some States taking a cut of

over 13 percent. Our January 1 inventory will permit sale of less than 10 percent of the 1955 quota out of 1955 production. In many areas men on new lands, making new homes, cannot get the right to plant beets; in older areas acreage cutbacks endanger rotation plans and threaten uneconomical ownership of expensive beet machinery.

You men and the other members of the California association set new production records last year. To my knowledge no acreage of equal size in the world ever attained so great a yield of beets or of sugar per acre. It was an extraordinary record. It evidenced the benefits of fertile soil and a favorable season. But it also reflected improvement in farming methods, application of new skills, the adoption of scientific and research findings, for which you men and the industry alone are entitled to the credit.

One of the most unfortunate implications in the situation in which the beet industry finds itself, because of the present quota provisions of the law, is that everything else being equal, such a record of progress would have to be offset by a reduction in acres in order that the fixed quota would not be exceeded. That would deny you and the industry the benefit of improvement, the fruits of scientific progress. Is there any American who would contend that this is right, that America can be made strong by such restrictions?

Yet in spite of these appalling facts, there is a determined intent in some high places to refuse relief, to deny even consideration of relief for 2 years. I understand that on Thursday last a group of 26 Senators and Congressmen took personally to the President a rather simple and direct proposal; namely, that this year, not 1956, was the year to consider and act on sugar law extension and revision; that Secretary Benson would be a good man to designate as the right person to set in motion consideration of what should be done. I understand that no attempt was made to present or urge substantive proposals. I understand the President's attitude was interpreted as reasonably favorable to these simple suggestions. Yet within a few hours the eastern papers carried big headlines screaming of a threat to Cuba's existence.

I have great hope that Secretary Benson, who has demonstrated his complete dedication to highest principle, will not only interest himself in, but with the consent and authorization of the President, will move forward to find a sound, equitable, and forthright solution to all sugar claims. It has been done before; it was done in 1947 under Secretary of Agriculture Anderson. If the will exists it can be done again. For our industry, I hope most earnestly that we will contribute a sensible, moderate definition of our needs. I urge this in the interest of the industry and of the Nation.

The basic position of the industry has had some real and very welcome support; the National Reclamation Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the legislatures of a number of Western States have passed strong resolutions and memorials in our behalf, and there will be many more.

But to go back for a moment to the American sugar system, the Cubans themselves think very, very well of it. Within recent weeks the well-known brokerage firm of Luis Mendez & Co., of Habana, had this to say:

"We are extremely lucky that such a quota system exists, as otherwise domestic beet and cane producers and Puerto Rico would be dumping half a million tons more in the American market, and Peru, Formosa, Indonesia, and all other sugar exporting countries would compete with us in the United States market causing Cuba's financial ruin."

The fact is that there is no single interest that has not been benefited by the law, including that most important person without whom there would be no market, the

American consumer. Let us never forget to make it our duty to see that his reasonable interests are fully looked out for.

There is one other war cry I make every time I have the opportunity and that is to sound my conviction that this country must see to it that we maintain a solvent and prosperous agriculture, with conditions on the farm that will prompt men and women to make their homes on the land, conditions that will provide them with more leisure, more opportunity, and more time for the education of their children, more satisfaction for the whole farm family. All that must be achieved for the proper livelihood of our cities, our enterprises, all industry. No one should make any mistake about it; unless agriculture is solvent and prosperous, this country will go to pot.

If we can get the needed adjustments, we can look to the future with real confidence. We can breed still better seed; still further improve yields; cut farming costs; increase feeding grains and lower feeding costs; continue mechanization so that both the pay and the dignity of the field worker are increased. We can continue to produce honest products and to provide users of them with the variety and the service they require and want. The industry should continue to pay fair returns to the people who grow the beets and to those whose money is invested in the properties; continue to bear its fair share of American taxes; build its part of the roads; provide steady and desirable employment.

Golden Anniversary of Jewish Memorial Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is a great satisfaction to record a communal achievement in the congressional district that I have the honor to represent, which deserves to be known widely and which can serve as an example for similar institutions throughout the country.

I refer to Jewish Memorial Hospital, a voluntary supported, nonsectarian institution, with a staff and with patients from all races and creeds, located at Broadway and 196th Street, which has rendered invaluable communal services to one of the fastest growing areas in the city of New York. This year it is celebrating its golden anniversary, the 50th year of its founding, marking a milestone in its history. The hospital is noted not only for its unusually high standards in medical and nursing services, but also for significant researches in medicine, for its program of community health education, and as a pioneer in programs for children.

The hospital has developed from a small institution to one that now has over 200 beds and bassinets, with a program approved by the Hospital Council of greater New York to increase its capacity by 140 beds, based on increased requirements of the area served by the institution.

As I have indicated, the hospital is currently celebrating the 50th year of its founding. In the course of its history

it has secured approval of all of the important hospital and medical associations and has attained a distinctive reputation for its high standards, its unsurpassed administration, its fine medical staff, and its dedicated board of trustees, a group of philanthropically minded citizens, headed by one of our city's outstanding businessmen, Mr. David Schwartz, of Jonathan Logan, Inc.

Research at the hospital has included important work, including: Work on the Rh blood factor—a dramatic achievement some years ago was a complete blood transfer to save a new-born baby; on leukemia—you may recall the Louis boy story, a Sing-Sing prisoner who offered himself for experimentation to save the life of 6-year-old Marcia Slater and who was later pardoned by Governor Dewey; with radioisotopes—Jewish Memorial Hospital is one of the few in New York City authorized to work on radioisotopes by the Atomic Energy Commission; and on trypsin—again, you may remember the dramatic last-minute call to the Jewish Memorial Hospital from Australia in an attempt to save the life of Sister Kenny.

I particularly emphasize the extraordinary research done at this hospital, because it paves the way for what can be done in other parts of the country.

Research at Jewish Memorial Hospital expanded to such a point in recent years that it was necessary to add a new wing to the present hospital building. Last fall the new research laboratory was dedicated and provided an occasion for community celebration and for tributes from outstanding Americans.

It may be of interest to recall some of the statements made on that occasion.

One of the main speakers was Dr. Ralph Bunche, the distinguished Nobel peace prize winner, who said:

This dedication signals a new advance in the development of a distinguished institution which for nearly half a century has rendered invaluable service to the community. Its portals welcome the needy. Its staff and facilities are open to all races and creeds. Its standards are among the highest.

The new research laboratory building will augment the facilities and expand the horizon of service of this hospital. Within these new walls, over the years, will be carried on the work of dedicated men and women which inevitably will bring new and greater benefits to humanity in its constant struggle against disease and suffering and untimely death.

Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, felicitated the institution in these words:

My congratulations to you, the board and all those who have made possible this auspicious occasion, the dedication of the hospital's new research laboratory building. The addition of this important new facility for the expansion of the many noteworthy services provided by the Jewish Memorial Hospital is in keeping with the magnificent tradition of progress and contribution to our community's welfare that has been continuous since the hospital's founding almost a half century ago. As I advised, I greatly regret I cannot be with you to express personally my warm admiration for your objectives, and how grateful we all are for your cooperation in providing the means to carry on important research so vital to the health and welfare of us all.

The president of the board of trustees, Mr. David Schwartz, explained the origin of the new Research Laboratory Building when he said:

From the first day of my association with Jewish Memorial Hospital I urged and fought for the extension of our research work. We, of this hospital, believe that our services to the community should consist not only of curing the sick but of doing what is possible to study and to prevent illness and disease. We achieved some success toward our goal within the limited facilities at our disposal up to this time. This is evidenced by a number of major contributions in the field of medicine and research by the members of our staff, as for example with radioactive isotopes, in the study of cancer, leukemia, and the Rh factor in the newborn. With the magnificent expanded facilities which we are dedicating today, we have every reason to hope for even greater advances and achievements in the field of research. This is not something abstract. It is of direct benefit to patients, patients in our hospital and in other institutions. This is our pride: That we are being of direct help to those who suffer from illness and disease. And we are also proud of the fact that no one seeking treatment in this hospital is asked about his race, religion, or origin. A disease germ does not recognize those distinctions. Neither do we. A glance at our staff and at our patients will show the nonsectarian, universal character of our hospital services.

Last, the building itself was dedicated by one of our city's most distinguished spiritual leaders, Dr. Israel Goldstein, rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, who said:

It is a source of special pleasure to me that my participation in these ceremonies today is an encore to my participation in the ceremonies at the dedication of your main building some years ago. The participation of clergy of several denominations then as now is no doubt a triple-clad guaranty of your success. Actually, it is a tribute to the broad character of your ministry of healing which does not ask whether a person is Christian or Jew; black or white; but only whether he is in need of the service you have to offer.

It is a sign of strength and progress that, between the dedication of the former building and the dedication of this building, new forces have come into your work, and into the carrying of the responsibilities. This is a tribute to the older men who have recognized the need for new reinforcements and have made room for new people. It is also a tribute to the younger men who so ably and generously have stepped into the noble tradition of their forebears.

This building can be dedicated because men have been dedicated, giving their time, their energy, and their resources to this institution. Yet, in every group, there is always one who stands out among his colleagues—*primus inter pares*—the one to whom recognition gravitates because his colleagues recognize in him unusual endowments of heart and spirit, in sight and foresight, sound judgment seasoned with courage and a dash of daring, and extraordinary business success which has not spoiled the humanity of the man. The Jewish Memorial Hospital is fortunate in having such a leader in David Schwartz, its president.

Efficiency must not necessarily be accompanied by austerity. A stern manner is not necessarily a sign of great skill. Though I am only a layman in this field, I venture the opinion that the doctor's affability and the nurse's smile do not retard convalescence. A pleasant manner does not hurt even in international relations, witness the success of Dr. Ralph Bunche who honors us with his presence today. To doctors and nurses, of course, the illness and suffering of patients

are part of their daily routine, but not so to the patients themselves. Fortunate, therefore, is the patient who receives the ministry of skill seasoned with kindness. I trust that this community will always think of Jewish Memorial Hospital as the hospital with a smile, where skill is sweetened with kindness.

This building which we are dedicating today has untold possibilities for the well-being of men, women, and children everywhere. In the age of the atom, when we are hoping that the secrets of atomic energy may serve the purposes of peace and not of war, it may be that this building will have much to do with applying some of the results of these researches to the healing or the prevention of disease.

Thus we dedicate the research laboratory wing of the Jewish Memorial Hospital. Recalling the phrase of the prophet, Malachi, I pray that, like the son of righteousness, the Jewish Memorial Hospital may bring healing in its wings.

Mr. Speaker, this is a singular occasion for all of us to join in our tribute to this invaluable institution that for 50 years has striven earnestly and effectively to save lives, to restore health, to cure, and in other ways to serve the people in the community.

The hospital is marking its golden anniversary with a dinner, to be held on April 16 in the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel under the chairmanship of another distinguished New York philanthropist, Sol Rosenblatt.

I know that the community and my distinguished colleagues join with me in felicitations, in grateful appreciation for services already rendered and in hopes that the next half century will see a continued flowering of the precious values that Jewish Memorial Hospital is bringing to its community, to the city of New York, to America, and to all the world.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, again this year, at the commemoration of the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the members and guests of the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore had the privilege of hearing from the counselor of the Lithuanian Legation, the Honorable J. Kajeckas; and, under leave to extend my remarks, it is a pleasure to insert his speech in the RECORD. It follows:

TRANSLATION OF SPEECH DELIVERED BY MR. J. KAJECKAS, COUNSELOR OF THE LITHUANIAN LEGATION, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PROCLAMATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE, AT LITHUANIAN HALL, BALTIMORE, MD., ON FEBRUARY 12, 1955

Today is the day of triumph for the Lithuanian Nation. The proclamation of Lithuania's independence, under the circumstances, was an heroic act. It marked the fulfillment of the hopes of the Lithuanian Nation through long years of oppression. It led her from oppression to freedom and its blessings.

There was eagerness to get things done and to progress. The people hastened to compensate for the time lost under oppression. The Lithuanian took his "plough, book, and lyre," and opened a new path to Lithuanian glory. A comparatively high standard of living was reached. Marvelous progress was achieved in all spheres of activity. Lithuania achieved that which can only be achieved under freedom. This is recognized by Lithuanians and foreigners alike. It is not without reason that even today Lithuania is referred to by its oppressors as Little America, and they hasten to it eagerly to garner the fruits thereof for their eternally empty beggars' pouches. It is not without reason that even today in the Caucasus and elsewhere in the Soviet Union an American is mistaken for a person from the Baltic States.

This anniversary is also our Thanksgiving Day. It is proper and right that we should remember, though briefly and only in part, those to whom we owe gratitude for Lithuania's independence.

In the first place to God. To Him who gave the command to love one's fatherland as one's mother. To Him who for centuries did not forsake the suffering Lithuanian Nation but extended solace and hope to the weary and terrorized serf. To Him who inspired the hearts of those who risked deportation to Siberia for a printed word, for a prayer book, and for clinging to the language those in a school of despair. To Him who brought to their knees neighboring giant states that sought Lithuania's enslavement and endowed freedom on the humbled Lithuanian Nation. If God had not blessed the efforts of the Lithuanian Nation to be free, they would have been in vain, as in vain they were in the case of much larger and stronger nations.

We are grateful to the signatories of the act of independence. Some of them paid for it with their lives to the present aggressor.

We are grateful to friendly countries, but most of all to these United States of America. America never has forgotten the enslaved peoples of the world, wherever they may be. Lincoln, whose birthday we also commemorate today, stressed that the American Declaration of Independence promised the hope of freedom to the whole world for the whole future. President Wilson raised the right of self-determination of nations and created proper conditions that freedom might also be Lithuania's rightful lot.

We are grateful to the simply-clad but determined Lithuanian volunteers, to the Lithuanian Army.

The role of Lithuanian-Americans in the achievement of Lithuanian independence and the strengthening of its foundations is great. Their efforts are both varied and imposing. I do not attempt to enumerate them. Honor and gratitude are due to the numerous known and less known supporters and friends of Lithuania.

This anniversary is also the day of mourning, solace, hope, and determination.

The storm raised by tyrants crushed Lithuania. She fell a victim in an unequal struggle. We mourn because of her present fate. Nevertheless, her spirit is still gloriously alive.

In the summer of 1941 everyone rose up against Lithuania's enslavers. When the Red Dragon returned a second time, it was confronted with a most remarkable and formidable underground resistance organization. The congressional committee presided over by the Honorable Charles J. Kersten registered numerous heroic episodes of that underground struggle. After the death of Stalin even the enslaved Lithuanians in the Vorkuta slave-labor camps in Siberia arose. Over there even Heaven is being stormed by secret and collective prayers under far more terrible circumstances than those of the darkest times of the catacombs of Rome.

We are deeply grateful to the American Government and the American people for the condemnation of Soviet aggression in the Baltic States and the nonrecognition of their occupation. Soon after General Eisenhower became President, he stated that he will never give into bondage any nation. In spite of the Soviet offensive of so-called peaceful coexistence, he stressed that: "the peace we seek is . . . not bought at the expense of others, of principle" (New York Times, October 21, 1954). In his Christmas address he again reiterated: "Let no one think that we want peace at any price, that we shall forsake principle . . . or that we may pawn our honor for transitory concession" (Department of State Bulletin, December 27, 1954).

We rejoice at the great work accomplished last year by the Baltic Committee, later known as the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, with the Honorable Charles J. Kersten at the head, and to Honorable Senator DOUGLAS for his sympathetic resolution.

We rejoice at the repeated sympathetic statements in regard to Lithuania expressed by the Honorable Governor of Maryland, by its senators, congressmen, the house of delegates and the Honorable Mayor of the city of Baltimore. Lithuania is also deeply honored by the presence of the distinguished guests gathered here tonight.

To all of them the Lithuanian nation owes a deep and lasting gratitude.

Thus, we are not forgotten and we are not alone. Our enemy is the enemy of both the free and the enslaved world. The Red Dragon seeks to "liberate" all: in other words, to enslave, annihilate, dehumanize, and steep in misery. Nevertheless, justice will prevail. Let us do our part. If a Lithuanian in his fatherland and an exile in Siberia do not break down, a free Lithuanian should never waver in his determination and hope to see Lithuania free again. Let us remain united and determined. Tyrants are not eternal. According to Valgantas:

"As soon as the hands of the strangler open, the nation will immediately revive with the first breath of its own precious air, and cry out: 'I am still alive.'"

Mr. Speaker, in the belief that the Members of Congress will also find very interesting the brief outline of Lithuanian history which emphasizes that nation's constant struggle to maintain its independence and freedom, sometimes successful, sometimes unsuccessful, I include it at this point:

THE OUTLINE OF LITHUANIAN HISTORY THE KINGDOM-GRAND DUCHY OF LITHUANIA, 1200-1795

Two hundred years of struggle against the German knights and the crusaders from all of Europe. Expansion of Lithuanian borders to vast regions of eastern Europe.

1251: Coronation of Mindaugas as King of Lithuania.

1236 and 1260: Two decisive battles in which invading Teutonic Order and crusaders were defeated and Germans' blitz conquest of Lithuania and whole eastern Europe was averted.

1362: The battle in Ukraine where Lithuania defeated Tartars, won Ukraine and checked the expansion of the Tartars to the west.

1387: Baptism of Lithuania.

1392: Vytautas the Great became the ruler of Lithuania. Lithuania became the largest empire in eastern Europe.

1410: Tannenberg. The combined armies of Lithuania and Poland under the direct command of Vytautas the Great crushed the Germans and stopped "Drang nach Osten" for several centuries.

1462-1795: Lithuania resisted the Russians "Drang nach Westen."

1400-1500: The pinnacle of Lithuanian power.

1528: Land census in Lithuania, the first comprehensive census undertaken in Europe.

1529: The first Lithuanian statutes, the first real code of laws in Europe since Justinian.

1550-1569: Agrarian reform.

1569: Treaty of Lublin created a confederation of Lithuania and Poland. Decline of Lithuania began.

1579: The Academy of Vilnius established. Later transformed into University of Lithuania.

1605: Lithuanian forces defeated Sweden at Salaspilis.

1620: Polish-Lithuanian Armies under the command of Lithuanian Marshal Katkus defeated huge Turkish Army in Moldavia.

Sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth centuries: Continuous wars with Russia and Sweden.

1795-96: End of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; Lithuania occupied by Russians.

1812: Temporary reestablishment of Lithuania during Napoleonic War with Russia.

1831: First insurrection against Russia.

1863: Second insurrection.

1905: Third insurrection.

1918-40—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

1918: February 16—Proclamation of reestablishment of Lithuania as an independent republic.

1919-20: War for independence against Russians, Germans, and Poles.

1923: Return of Klaipeda Memel region from Germany to Lithuania.

1922: Agrarian reform.

1920-39: Rapid growth of Lithuanian economy and cultural life.

1939: Lithuania regained the capital Vilnius.

1940: Occupation of Lithuania by huge Russian Army.

1941: The first deportation to Siberia.

1941: Revolt of Lithuania against Russia at the beginning of German-Russian War. The Government of Lithuania reestablished. In short time the independence was suppressed by Nazis.

1944: Russians reoccupied Lithuania.

1944: Underground resistance against Communist Russia and continuous heroic fight of Lithuanian partisans for freedom of Lithuania and also of all freedom-loving people in the world.

Also for the information of the Members, I am including the text of the resolution adopted by those present at the banquet, relating to the fate of Lithuania and recommending certain action to be taken by our Government:

At the 37th commemoration of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, sponsored by the Council of Lithuanian Societies of Baltimore, Md., held at Lithuanian Hall, 851 Hollins Street, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas nearly 10 years have passed since the liberation of Europe from the Nazi yoke; and

"Whereas in excess of 100 million people of the Central and East European countries, among which is Lithuania, are still enslaved by ruthless Communist Russia; and

"Whereas the Lithuanian people are faced with the extermination of their race by mass deportations and slaughter; and

"Whereas under the Potsdam agreement, part of East Prussia was taken from Germany and turned over to Soviet Russia for temporary administration and taking advantage of this opportunity Soviet Russia for its own imperialistic purposes has colonized this region with people from Soviet Russia to the end that the Lithuanian nation will be encircled by a hostile Russian-Asiatic population; and

"Whereas this part of East Prussia from time immemorial was inhabited by Lithuanians and in later years by planned colonization it was partially Germanized and settled by Prussian Junkers; and

"Whereas since World War II this aforementioned area is no longer inhabited by Germans; and

"Whereas in the future formation of the political destiny of this territory it would be totally unwise to reestablish a settlement of militant Prussian Junkers and to again set up a Polish Corridor problem and so create the risk of another future war between Germany and Poland: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent, professing grave anxiety over the fate of our fatherland, Lithuania, appeal to the Government of the United States—

"1. To continue its policy of nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"2. To exert its strong influence in the United Nations in order to prevent the annihilation of the Lithuanian people.

"3. To incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved countries as an integral part of United States foreign policy.

"4. To urge that the area of East Prussia, which is now under the administration of Soviet Russia, shall be ceded to Lithuania at such time as the East Prussian question shall be proposed for determination."

THOMAS G. GRAY,
President.

MARTIN RAILA,
Secretary.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement in opposition to the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements:

STATEMENT OF E. L. TORBERT, VICE PRESIDENT, ONONDAGA POTTERY CO.; CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN TRADE COMMITTEE, VITRIFIED CHINA ASSOCIATION, INC., BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 27, 1955

I am E. L. Torbert, vice president of Onondaga Pottery Co., Syracuse, N. Y., and chairman of the foreign trade committee of the Vitrified China Association, Inc. In addition to the members of the Vitrified China Association, Inc., I am authorized to represent other manufacturers of vitrified china tableware, in all fully 80 percent of the vitrified china production of the United States.

We in the American china tableware industry have been struggling with ever-increasing burdens placed upon us by our Government. Aside from the imposition of domestic taxes and other burdens common to most American industries, we find ourselves in an industry that apparently is considered by some people as expendable in the interest of furthering certain foreign relations.

As each new load has been placed upon us we have listened to soft words and offers of relief if our industry was harmed. In an interview with Mr. Paul Hoffman, then Administrator of ECA, he stated that "some industries will be hurt, perhaps it will be your industry. If so, we must arrange for a subsidy."

When we turn from such assurances to look at the record we will, I am sure, be considered justified in suggesting that the time has come for our Government to show some interest in our increasing problem.

It is now well known that the china tableware industry is by nature dependent largely on handcraft artisans. Notwithstanding mechanization within our industry in this country, which is the most streamlined, the most proficient in the world, labor still accounts for nearly two-thirds of total production costs.

The American standard of wages in the pottery industry in 1952 was about 4 times that of England, 4½ that of Germany, and 9 times that of Japan—United States Tariff Commission.

Just as American agricultural industry needs to be protected (mostly by quotas on imports) against destruction by competition from low foreign prices, so American wages in industries whose product has a high-labor content, need protection from destruction by competition based on low foreign wages.

The foreign china tableware wages and selling prices being so low, the American Tariff Act of 1930 carried on decorated china an ad valorem rate of 70 percent plus 10 cents per dozen pieces.

Beginning in January 1939 and the trade agreement with the United Kingdom and continuing through the Geneva negotiations of 1948 and the negotiations at Torquay in 1951—nine separate reductions have been made in the 1930 rates of duties on chinaware in some classifications to the full limit allowed by the law.

Further inroads on this reduced protection were accomplished by increased exemption granted returning tourists, in 1948 and again in 1949.

During the period in which this whittling away at our industry has taken place imports of decorated household china tableware from all foreign countries have increased from 2,070,000 dozens in 1948 to 4,940,000 dozens in 1953, an increase of 138 percent—United States Tariff Commission, November 1954.

In contrast to the growth in imports of china tableware sales in the United States market, study of Tariff Commission reports show that domestic manufacturers in 1948 supplied 29.7 percent of the United States market, in 1952, 15.8 percent.

Injury to domestic manufacturers of vitrified china household tableware is confirmed by the Tariff Commission's reports which show the total United States production decreased 10.3 percent from 1949 to 1952, inclusive (U. S. Tariff Commission, November 1954). Since 1952 was the last year reported by the Tariff Commission it has been ascertained by recent independent survey that there was a further reduction of 10.1 percent in domestic production from 1952 to 1954.

Injury to the domestic china household tableware industry is further shown by a study of the profits of four of the larger producers of vitrified household china tableware. This statement of the combined operations of the four companies shows a drastic decline and trend from a profit before taxes in 1948 of 13.79 percent to a loss of 1.47 percent in 1954.

During this same period 4 vitrified china plants in this country, 3 of which had been in business a total of 184 years, have been forced to liquidate. In terms of those 4 companies only, the livelihood of over 1,000 persons and their dependents was wiped out in a little over 4 years.

It is a matter of the greatest concern to us that in three additional units of our industry, employment, which stood at over 3,800 in 1948, has dropped to less than 2,100 today.

There has been no compensating growth among the remaining units of our industry. To the contrary, the balance of 14 potteries

have also, in total, experienced this attrition, if to a lesser degree.

This evidence and other facts cited earlier in this testimony show clearly that the china tableware industry in the United States is in precarious straits. Under these conditions, the further reduction of already inadequate tariff protection could have but one outcome.

We can see no practical alternative to the setting up of import quotas as a means of creating equity and stability where neither now exists.

During the time this serious situation was developing we sought relief through the escape clause and the cost-equalizing provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

As to the escape clause:

Our situation fulfilled each of the basic injury criteria as set forth in section 7B of the Trade Agreements Act of 1951—

"A decline in sales, an increase in imports, either actual or relative to domestic production, a higher or growing inventory, or a decline in the proportion of the domestic market supplied by domestic producers." The Commission was against us unanimously.

Since the escape-clause procedures have been available to American producers 53 appeals have been considered by the United States Tariff Commission. In only five of those cases has relief been granted. Is it probable that in the other 48 cases no injury or threat of injury was present?

In discussing H. R. 1 with Members of the present Congress, we have pointed out the ineffectiveness of the escape clause and have been told that such ineffectiveness was the result of "improper administration"; that it was the intent of the Congress that the escape clause should provide relief to industries that have been harmed.

Our circumstances require fair legislation with respect to escape clause, so drawn as to insure proper administration.

We favor the withdrawal of the discretion granted the President by the Congress in putting the findings and recommendations of the Tariff Commission into effect. The Commission is not a Cabinet department but a bipartisan, semijudicial body. After a matter has been considered and decided under the law, it should not be subject to review or change by any other department.

It is futile and without real value to have a Commission, and for industry to take part in the arduous and expensive proceedings, if those proceedings are then to be set aside.

Let me emphasize that this is not an infringement of Presidential powers, inherent or otherwise, but a simple withdrawal of congressional powers abdicated to the President to be exercised without public hearings and without recourse.

When we suggest return to Congress of its constitutional rights as to tariffmaking we are told that logrolling will result. We suggest that it would be far wiser to do our own logrolling if any is required than permit such logrolling to be done for us by 30 to 40 foreign nations constituting GATT.

I now wish to raise questions having to do with preserving the livelihood and jobs of hundreds of thousands of honorably employed citizens of this country. One question examines the intent of this bill, H. R. 1; another is directed to the intent of this committee with respect to that matter.

In a day when nearly every lawmaker and court of this land is on guard against special interest legislation, it is almost incredible that we should read the following excerpts from H. R. 1:

"For the purpose of expanding foreign markets, so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, etc."

Have we so drifted from our basic concept of equal rights for all people of this Nation that it is proper to propose that the interests of selected industries of this country should be promoted even to the extinction of other industries and the employment which they now afford?

This proposition is implicit in the preamble of H. R. 1 and, if I were a Congressman of the United States, I would consider it an affront to democratic justice.

Is it better to attempt to hold and enlarge foreign markets which were never ours traditionally than to retain for ourselves our own markets and thereby safeguard employment in domestic industries which helped to create those markets?

During this past week and for some time precedent to it, you have been told and the public has been told that this bill provides for a gradual reduction in tariffs. It has not been advertised that this bill also provides for a drastic reduction in tariffs and I am confident that many who have spoken in favor of it were not aware of this feature.

The radical tariff-reducing provisions of H. R. 1 are vital to the pottery industry. This bill has been carefully examined by expert counsel and I am advised that, under it, existing tariffs on critical categories of china tableware and items other than pottery could be reduced by 50 percent by June 30 of this year and by a total of 58½ percent within 25 months of its passage.

I should also like to refer to those provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which relate to "unemployment of or injury to American workers, miners, farmers, or producers, producing like or competitive articles" and "unemployment, injury, or impairment, or threat thereof."

Was it the intent of Congress to safeguard established employment and wages in this country against the insurmountable competition offered by products of low-cost labor from foreign countries?

I think it was—clearly.

Has the will of the majority of the Members of Congress, who voted in approval of those safeguards, been observed in the administering of this legislation?

Why have so many applications for relief been denied? A partial answer may be present in the findings of the United States Tariff Commission handed down to our industry in July of last year in compliance with Senate Resolution 253, adopted May 12, 1952.

Under the provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the Tariff Commission is empowered to determine the differences in costs of production of items (certain household chinaware in the case in point) imported into the United States and like or similar domestic items, and to make recommendations for suitable relief.

The study indicated that the cost of like and similar articles, laid down at the same point in this country, was \$1.30 for Japanese ware and \$3.69 for American. (U. S. Tariff Commission Investigation No. 118, June 24, 1954.) The rate of duty found necessary to equalize the United States and Japanese costs of production was 284 percent ad valorem based on foreign values plus 15 cents per dozen separate pieces. The rate in effect was and is 70 percent ad valorem plus 10 cents per dozen pieces.

Imports of this ware from Japan alone had captured 30 percent of the United States market by 1948 and 65 percent by 1952. In the same period the share and volume falling to American producers declined and profits plunged drastically to approach the vanishing point. Yet no relief was granted.

Why?

Four members of the Tariff Commission¹ reasoned that, because prices of Japanese

¹Chairman Brossard and Vice Chairman Talbot dissented.

ware were so much lower than those of nearly identical American ware, these items were not commercially interchangeable. Since they were not commercially interchangeable, this logic ran, they were, therefore, not like and similar. Not being like and similar, section 336 could not apply. Case dismissed.

Is it the intention of this group that the problems of an American industry that is older than this Nation—that is doing everything in its power to insure employment to honorable and respected citizens—should be treated in this manner?

I consider H. R. 1 to be a request for authority by an administration that has abused similar authority in the past and which administration declines to commit itself on its considerations in using such authority in the future.

In the words of Secretary Dulles, "it is the administration's intention to exercise powers contemplated by the bill in such a manner that the legitimate concerns of United States business will be fully taken into account."

What is meant by the phrase "legitimate concerns"? Would his definition of that term be your definition?

When Mr. Dulles refers to United States business is he speaking of all United States business, or is he setting apart producers for export and United States companies with plants and investments abroad who would export to this country the products of cheap labor at the expense of American employment?

What sort of assurance is Mr. Dulles giving when he says these matters "will be fully taken into account"? The act of "taking into account" is no guaranty that judgment and decisions based thereon will conform with the intent of Congress and its concept of the true interests of this Nation.

In its way this administration has "taken into account" the escape clause procedures of this act. And in its way it has chosen to do as it well pleases, ignoring the will of Congress by refusing to invoke those provisions when, in all justice, the relief provided by them should have been granted.

We, who have suffered from the inroads of imports, who have had to throw on relief rolls hundreds and thousands of loyal employees, who are now operating at a loss because of this vicious foreign competition and who can see in prospect only dwindling markets for our industry, hear with amazement the trade proposals of this administration.

While the Secretary of Labor takes the pulse of national unemployment, carefully ignoring conditions in the growing list of industries vulnerable to imports, and reports all is well—reciprocal trade is a success—the Secretary of State pleads for consideration of foreign manufacturers who must be assured that American markets will be theirs to exploit at will.

All concern in H. R. 1 is for our export industries, for capitalists who have investments abroad. Not one word of comfort is there in H. R. 1 for workers in our industries that, if they are to live, must have protection from the imported production of cheap labor of other countries. Not one word. Only a promise of slow death while our economy adjusts itself to the assumption of our markets by industrialists of foreign nations.

The issue is quite clear. Are we to live or are we to die?

If we are to live, if our industry is to be restored to its rightful place—a position of equality of competition—then adequate safeguards must be written into H. R. 1 and we must be sure those provisions will be applied promptly and with the full force and effect intended.

The 57th Anniversary of the Sinking of the "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, each year on February 15, we observe the sinking of the battleship *Maine* which cost the lives of 2 officers and 253 men and resulted in the war with Spain in 1898.

This is an occasion when we pay annual tribute to the gallant Spanish-American War veterans who defended the Stars and Stripes, fighting in the cruel heat of San Juan and battling pestilence and disease in the steaming jungles.

When President McKinley issued the call for volunteers, the United States had an Army and Navy of only 2,143 officers and 26,040 enlisted men; while Spain had one of the largest navies in the world and an army of 500,000 with over 192,000 in Cuba alone.

There were some 483,000 American youths who served in the Spanish-American war and of this number nearly 20,000 lost their lives either in battle or by yellow fever contracted in the disease-infested jungles.

The feat of Admiral Dewey on May 1, 1898, when the Spanish Fleet was destroyed is one of the glorious pages in American naval history.

Yet while we salute the United States Navy for its stellar role, let us not forget that the valiant foot soldiers and daring cavalymen fought against great odds in heavy clothing in hot weather that sapped the vitality of the sturdiest men.

Let no man underrate the soldier of the Spanish-American War. Facing the perils of yellow fever and with poor rations and contaminated water, his life was made more difficult by disease-carrying insects that 57 years ago were uncontrolled and a plague to mankind.

Medical progress has made stupendous strides in the past 57 years yet the boys of '98 had no miracle or wonder drugs with the result they were virtually guinea pigs in the desperate attempts made to halt epidemics of every known variety.

These were the young men who carried the American flag in America's first crusade for the liberation of mankind.

Many of them again served their country on foreign soil together with their sons in World War I; while in World War II and the Korean war their sons and grandsons carried on in the noble cause of defending humanity by thwarting the ambitions of power-crazed dictators.

Truly, the American Nation owes an undying debt to those who fought in the Spanish-American War for they were pioneers in the battles waged on foreign soil in defense of liberty and freedom.

Today, on the 57th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, I should like to

describe briefly the battleship *Maine* and the scene of that eventful evening February 15, 1898, when two terrific explosions sank the ship in Havana harbor resulting in a terrible disaster.

To begin with, in the winter of 1897-98 mobs of Spanish loyalists, namely, those inimical to the United States and fiercely resentful of the well-known sympathy of the American people for the oppressed Cubans, became so formidable that the American consul general at Habana, Fitzhugh Lee, appealed to this Government for moral support in the shape of a naval force in Cuban waters. This request, made often before, was at last heeded. In January 1898, orders were issued to the North Atlantic squadron to assemble at the Dry Tortugas, within 6 hours' steaming distance of Habana. On the 25th of the month the *Maine* was ordered to Habana itself. A second-class battleship, she had, nevertheless, for that day, certain formidable aspects. She had an extreme length of 324 feet; beam, 57 feet; displacement, 6,650 tons; indicated horsepower, 9,290; and trial speed, 17.45 knots. In addition, she had an armored belt extending 180 feet at the waterline on each side, over which was a flat, armored deck. Joining the two forward ends of the belt was a heavy steel bulkhead, at the bottom of which was an armored deck which continued to the stem. The flat steel deck above armor dipped down abaft the belt, and was continued to the stern, one deck below, with a slightly diminished thickness. The barbettes and turrets were of heavy steel.

As for armament, the *Maine* had two "winged" turrets, each containing two 10-inch breech-loading rifles. She carried six 6-inch breech-loading rifles, besides seven 6-pounder and eight 1-pounder rapid-firing rifles. Finally, she had four above-water torpedo tubes on her berth deck, all in broadside.

On the morning of January 25, 1898, the Spanish authorities having been previously notified of her advent, the *Maine*, Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, steamed into Havana Harbor and was duly assigned a berth 500 yards off the arsenal.

No United States vessel had visited Havana during the previous 3 years and meanwhile tension had been steadily mounting between the Spanish and American Governments.

There was much doubt as to the nature of our reception—

Wrote Captain Sigsbee—

for I was not aware of the character of the diplomatic exchanges. I was sincerely desirous of a friendly reception, but it was my affair to be ready for all emergencies. The *Maine* was in such a state of preparation that she could not have been taken at much disadvantage; nevertheless, she presented no offensive appearance, and meant no offense. On board United States men-of-war—

The Captain added thoughtfully—

It is commonly only a short step from peaceful appearance to complete readiness.

The Spanish port officials behaved with punctilious courtesy and the social amenities between American and Spanish authorities proceeded according to naval protocol. Then at 9:40 p. m., on the

night of February 15, the blow fell. At that fateful moment two terrific explosions threw parts of the *Maine* 200 feet in the air and illuminated the whole harbor.

The first dull explosion had been followed by a second, much more powerful, probably that of the forward magazine. The forward half of the ship was reduced to a mass of twisted steel; the after part slowly sank. The *Maine* carried 26 officers and 328 men, all of whom were on board when the explosion took place, except an assistant engineer, 2 naval cadets, and a gunner. Two officers and 250 men were killed at once and 8 men died afterward.

Captain Sigsbee's own immediate impressions, set down in his book, the *Maine*, are of interest. I quote:

At taps ("turn in and keep quiet"), 10 minutes after 9 o'clock, I laid down my pen to listen to the notes of the bugle, which were singularly beautiful in the oppressive stillness of the night. The marine bugler, Newton, who was rather given to fanciful effects, was evidently doing his best. During his pauses the echoes floated back to the ship with singular distinctness, repeating the strains of the bugle fully and exactly. A half hour later Newton was dead.

I was enclosing my letter in its envelope when the explosion came. The impression made on different people on board the *Maine* varied somewhat. To me, in my position, well aft, and within the superstructure, it was a bursting, rending, and crashing sound or roar of immense volume, largely metallic in character. It was followed by a succession of heavy, ominous, metallic sounds, probably caused by the overturning of the central superstructure and by falling debris. There was a trembling and lurching motion of the vessel, a list to port, and a movement of subsidence. The electric lights, of which there were eight in the cabin where I was sitting, went out. Then there was intense blackness and smoke.

The situation could not be mistaken—the *Maine* was blown up and sinking.

Within half an hour, having ascertained that the ship was doomed, Captain Sigsbee sent his famous dispatch to the Secretary of the Navy from the steamer *City of Washington*. After reporting the terrible disaster he added sober words of caution that public judgment should be suspended until further report. The rest, as the saying goes, is history.

As to the final chapter of the story of the *Maine* herself, I take the liberty of quoting William B. Norris' brief but admirable summary in his article, *The Destruction of the Maine*, which appears in the *Dictionary of American History*:

Investigations were soon made by the American and Spanish authorities separately. Their decisions differed. The Spaniards reported that an internal explosion, perhaps spontaneous combustion in the coal bunkers, had been the cause; the Americans that the original cause had been an external explosion, which in turn had set off the forward magazines.

News of the disaster produced great excitement in the United States, and accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed by certain newspapers. Without doubt the catastrophe stirred up national feeling over the difficulties in Cuba, crystallized in the slogan "Remember the *Maine*." The wreck remained in Havana harbor until 1911, when United States Army engineers built a coffer dam about the wreck, sealed the after hull

of the ship, the only part still intact, and floated it out to sea. There, on March 16, 1912, appropriate minute guns boomed as it sank with its flag flying. The remains of 66 of the crew which were found during the raising were buried in the National Cemetery, Arlington.

During the removal of the wreck a board of officers of the Navy made a further investigation. Their report, published in 1912, stated that a low form of explosive exterior to the ship caused the first explosion. "This resulted in igniting and exploding the contents of the 6-inch reserve magazine, A-14-M, said contents including a large quantity of black powder. The more or less complete explosion of the contents of the remaining forward magazine followed." The chief evidence for this was that the bottom of the ship had been bent upward and folded over toward the stern. European experts, perhaps influenced by several internal explosions in warships in the intervening years, still, however, maintained the theory of an internal explosion. No further evidence has ever been found to solve the mystery.

One visible token of the *Maine* still remains. Before her shattered hull sank forever in 1912, her remaining mast was removed, and now it stands in Arlington Cemetery, its conning tower and shrouds still in place, watching over the gallant old ship's honored dead who lie all around its base until the next and last reveille.

Impressions of Our Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Miss Jeannie Hughes, high school senior, of the Shawnee High School, route 1, Lima, Ohio, from the Chief-school publication—of January 28, 1955. This article resulted from her impression of our Nation's Capital. Miss Hughes, in company with the members of her Girl Scout troop, visited Washington the week of January 3.

The article is as follows:

(By Miss Jeannie Hughes)

During a recent visit in our Nation's Capital, which several of us were fortunate enough to be able to make, I was impressed with how little an average United States citizen knows about his Government. How little we appreciate its functions and the privileges it offers.

When you stand gazing at the Capitol at night with its beautiful dome lighting up the sky, you feel the greatness of our Nation. The building seems a symbol of unity and of all our country is and will be.

Watching men and women of every State working together for every individual in our country, regardless of race, color, or creed, makes one feel a little special, as if you do count very much.

We barely recognize the thousands of people from our President, Congressmen, and Cabinet down to secretaries, judges, and page boys who keep our Federal Government ticking, making it the greatest on earth. Instead we sit at home complaining about income taxes and other taxes, or when elec-

tions come around we don't take time to go to the polls.

That isn't our kind of country, we aren't that kind of people, but we—each one of us—make it what it is. What will you make it?

The 37th Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1955, marks the 37th anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania, and I join with 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in saluting and encouraging the 3 million Lithuanians in that distressed country as they suffer under the iron heel of their Russian masters.

Lithuanians down through the centuries have dearly loved liberty and freedom, but it has been their unhappy lot to be deprived of such God-given rights under the mailed fist of one conqueror after the other as they were ruthlessly subjected to partition, devourment, and bitter persecution during the centuries of the existence of their beloved Lithuania.

History is replete with bloodcurdling accounts of the cruel persecution of the Lithuanian people who through their long and admirable history as industrious and peace-loving people have exhibited at all times a burning desire to live their lives in liberty and freedom.

In the great State of Pennsylvania, we have thousands of Americans of Lithuanian descent. Many of them, especially in my congressional district, have parents living here who have become naturalized citizens and with their American-born offspring constitute a virile and vibrant segment of the America we all love. Therefore, it is only natural that all Americans sympathize with the plight of the Lithuanian people in the homeland because our hearts are attuned to the spirit of liberty and independence purchased for us by the blood of our forefathers.

Mindful of the turbulent conditions of world affairs we join our prayers with those of the patient, brave, and persevering Lithuanian people in commemorating the 37th anniversary of their independence—an independence that was short-lived and wrested from them by cruel tyrants.

We realize that the future of all liberty-loving nations is threatened by the ruthless forces of world communism. Nevertheless, we know that all of us must cling firmly to our unshakable belief in almighty God and His mercy, confident that He will not desert us but will grant our supplications that the scourge of communism be erased from the earth so that human dignity among men and nations may be restored and that all God's children may live in

the peace and harmony embodied in His teachings and reflected in His daily salutations while He dwelt on this earth—"Peace be to you."

Expose Truth About Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, of February 5, which has come to my attention. The editorial refers to the work and reports of the Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression during the 83d Congress.

This editorial points up the timeliness of the reports of the committee, particularly the findings, conclusions, and recommendations set forth in the committee's summary report. It makes an analysis of these findings in terms of the present crisis in the Far East, and emphasizes the great vulnerability which besets the leaders of the Soviet Union as they plan for further world conquest.

This editorial pays tribute to a distinguished member of the Committee, Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN of the 20th District of Ohio. Congressman FEIGHAN was one of the hardest working members of our committee, and his untiring efforts and keen understanding of the nations enslaved by communism is well reflected in the reports made public by the committee.

I feel editorials of this type which bring home to the American people the true facts concerning communism, make an immeasurable contribution to our national security and well-being. Truth is the greatest weapon we have against the Communist conspiracy. I hope there will be more editorials and newspaper articles in the immediate days ahead, like the one which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "A Timely, Significant Report":

The House select committee, of which Representative CHARLES J. KERSTEN, of Wisconsin was chairman, has issued its report on Communist aggression and the forced incorporation of Baltic States into the Soviet Union. It is of especial interest to our readers, as Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland, was a member.

It is of especial interest also in the light of the major events of recent days, the passage by Congress of the Formosa resolution and the ratification by the Senate of the Southeast Asia Defense Treaty. The report bears out the wisdom of this course of action.

The select committee took testimony from more than 300 persons who were eye witnesses to Communist aggression in Central and Eastern Europe and amassed 1,500 depositions, documents, and other authoritative evidence in the course of 50 public hearings at home and abroad.

The committee, in conclusion, asserts "that communism is a criminal conspiracy purposely designed for and deliberately directed at the enslavement of all mankind and the establishment of a world colonial empire."

It shows that "no nation, including the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic, has ever voluntarily adopted communism," that all have succumbed to force or the threat of force. And in 37 years it has enslaved 800 million people and extended its sway over one-third of the earth's surface.

It becomes very clear, therefore, that the task of America and her free-world allies is twofold: To draw a military line beyond which the Communists shall not pass, and to propagandize the peoples on the fringes of the Iron Curtain and within.

The ruthless oppression of the people by the state behind the Iron Curtain makes them our most effective potential allies, as the fomenting of revolution within the Communist nations would most quickly break their military strength and expose the hypocrisy of their propaganda.

Great strides forward were made in a military sense by the Formosa resolution and the Southeast Asia Defense Pact, as all doubts were removed at home and abroad as to our willingness and ability to utilize our Navy and Air Force to stop aggression.

We have not been as effective in propaganda as we might have been. The select committee recommends that the President launch a positive bipartisan program and take the initiative in calling an international conference of free nations for propaganda purposes.

The members of the committee are to be commended for the tremendous amount of work they performed and for producing significant factual evidence.

Pay Adjustments and Reclassification for Employees in the Postal Field Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide an immediate 10 percent salary increase, with a minimum of \$400, for all officers and employees in the postal field service. The amount of each employee's salary will be rounded out to the next highest \$100 figure, so that as a practical matter in most instances the minimum increase will be \$430.

My bill also will provide for a reclassification of positions in the postal field service, thus establishing a modern classification and pay structure suitable for present and future needs of the service. The reclassification provisions of my bill incorporate the essential principles recommended by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, modified to the extent which hearings before our committee have indicated is necessary to insure adequate protection for all officers and employees while at the same time allowing management full latitude to operate the postal service with maximum efficiency.

The reclassification provisions in my bill eliminate the so-called nullifying clause which appeared in the administration's proposal in some 21 places. This clause would have allowed workers to be assigned, without limitation, to perform work at a lower level than the level of their jobs, thus leaving the way open for downgrading and loss of pay.

The clause also would have permitted assignment to higher level work without increase in pay.

In my judgment, a 10 percent immediate increase, to be followed by reclassification, is the absolute minimum increase which our postal employees have earned. Representatives of employee organizations have conclusively proved that postal salaries lag far behind increased living costs and pay rates in private industry, and that no recognition whatever has been given to tremendously increased productivity and efficiency by these employees. As a matter of fact, if proper recognition were given to these factors, a greater increase would be provided.

I have introduced this bill in a spirit of friendly compromise and cooperation. It is my belief and hope that it will provide a common ground for a meeting of the minds between the employees and the Postmaster General. It will be a very fair and effective pay and reclassification statute, under which the Department can operate with maximum effectiveness and all employees will be assured of fair treatment and of real incentives for ever greater productivity.

H. R. 3828

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I will not be present on the floor of the House today during this debate because of my incarceration in the hospital. Nevertheless, because I feel so strongly on this subject, I do want my thoughts included in the Record of the debate. It will be impossible for me to vote on the various amendments which are made on the floor, but I know that when the bill comes to a vote the basic question will be whether or not Congress and judicial salaries shall be increased, for if this bill is defeated, the question will die for at least another session of Congress.

I must say at the outset that I hope that an amendment will be offered and adopted which will make this pay raise not applicable to the present Members of Congress, but rather to become applicable to the members who will be elected to the 85th Congress and those who follow.

I will grant there is much logic in the position that if the Members of the next Congress are worth an increase, so are we. Nevertheless, it goes against my grain to some extent to vote an increase in my own salary when I went before the people of my district willing to take office, if elected, at the present salary rate.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, even though this provision may remain in the bill and the raise become effective immediately, I have requested my whip pair me, if possible, in favor of this legislation for several reasons.

It has been my privilege to be closely associated throughout my adult life with Members of Congress. I knew before I was privileged to join this body of the sacrifice required. I do not feel that to all the other sacrifices and pressures which the job entails should be added an impossible financial burden.

Certainly the people of my district and of my State do not want independent means to be a prerequisite of service in the Congress. Regardless of race, creed, color, or station in life, the only criterion of service here should be ability. Members of Congress should not be forced to rely on outside sources of income, whatever they may be, to make ends meet.

I know \$15,000 a year sounds like a tremendous amount of money and yet, I wonder how many of our constituents realize that our trips home to report to them come out of our salary; that the cost of living here in Washington is higher than in almost any other area of the country; that there are a myriad of little expenses that build up to a large tab which we must pay, and above all that we must not only move our families back and forth but also maintain 2 homes at the same time, 1 here and 1 back home.

Unless this legislation is passed, I sincerely believe that in all too few years we may well see the time when the Members of this body are either bachelors, men or women of independent wealth, or men or women who are forced to obtain additional income from some other source.

The job of a Congressman today is far different than it was 20 years ago. No longer is it a part-time avocation. Rather it is a full-time, complete year-around job for most of us. If we are to continue in the years ahead to attract men of ability from all walks of life in all types of background and experience, it is imperative that we pay a salary which will permit each Member to give service to his district and to do his job as well as that of a man with independent means.

The Torch of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under further leave to extend my remarks in connection with today's observance of Lithuania's Independence Day, I include an excellent editorial appearing in today's New York Times, entitled "The Torch of Liberty," which follows:

At a moment when, with President Eisenhower's endorsement, a nationwide Crusade for Freedom is underway to keep the torch of liberty burning behind the Iron Curtain, the American people will gladly join in spirit and in sympathy the Lithuanian Nation, which though under the Soviet heel, still observes today the 37th anniversary

of its independence. The Lithuanians, 3 million strong at home, with 1 million descendants in the United States, are part of the 70,000,000 people whom Soviet Russia has subjugated in Eastern Europe during and after the war in defiance of the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, and all other wartime agreements, from Teheran to Potsdam. But, though subjected, they have not succumbed.

Like all other subjugated peoples, the Lithuanians, and their leaders in exile in particular, realize that liberation will not come overnight, and that until it does come resistance will exact a fearsome price in death and mass deportations. They also realize that the time for small nations as self-contained entities is over, and that they must seek salvation in a wider all-European organization. But for the present the fight for liberation must invoke all the values that go with nationhood and independence, and the observance of a national independence day is part of that struggle.

In this struggle the subjugated peoples need and deserve the moral support of the free world, which, by extending such support, also serves itself. For, as President Eisenhower said, the masses imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain will remain potential deterrents to Soviet aggression as long as they know that the outside world has not forgotten them.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day, February 16, 1955, which is the 37th anniversary of the Independence of the Republic of Lithuania, it is fitting that we pause to pay tribute to the freedom-loving spirit which has always motivated that small nation, and give voice to our belief that such a spirit has not and will never be crushed by foreign tyranny.

Lithuania's independence came as a blessing for its people won after centuries of subjugation under a staggering succession of alien despotisms. For 22 years thereafter, the people of Lithuania knew the, to us, commonplace pleasures of self-government and experienced the pride which citizens of a state entitled to an honored place among other free nations may justly feel.

In 1940, however, as a result of a secret conspiracy with Nazi Germany, and taking advantage of the collapse of political and military order in Europe, the government of the U. S. S. R. forcibly invaded the Republic of Lithuania. Following the Soviet imperialistic plan, the legal government was supplanted by Communist-controlled puppets, and in due course Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union. Thereby began a new and more infamous era of foreign tyranny and oppression for this heroic people.

The Government of the United States has steadfastly refused to recognize the cowardly usurpation of the sovereignty of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, and in so doing we continue to reaffirm our

belief that the many years of struggling and suffering which the people of Lithuania have endured without abandoning their hope for the eventual restoration of their nation's independence have not been in vain.

Equality for Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Industrial and Engineering Chemistry News, August 9, 1954, deals with an inequality that affects many scientists now rendering excellent service to our Government:

EQUALITY FOR SCIENTISTS

Our tale today deals with those Government chemists and other doctor of philosophy scientists whose salaries are lower than several other groups of professionally trained men in allied fields but whose work and experience are identical. In some instances the situation is so absurd that a chemist project officer receives less money than professional men working under his supervision.

The story behind this Alice in Wonderland situation has its inception in the period following World War II. At that time (1947) the armed services were encountering great difficulty in obtaining and retaining personnel for the Medical Corps and Dental Corps of the armed services and the Public Health Service. The reason given was that physicians and dentists felt that they were better off financially in civilian life.

To overcome this problem, the Secretary of Defense requested legislation authorizing additional pay of \$100 a month for all medical and dental officers on active duty. A law including this provision was passed in September 1947 and was to be effective for 5 years. A similar provision was enacted in the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

In the summer of 1953 the Universal Military Training and Service Act was amended (Public Law 84). This amendment not only extended the extra-pay provisions for physicians and dentists to July 1, 1955, but also blanketed in veterinarians.

There are good arguments, pro and con, with respect to the question of whether preferential treatment should be given to one or more groups of professionally trained people. We do not wish to argue this point. We do feel, however, that our laws should be fair.

In this case we feel that all arguments advanced to support extra pay for physicians and dentists and, particularly, veterinarians apply equally well to chemists and other scientists. These include higher costs of education. To obtain a Ph. D. in science takes as long as to attain the education required of physicians, dentists, and veterinarians by the present law. The argument concerning personnel shortages is still acute with respect to scientists. A few months ago, the Secretary of Defense said that there was a surplus of medical personnel in the armed services.

Another supporting argument advanced is the contribution to national defense. We feel that scientists contribute as much as those covered by the law.

One reason that veterinarians were included was because of inequalities in pay structure and professional standing. This

argument certainly applies to doctor of philosophy scientists.

The law does not specify that recipients must be doing work in their own field but only that they hold degrees in that field. In Government facilities such as the public health service's, National Institutes of Health, physicians and dentists are often engaged in research projects exactly the same as those carried out by chemists, biologists, and other scientists. In some such cases project directors are scientists and some of the subordinates are physicians and dentists. Yet the latter get \$1,200 a year more than their project supervisors.

It is to be noted that this bonus pay provision applies only to those men who are on active uniformed duty and not to physicians and dentists who may be employed as civilians.

We believe that in all fairness Congress should give equal treatment to Government employees with comparable education training and experience. This could be done by extending the provisions of Public Law 84 to cover scientists who hold earned doctor's degrees and who hold active commissions in the armed services or the Public Health Service.

School Aid: Method Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of February 14, 1955, entitled "School Aid: Method Counts":

METHOD COUNTS

Few are questioning that there is an acute need which must be met in the Nation's school system. Criticism of the President's message on Federal aid to education comes chiefly from those who agree with him that something must be done, but disagree that his plan will meet the situation sufficiently and in time.

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, to whom we listen respectfully, is introducing a bill on this premise authorizing the Federal Government to grant outright \$1 billion in 2 years. On the other hand, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has told newsmen that the administration plan offers the quickest way, and would make possible \$7 billion of construction by Federal-State cooperation.

If one believes that the school need is so great and so urgent that little else counts, then direct Federal grants on the scale Senator HILL proposes must seem justified. But there are other values to be preserved.

The first of these lies in preserving the maximum of initiative, responsibility, and control to the States and local communities. This means that the role of the Federal Government must be that of supplementing, not preempting, the effort.

Preserving the second value complements the first: That Federal aid be not dealt out on considerations of geography, political weight, or even of a share for everyone, but that it be apportioned according to volume of local need and lack of volume of local resources.

Many school districts, to be sure, will have to work with State school construction agencies in order to finance their part. And a number of States will have to authorize

setting up such borrowing and renting authorities. All of this can be done. And the President proposes a grant fund of \$200 million to bring relief to exceptional cases. The administration's aid-to-borrowing program simply requires that each locality and each State make use of the resources and devices available to it.

It may be that this plan will have to be tailored here and there to fit the contour of the actualities. But we believe that both the need can be met and basic values preserved, and that the President's plan is headed in the right direction.

Security Is Everybody's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, never before in our time have we had such a need for an adequate air arm as we have in this atomic air age of today.

The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Gen. Thomas D. White, recently made a very worthwhile report on this subject to an outstanding patriotic organization assisting the Air Force in its current recruiting efforts, the junior chamber of commerce. I am proud of General White, who happens to be a constituent of mine, as he is recognized as one of the greatest authorities on air power in our country. General White called his address Airpower: Everybody's Business. But his theme was not merely airpower, it was security. There is nothing that should be of greater concern to all Americans today than security. It is the business and the responsibility not only of the Congress, but of the entire body of American citizens. But only superior airpower can give such security to us.

The Jaycees—the members of the junior chamber of commerce—are assisting the Air Force to recruit the men needed to man the 137 wing, 975,000-man Air Force which we are told is the minimum Air Force necessary to guarantee the security of the United States, and which we hope to have by the end of fiscal year 1957. General White stressed public understanding of the Air Force and its needs as fundamental to any effort to enlist the men, and to create such a framework for their activity as will persuade them to make a career out of service with the Air Force.

In times of war the American people are wonderfully patriotic and willing to make any sacrifice to insure victory. Today, with the threat to our cities and people and our civilization many times greater than it ever was even during World War II, the American people are not showing the same kind of fervent patriotism. They do not see the dangers in the current perilous peace, which are just as real, though not as apparent as the dangers in war.

During this period of so-called peace, the Soviets have made amazing progress in the building of nuclear weapons and long-range bombers. We were surprised

to learn during the Korean war that the Russian built MIG-15 was almost as good as our F-86 Sabrejet; we must realize, before another war emphasizes the fact, that Russian technology is excellent, and quite capable of engineering our destruction. As General White says:

The Soviets are building a stockpile of tremendously destructive nuclear weapons. They have built the world's largest air force, including a sizable fleet of long-range bombers. They have built several hundred light jet bombers, and are producing a new jet bomber similar to our B-47. Aimed directly at our sources of strength at home is a new, heavy jet bomber similar to our B-52. They designed and built this bomber for one primary purpose—to be able to strike this continent. * * *

It would be thoughtless of anyone to needlessly scare our people. Nevertheless, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not call attention to the urgency and terrible reality of the situation. Only if our people are intelligently aware of the threat, can they share our security burden. Ignorance leads to ultimate panic and confusion.

We find it easy to accept the new concepts of war brought on by the nuclear-air combination. But one of our main problems is that nuclear weapons mean not only a new kind of war, they mean a new kind of peace. This is a peace that can be kept only through strength.

Acceptance of this fact and an understanding of Air Force needs will help the Air Force to get the men it needs, and the legislation it needs in order to retain those men after they have been trained, and become experienced, and developed their greatest usefulness to the Air Force.

The ultimate goal of the Air Force is not 137 wings, or 975,000 men; it is public understanding of the true nature of airpower, and appreciation of the inexorable need for air superiority over any possible enemy. Unless we hold the lead we now have, numbers of wings or men will have no meaning. If we are to hold the lead, who can say now how many wings or men we may require tomorrow? But understanding is the fundamental thing. We must have it because security is everybody's business, security for ourselves and our institutions, and our beloved United States.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include General White's stirring call for understanding in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The text of his address follows:

AIRPOWER: EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

(Address by Gen. Thomas D. White, Vice Chief of Staff, USAF, before the junior chamber of commerce, Air Force recruiting assistance kick-off dinner, Dayton, Ohio, January 26, 1955)

Thank you for those kind words, Milton Caniff. I also want to thank you for something else. On behalf of the United States Air Force, I want to thank you for getting Lieutenants Pipper and Murphy off the ice. Along with your millions of other readers, I was getting worried about those boys. Your rescue plan showed imagination.

Seriously, I want to thank Milton Caniff for the job he is doing. Through Steve Canyon, he is telling the Air Force story and paves the way for greater public interest and understanding of the Air Force.

Tonight the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is launching a nationwide campaign to bring the Air Force and our citizens more closely together. This campaign will strengthen the link between the

man in uniform and his civilian supporters. The stronger this link, the stronger our national security.

I am certainly happy to be here with you tonight and to have the opportunity to participate in this kick-off ceremony. I can think of no better group than the Jaycees to conduct this program. You have a reputation for dynamic action and for getting results. Your goals are cast in terms of general good, and not in terms of individual gain. As a result, you have gained wide public acceptance and nationwide support.

Your organization is composed of young men and is devoted to the development of young men. For this reason you share with the Air Force an intense interest in training and equipping our young Americans to keep our country safe and strong.

Just last Saturday the junior chamber of commerce paid a unique tribute to one of our better known, young Air Force officers and in doing so you honored the Air Force. I refer to your including Maj. Chuck Yeager in your list of the 10 outstanding young men of 1954. We in the Air Force are very proud of Major Yeager—not only because he has flown faster than any other man in the world, but also because he typifies so many others like him in the Air Force. They do their jobs as a matter of duty. They do these jobs whether they be dangerous or routine, dramatic or dull, exciting or safe. We are particularly proud of the fact that there are thousands of young pilots in the Air Force who literally envy the opportunity Yeager has had. They would give their eyeteeth to have the job he had as a test pilot.

I have reviewed your program and I am glad to see that you have recognized the need to make it much broader than a mere recruiting drive. Your objective is to develop a better understanding of our Air Force and to acquaint the public with the men and women who are playing such a vital role in keeping our Nation free.

This is exactly what needs to be done. Success will not only result in helping to solve our reenlistment problem, but will also result in better guided, understanding support of Air Force objectives.

Why is understanding so important? We are an air-minded Nation. Very few people in the Nation would disagree that our Air Force must be supported as a matter of high priority. What more do we need?

The Air Force needs a lot more than mere acceptance. It needs the kind of active support that, in a democracy, comes only after real understanding. In fact, in the United States, getting understanding is the key step to getting support.

The fact that our military forces must have the support of the people is one of America's most important democratic characteristics. It is one we are very proud of.

There is a related characteristic of which we are equally proud. It is that during a war the security of our Nation is everybody's business, and not the exclusive province of people in uniform.

The American people are doing a magnificent job of maintaining strong armed forces during these days of tension. However, World War II and Korea are fresh in our minds. Our people, like all others in the free world, are sick of strife. Recognizing the need for security, they are willing to pay the cost of preparedness by taxes; but they are reluctant to contribute to preparedness by personal interest and participation.

This attitude certainly has been normal in the past. For centuries each nation of the world has had its citizenry and its armies. The citizenry paid the cost of the armies, but stayed aloof. The army was paid to worry about wars as well as to fight them. Wars were strictly the army's business.

Our revolution and evolution as a democracy tended to change those old concepts. We could not afford an army of mercenaries, nor did we want one. The citizen soldier

had won his freedom and the citizen soldier would safeguard it. But as time went on he developed this inevitable and understandable attitude:

"All right; I will be a soldier when there is a war on. But in peacetime I am strictly a civilian."

The citizen soldier, with this attitude, became the basis for the American tradition of nonaggression, small forces in peacetime, and so on. When we became involved in war, no nation's people ever responded more magnificently. However, when peace was won again, no nation's people ever were quicker to lose interest in their armed forces.

For this reason the history of our armed services in America has been one of high peaks of strength followed by almost bottomless valleys of weakness. The last valley we passed through was right after World War II.

These peaks and valleys of strength and weakness were tremendously expensive and wasteful, not only in money but in lives. Had we been ready for World War I and World War II, we might have prevented them entirely. It is certain that we could have ended them much sooner with far fewer casualties. However, we seemed willing to pay a high price for the privilege of ignoring danger until it was upon us.

The last valley we passed through could have been disastrous, because World War II ushered in a new weapon, the atomic bomb. This new weapon, combined with the capabilities of long-range airpower, has revolutionized warfare.

We felt fairly secure as long as we held a practical monopoly in long-range bombers and an absolute monopoly in nuclear weapons. However, there can be no monopoly in science and this has been demonstrated by the remarkable progress the Soviet Union has made in the building of nuclear weapons and modern long-range bombers. Communist possession of this combination has put us in what our President has termed "an age of peril."

The Soviets are building a stockpile of tremendously destructive nuclear weapons. They have built the world's largest air force, including a sizable fleet of long-range bombers. They have built several hundred light jet bombers, and are producing a new jet bomber similar to our B-47. Aimed directly at our sources of strength at home is a new, heavy jet bomber similar to our B-52. They designed and built this bomber for one primary purpose—to be able to strike this continent.

The masters of the Kremlin have not deviated one whit from their goal of communism worldwide. The United States is the principal obstacle which confronts them in their path to this goal. The Reds are well known for their utter ruthlessness in removing obstacles.

It would be thoughtless of anyone to needlessly scare our people. Nevertheless, we would be remiss in our duty if we did not call attention to the urgency and terrible reality of the situation. Only if our people are intelligently aware of the threat, can they share our security burden. Ignorance leads to ultimate panic and confusion.

Our traditional attitudes must change. As long as this threat exists, security can never again be considered as solely military business. This threat is not in the future, it is here today and it is real. Today security is everybody's business, not just during an actual war, but all the time.

We find it easy to accept the new concepts of war brought on by the nuclear-air combination. But one of our main problems is that nuclear weapons mean not only a new kind of war, they mean a new kind of peace. This is a peace that can be kept only through strength.

This means that we cannot continue any old habits of huge build-ups followed by

drastic cuts in the Armed Forces. We can no longer wait until we are sucked into a whirlpool of war to begin building our strength. Our new weapons can give us the strength to prevent a war if we will but develop them, but to be effective they must be maintained. We can no longer derive any strength from a program characterized by fits of stops and starts resulting from shifting political and diplomatic sands.

I mentioned America's magnificent responses in times of war. It seems paradoxical to me that our people are willing to sacrifice less now than they were during a period when our land was in little danger. During World War II, no enemy had any great capability of damaging the United States. Our children, our schools, our hospitals, and our cities were not attacked. Yet even when it was clear that we were winning, all our men, women, and even children were still pitching in cheerfully. Even after V-E Day they continued to give up their butter, their meat, their tires, and their gasoline. Our women stayed on their jobs as war workers. Our sons and fathers stayed on duty as servicemen. There were inconveniences, shortages, and tragedies, but no reluctance.

There was also no serious threat to our homeland.

Today the threat to our cities and people is many times greater than it ever was during World War II. Yet among our people there is little evidence of the same kind of fervent patriotism that there was 10 years ago.

The reason for this, as I indicated before, is that the dangers in this new kind of peace are not as apparent as the dangers in war, but they are just as real. As I see it, this job you have set for yourselves is to explain how the Air Force fits into this kind of new peace and how it can guard that peace.

We have a head start. Most of our people realize modern technology has made the Air Force truly the first line of defense and our hardest-hitting, longest-reaching arm of protection. The defense program now before Congress clearly shows the Nation's emphasis and reliance on airpower. This program shows that our planners have recognized the real nature of the threat and the most effective counter to it.

This is one kind of support which is certainly essential. Legislation and appropriations can solve our weapons and equipment needs. Congressional action can go a long way toward helping us to get the other vital element—men. But to get and keep good men, we must have more than laws and money. An additional essential is public understanding and public support.

Last week we held our yearly conference of all the top Air Force commanders. We discussed many problems, but one was common to all. Each commander asked this question:

"Where am I going to get the men to keep my organization going?"

Our number one problem within the Air Force is the current and future shortage of trained, experienced men. At the present time our reenlistment rate is down below 30 percent. This figure does not reflect the worst part of the situation. Among the men we need the most—the trained, skilled, experienced technician—the rate has sunk below 15 percent. We cannot hire ready-made radar technicians. We have to train them ourselves and it takes a lot of time and costs a lot of money. This problem is not confined to technicians. We are also losing veteran pilots and experienced staff officers.

We need the kind of support that will help our young men to realize that an Air Force career is a valued opportunity. We have high hopes that Congress will approve a substantial pay raise this year, as well as other legislation designed to improve service attractiveness. Considering what it costs this

nation to train a man, his pay could be increased by many, many dollars before it would equal the cost of losing him.

In addition to pay raises and improved conditions, we need the same kind of support for the airman that he enjoyed during World War II. He must be encouraged to serve. His community must be proud of him for serving. The Air Force job is so big and our equipment is so complex that we need numbers of career men to man our units. Only in this way can we get the best out of the weapons and resources provided us.

To achieve the kind of support that will solve our personnel problem, the public must understand much more than the mere details of this one problem. They must understand air power and the Air Force. I will mention a few of these goals of understanding.

First, our people must realize the part that nuclear weapons play in our defense. There is still some resistance to their use and this is understandable. Nevertheless, they are the results of progress and are the weapons of today.

We can solve no problem of national security by ignoring them. Instead, we should be thankful that we have them in ever-increasing numbers. These weapons are the sole means we have to counter the overwhelming Communist superiority in manpower. So far they have deterred the Communist from all-out war but for only one reason. The Communists have felt that if necessary we would use our most effective weapons against them. Our power will be no deterrent at all if the Communists ever get the idea that we will hold back.

However, despite all our efforts to prevent war, the Reds may strike. We must prepare against that possibility. The two main elements in our preparations here at home for a possible attack are civil defense and air defense. Public support of civil defense is lagging. I emphasize that this is through no fault of our Civil Defense Administration. They have found it almost impossible to jar the general public out of its complacency.

Again I draw a parallel to World War II. Then, when no enemy had long-range bombers, we cheerfully cooperated in blackouts and civil-defense drills. Today when the enemy is capable of launching large-scale attacks on this country, the majority of our people pay lip service, but no effort, to civil-defense preparations. However remote we may believe the possibility of an attack to be, we must be ready. In case of attack, how could we hope for military success if our home front collapsed?

Our air-defense picture is brighter. Our warning systems are progressing. Our airplanes are getting better, and our network of air-defense bases is spreading. There has been one bothersome byproduct of our air defense. This byproduct is noise. To defend an area, the interceptors must be based centrally in the area they are to protect. This is one of the reasons that some of our jet bases are near cities.

Although our scientists are searching for ways to eliminate or reduce disturbances of high-performance airplanes, it looks as if we must face the fact that jets are loud. Our people must also realize that this is one of the minor, but troublesome prices of security.

We are doing all we can to avoid bothering the people whose lives we must protect. We have changed flight patterns, and approach altitudes, and in some areas, we have relocated airbases. Nevertheless, our people must learn to be grateful for the whine of our jets, it means protection.

This is, of course, only one of many small irritations that the Air Force unavoidably inflicts upon our public.

We crowd the public schools, we glut the roads around the bases. Seldom do we have the opportunity to live in one community long enough to be accepted as solid citizens.

All of these things are elements of what we call public relations. The Air Force realizes how important these relations are, and so do you. Your project "top flight" is evidence of that. All the things I have talked about are goals of understanding that we must shoot for. We must achieve these goals if we are to remain strong enough to keep our freedom and honor.

The kind of help your project brings to the Nation means a great deal to us all. This is exactly what we need.

I hope that this kickoff dinner tonight is typical of what will be happening in cities and towns across the Nation throughout the next year. It is a great thing you are doing. I wish you all the success in the world.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the Record the following statement in opposition to the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements:

STATEMENT OF CALIFORNIA FISH CANNERS ASSOCIATION, INC., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS IN CONNECTION WITH H. R. 1, JANUARY 26, 1955

My name is Donald P. Loker. I am president of the California Fish Cannery Association, Inc., the members of which account for 87 percent of the total United States production of canned tuna. They also process sardines and mackerel.

Our industry is opposed to H. R. 1 for two reasons:

First, we believe your committee is interested in knowing how the canned tuna industry, which we believe is a typical American industry, has been affected by the operation of the trade agreements program over the years since the program has been in effect. We can illustrate best the difficulties caused us by contrasting what has happened to us under the program with the situation prevailing in prior years.

The tuna industry first began to feel the impact of import competition in the year 1933. In that year Japan exported to this country canned tuna in an amount equal to 34 percent of domestic production. Because of the effect of these imports on our domestic industry, an application was made to the Tariff Commission for an investigation under section 336 of the Tariff Act which resulted in a finding that an increase in the tariff was necessary because of differences in the cost of production between this country and Japan. President Franklin D. Roosevelt accepted the Tariff Commission recommendation and increased the tariff to the extent found by the Commission to be necessary to equalize cost of production; that is, from 30 percent to 45 percent. Thereafter imports remained at this level enabling our industry and the Japanese industry to progress together in the development of the United States market for canned tuna.

That was the old system, Mr. Chairman, before the reciprocal trade agreements program went to work on our industry. When we had trouble we went to one agency of the Government. That agency made an impartial investigation and the President acted as he was permitted to under the law. There-

after our industry and our foreign competitors knew exactly where everyone stood.

It was just as simple as that.

But what do we find when once the operation of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program cast its eye upon us?

We find, Mr. Chairman, an entirely different picture. Here is what happened:

In November 1941 the Secretary of State issued a notice of intention to negotiate a trade agreement with Iceland. There was nothing in that announcement or in the trade agreement subsequently negotiated which seemed to have any bearing on the tuna industry. If anything, tuna was clearly eliminated by the announcement as we read it. Nor, in fact, did the agreement have any importance to the tuna industry at that time. In May 1942, while the negotiations with Iceland were still proceeding, the Department of State issued a new announcement of intention to negotiate a trade agreement with Mexico in which tuna was mentioned. That, however, was during wartime when all of our people were contending with far more serious problems than nonexistent imports so that we took no steps to protest. At any rate, our people probably reasoned, since we were fighting a war against Japan, our principal competitor, it was inconceivable that our Government would permit Japan ever to drive us out of the tuna business. That, Mr. Chairman, is where we made our biggest mistake.

While tuna, of course, has been our biggest concern, our industry also packs sardines, mackerel, the tuna-like fish "bonito," and other species.

Since the end of the war we have been plagued by a series of trade agreement negotiations, commencing with the Geneva negotiations in early 1947, and continuing up to this very minute.

We have not been able to escape participation in a single trade-agreement negotiation from 1947 to the present. In every one tuna, bonito, or sardines have figured and we have been required to appear, file statements, and go through all of the redtape usual to such proceedings before a governmental agency.

I need not remind you that such activities are expensive, both as to time and money.

The aforementioned trade agreement with Mexico became effective in 1943 and, among other things, provided for the reduction of duty on tuna canned in oil from 45 percent ad valorem to 22½ percent ad valorem, the maximum reduction permitted under law at that time. We have no knowledge of why canned tuna was considered in a trade agreement with Mexico, inasmuch as Mexico was no factor in the export of canned tuna to the United States. Accepted practice for the granting of trade-agreements tariff concessions is to negotiate with the principal exporting country.

However, let's take a look at how imports of canned tuna from Mexico related to that practice. For the 3-year average prior to the negotiations of the trade agreement, imports of canned tuna from Mexico averaged slightly over \$15,000 a year in value, or 2½ percent of total United States imports of canned tuna.

Now, let's look at what happened to imports of canned tuna from Mexico after the trade agreement became operative. In the 3-year period immediately after the trade agreement became effective, imports of tuna from Mexico averaged less than \$51,000 a year in value, or 1½ percent of the value of total imports from all sources, and since that time imports of canned tuna from Mexico have been so inconsequential that they have not been sufficiently important to set out separately in official United States statistics.

As of June 30, 1950, Mexico abrogated the trade agreement for reasons totally unrelated to tuna. Six months' notice of this abrogation was required before the duty reverted to its former 45 percent ad valorem. During

this 6-month period, imports of canned tuna from Japan reached unprecedented proportions in order to get in before the increase in duty, and the year's imports constituted 34 percent of the United States market as opposed to a normal share of 10 percent that imports previously took of the United States market. It took the domestic industry 2 years to recover from the shock of this volume of imports.

The Icelandic trade agreement also became effective in 1943. It is contended, wrongfully we believe, by administrative governmental agencies that this trade agreement reduced the duty on tuna canned in substances other than oil from 25 percent ad valorem to 12½ percent ad valorem.

In that particular agreement, a catch-all or basket category was established, which is interpreted by some to include the product "tuna packed in substances other than oil." But we vigorously contend that it was not pointed at tuna. We further contend that the wording of that agreement represented a sin of omission on the part of the persons from the United States Government responsible, and that such an omission was perhaps responsible for what we further contend is the misinterpretation of this agreement by the administrative governmental agencies. It is important for you to know that Iceland has never processed tuna, her fishermen have never caught any tuna and consequently her exports of tuna are nonexistent.

That is where Iceland fits with relation to the accepted practice of negotiating with the principal producer in reducing tariffs through the instrument of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In addition, the loophole created by the Icelandic trade agreement and its erroneous interpretation have resulted in the very opportunity the Japanese tuna industry sought and found. They immediately switched their production of tuna canned in oil subject to a 45 percent duty to tuna canned in brine at 12½ percent ad valorem. By this device Japanese exports of tuna to the United States have increased from their prewar 5-year average volume of 337,000 cases per year to more than 1,500,000 cases currently. It is underselling American-produced tuna on the grocer's shelves by as much as 10 to 12 cents a can. The domestic industry has been seriously harmed and the threat of further injury is most substantial.

The domestic tuna industry has sought every means available to it, through administrative channels, to rectify the damage done to it through the great disparity in tariff rates applicable to tuna canned in oil and tuna canned in brine. These efforts to date have been to no avail.

Let's look at the reciprocal features of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In the "Summary of Foreign Control Regulations Applying to Imports From the United States" which appeared in the June 7, 1954, issue of Foreign Commerce Weekly, published by the United States Department of Commerce, there is a tabulation of imports and exchange permits required in foreign countries as of May 1, 1954.

This tabulation shows that out of some 88 countries or customs areas in the world, 66 require prior import permits, while 41 require exchange permits for goods imported from the United States or other dollar countries.

It will be noted that in many cases the import permits automatically assure foreign exchange, while in other cases it is necessary for the importer to have both documents authorized by the respective governments.

These import restrictions can be used very handily to nullify or impair concessions that have been granted the United States in trade agreements under which we also made concessions but do not nullify.

To illustrate how foreign countries are continually changing import regulations and

erecting further restrictions against imports from this country, we would like to give you as examples some typical changes which have been published during the past 3 months in Foreign Commerce Weekly:

On July 16, 1954, Ecuador revised 30 import tariff items (Oct. 18, 1954, p. 9).

Mexico during September and October 1954, raised import duties on a long list of items (Oct. 25, 1954, p. 10).

Guatemala imposed a new import duty of 10 cents per gallon on gasoline which was formerly free of duty (Nov. 29, 1954, p. 14).

Iceland placed a special import tax on passenger automobiles in addition to the 35-percent permit fee. The new tax amounts to 100 percent of the f. o. b. price when the country of origin is the United States or Western Europe (Nov. 22, 1954, p. 13).

Import duties for the greater part of the Mexican import tariff have been modified by a decree published on November 18 apparently for the purpose of incorporating directly into the tariff the 25 percent general duty increase of February 15, 1954 (Dec. 6, 1954, p. 13).

The Irish Government set quotas for various imports (Dec. 27, 1954, p. 11).

Syria changed a number of import tariffs (Jan. 3, 1955, p. 11).

So much for that. I now would like to make an interesting observation concerning cause and effect. On page B-6 of the Long Beach Press-Telegram of Monday, January 17, 1955, two articles of news interest appeared. One was an account of the appearance before this Committee of the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, advocating H. R. 1. On the same page a news story appeared under a San Diego, Calif., dateline, which announced the closing of the San Diego cannery of the Van Camp Sea Food Co., packers of Chicken of the Sea brand, and 1 of the 2 largest producers of canned tuna in the United States. The eight-hundred-odd employees of this cannery and many employees of suppliers are direct casualties of our trade agreements program.

If there remains any further question as to why the United States canned tuna industry opposes a further extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, I will revert to the vernacular and say, gentlemen, we've had it.

While the whole matter of extension of the Trade Agreements Act is disturbing, we find that section which deals with Japan particularly distasteful.

The language in this paragraph goes far beyond a simple extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act requested in the President's message to Congress on January 10. It would seem that instead of the primary purpose of the act, that is, the encouragement of reciprocal world trade with all its virtues, we are now substituting especial consideration to Japan, dictated by the expediency of her economic plight, in the form of tariff reductions, instead of direct aid or other forms of subsidy. Apparently, in the minds of those who wish it, the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 can be stretched to cover a multitude of situations not contemplated by the architects of the program—adherence to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, for instance, and now this.

We are quite aware of the position of the administration in aiding the expansion of trade with Japan in order to retain the country within the orbit of free nations and we endorse that position wholeheartedly. However, if this is in the national interest—for the good of all our people—we wonder why a handful of American industries should be required to foot the bill.

Now, as to the second of our reasons for opposing H. R. 1:

We are advised by counsel that this legislation and all previous reciprocal trade

agreements legislation is probably unconstitutional.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is unconstitutional—hence all trade agreements negotiated under it are unconstitutional—the Tariff Act of 1930 is the law of the land and its rates should apply.

Regardless of what the administration has elected to call them, every agreement negotiated under this act is in fact a treaty between the United States and a foreign nation.

Our Constitution requires that treaties with foreign nations be negotiated by the President and ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate:

"The President . . . shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; . . ." (art. II, sec. 2).

To date, all so-called trade agreements have been negotiated by our State Department behind closed doors and as far as we know the contents have never been submitted to the Senate or to the Congress, nor have they ever been disclosed to the public until after the agreement was consummated.

Each and every one of these actual treaties has reduced tariff rates on articles and commodities when imported into the United States. Under our Constitution the right to impose import and export restrictions is expressly reserved to the Congress as is the right to regulate interstate and foreign commerce:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; . . ."

"To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes" (art. I, sec. 8).

Our Constitution also expressly says that all legislation which provides revenue must originate in the House of Representatives:

"All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills" (art. I, sec. 7).

Up until 1934, the raising and lowering of tariffs, since the very first Congress, has been recognized as revenue legislation. Yet the House of Representatives has not seen nor had an opportunity to pass upon a single one of the revenue-lowering agreements which have been negotiated and put in force. Call them what anyone will, agreements, treaties or negotiations, the incontrovertible fact remains that they are revenue measures—United States revenue measures.

Now as to a constructive suggestion on how to remove the basic reason for our dissatisfaction and discontent:

We recommend a return to the constitutional method of adjusting tariffs by negotiating treaties with the advice and consent of the Congress. We see no reason why Congress should now be considered unqualified to protect the international trade interests of the United States. It may be desirable to provide more adequate machinery to study the effect of tariff adjustments on the United States economy by strengthening the Tariff Commission, but we feel certain that such action can very easily be accomplished by the Congress. If it is considered that this would place too great an obstacle to successful prosecution of our foreign relations program, we strongly recommend that these treaties arrived at under the Trade Agreements Act be submitted to the Congress or at least to the Senate for ratification before they become operative. In such a way the various domestic industries which have a history of hardship under the trade agreements program would have an opportunity to place their problems before the Congress whose Members come from the country as a whole and who are both responsible and responsive to the people.

I thank you.

The Need for Increasing the Salaries of Postal Workers and Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a copy of my statement which was submitted yesterday to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I believe it to be imperative that we immediately pass legislation which will provide an increase in the salaries of postal workers and classified Federal employees. The facts and figures contained in my statement will support my contention that such action should be taken now. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this opportunity to appear before your distinguished committee today. I am making this appearance in behalf of increased salaries

for postal and classified Federal employees. These deserving people cannot be here to speak for themselves and we, as their Representatives, bear the responsibility of presenting and studying their problems and arriving at solutions thereto.

Almost 4 years have passed since postal and classified civil-service employees have received their most recent pay increase. During this period the faithful and loyal Government employees have seen their take-home pay eroded by increasing costs of living and rising tax burdens. While the earnings of postal and Federal employees have been deteriorating, the living standards of practically all other groups of the economy have been rising. Construction workers have increased their hourly rates since July 1951, when Federal employees received their last increase, by 20 percent, and employees in trade and manufacturing have enjoyed average hourly increases amounting to 14 percent. Workers in agriculture have also received wage increases which compensate for the rising cost of living.

It may be well, in considering a salary increase for postal and Federal employees, to study the average hourly earnings in certain selective industries.

AVERAGE HOURLY EARNINGS, SELECTED INDUSTRIES

Hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing industries averaged \$1.83 in December, the same as in November, and 3 cents more than in December last year.

For production workers or nonsupervisory employees

[Current prices]

Period	All manufacturing	Durable goods manufacturing	Nondurable goods manufacturing	Building construction	Retail trade
1939.....	\$0.633	\$0.698	\$0.582	\$0.932	\$0.542
1944.....	1.019	1.117	.861	1.319	.731
1946.....	1.086	1.156	1.015	1.478	.893
1948.....	1.350	1.410	1.278	1.848	1.088
1949.....	1.401	1.469	1.325	1.935	1.137
1950.....	1.465	1.537	1.378	2.031	1.176
1951.....	1.59	1.67	1.48	2.19	1.26
1952.....	1.67	1.77	1.54	2.31	1.32
1953.....	1.77	1.87	1.61	2.48	1.40
1954:					
January.....	1.80	1.91	1.65	2.58	1.43
February.....	1.80	1.90	1.65	2.59	1.43
March.....	1.79	1.90	1.65	2.59	1.43
April.....	1.80	1.90	1.65	2.58	1.43
May.....	1.81	1.91	1.66	2.53	1.45
June.....	1.81	1.91	1.66	2.58	1.46
July.....	1.80	1.91	1.66	2.58	1.47
August.....	1.79	1.91	1.65	2.60	1.47
September.....	1.81	1.93	1.66	2.62	1.47
October.....	1.81	1.93	1.66	2.63	1.47
November ¹	1.83	1.94	1.67	2.62	1.46
December ²	1.83	1.95	1.67	(³)	(³)

¹ Data beginning with January 1948 are not strictly comparable with those for earlier periods.

² Preliminary estimates; only manufacturing for November charted.

³ Not available.

Source: Department of Labor.

Postal and classified civil-service employees depend upon us for an increase. They cannot bargain collectively on salaries and other working conditions as do workers in private industry.

Last year I supported the legislation providing a salary increase for these faithful workers, even though I felt that the increase Congress recommended was inadequate. I voted for the increase as a stop-gap measure with the hope that the present Congress will deal with the problem justly and fairly.

The Presidential pocket veto of our pay-increase measure was a shocking disappointment to me as it was to most of you who voted for the bills.

We must correct the pay inequity to which the loyal postal and classified Federal employees have been subjected as expeditiously as possible. The efficiency, hard work, and sincerity of purpose which the distinguished members of this committee have shown toward solving the problem since the opening of the 84th Congress is most gratifying, and

I am sure that this committee will recommend a fair and equitable bill. Obviously, a just bill will require more than mere compensation for increases in cost of living since July 1951. Sound public policy would require that the faithful servants of the people should share in the rising standards of living and increased productivity of our economy.

No study of this problem would be complete without taking a look at Consumer Price Indexes over the 1939-54 period. These figures are given in the accompanying table.

Consumer price indexes, 1939-54, for city wage-earner and clerical-worker families

[1947-49 = 100]

Monthly average:	All items
1939.....	59.4
1940.....	59.9
1941.....	62.9
1942.....	69.7
1943.....	74.0
1944.....	75.2
1945.....	76.9

Consumer price indexes, 1939-54, for city wage-earner and clerical-worker families

Monthly average:	All items
1946.....	83.4
1947.....	95.5
1948.....	102.8
1949.....	101.8
1950.....	102.8
1951.....	111.0
1952.....	113.5
1953.....	114.4
1954.....	114.8

Productivity measurements of white-collar and professional workers are difficult to obtain. But where measurements are available, there is incontrovertible evidence that the productivity of postal employees has increased over the years and is constantly moving upward. During the past 15 years, employment in the postal service has increased by about two-thirds but the volume of pieces of mail handled has almost doubled. This means that the average post-office employee handles about 20 percent more mail today than he did before World War II. The 1956 budget indicates that the trend in rising productivity is expected to continue. In 1954 the average mail clerk handled 142 units per man-hour. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that during the current year the average will increase to 146 units, and in fiscal 1956 to 150 units per man-hour. Similar increases are expected in the productivity of collecting and delivery of mail.

Sound public policy as well as fair play would dictate increases for postal and classified Federal employees. Turnover in Federal employment is exceedingly high, and training of new employees is costly. Passage of a fair wage increase to these employees is, therefore, in the public interest, because it is becoming increasingly difficult for the Federal Government to retain the most qualified employees and to attract the promising young men for a career in Federal employment.

A fair and justified increase for the devoted and faithful postal and classified civil-service employees would have to consider the increases in cost of living since July 1951, the prolonged period during which no increase was granted, the increased productivity and the general rising standard of living in our great country. Furthermore, owing to the fact that the salary increase has been long overdue, it should be made retroactive to the date when the wage increase, voted overwhelmingly by the 83d Congress, was unjustly vetoed in August 1954.

Faithful men devoted to duty and their country have been considered rare. In the Bible the wise man asked: "A faithful man who can find?" Our country is fortunate to find them in abundance in the postal and Federal employment. We should recognize their faithfulness and loyalty by granting them the pay increase which is long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge your committee to report legislation which will provide for at least a 10-percent salary increase for these workers. I believe that Congress would look with favor upon such a measure.

The Federal Retirement System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in years gone by the civil-service retirement system was considered a model and as such

was used as an inducement to attract the better qualified citizen to choose the civil service as a career.

Recent official research proves that on the average the Federal employee contributes more to his pension fund than is exacted by private industry; that the retirement benefits enjoyed by people belonging to private pension funds are superior to those enjoyed by civil-service employees; and that an increase in benefits is practical.

So as not to befuddle any issue and allow for free discussion of individual inconsistencies, each inequality is being corrected by an individual bill. If adopted, the bills will not make the Federal retirement system a new model for private industry but will increase benefits commensurate with employee contributions and put the governmental retirement system more in line with that of private industry.

Opposition To H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement in opposition to the extension of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements:

STATEMENT OF SAMUEL LENHER, PRESIDENT, SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON H. R. 1

I am Samuel Lenher, president of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association. We represent 92 chemical companies who produce organic chemicals in 248 plants located in 35 States.

Our industry is the sector of the chemical manufacturing enterprise in this country which is most vulnerable to import competition. Little more than 30 years ago, America had no organic chemical industry. The shortage of key organic chemicals for explosives, dyes, medicinals, and industrial uses in World War I led to a determination by the Government to see that a strong and flourishing industry was built. President Wilson sounded the keynote and the Congress drew up a tariff policy for synthetic organic chemicals to meet that need.

Our association was formed in those troubled days, and it has patiently worked for the fulfillment of the objects of that tariff policy: to build a vigorous, expanding organic chemical industry whose growth through the years would protect the national security, strengthen our national health resources, provide for new industries through organic chemical research, and attract students to chemistry so that the Nation would have an adequate reservoir of skilled scientific personnel in time of war. These efforts have often brought our association before your committee, where we have unfailingly been received with courtesy and consideration.

Strong national movements have strong proponents. Not all proponents are disposed

to yield that respect for differing views which our American tradition would recommend. I am sure, however, that this will not be the case of your committee as we very candidly state our views on H. R. 1 in as constructive a spirit as we can.

Our industry is a classic example of the constructive results which can be achieved by a wise tariff policy. Brought into being through such a policy, we believe we have measured up to its clear responsibilities. We were ready for the totally absorbing role which the Nation's war production effort required of our industry in World War II. We have been well above average in rate of growth, wages paid to workers, and earnings put back into the business to finance expansion. Our research budget, 5 percent of sales, is outstanding. No other industry using its own funds devotes so much to research.

Because ours is not a mass-production industry for the most part, the tariff is an important economic factor in the stability of our operations. The industry produces a great many chemicals (more than 7,000 commercially) for the most of which the total demand is relatively small. Hundreds of chemicals will make up the product line of an organic chemical plant. There is little of the dedication of an entire plant to the continuous or automatic production of a high volume chemical in our industry. We make our various chemicals in batches using techniques very much like those used abroad. The high labor content of our chemicals is measurably no different from that in foreign chemicals. The skills and techniques were born in Germany and the other foreign nations who were dominant in organic chemicals long before we became proficient in their use. Differences in foreign wage costs ranging from one-fourth to one-seventh our wages spell the difference in cost of production here and abroad which requires the tariff to equalize landed costs with ours.

We are proud of the vigor of our industry, its trailblazing research activities, and the steady expansion which has invested nearly half a billion dollars a year postwar in plant and equipment. Much of this has been carried out with the Government's encouragement to strengthen the mobilization base for organic chemicals. Much of it is now, and has been for more than a year, idle in at least substantial part. This is not in itself a mark of weakness in economic conditions in our industry. It is to be expected that capacity for defense will generally exceed capacity needed for peacetime production. It is, nevertheless, a significant economic problem for our companies. Production of organic chemicals in 1953 was about 7 billion pounds below the capacity required for defense mobilization.

It is our belief that tariffs can and should fulfill two distinct functions, so far as a basic industry is concerned. They should prevent the impairment of defense mobilization capacity by import competition. They should also, where necessary, preserve the economic conditions which contribute to the vigor and dynamic rate of growth of the industry. The first function serves our national interest by strengthening the industrial sector of the mobilization base. The second serves the national interest by strengthening the domestic economy.

It would be unwise to assume that continued expansion of international trade and the realization of these two tariff functions are incompatible. We owe it to ourselves as a nation, and to our workers who earn their livelihood in the non-mass-production industries to strive for a foreign economic policy that will avoid the impairing of defense capacity or sapping the strength of those industries. We should until we have given such an approach a fair trial forego the temptation to enter into a program of

tariff cutting which selects arbitrary percentage levels as an objective.

A foreign economic policy which avoids vicarious injury to our Nation's defense capacity while preserving the vigor of our own industries would be consistent with our current national objectives. Further extension of the trade agreement authority is being sought as a means of strengthening the economies of our allies, and thus their defense potential. In itself this is a laudable objective. But our Government has other laudable objectives with which it must be reconciled. As part of our policy of opposing aggression and promoting peace in the world, the Congress has declared the Nation's determination to develop and maintain our own military and economic strength. The national objective is a defense mobilization program of such magnitude to deter an aggressor, or if we are attacked, to enable us to fight to win. We must have the capacity to shift on a moment's notice to all-out mobilization. As the Joint Congressional Committee on Defense Production very recently stated, "time has been eliminated from the arsenal of democracy." Should enemy attack precipitate a full emergency, we will not have the time for large expansion of plant capacity, as we did after Pearl Harbor and Korea.

A deep realization of the soundness of our mobilization policy has led the Nation in partnership with private industry to make an enormous investment in additional capacity and to maintain it in readiness. The difficulty imposed on private industry with capacity in excess of normal peacetime needs is very great. In the view of the joint committee, maintenance of the mobilization base and avoidance of the loss of existing capacity is a major problem. The Director of Defense Mobilization in his 1954 report also emphasized that the development of an adequate, secure mobilization base depends on the understanding and conviction of the Government and the people as a whole that these things are necessary and offer the best assurance of surviving in an age of peril.

If industries such as ours which are vulnerable to import competition are to receive such understanding and help in keeping surplus capacity in readiness for mobilization, the implications for our foreign trade policy are clear. Enthusiasm for strengthening our allies must not lead us into the error of overestimating what reduction of our tariffs can contribute to that objective or of underestimating the impact which increased imports can have on our industrial capacity required for national defense. We must not add strength abroad if it means subtracting strength at home.

How are we to secure this balance in our trade program? Present trade agreement procedures are not keyed to the selective revision of tariffs from the viewpoint of our national security interests. To be sure, the peril point and escape clause are important procedures for balancing economic strength at home with expansion abroad. But they are limited in concept to the avoidance of serious injury to the domestic industry. Without the domestic industry concerned being seriously injured under traditional peril point or escape clause criteria, the mobilization capacity projected through expansion can be hurt if increased imports thwart the needed expansion.

There is needed a positive policy and procedure under which tariffs could not be reduced below a point which the Tariff Commission finds would threaten impairment of the domestic productive capacity declared by the Office of Defense Mobilization to be part of the mobilization base. An essential corollary to that policy and procedure would provide for the withdrawal of concessions which in whole or part have resulted in a volume of imports which

threaten impairment of the domestic productive capacity programed by the Office of Defense Mobilization as part of the Nation's mobilization base.

This type of policy and procedure could be established by amending the peril point and escape clauses to add the concept of "impairment of the national security" to the existing situation which those remedies are designed to prevent. Under such an amendment, the President could establish a procedure by Executive order to provide for mobilization status determinations on particular products by the Office of Defense Mobilization. Those determinations would be the reference points used by the Tariff Commission in finding whether past or proposed tariff action would impair mobilization capacity.

We respectfully urge the committee's consideration of these amendments to the peril point and escape clauses regardless of the final conclusion it may come to on the merits of H. R. 1.

We see seven basic issues in H. R. 1 itself.

First, we do not oppose a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

Second, we do oppose the bill's threefold approach to tariff reduction. We cannot avoid the feeling that tariff-cutting objectives have been chosen which have little independent reason for existence. If the 15-percent authority were intended as an outside limit rather than an objective, we should feel more enthusiasm for it.

Assuming that the 15-percent authority will be granted, we can see no justification for the additional tariff-cutting authority on so-called negligible import items or on the over-50-percent group. There is no particular validity to an arbitrary demarcation point such as 50 percent. It would be rather contemptuous to assume that the 1930 rates had no relationship to the differential in foreign and domestic costs. With 20 years of rather zealously applied trade-agreement authority intervening, it assumes far too much to say that any rate now over 50 percent ad valorem ought, irrespective of the product to which applied, to be reduced to that level.

So, too, the concept that items being imported at a particular moment of time in negligible quantities ought to be reduced by 50 percent of the 1945 rate is objectionable. By what prescience can it be said that an increase in imports from negligible to substantial quantities on any item requires a great reduction or a slight reduction? Would it not be more consistent with the promised modernization and gradualness to approach the reduction on any item with a single standard, 5 percent a year?

Third, we are opposed to the new substantive authority which the bill would give the President to include provisions pertaining to nondiscriminatory standards, quantitative restrictions, customs formalities and similar international trade matters in trade agreements. We are concerned that such sweeping authority could be offered amid such deep silence as to its intended purpose. From our own analysis it would appear that under this grant of power the President could sign a revised General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade with its extensive substantive provisions and proclaim it effective. Many substantive provisions, such as those pertaining to quotas, countervailing duties, anti-dumping duties, and even perhaps valuation procedures contained in GATT could become law without Congress ever having an opportunity to look into the matter. There is considerable doubt that such a broad grant of power without any intelligible principle to limit the Executive to congressional purposes could be constitutional. Were such authority to be granted, the divestment by the Congress of its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign commerce would have run its full course. With this silent ac-

quisition of great power, the temptation would be strong to bring the substantive provisions of a revised GATT into full force without submission to Congress. Significantly, there are no announced intentions to lay other than the organizational provisions of the agreement before the Congress.

There are some who speak in self-appointed roles as friends of the Congress to decry the prospect of Congress ever again going through a complete tariff revision such as it is said occurred in 1929 and 1930. This ordeal, imagined or real, is said to require that Congress never again undertake to legislate in tariff matters. Conveniently, as it serves their purposes, these proponents would leave such tedious detail to the Executive. This, we are told, forbids Congress looking legislatively into tariff rates. This it is which now in a new boldness should prevent Congress from attending through the exercise of its own judgment to changes in the substantive provisions of the tariff act quite apart from the rates.

Surely the Congress will not thus at a stroke immunize the laws pertaining to foreign commerce from its care and attention. It is preposterous to compare the attention required in reviewing substantive provisions such as GATT contains to the much different task of creating an entirely new tariff act with its hundreds of individual classifications and rates. Many who are opposed to the latter are also opposed to tariff ratemaking by the Tariff Commission, which was formed to relieve Congress of much of that tedium. Their objective is not so much easing the cares of Congress as insuring that Congress and its agent for tariff matters are taken as far out of the picture as possible in the regulation of foreign commerce. In brief, they see tariff policy solely as a gambit in foreign diplomacy.

Section 3 (a) (1) (A) of the bill is an unwise proposal, foreign to our traditions. It should be omitted from the bill.

Fourth, we oppose the changes which have been made in the procedural authority conferred upon the President by the bill in comparison with its predecessor, H. R. 8860 of the 83d Congress. The earlier bill required the President to make his determination of negligible imports on the basis of Tariff Commission information. H. R. 1 removes this basis, and leaves the President discretion at large to make the determination. It is the Tariff Commission which has the greater expertise and independence of judgment in tariff matters. It can hardly be sound policy for Congress to delegate power to the Executive to act in accordance with a particular standard, and at the same time be unwilling to confine the exercise of that power to those instances in which its own expert agency finds the prescribed standard is met. Moreover, the bill brings the finding of negligible imports down to the point of time coincident with entering into the trade agreement. Such a limitation would seem unsound, for it would ignore the historical situation on imports, and turn solely to a moment of time which foreign nations intent on securing a favorable concession could influence by shutting off exports for a limited period.

Fifth, we oppose the authority which the bill would give the President under the over 50-percent provision to use any value basis he finds practicable in computing ad valorem equivalents of specific or combination duties. The heart of our industry's production is of coal-tar chemicals which are protected by duties based on the American selling price value basis. The earlier Kean bill required that value to be used as the basis for computing ad valorem equivalents on items dutiable under the American selling price. Through the use of different language, H. R. 1 would seem unintentionally to eliminate that requirement. The concept of the bill is that all dutiable commodities should be subjected within certain safeguards to fur-

ther rate reductions within established percentage limitations. These limitations are based either upon the rates of duty presently in existence or those in existence in 1945. In the case of items subject to the American selling price, the rates of duty now in existence or in existence in 1945 were premised upon the use of that value basis. If the items dutiable on the American selling price basis were to be subjected to treatment in which the ad valorem equivalents are computed on the basis of some lower value than American selling price, such as foreign value, the effect would be a reduction in the amount of protection available for those items quite apart from any reduction in duty. Then if the rates of duty itself were reduced within the percentage limits of the bill, a further reduction would be imposed on those items. The bill in this manner would permit American selling price items to be subjected to treatment which would result in a greater loss of protection than any other class of commodities could be subjected to under the bill. There is no justification for this type of discrimination. We feel sure you would not wish to subject our products to a greater reduction than other commodities could receive under the bill.

As indicated, we oppose the negligible quantities and over 50-percent reduction provisions in the bill. We sincerely hope that they will be eliminated. If they are not, the changes made in the procedural provisions referred to above should be abandoned, and the comparable provisions of the earlier Kean bill, H. R. 8860, adopted in their stead.

Sixth, we oppose the provisions of the bill which would ratify the multilateral grant of concessions which the administration intends to make in the Japanese trade agreement negotiations. Throughout the history of the Trade Agreements Act the authority of the President has been confined to bilateral negotiations in which concession is traded for concession on a reciprocal basis. Though negotiations with a number of nations have been carried on under the auspices of GATT, they have heretofore consisted of a series of bilateral negotiations conducted simultaneously. Never before has the United States considered offering a concession to one country on condition that the country make a concession to a third country. We think the planned course of action in the Japanese trade agreement negotiations is illegal under the present trade agreement law, and oppose its ratification in H. R. 1. It should be evident that the historic function of the law of regulating the admission of foreign goods into this country in accordance with the needs of our producers in exchange for corresponding market outlets for United States goods in foreign countries can never be achieved if we give our concessions in order to afford market opportunities for third countries in the country to whom we grant the concession.

The other provision of H. R. 1 pertaining to the Japanese trade agreement would permit the reduced rates negotiated with Japan and third countries to be proclaimed after July 1, 1955, and still serve as the basis from which a further reduction of 15 percent could be made under the bill. There is no justification for exposing the products covered by the Japanese agreement to double reductions. The Executive is getting a last minute cut on the duty for hundreds of items in the Japanese agreement. This is scarcely a logical basis for changing the rules on those items from that applying to all other articles under the bill so as to make them vulnerable to greater reductions than other tariff items. Section 3 (c) (2) (C) should be eliminated from the bill.

Seventh, we oppose the proposal in the bill that the President have the power unilaterally to reduce duties on the negligible imports items. This provision is understandable only if it be assumed that America has high-tariff walls which are barriers to trade. This,

as in the case of other premises upon which the argument for tariff reduction is built, is simply not true. There is no reason why our own Government cannot be realistic about this matter and acknowledge that the United States is, by comparison with its commercial rivals, a low-tariff country. You are familiar with the fact that the ad valorem equivalent of our dutiable imports has been cut sharply from 46.7 percent in 1934 to 12.4 percent in 1953, while the ad valorem equivalent of both dutiable and free imports has dropped from 18.4 percent to 5.6 percent in the same period.

While we have been busily engaged in cutting our tariffs, our foreign friends as often as not have been moving in the opposite direction. Their concessions have frequently been withdrawn or nullified by quantitative restrictions. Too, we have often accepted the binding of existing rates in exchange for our duty reductions. These experiences should teach us that it is difficult enough to secure realistic concessions from foreign countries without proposing unilateral reductions. If I may borrow President Washington's words, the Nation is in the position "of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more."

The mere existence of unilateral authority would expose our executive department to unrelenting pressure from our foreign friends under varying pretexts to get us to cut our duties without their giving up anything. After the lengths to which the United States has already gone through tariff reduction, grants, aid, offshore procurement, and dilution of the Buy American Act by Executive order, it is surely the coup de grace to load on the backs of American industry a program of one-track tariff cutting.

We conclude with this summary: We do not oppose a 3-year extension of trade agreement authority so long as its exercise is limited to reduction of tariffs on a genuinely selective basis up to 5 percent a year during that period under procedures which will prevent impairment of defense mobilization capacity, present or projected, and which will preserve the vigor and strength of our domestic industries.

Thank you for your attention.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to extend my greetings in honor of the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania this February 16.

The plight, the privation, and the hardships endured by those nations swallowed up in the shadows of the Iron Curtain remind all of us in the free world that we must continue to recognize the Soviet plague for the cruel design it cuts in the face of humanity and decency. No one knows better of these tyrannies than those enslaved in such countries as Lithuania.

The reports we receive from these countries tell us of forced labor, murdering of anti-Soviet resistant forces, the collectivization of prosperous farmland,

and in short, man's inhumanity to man. Truth again becomes stranger than fiction in this tragic russification of the brave once free Republic of Lithuania.

As a Member of this great Congress, I joint with others paying tribute to the cause of freedom and independence and in the prayer that Lithuania, through the continued spirit of her citizenry and the unwavering voice of America and the free world, will once more cast off the shackles of this bondage.

Aliens: Americans in Heart, Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, a very timely and worthwhile article appeared in the Connecticut Sunday Herald on January 30, 1955, which is commended to my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, the article follows:

ALIENS: AMERICANS IN HEART, SPIRIT

There is man who has a business and has raised a family in New Haven. He is active in many community groups. He loves the United States.

He likes to talk politics, but he has never voted.

He is an alien.

There is in Hartford a woman who has raised a son who as an American GI died in World War II. Her husband is a good Republican. Her son-in-law is a good Democrat.

She listens to their arguments, but she has never voted.

She is an alien.

These are 2 of about 70,000 persons who have come from every corner of the world to live in and work in Connecticut and who the law requires must go to the post office and register as aliens.

Some of these people have been here for only a few months; others have been here for more than 50 years.

Almost all of them want to become American citizens.

Some of them have been trying for years, but are still unable to achieve United States citizenship.

The alien population can be split up into two main groups—the oldtimers and the newcomers.

The oldtimers make up nearly one-half of the alien population. Many of them have been here since before World War I.

They have children who are citizens and they have lived here so long that they think of themselves as Americans.

Most of this group are women who have had to work hard all their lives and have had little opportunity to learn the language and study the formal requirements for citizenship.

Lack of time and timidity have been the chief obstacles to their becoming citizens.

Recent legislation has made their goal easier to reach.

Aliens who are over 50 years of age and have been here for more than 20 years can obtain citizenship by merely answering a few simple questions once they can prove their date of entry into the United States.

The entry problem is the toughest nut to crack.

Many of these aliens came here when they were children and don't remember the name

of the boat they came on, or the exact date of their arrival.

Even when they do remember, the steamship company records which they would need as evidence are no longer in existence.

The alternative to proving date of entry is to prove legal residence in the United States for a period of 20 years.

This means poring through battered city directories, or trying to find old bills and receipts. Or getting specific affidavits from former neighbors.

It takes time and energy and enormous patience, and usually yields as much satisfaction as pounding one's head against a stone wall.

It's surprising, not that some of these people give up in discouragement, but that so many persist in their search.

For the second group of aliens, who have arrived since the close of World War II, the prospects for citizenship are brighter.

Most of these people have had their lives disrupted by war. They shifted from one country to another, and spent time in concentration camps and displaced person camps.

Because they have had to learn how to take care of themselves in order to survive, they can better cope with the problem of achieving citizenship.

The alien goes almost shamefully to sign up at the post office, but most are loyal Americans in everything but formal citizenship. He contributes and acts as a good citizen.

Whether barred from citizenship by technicalities or by simple negligence on his own part, the chances are that your alien neighbor is a real American in heart and spirit.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is being observed on February 16. The little Baltic state was established as an independent nation in 1918, only to have its freedom and existence snuffed out in 1940 by the Soviet Union which has since enslaved its people and destroyed every vestige of their independence.

In the years since 1940, the people of Lithuania have paid a tremendous toll in human suffering and destruction at the hands of a ruthless oppressor. The culture of this little Baltic country is gradually being wiped out, its churches destroyed, and its people are subject to mass purges and deportations. Yet, despite all this suffering and subjugation, the spiritual and moral resources of the Lithuanian people have not been exterminated, nor has its indomitable desire for national freedom been extinguished.

The fake annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic states has never been recognized by the United States. The American people have followed with great sympathy the plight which has befallen the Lithuanian people and we have on numerous occasions raised our voice in their behalf.

On this occasion, the 37th anniversary of their independence, we extend our greetings and encouragement for their righteous cause. The American people hope and pray for their early liberation from Communist tyranny. We renew our solidarity with this heroic people in their struggle against the forces of evil.

Resolution Adopted at the Memorial Service and Rally Sponsored by the American Zionist Council of Los Angeles at Hollywood Temple Beth El, February 13, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimously having heretofore been given consent so to do, I present to the distinguished Members of this great legislative body the following resolution which I this day received from Dr. Max Nussbaum, chairman of the American Zionist Council of Los Angeles, Calif., whose address in that city is 590 North Vermont Avenue:

We, the 1,000 citizens of Los Angeles assembled at Hollywood Temple Beth El on Sunday afternoon, February 13, for a memorial service, voice our shock and indignation at the brutal murder of 2 Jews by the Egyptian military dictatorship and the torture of 2 more, resulting in their death.

This action was taken in wanton disregard of the forceful representations for clemency made on the grounds of moderation and humanity by many governments, including our own.

Together with the entire civilized world, we express our sense of outrage at the inhuman trials and executions which are a mockery of justice. The Egyptian Government stands condemned in the eyes of all mankind for its brutal disregard for human decency. Events in that country in the past year have shown a striking resemblance to the bloody path by which other dictators have maintained power through a totalitarian regime.

Moreover, we are deeply disturbed by this evidence, pointing to an intensification of the bitter tensions existing between Egypt and the State of Israel. It must be feared that unless the conscience of the civilized world can be aroused to deter the criminal intent of the Arab rulers, they will be emboldened to intensify their attacks upon their own Jewish community and possibly to undertake a full-scale attack against Israel.

This sacrifice of Jewish martyrs will not long appease a government which is intent upon diverting the peoples' attention from economic misery and social despotism at home. We shall hold the Egyptian Government eternally responsible for the blood bath which can ensue if scapegoats are to be the technique for appealing to mob passions and for maintaining in power a military dictatorship.

We do urge the continued vigilance of our Government in cooperation with the other governments which view with moral indignation and horror this tragic hanging, in order that the adherence to the principles of justice and respect for civil rights and international law be strengthened in Egypt and throughout the Arab world.

Soviet Faithlessness at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, basic to the ultimate success of any agreement or contract is the existence of the will to fulfill in good faith what has been stipulated. The will to act honestly and faithfully is the heart and core of any agreement in international relations.

At Yalta in February 1945 an agreement was reached between the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States; Winston Churchill, the present Prime Minister of Great Britain; and the deceased Soviet dictator, Marshal Stalin. This agreement concluded in the Crimea contained many elements that were intended to insure lasting world peace. Among these elements were: The projection of the basic concept of the United Nations Organization; a declaration on liberated Europe, based upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the declaration by the United Nations; the occupation and control of defeated Germany; war reparations; treatment of major war criminals; an agreement relating to prisoners of war and liberated civilian nationals; agreement on policy toward Japan; settlement problems in Eastern and South-eastern Europe bearing upon Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Italy, Greece, and Rumania; consideration of the question of Iran; the establishment of permanent machinery for periodic conferences between the foreign secretaries of the three powers; and, finally, consideration of the question of the Turkish Straits.

In the conclusion of the Crimean Agreement President Roosevelt exercised the constitutional power invested in the office of the presidency. And in like manner Prime Minister Churchill exercised the equivalent constitutional power invested in his office. As a supreme dictator Stalin was not governed by any such constitutional principles. Both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill entered into this agreement in good faith, and with the will to carry out the stipulations laid down. But, unfortunately, Stalin, the third party to this agreement, had no intention of fulfilling his obligations.

As a consequence of Soviet bad faith we have seen time and again willful violations of the Crimean Pact. No violation, however, could be more distressing to witness than the one that bore upon Poland.

At Yalta, the Polish eastern frontier was delineated roughly along the old Curzon line. Thus, Poland lost a large amount of her eastern territories. But further stipulations provided that Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west. Another stipulation was made in the agreement calling for the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot.

At the Potsdam Conference, the western frontier of Poland was moved to the Oder-Neisse line in Eastern Germany pending final delimitation at the peace conference which, incidentally, was never held. However, free and unfettered elections were never held in Poland, and here in this display of bad faith on the part of the Soviet Union, the hopes of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill for a free, independent, and democratic Poland vanished.

Seldom before has the world seen such a display of bad faith as in the farcical elections that brought Poland under Communist domination. Every device of terror, imprisonment, and intimidation was used to destroy the effectiveness of the Polish democratic forces. Such were the free and unfettered elections that Yalta promised for Poland. We have long since discovered, much to our woe, how little good faith and good will we can ever expect from the Soviet Union.

On this 10th anniversary of the Yalta Agreement let us, therefore, recall to mind the diabolical dishonesty of the Soviet Union; let us remember the terrible consequences that this breach of faith has brought to the world; let us remember also the unhappy fate of Poland as a result of this breach of faith.

In the Polish people, who stand today before the world swathed in chains but with souls unconquered, there is exemplified the spirit of heroism in resistance, resolution in adversity, and faithfulness to the cause of freedom.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following quotation from a letter I have received from Mr. James D. Francis, president of the Powellton Coal Co., Huntington, W. Va.:

H. R. 1 affects the oil only. Most people think this affects a few coal miners and a few coal operators. It is not generally recognized—and Congressmen and members of the Ways and Means Committee probably do not know—that for each man employed in 1 of our coal-producing counties there is 1 additional man employed servicing the needs of each man and his family in the community and that when there are 100,000 coal miners idle, or partially idle due to heavy imports of residual oil, there are also another 100,000 unemployed or largely unemployed and living partially on relief in the same immediate sections.

In addition to these men, for each 100,000 men in the mines there are approximately 25,000 railroad, transportation, and dock and vessel employees engaged in giving railroad and transportation service to the coal mined by these miners and in maintaining the cars and locomotives used to haul this coal; and for each of these men out of income in their

communities, approximately an equal amount of men and women are out of employment in servicing transportation, dock workers, and steamship men handling this volume of coal.

It should also be realized by the committee that for each 100 million tons of coal lost due to this form of competition, the manufacturers and suppliers of mine supplies and mine equipment lose sales on mine supplies and equipment of approximately \$1 a ton and causes a very substantial unemployment in the industries furnishing these supplies.

The wholesalers, retailers, and jobbers in our community suffer in their loss of business and their income; and schools, churches, and all public welfare organizations are likewise greatly injured.

Yours very sincerely,

JAMES D. FRANCIS,
President.

Education Is Our Job, Not Washington's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News on Sunday, February 13, 1955. I am in thorough agreement with the views expressed in this editorial:

EDUCATION IS OUR JOB, NOT WASHINGTON'S

Although we are keenly troubled about the plight of the schools in the Nation and the South today, we do not like President Eisenhower's proposal to help solve it with a \$7 billion Federal-aid program.

In the first place, we look on education as primarily a State or local duty and responsibility. If the Federal Government subsidizes schools, we fear that in the long run it will try to tell teachers what they can or cannot teach. Already there are ominous threats of Federal interference with the operation of our schools. The initiative and responsibility for the schools should always remain in the States or localities. Their control should never be vested in Washington. That way lie all sorts of dangers of thought control or worse. No free country should undergo that risk.

In the second place, the President's proposal is not for outright grants of money but for loans, except in the case of some States which might get direct grants on a matching basis but would practically have to take a pauper's oath to obtain them.

North Carolina is not a pauper State. Its credit is excellent. If it has to borrow money to educate its children it can get it from other sources than the Federal Government at reasonable rates, without the risk of thought control or interference with the operations of the schools implicit in Federal subsidization. No State is too poor to educate its young people—it is absurd to think so in a period of prosperity when we universally spend more for joy riding, cosmetics, and drinks than we do for education—and no State is rich enough to neglect their education.

North Carolina, half a century ago when it really was poor, undertook the high task of educating all its children; we knew it would entail sacrifices and we undertook them gladly because we knew the end would justify the cost. The results speak for themselves. We have done a reasonably good job and we know we can do better. It is our job and we will stick with it.

The Real Quemoy Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks an article written by Joseph Alsop, appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 16, 1955, which, if true, is an amazing disclosure:

THE REAL QUEMOY STORY

(By Joseph Alsop)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA.—The controversy now raging in Washington about the real status of Quemoy and the Matsu Islands is easily understandable.

The confusion grows directly from the curious, tortuous, and even somewhat shabby dealings of the American Government with the Chinese Nationalist Government on this vital issue. The real history of those dealings (which leaves the true status of Quemoy and the Matsus as dubious as ever) can be summarized as follows on high and undoubted authority.

Originally, as the whole world knows, President Eisenhower's policy, adopted against the recommendation of 3 of the 4 Joint Chiefs of Staff, was to defend none of the offshore islands that constitute the Formosa approaches. This decision was taken last September, at the famous Security Council meeting in Denver, after the first major Communist shelling of Quemoy had brought the problem of the offshore islands to the forefront.

How or why this original decision was changed in January is not known here. It is suspected, however, that the lever of change was a growing conviction that the Chinese Communists seriously intended to attack the Pescadores and Formosa proper, which in turn made the defense of the more advanced positions seem more logical and important. At any rate the original decision was changed, and the new policy was adopted of abandoning the Tachen Islands but assisting, if need be, in the defense of Quemoy and the Matsus.

This led directly to the President's request to Congress to pass the so-called Formosa resolution, and to the key scene in the discussions of the problem of the offshore islands between the Chinese and American Governments. This key scene was a meeting between Chinese Foreign Minister George Yeh and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles while the Formosa resolution was pending and shortly before Secretary Dulles' departure for his Caribbean holiday.

At this meeting, Secretary Dulles informed Foreign Minister Yeh, without qualification or equivocation, that President Eisenhower would issue a statement in effect guaranteeing Quemoy and the Matsus as soon as the Formosa resolution had passed the Congress. The statement, Secretary Dulles asserted would specify Quemoy and the Matsus as being related areas essential to the defense of Formosa. It would thus put the Chinese Communists squarely on notice that an attack on these islands would bring the United States into the fighting.

There was no possibility of misunderstanding about this promise made by Secretary Dulles to Foreign Minister Yeh. Official State Department minutes were taken of the meeting between the two men, and a copy of these minutes was given to Foreign Minister Yeh. The minutes clearly recorded that Secretary Dulles said the President would issue a statement effectively guaranteeing

Quemoy and the Matsus in the manner described above.

On the basis of this apparently solid commitment, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek then agreed to the evacuation of the Tachen Islands, as Secretary Dulles had requested. The plan here was to coordinate the Generalissimo's order for evacuation of the Tachens with President Eisenhower's expected statement on Quemoy and the Matsus. As late as a week ago Friday, United States Ambassador Carl Rankin had no idea that Secretary Dulles' promise to Foreign Minister Yeh was about to be broken. He even held a press conference cheerfully stating that Quemoy and the Matsus were now covered by an American guarantee.

At this very late date, however, Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson informed Foreign Minister Yeh, one assumes with some embarrassment, that there had been a little misunderstanding between the State Department and the White House. The President was not prepared to keep the promise that his Secretary of State had made.

Foreign Minister Yeh produced the minutes of his meeting with Secretary Dulles. Assistant Secretary Robertson showed the minutes at the White House. But all to no avail. Apparently the President had hedged his position, in order to undercut the Senate opposition to the Formosa resolution, in a way that made it impossible for him to do what Secretary Dulles had said he would do.

On receiving this news, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek refused to keep his part of the bargain either, with the result the world knows—the long delay in the Tachen evacuation. These days of delay were occupied by the Chinese in pressing the President to keep the Dulles promise, and by the Americans in fending off the Chinese with one hand and pressing them to evacuate the Tachens with the other.

This curious impasse ended, partly because Chiang Kai-shek had no easy alternative except to bow to the will of the American Government, and partly because President Eisenhower finally consented to toss President Chiang a diplomatic biscuit. This took the form of a communication relayed by Ambassador Rankin assuring the Chinese President that the American President was still undyingly determined to defend Formosa and all related areas "he deems necessary" for the defense of Formosa, "including Quemoy and the Matsu Islands."

If these were not the precise weasel words, they are said by high authority to reproduce the sense with complete exactness. They can, of course, be read any way you choose to read them. For President Eisenhower did not deem Quemoy and the Matsu Islands essential to the defense of Formosa in September. Then he deemed them very necessary in January. And who can tell what he will deem them next month?

The Chinese hopefully believe that there has not been a second change in American policy, and that Quemoy and the Matsus will in fact be defended with American help if attacked. But there was a commitment, which turned into a noncommitment, and it is hard to forecast what transformations this noncommitment may be subject to. And that is where this strange matter now stands.

Lithuania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to

call attention of the House to the fact that today is the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

The small but fiercely proud Baltic country won her independence after World War I, to the plaudits of the whole world. For 22 years her people enjoyed the fruits of freedom, and under freedom Lithuania became an outstanding member of the family of free nations. A successful land reform program, coupled with the intelligence and industry of her farmers, converted the country from a merely self-sustaining nation to an exporting nation; universal education swiftly reduced illiteracy from 64 percent to 15 percent, as the number of children in grammar schools rose from 45,000 to 300,000. Her state opera, the theater, and the ballet added cultural luster to her economic and commercial development.

In 1940, the Soviet Government drew the Iron Curtain down on Lithuania, thinking to snuff out the people's will to freedom.

It has not succeeded. The Lithuanians, like their Baltic neighbors, the Latvians and Estonians, have never ceased to resist subjugation. It was a proud day for our own country when we determined not to recognize the conquest of these three republics by the voracious Soviet bear, but to sustain the spirit of freedom within them by continuing recognition of the republics. All of us share with them the hope that the spirit of freedom will not die, and that the day of liberation is not too far distant.

The National Right To Work Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago public announcement was made of the formation of the National Right To Work Committee. Mr. E. S. Dillard, an outstanding citizen of Charlotte, N. C., was elected chairman of this committee and issued a public statement outlining the aims and principles of the committee. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the statement issued by Mr. Dillard on this subject, as follows:

The National Right To Work Committee declares its keynote belief to be that unionism by compulsion is utterly wrong and is a rising menace to the future of the United States.

This organization will strive diligently to accomplish a single major objective, which is to establish in the United States the principle that Americans must have the right, but not be compelled, to join labor unions.

Labor unions hold in their membership hundreds of thousands of American citizens against their will. Furthermore, thousands of persons have lost their jobs because they would not bend the knee to such compulsion.

Emphasizing these and the many related facts and the injustices inherent in them is the determination of this committee. Further, the committee intends to defend the

right to work principle against all who would invade it, whether unions or employers.

A basic fundamental of American democracy is for every individual to have the right to earn one's own livelihood without being compelled to join, and pay money to, any organization. The National Right To Work Committee expects to carefully avoid injecting itself into the many complicated problems of labor-management relations. The committee will not oppose the expansion of voluntary unionism.

The committee's conviction is that, in keeping with American guarantees of personal liberties, unionism must be voluntary, devoid of compulsion.

Intentions of this committee are to sponsor a program sufficiently broad and adequate to accurately present this whole problem in its many details not only to the American people but also to those men and women who exercise the authorities of government.

When analyzed, this right to work problem presents political and economic issues which are of deep and far-reaching importance.

Ranking first among these issues is whether or not justice is violated when a one-sided state of law protects the individual's right to join a union while providing no protection whatever for the right not to join a union.

Another of these issues is this: Shall the Federal Government be allowed to strike down all State laws which seek to give the individual free choice as regards labor-union membership?

American policy is positively set against the evils of monopoly in business and yet the question arises whether labor unions shall be permitted to achieve monopoly over the working forces of the Nation.

A basic principle of our Republic is to protect civil liberties and minority rights against majorities. Shall this principle have no effectiveness in the basic realm of working and earning a living?

The National Right To Work Committee hopes to convince the American national and State governments and the whole populace that failure to eliminate unionism by compulsion will represent a triumph for collectivism. Already widespread unionism by compulsion has drastically encroached upon, and has severely damaged, various American individual rights.

The foregoing paragraphs present broadly the fundamental policy and objective of the National Right To Work Committee.

Overnight Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Washington woods are suddenly full of armchair experts in military matters, who know, better than the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and the President of the United States, what our military manpower needs are.

The new emphases in military manpower are, of course, the result of extended consideration by the best military minds of our times. Moreover, the President has explicitly taken full responsibility for the judgments that have been made. In his state of the Union message last month, President Eisenhower discussed the new directions which

our defense planning is taking, and said: "These emphases in our defense planning have been made at my personal direction, after long and thoughtful study. In my judgment, they will give our Nation a defense accurately adjusted to the national need." Nevertheless, the armchair experts continue to wage a war of nerves against the public by seeking to undermine confidence in these judgments, including that of President Eisenhower. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the judgment of the man in the White House in this matter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following editorial from the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of February 14, 1955, with reference to this matter:

OVERNIGHT EXPERTS

Some of the Democratic critics of President Eisenhower's projected cutbacks in military manpower have become, overnight, military experts.

Their hullabaloo stems from Defense Secretary Wilson's announcement of December 20 that the Armed Forces would be reduced from 3 million men now to 2,850,000 by mid-1956. On January 5 the reductions were somewhat modified.

To do less than the minimum in the way of defense, said the President, would "expose the Nation to the predatory purposes of potential enemies." "But," he added, "to build excessively under the impulse of fear could, in the long run, defeat our purposes by damaging the growth of our economy and eventually forcing it into regimented controls."

The Army will bear the brunt of the projected manpower slashes; the Navy will be cut slightly; the Air Force, in line with more apparent needs, will be enlarged slightly. Draft calls, starting this month, have been cut from 23,000 to run indefinitely from 10,000 to 11,000 per month.

The heart of the administration's plan is the Reserve system. Under it 100,000 young men each year would get 6 months' training followed by 9½ years in the Reserves. General Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, now believes National Guard and other Reserve units could be prepared for combat in 5, rather than 10 months. Thus, three main sources will feed manpower into the services—the Reserves, the draft, and volunteer enlistments.

The cutback decision was not a snap judgment. The President was advised by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the National Security Council, although, in a press conference, he said he takes full responsibility. Democratic sniping has contributed little except the conviction the snipers are scared civilians attacking plans drawn by unscared military experts.

The President's steadiness in this as in other high-level decisions speaks for itself. He has access to more facts than any of his critics. Until some more convincing adverse evidence comes along, we'll stick with his judgment.

Lithuania's Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1955, marks

the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. Although the freedom that once belonged to Lithuania has been taken from her by Soviet Russia, the Lithuanian people are united in their determination to again establish their complete independence.

There are 3 million Lithuanians living in their rugged and admirable homeland. Here in America we have over 1 million Lithuanian citizens who have greatly proved their quality, their fineness, and their strength as citizens of our American Republic. All Lithuanians are united today, including those in the homeland and those here in America, in the celebration of this 37th anniversary of their independence.

During her independence, 1918 to 1940, Lithuania was an exemplary nation and an honored member of the family of free nations, honorably fulfilling all her obligations. Her land reform act of 1922, the first in all Europe, was one of the most important events in her history as 73 percent of her population was engaged in agricultural pursuits. This land reform act lessened greatly the influence of Communist propaganda. Universal compulsory education—1930—reduced the illiteracy from 64 to 15 percent. From 1919 to 1939 the number of pupils in grammar schools alone rose from some 45,000 to nearly 300,000. Economically, her great progress in dairying and hog production transformed Lithuania from a self-subsisting nation to a commercial type one. Her rapidly developing cooperatives raised the standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry. Lithuania's state opera, the theater, and ballet attracted internationally famous conductors and artists and added luster to the culture of this ancient nation.

Then came the Soviets on their drive to world domination. Today a rigid censorship conceals from the world the continuing deportations under the guise of volunteer work elsewhere, collectivization, the slave labor camps, the russification and colonization by Russian elements, the systematic efforts of the Soviet occupational regime to merge Lithuania organically into the Soviet system, the extermination of the hostile native anti-Soviet element by killings of the resistant groups.

In this great struggle for independence, Lithuania has not given up. She still fights on. Little does Communist Russia realize the strength of heart and determination of the spirit of the Lithuanian people. These stalwart people know they have a friend in America. They know the Government and the people of the United States are with them all the way. Never has the Government of the United States recognized the annexation of Lithuania by Communist Russia, just as the United States Government has never recognized the annexation of Latvia or Estonia under their rule and domination. It is my view that the United States Government will stand firm in this position, and that the people of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors may rest assured the United States will never recognize the incorporation of these wonderfully fine small Baltic

countries into the Soviet Communist Union.

On this anniversary day I extend my congratulations to the people of Lithuania. In doing this I say to them, "Hold fast to your faith, and hold fast to your hope and courage, for with these necessary qualities I am positive the sun will again shine on an independent Lithuania and a happy nation of Lithuanian people living in freedom."

Help for Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to read an editorial which is sympathetic to our coal industry, one that recognizes one of the difficulties lies in the dumping of residual oil from Venezuela to our eastern-shore States.

It is also, at the same time, difficult for those interested in the coal industry to impress sufficient Members with the necessity for nurturing this basic industry.

It might be pointed out that in case of war we would be in difficulty. We would be in a coal economy overnight.

With permission to extend my remarks, I am including this editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on Monday, February 14:

HELP FOR COAL

There has been so much head shaking of late about the troubled condition of the coal industry that it comes as something of a shock to realize that the Federal Government still is taxing the transportation of coal at the rate of 4 cents a ton.

This is a tax that was laid on in World War II to help pay the huge expenses of that war, and at a time when it couldn't possibly have hurt the coal industry.

But that time is past. The coal industry is in trouble now and the transportation tax is unwise and unjust. It helps to nibble away more of the vanishing market for coal and adversely affects the transportation industry.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Wilkes-Barre, Democrat, points out that other industries afflicted with wartime taxes that handicapped them in peacetime have obtained relief. He wants the coal tax repealed, too, and he points out that coal is more essential to our national economy and our national security than other industries which have been given relief from taxes.

Most of the unemployment in this part of Pennsylvania stems from the coal slump, plus the advance of mechanized mining, and its effects on the railroads. Any move that would help coal to compete in price with other fuels should help employment.

The loss of tax revenues to the Federal Government in repealing the coal tax would not be serious, and if greater employment in the mining industry resulted, Uncle Sam could make up his losses in collections from other taxes, such as the income tax on corporations and individuals.

The coal industry, in fact, appears to have a sort of stepchild status with the Federal Government. One of its standard complaints

is that the importation of residual fuel oil (a heavy oil remaining from refinery operations) has robbed it of much of its eastern seaboard industrial market.

Nothing much comes of these complaints, even though the dumping of this oil in eastern markets means loss of jobs for coal miners and railroadmen.

Another blow was reported over the weekend by Press Washington Correspondent Chester Potter. The State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration plan to buy one million tons of coal from Formosa for the use of United States military forces in Japan and Korea. Such a purchase would provide a full year's work for 800 United States miners.

Perhaps there are good reasons for this plan—although they haven't been made public. But we can't help remembering that during last year's election campaign, Foreign Operations Administrator Harold E. Stassen announced a plan to buy 10 million tons of United States coal for economic aid to foreign countries.

Someday, we hope, Washington will wake up to the fact that it makes sense—both economically and from a defense standpoint—to help keep the coal and railroad industries in shape to meet any emergency demands that may be made on them.

The Marble Industry of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from Mr. Roger W. Howdysell, vice president of Marble King, Inc., of St. Marys, W. Va.:

DEAR MR. BURNSIDE: The writer would like to bring to your attention the seriousness of the situation which is facing the marble industry in the United States. The industry is facing complete ruin unless something can be done about the importation of Japanese marbles. The Japanese can deliver into San Francisco, Calif., marbles which compare to size and count of our own including handling, freight and ad valorem at a price which we cannot meet.

The difference in prices of the Japanese is from \$1.30 per gross to \$4.04 per gross delivered in San Francisco under our delivered price to the same point. For approximately \$0.30 more in freight they can deliver to New York. In addition to the two mentioned above, they are using the following ports of entry: Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Charleston, Jacksonville, New Orleans, Galveston, Los Angeles, Portland and Seattle.

We have been advised that hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of business which we previously enjoyed, has been placed with the Japanese concerns. Unless we receive help immediately, it will be disastrous to the industry. This does not only mean the companies in the industry but also for the employees; involuntarily forcing us to close our factory July 1, 1955.

In our plant alone we employ 10 percent of the families living in our community. Most of them are of the age and qualifications that they could not find employment elsewhere.

I would also like to mention the fact that we are one of the most highly mechanized industries in the United States.

Yours very truly,

MARBLE KING, INC.,
ROGER W. HOWDYSHHELL,
Vice President.

Why President's Opponents Are Not So Sure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Sunday News on February 13, 1955, which is very much to the point:

DEMS NOT SO SURE NOW

Just a couple of months back it was a truly cautious Democrat who didn't feel the election was in the bag. We mean, of course, the November 1956 national balloting—the big apple of American politics.

There were some solid-looking reasons for that optimistic attitude. First, of course, Vox Pop had just spoken, and had popped more than a few half-surprised Dems into gubernatorial and congressional seats.

Also, Ike hadn't balanced the budget as promised; and the McCarthy feud, in some precincts, had chased an estimated sixth of the normal GOP vote away from the polls.

So what's erasing those donkey party smiles now?

Ironically, the Dems own scouts and pollsters are spreading that gloom. Off the record, realistic Democrats are admitting that probable 1956 candidate Dwight Eisenhower is far from licked. In fact, his personal popularity may be nearing its peak.

Why? First, we'd say, the people like the firm way in which Ike handled the Formosa menace. No jitters; no hysterical midnight declarations of police actions. Just a non-bluffing statement of our position versus the rampaging Chinese Reds—and no shooting war came tumbling down.

On the domestic front, political professionals are admiring the way in which Ike has handled the touchy issue of racial discrimination in jobs covered by Government contracts.

When Congress failed to cooperate on this one, Ike quietly set up his own shop. His President's Committee on Government Contracts, at last count, had checked into and taken fast, realistic action on 104 discrimination complaints.

As of January 15, some 37 of the offending employers had been persuaded to comply voluntarily with those nondiscrimination clauses. Direct violations were found by Ike's men in 13 cases; contractors hastened to correct the situation. Some 42 bias cases are in the works now. The committee found it had no jurisdiction in the other 25.

Not much publicity has been given this. But our so-called minority and labor groups know what's been going on, and are telling pollsters they appreciate it. As far as can be foreseen, they'll still have that gratitude come 1956.

Meantime, Ike's most likely rival for next year's race is reputed to be the no-longer-reluctant political dragon and jokester from Illinois. So—

HOW ABOUT ADLAI?

Nothing's truly certain in politics. But Mr. Stevenson probably lost considerable prestige during the hottest Formosa crisis days. The Nation then was rooting fervently for Ike and our boys with the 7th Fleet. At about that time, Adlai opined wishy-washily that the United States, really, ought to "exercise restraint," at least until the ownership of Formosa could be "adjudicated peacefully." Very high-sounding words, those, but plenty of Democratic professionals wished that their fine-feathered orator had chosen that particular moment to keep his trap shut.

It's possible, though, that Adlai's political kiss of death may be the one bestowed on him by some fervent admirers in London, England. We quote from The Listener, a weekly publication of the British Broadcasting Corp.

"Mr. Adlai Stevenson gave three erudite and thoughtful lectures on foreign affairs at Harvard University in March this year (1954). He is the least American of American politicians; if he lived on this side of the Atlantic his temperament and outlook would carry him far in English public life. He sees America with a detached as well as a patriotic view and he is clearly not happy at the impression she creates among her allies. These lectures, now printed, are an explanation to Americans of the complexities of international affairs and a warning against exaggerated black and white judgments and pronouncements. Be patient, is the message that Mr. Stevenson gives to his fellow countrymen and in doing so he draws illuminatingly upon the experiences of his recent world tour. It is a comforting thought that approximately half of America looks to this calm and wise counsellor for leadership."

Well, as we were saying to you common American Americans, it's looking more and more like Ike.

Resolution on Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following resolution adopted by the American Veterans Committee at the eighth national convention held in Boston, Mass., on December 4, 1954:

RESOLUTION ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Whereas in the age of atomic warfare and the hydrogen bomb, it is manifest that an adequate civil-defense program is essential to the country's safety; and

Whereas the Federal Government has failed to assume its proper responsibility to set up an effective program of civil defense; and

Whereas the State and municipal governments are incapable of financing or planning the necessary national program of civil defense.

Now, therefore, the delegates of the eighth national convention of the American Veterans Committee call upon the Federal Government to assume its responsibility for the financing, planning, and supervision of a proper and integrated civilian-defense program.

Congress Should Lead Crusade Against Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the International News Service, one of the leading news-gathering agencies in this country and abroad, I have written an article dealing with the problem of crime and the need for Congress to lead a crusade against this evil. The article was published in various newspapers serviced by this agency. The New York Sunday Mirror printed the article in its issue of February 13, 1955. It reads as follows:

A CRUSADE AGAINST TEEN-CRIME URGED

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat, of New York, has been a widely acknowledged expert in the study of juvenile delinquency. As a New York City magistrate he dealt with young offenders. He is also the founder of a New York City Crime Prevention Institute. Representative ANFUSO introduced two bills in Congress designed to help ease a crime problem he says has assumed alarming proportions. How Representative ANFUSO would deal with the problem, and what his two bills would achieve, are described by him in the following article.

(By Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—The growth of crime in the Nation must be checked and it's up to Congress to lead the crusade.

Our newspapers daily report all sorts of serious crimes, juvenile delinquency cases, youths equipped with deadly weapons, youthful narcotic addicts, and other gory tales. Since the end of World War II this situation has assumed alarming proportions throughout the country.

Evidently, we have failed somewhere along the line. But where? How?

I am the parent of five growing children and, like every other parent, anxiety often grips me concerning their future, their associations, their interests.

For many years I have studied the problem of juvenile delinquency and crime prevention. Back in 1936 I founded a Crime Prevention Institution in New York City which is still in existence and is doing a magnificent job in its locality.

As a city magistrate in New York, I dealt with youthful offenders, not interested merely in meting out stern punishment but in rehabilitating character and young lives.

From my experiences, I have reached the conclusion that crime is not confined to any particular race, nationality, or religious group. I regard crime as a social disease which stems from many causes, such as extreme poverty, slums, poor environment, neglect by parents, lack of family discipline, breakup of family units, and emotional disturbances.

Teen-age criminals and juvenile delinquents are the outward manifestations of this social disease. Because of the large number of these offenders and the serious crimes committed by them, it has become a problem of grave national concern.

Our Government has been derelict in dealing with this problem from a preventive standpoint.

I often ask myself, as undoubtedly millions of our citizens do:

What is wrong with our educational system that it is helpless in eradicating this evil when our children are still in an impressionable age? What is wrong with the communities in which we live that our young people are attracted by evil forces? What is wrong with the churches that their influence upon our youth is so negligible? Where have we fallen down on the job of raising the young generation to be law-abiding, respectable and responsible citizens?

Many also ask this question: We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to fight crime by means of large prosecuting staffs, huge police forces, criminal courts, and penal institutions, but what are we doing to prevent crime and to curb juvenile delinquency?

Arrests and court warnings, evidently, are not enough. Police protection is not enough. Even jail sentences do not curb this evil.

The American public must be thoroughly aroused to this menace which is affecting us all.

It is my view that Congress should give leadership and guidance to our people in dealing with this problem.

For this very reason, I introduced two measures in the 84th Congress. One is a resolution to create a fact-finding committee of five Congressmen to conduct, without regard to politics, an investigation of the causes of crimes committed in violation of the laws of the United States, as well as the methods for the prevention of such crimes.

A study of this nature should include an examination of criminal records as well as the relationship of neighborhoods and schools with the causes of juvenile delinquency. The committee would later submit a program of legislation to Congress.

The other is a bill which calls for the creation of a Bureau of Crime Prevention in the Department of Justice as a permanent agency to conduct a continuous study of methods to prevent crime and curb juvenile delinquency.

The bureau would be required to have offices in each State and to cooperate with Federal and State agencies in initiating crime-prevention programs.

I am not so naive to think that this is the whole solution. I prefer to regard it as a beginning that may perhaps snowball as we go along, until we succeed in getting control of the situation.

It is of utmost importance to imbue our youth with a better understanding and appreciation of our way of life and everything that is fundamental and constructive in the makeup of America.

Our young people must realize that crimes committed against society will affect their own future lives and undermine their opportunities to become useful members of society. It must be made crystal-clear to them that they themselves will be the greatest victims of their criminal acts, that they themselves stand to lose most by their folly.

The dollars we spend today to prevent crime may be repaid a hundredfold, not only in saving the taxpayers' money for fighting crime, but in helping our youth become better citizens tomorrow.

great legislative body so to do, I am pleased to here place to the attention of all the Members of this 84th Congress an editorial dated February 1, 1955, in the Los Angeles Evening Herald-Express.

It is another of the pertinent and timely treatments of this subject which has come to my attention for I have many years been interested in the problem of the elder citizens and am frankly worried about the conditions and facts which this editorial calls to our attention.

I agree with the last paragraph of the editorial wherein it says, "It is a problem that must be tackled, and tackled soon."

EMPLOYMENT AGE BARRIER

What are we going to do about our older workers who are seeking employment?

By older workers we do not mean necessarily the aged. In most cases, the latter are taken care of, at least partially, by old-age pensions.

But millions of would-be workers from the ages of 35 for women and 45 for men are finding great difficulty in obtaining employment in Los Angeles and throughout the Nation.

It is because in a larger percentage of cases employers insist on hiring the younger men and women and turning away those older.

In many instances, this is due to pension and insurance systems which make it too costly to employ older persons as beginners. Where they already have been working in firms for many years, of course, this would not apply.

But also in many cases it is due to the desire of companies and corporations to employ "young blood", forgetting the importance of having more mature workers with years of responsibility and experience behind them.

Many letters have been received by the Herald-Express from unfortunate older workers who cannot get jobs in Los Angeles because of this age bar.

Our eminent columnist, George Sokolsky, whose columns appear daily on the editorial page, has written about the problem frequently.

James P. Mitchell, United States Secretary of Labor, has pointed the problem up as extremely serious in an article in Collier's magazine.

In fact, he cites figures of the Census Bureau stating that by 1975, there will be 63 million persons over 45 in the United States, half of our adult population.

Unless industry itself will go to work on the problem to solve it, the labor secretary says, these people eventually will force some kind of public program for their survival, which probably will mean pensions or "middle-age" insurance and an almost unbearable load on the taxpayers.

And yet the President of the United States, his cabinet members, and members of Congress are almost all of them past this young-age barrier.

It is a problem that must be tackled, and tackled soon.

Sun. I should like to quote just briefly from this advertisement:

I like living in the United States. I like living in Massachusetts. I like my home and job here in Lowell because these are matters of my own choice. But here is a point which bothers me and my wife. It's this rumbling in Washington about a new bill coming up Thursday of this week in the House of Representatives which will lower the tariff. It seems to me this is going to make a big difference in my job, my home, and my future.

If you vote to pass this bill to lower the tariff, it means that people in England who work for 45 cents per hour; also people in France who work for 43 cents per hour, Italy at 30 cents, and Japan at 14 cents, they will all be working steady but I won't.

It's just as simple as that.

I'm just one of many workers all over the country, whose homes and jobs will be affected by the passage of this bill. If you are interested in me, my family, my home, and Lowell, please do not approve this bill.

Respectfully yours,

A WORRIED WORKER.

Then it is signed by many of the biggest manufacturers of the cotton-woolen textile industry in Massachusetts.

It says:

If you work for wages, own a store, run a business, or are a housewife, you have a deep interest in affairs in Washington during the coming few days. Along about Thursday your Congressmen will be asked to vote on a bill to lower the tariff. Congressmen are sent to Washington to represent the people back home. But you've got to let them know how you feel.

Once again our jobs and homes are in danger because of the tariff. They are in danger because some people—the free traders—are trying to pass a bill in Congress to cut United States tariffs 15 percent in the next 3 years. The free traders don't worry about your job.

Tariffs actually are supposed to even up the big wage gap between your pay and that in foreign mills. Our tariffs now are too low as it is. That is why imports coming to the United States can undersell the goods we make here.

You are competing with England, where mill pay is about 45 cents an hour. You are competing with France, where it is about 43 cents; with Italy, where it is 30 cents; and with Japan, where it is only 14 cents an hour. Our low tariffs now are no bar to imported goods, yet the United States Government is willing to cut tariffs again on many kinds of textiles to aid Japan.

The people who want to cut tariffs say you can learn a new kind of work if imports kill your job. They say you can move some place else and try to find work.

Bear in mind, and tell your Congressman, that if H. R. 1 becomes a law, it means Congress once more, and to a greater degree than ever, will have given up its constitutional obligation to control our foreign trade. The State Department will continue in the saddle. If H. R. 1 passes, there is nothing your Congressman and Senators can do to help you combat imports. They might protest to the State Department, but it would be too late, because the Department again would have the power Congress surrendered.

All of the people in the city of Lowell and the surrounding towns are asked to write to their Congressmen. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. PHILBIN) and I have had several letters on this subject. I am glad to have the additional letters coming in. I saw some workers today from Pennsylvania, and they made some very fine statements.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Employment Age Barrier That Must Be Tackled, and Tackled Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, having been accorded unanimous consent of this

The Textile Industry

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked and received unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a full-page advertisement which appeared in the Lowell

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. I want to compliment the gentlewoman on the excellent speech she made and particularly upon those splendid, pertinent remarks she read from the paper that she is evidently going to include as part of her remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. PHILBIN. It was stated very succinctly and vividly sets forth the true situation that is presented to the country. There is no way to meet the situation that confronts the people as the result of these tariff cuts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

And, they talk of a number of other related industries in our district and all over the country that will be affected and closed down when our textile mills close down. Many do not seem to realize what it is going to do to the farmers who will not have their local markets to sell their agricultural products, their butter, their eggs, their cheese, and other commodities. It is going to ruin a lot of those farmers. Also, there are a good many farmers who have mortgages at the banks, and if the money is not forthcoming on the sale of their products, they will not be able to pay off their mortgages. I do not think some of the farmers realize that.

Thoughts From the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial appearing in the Rowan County News, of Morehead, Ky., on Thursday, February 10, 1955.

Titled, quote properly and appropriately, "You Can Develop a Fever Buying Stocks," it treats on a subject matter that has been of deep concern to each of us, the depth of which is so definitely evidenced by the creation of the so-called Fulbright committee for the purpose of studying and exploring the recent trends and developments in the stock market and ascertaining the cause.

Well and intelligently presented, the article suggests the need for the exercise of extreme caution and care in playing the stock market. It should serve as a timely flashed yellow light, especially to the small investor—the group whose continued financial stability is so important to the preservation of a healthful overall economy.

It emphasizes the urgency with which the Fulbright committee should get under way with its work.

Because of its general pertinency and poignancy, I sincerely urge each of you to read seriously and digest this splendid editorial:

YOU CAN DEVELOP A FEVER BUYING STOCKS

One of the ironies in the great game of buying stocks, and playing the stock market, is the fact that the people sometimes develop a fever to buy stocks as a result of an extended bull market. The best authorities on the market cannot explain this phenomenon precisely but they admit it exists.

It certainly developed in the twenties and led to reckless speculation on the part of millions of citizens. The result of this buying mood is usually seen in a continuation of the bull market. In other words, if a normal bull market comes along, and stocks rise for a reasonably long period, and then the number of citizens investing in the market begins to increase noticeably, the bull market can be extended.

Quite often a bull market does not attract the interest of the attention of the people as a whole, but sometimes it does. The bull market which has now been on since 1953 apparently is beginning to catch the eye of the average citizen. Although stocks are not paying dividends to make them better buys than they have been on many other occasions, in other bull markets, today there is certainly more speculation and general talk about the market among the average citizen.

The Government, somewhat realizing this, recently increased the cash margin for buying stocks and, as a result, the market suffered for several days. But the losses caused were wiped out in a short time and the market again seemed firm and inclined toward a steady rise.

In times such as this, when the market has been rising for over a year, stockbrokers have a very fine advertising theme to utilize. Many brokers are now sending representatives around to various groups and clubs, and these brokers explain to citizens how they can invest in the stock market.

While the great majority of these brokers are honest and do not attempt to encourage the people to speculate recklessly, they do create new enthusiasm and attract new investors, and thereby increase citizen participation in the stock market.

It should be kept in mind that the country is now experiencing a surge of interest in the stock market and that stocks are not any better buys today than they have been on many occasions in the past, and, in many cases, they are not the buys they have been in recent years.

While we do not attempt to advise any citizen what to do in his own particular circumstances, we believe that the country is now experiencing one of those cycles when the citizenry shows unusual interest in the stock market and we believe this is connected to the fact that a bull market has extended over the last year and a half.

The Eisenhower School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message to the Congress outlining a school-construction program took note of the fact that our system of public schools has always been—and we hope it always will be—a school system based upon State and local control. Then the President proceeded to assume that certain States and local communities were unable to raise the money neces-

sary to provide adequate schoolrooms to properly take care of the children; and, therefore, such States and local communities required Federal aid in the shape of Federal funds, aid to help pay the building costs of the new buildings or to underwrite local school building bonds.

Of course we all know that there are certain impacted areas, where defense plants have been built, that have more children than schoolroom space. Since these impacted areas were created as a result of Federal action and Federal needs, then of course such impacted areas should be given Federal aid—and that has already been provided for in previous legislation.

For the President to propose Federal aid for school buildings on a national scale is something else. In the first place, is it necessary? Why is such a step needed today more than it was 20 to 30 years ago, before Uncle Sam became such an all-wise, beneficent person to whom States and local communities might turn for fiscal aid for any and all purposes?

Mr. Speaker, in the first place Uncle Sam has no money to give out that he does not first get by levying taxes upon the State and local communities. Twenty years ago the Federal Government was satisfied by taking 25 cents out of every tax dollar paid in the United States, leaving 75 cents for the support of the States and local communities. Today, the Federal Government takes 75 cents out of every tax dollar paid in the United States, leaving only 25 cents for the States and local governments to exist upon. If the Federal Government did not rob the States and local governments of their tax dollars they could and would provide proper school facilities for their children without calling upon Uncle Sam for help.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, that should be given serious consideration before the Congress approves the President's request for school construction funds is the fact that our schoolrooms today are not as crowded as they were 20 or 30 years ago. They got along then without Federal aid; why can they not get along now without Federal aid?

In 1920-21 the average teacher load—number of pupils per teacher—for the Nation was 31.7. In 1950-51, according to United States Department of Education figures, the average teacher load was 24.1—7.6 fewer pupils per teacher than 30 years ago. The situation, therefore, so far as crowded classrooms are concerned, has actually improved. It has definitely not become worse. Why, then, all the furor? Why must the Federal Government rush to the aid of the States and local communities?

Mr. Speaker, a careful analysis of the school situation is contained in the following editorial taken from the Chicago Tribune of February 11, 1955. I include it as a part of my remarks and recommend it to my colleagues for careful consideration:

THE EISENHOWER SCHOOL PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's message on Federal aid for building schools sets forth sound principles and then proposes action that

flies directly in the face of the precepts he has just uttered.

"Diffusion of authority among tens of thousands of school districts is a safeguard against centralized control and abuse of the educational system that must be maintained," he told Congress. "We believe that to take away the responsibility of communities and States in educating our children is to undermine not only a basic element of our freedom but a basic right of our citizens."

Having voiced these traditional arguments against Federal aid, the President asked Congress to vote for more than a billion dollars' worth of undermining. His proposals for Federal participation in financing of local school construction took three forms, under each of which States whose districts were helped would have to match Federal funds, dollar for dollar.

The first category of districts to be aided would be those that cannot sell their building bonds at a "reasonable" rate of interest. A White House aid put the limit on "reasonableness" at 3½ percent. To buy these bonds the Federal Government would put up \$750 million and the States the same sum, to be used within 3 years.

The Dow-Jones index of school-bond yields stands at 2.42 percent. Probably then, only a small proportion of school districts have been unable to sell bonds yielding 3½ percent or less. But Mr. Eisenhower would provide funds to buy a half billion dollars of these bonds annually, one-fourth of the cost of all school construction in the Nation during this school year.

The second form of aid would go to districts that cannot borrow because of constitutional or statutory debt limitations. Federal and participating State governments would put up a total of \$300 million. This would be used, Mr. Eisenhower proposed, as a revolving fund to advance the first year's rent until the districts could levy and collect taxes for the purpose. So used, the fund would permit the construction of \$6 billion worth of schools within 3 years.

The Nation is building \$2 billion worth of schools in the present school year. This rate of expenditure is the highest in history. In the last 5 years the country has built \$7 billion worth of schools to accommodate 6,750,000 pupils. The increase in pupil population has been only 5,500,000; so the country has, until now, kept well ahead of the growth in school population. But by the President's calculations, school districts unable to borrow another cent need as much money annually to build new schools as all the districts in the country have ever spent in a year.

In the final category of districts that supposedly need Federal aid most desperately are those that can neither sell bonds nor raise taxes to rent a Federal-State school building. For these, Federal and State governments together would provide \$400 million in outright gifts, spread over 3 years.

Illinois has distressed school districts. The legislature seems likely to adopt a scheme for a school building authority almost identical with that in the second Eisenhower proposal, except that no Federal aid is contemplated. The suggested capitalization for this authority is \$15 million. This sum, it is expected, would provide building funds for all the districts unable to sell their own bonds. By comparison, this State's share of the \$6 billion Eisenhower build-rent scheme would be \$114 million, half contributed in Federal income taxes and half raised by the State.

The poverty of school districts portrayed by Mr. Eisenhower doesn't exist anywhere in the Nation in the proportions he alleges. It will no doubt manifest itself if the Federal purse is opened. Why should States that have been stingy with their schools tax themselves to make amends when they can

pass half the bill on to taxpayers in States that have made more nearly adequate provision for educating their children?

Mr. Eisenhower relied, for proof that a serious shortage of classrooms exists throughout the Nation, on a survey prepared by the Federal Office of Education. Its figures have already been exposed as unreliable.

The Eisenhower message also expressed concern over the low compensation of school teachers. The local taxpayer is charged for paying off school bonds and for paying teachers in the same tax bill. Encouragement of extravagance in construction would be the unkindest act possible to underpaid teachers. It would leave that much less for salaries.

Testing United Nations and Shrine to American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an address by Mr. Thomas Dixon, national commander, United American Veterans, which I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The subject of Commander Dixon's address is a most worthy one, and I hope it will meet with a gratifying response.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY THOMAS DIXON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, UNITED AMERICAN VETERANS, OVER FACILITIES OF WPIK, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 12, 1955

Patriotic Americans, this month we celebrate the birthday of two outstanding Americans, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln.

It is important indeed that we pay respectful tribute to those Americans who laid the solid foundation for our great country, the United States of America.

There are many dark clouds of war today hovering over the security of our democratic form of government. I feel hopeful that our present-day leaders will have the wisdom to meet these vital issues in the same manner in which George Washington and Abraham Lincoln met the issues of their times.

It's a pleasure indeed to note that Congress gave the green light to President Eisenhower so that he may use every facility at his military command to stop the spread of that damnable philosophy of communism.

It is certainly to be hoped that we can avoid another shooting war. But should a shooting war be forced upon us, this will give the United States a chance to put the members of the United Nations to test. Those members, especially of the free countries, should be called upon to take up arms as they did during the Korean war.

If other members of the United Nations refuse to go to war to protect world freedom, then Congress should enact H. R. 3296, which was introduced by Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota. This resolution calls for the withdrawal of our membership from the United Nations. Then we should expel the United Nations from this country, because it would have proven itself absolutely worthless as an effective instrument to bring about world peace.

Just look at the trouble and unrest which we are having in our educational institutions. This unrest can be laid right at the doors of the United Nations. American chil-

dren deserve to be taught the outstanding advantages of American ideals and to be proud of their American patriotism.

Well, here is some good, really American news. A group of World War I veterans has started a movement to build a shrine honoring the American Indians. This shrine will be located here in our National Capital, and will be known as the Temple of the Great Spirit.

Good people all over the world have awakened to the fact that the need of today is moral rearmament. Consequently, the building of this temple fits into the movement of moral rearmament.

First and most important, the paleface fathers must remember that we owe a debt to the American Indians for the many injustices which the white man has inflicted upon them, and this debt cannot be paid in cash.

Therefore, the financing of this temple by the paleface fathers would at least show genuine acknowledgment of the sacrifice, injustices, and moral destruction which the American Indians have been, and are still subjected to.

We should always remember that the American Indians were the original owners of every inch of land in these United States of America. And we should also remember that this Indian land has produced more paleface millionaires than any other country.

The record of services rendered, in deeds and action, by the American Indians to the white man and to the Government of the United States of America is so numerous and outstanding that it is impossible to cite all of them on this broadcast. However, if you will listen in on this station next Saturday, same time, I will refresh your memory on many other contributions made by the American Indians for the welfare of this country.

The building of this shrine, financed by public subscription from the paleface fathers, will have a twofold effect. First, and most important, it will show the Indians that their paleface fathers have finally recognized a debt of gratitude which justly should have been paid many, many years ago. Second, the building of this shrine will also put a stop to the propaganda used by the Communists to poison the minds of the Indians, so as to win them over to communism.

It is public knowledge that communism has made great progress on Indian reservations. What is the principal argument which the Communists use? This is their main argument: "What has the white man done for the Indians?" "Nothing, absolutely nothing!" "The white man has stolen all of your land, and also deprived you of your original forms of worshipping."

During this great surge of moral rearmament, what could be better than to extend an invitation of the Great Spirit to come back to the land of his origin—America.

And what better invitation could there be than to erect a temple to The Great Spirit here in our National Capital? Why, many small foreign countries have constructed beautiful temples in Washington!

The temple which the founders have planned will have small chapels to accommodate as many as five tribes simultaneously, and they will be able to worship in their own dialects, and in accordance with their original methods of worshipping, while visiting Washington. There will be, of course, a principal chapel where regular services will be held, and these services will be open to anyone who may wish to attend. A regular ordained minister of Indian parentage will be in charge of this temple. This main chapel upon proper application also will be open to any visiting ordained minister who desires to preach the word of God.

However, the general public will not be permitted to attend the tribal rituals without a written permit from the tribal leaders.

Another restricting and proper feature of this temple and its pulpit is that it will be used for sacred rituals only, and will not be used for secular or political propaganda.

It will add to the historical background and ecclesiastical beauty of Washington, and will be a center for visiting students and sightseers.

All of the God-loving people who appreciate this great movement and would like to learn more about it are requested to send their names and address to post office box 2518, Washington, D. C. Your personal ideas on this long overdue recognition of our first citizens—the American Indian—will be appreciated.

I thank you.

Producers Have Big Stake in Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce:

PRODUCERS HAVE BIG STAKE IN EXPORTS

United States exports of merchandise in 1953, totaling approximately \$16 billion, amounted to about 4½ percent of the gross national product, or over 8½ percent of the value of movable goods—at early stages of distribution—produced in this country.

These ratios were similar to those for the preceding year and only slightly lower than the average for the entire period since World War II.

In recent years, some 3 million workers have been employed in the production of United States exports and in service activities associated with them. Nearly all United States producers have some stake in export markets, many selling abroad much larger percentages of their goods than the national averages indicate.

Exports of leading agricultural products traditionally have represented exceptionally high percentages of production, but exports of machinery and a wide range of other products also comprise very substantial proportions of production.

Agricultural exports declined appreciably in the 1952-53 marketing year as compared with those of the preceding year, stemming primarily from declines of about one-third in exports of wheat and over two-fifths in cotton. Despite this shrinkage, however, the proportions of wheat and cotton exported from the 1952 crops remained quite sizable—about 25 and 20 percent, respectively.

Tobacco and soybean exports decreased only moderately, and rice exports remained close to the level of the preceding year, so that the ratios of exports to production of these commodities were little changed. About 56 percent of the rice, about 22 percent of the tobacco, and 14 percent of the soybeans were exported in the 1952-53 marketing year.

Exports of cotton, tobacco, and soybeans have increased in the current marketing year, and thus the proportions of the 1953 crops exported will be somewhat larger than those of the 1952 crops.

Exports of machinery and vehicles, which represented over one-third of total exports in 1953, include many products for which foreign markets are of great importance.

In 1952, for example, exports of track-laying tractors comprised 37 percent of their production; exports of construction machinery and textile machinery represented over 20 percent of production; and exports of wheel tractors, agricultural machinery, motor trucks, machine tools, office appliances, and refrigerators made up between 10 and 15 percent of production.

Exports of all these products, with the exception of tracklaying tractors, declined in 1953, and the ratio of exports to production also appears—as far as production data are available—to have fallen slightly. Track-laying tractor exports, however, increased more than two-fifths, and the percentage of output exported rose to 45.

In addition to the agricultural and machinery products already mentioned, export sales of a variety of other products amount to 20 percent or more of output. This group

includes lubricating oils, sulfur, resin, and such chemicals as DDT, copper sulfate, carbon black, and penicillin.

Even where the ratios are much lower, the significance of exports as a vital marginal element of sales and profits is considerable. This is true, for instance, of passenger automobiles, steel, and many textile manufactures, for which the proportions of output exported fall in the 3-7 percent range.

In table 3 production and export data are shown for an extensive list of commodities, representing half of United States exports in 1953. The report covers many of the leading products and some of the principal product groups in United States exports, and also shows data for numerous items included in other important broad classes of export goods which are not covered comprehensively because of a lack of directly comparable data on both exports and production.

The relative importance of the various classes of goods in total United States exports in 1953 and the extent to which each class is represented by data in table 3 are shown in table 4.

TABLE 1.—United States production of movable goods and the proportion exported, 1929, 1933, 1937, 1939, and 1947-53

[Value in millions of dollars]

Year	Agricultural products ¹	Manufactures ²	Mining ³	Freight receipts ⁴	Total ⁵	Exports United States merchandise ⁶	Exports as percent of total
1929	13,003	30,591	4,908	5,100	53,602	5,157	9.6
1933	6,332	14,008	2,050	3,100	25,490	1,647	6.5
1937	10,213	25,174	4,265	4,300	43,952	3,299	7.5
1939	9,043	24,487	3,808	4,200	41,538	3,123	7.5
1947	32,372	74,426	9,610	9,200	125,608	15,160	12.1
1948	32,842	82,000	12,273	10,800	137,915	12,532	9.1
1949	30,133	75,367	10,580	10,000	126,080	11,936	9.5
1950	30,335	89,750	11,855	11,000	143,540	10,142	7.1
1951	35,042	102,086	13,524	12,900	163,552	14,879	9.1
1952	34,517	108,477	13,430	13,300	169,724	15,039	8.9
1953	33,056	117,500	14,346	14,200	179,102	15,626	8.7

¹ Cash receipts from crops and livestock and products, and value of home consumption as reported by Department of Agriculture.

² Value added by manufacture; data as reported in the Census of Manufactures through 1947; estimates for later years.

³ Value of crude or prepared minerals at the mine, well, or plant: Bureau of Mines data.

⁴ Estimate of cost of moving goods from place of production to points of distribution or exportation: based on freight revenue of steam railroads, of intercity motor carriers of property, and of pipelines as reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

⁵ Total of items shown representing a rough estimate of the value of production of movable goods at point of distribution or export. Figures are not adjusted for price changes.

⁶ Shipments to foreign countries as recorded by the Bureau of the Census. In recent years the data include, besides commercial goods, foodstuffs and other supplies sent to civilian populations through the U. S. Armed Forces stationed abroad, shipments under the ECA (Economic Cooperation Administration), and mutual security program and other aid and relief shipments whether financed by Government or by private agencies. Shipments to U. S. Armed Forces abroad for their own use are excluded from export statistics.

TABLE 2.—United States merchandise exports and imports and export surplus in relation to gross national product, 1929, 1933, 1937, 1939, and 1947-53

[Value in millions of dollars]

Year	Gross national product ¹	Exports ²	Exports as percent of GNP	Imports ³	Imports as percent of GNP	Excess of exports over imports	Export surplus as percent of GNP
1929	103,828	5,347	5.1	4,463	4.3	884	0.9
1933	55,760	1,730	3.1	1,510	2.7	220	.4
1937	90,213	3,451	3.8	3,181	3.5	270	.3
1939	91,339	3,347	3.7	2,400	2.6	938	1.0
1947	233,264	15,977	6.8	6,129	2.6	9,848	4.2
1948	259,045	13,346	5.2	7,822	3.0	5,524	2.1
1949	258,229	12,337	4.8	7,066	2.7	5,271	2.0
1950	280,826	10,658	3.7	9,315	3.2	1,343	.5
1951	329,822	15,485	4.7	11,668	3.5	3,817	1.2
1952	347,956	15,806	4.5	11,503	3.3	4,303	1.2
1953	367,247	16,437	4.5	11,904	3.2	4,533	1.2

¹ Department of Commerce estimates.

² Merchandise trade as recorded in balance-of-payments statistics, representing all transfers of ownership of movable goods between the United States and foreign countries.

TABLE 3.—United States exports of leading commodities in relation to production, 1939 and 1949-53

Export figures include foreign-aid shipments. (See footnote 6 to table 1.) Figures for most agricultural commodities are for crop-years as explained in footnotes 7 and 19. All other figures are for calendar years except as noted. For certain agricultural commodities (as noted) export figures include estimates of the more important processed forms, but for other crude and semimanufactured goods, such as raw cotton and

steel, no attempt has been made to include their equivalents sent out as finished products. Values of production are f. o. b. factory, while values of exports are f. a. s. port of export, and, therefore, percentages based on values may somewhat overstate the part of production exported.

[Letters in parentheses refer to sources of data; explanation of sources follows footnotes]

Commodity and source of data (a-t)	Production			Exports								
	Quantity or value			Quantity or value			As percentage of production ¹					
	1951	1952	1953	1951	1952	1953	1939	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES												
Meat products (a).....millions of pounds ²	21,909	23,035	24,857	109	129	132	0.9	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.5
Animal fats:												
Lard, including rendered pork fat (b).....do.....	2,804	2,886	2,413	689	634	423	13.6	24.1	17.7	24.1	22.0	17.5
Tallow, inedible ³do.....	1,301	1,448	1,676	460	653	1,016	.3	28.9	36.3	35.3	45.1	60.6
Dairy products: (b)												
Milk, condensed, evaporated, and dried ⁴do.....	1,577	1,092	(⁵)	203	111	139	1.4	18.2	17.0	12.9	6.5	(⁶)
Condensed, sweetened.....do.....	300	271	(⁵)	29	30	18	.9	21.6	9.0	9.3	10.9	(⁶)
Condensed and evaporated, unsweetened.....do.....	3,614	3,564	(⁵)	203	97	133	1.1	7.1	4.1	5.6	2.7	(⁶)
Dry whole milk.....do.....	131	102	105	59	42	47	25.6	64.8	50.0	45.4	41.6	44.5
Dry nonfat milk.....do.....	702	863	1,200	123	89	81	.8	22.9	25.7	17.4	6.8	6.7
Cheese, excluding cottage and full skim.....do.....	1,101	1,170	1,298	80	4	6	.2	8.2	4.0	6.9	.3	.5
Grain and products (a): ⁷												
Barley ⁸millions of bushels.....	304	254	226	40	31	37	4.4	8.8	9.1	13.2	12.2	10.4
Corn ⁹do.....	3,058	2,899	3,279	111	78	141	1.4	3.1	3.3	3.6	2.7	4.3
Grain sorghums.....do.....	235	160	83	75	62	10	(¹⁰)	30.5	21.3	32.3	38.7	12.5
Rice ¹¹millions of pounds ¹²	2,515	2,977	3,127	999	1,724	1,741	21.3	40.0	42.4	36.1	57.9	55.7
Wheat ¹³millions of bushels.....	1,019	961	1,291	366	475	317	11.6	38.8	27.2	35.9	48.4	24.5
Vegetables (a): ¹⁴												
Beans, dried ripe ¹⁵thousands of 100-pound bags ¹⁶	14,456	14,956	14,319	2,559	3,519	3,284	2.1	10.3	4.8	17.7	23.5	22.9
Peas, dried ripe ¹⁶do.....	2,951	3,521	2,377	1,014	637	485	8.0	38.3	21.7	34.4	18.1	20.4
Fruits: (a)												
Canned fruits, total ¹⁷thousand cases ¹⁸	58,300	64,000	55,700	1,633	1,610	1,844	24.4	2.7	2.4	2.8	2.5	3.3
Dried and evaporated fruits, total ¹⁹thousands of short tons.....	370	481	431	76	134	151	37.4	38.0	35.0	20.5	27.9	31.4
Raisins.....do.....	156	242	295	18	94	110	29.0	24.1	45.3	11.7	38.7	37.4
Prunes.....do.....	150	180	137	31	47	38	40.8	64.4	47.7	20.6	26.3	27.5
Citrus fruits by kind, in terms of fresh: ²⁰												
Grapefruit ²¹thousands of boxes.....	46,580	40,500	38,360	3,134	3,332	3,172	7.1	7.7	5.5	6.7	8.2	8.3
Oranges ²²do.....	121,710	122,590	124,580	9,578	10,184	12,955	8.4	7.5	6.5	7.9	8.3	10.4
Other fruits by kind, in terms of fresh: ²³												
Apples ²⁴thousands of bushels.....	124,458	110,660	92,489	3,321	4,625	1,743	16.8	1.8	2.6	2.7	4.2	1.9
Apricots.....thousands of short tons.....	215	193	177	13	10	10	51.6	9.0	8.4	7.8	7.1	5.6
Peaches.....do.....	2,688	3,300	3,164	118	428	500	14.1	8.6	19.6	4.4	12.6	15.8
Plums.....thousands of bushels.....	50,627	63,627	62,560	1,068	1,269	1,533	7.8	2.1	1.2	3.3	1.9	2.5
Pears.....do.....	29,312	30,028	30,947	1,435	1,208	1,448	21.8	2.8	3.0	4.9	4.0	4.7
Prunes and plums.....thousands of short tons.....	603	640	484	80	121	97	30.5	38.5	29.7	15.9	18.9	20.1
Oilseeds (a): ²⁵												
Peanuts.....millions of pounds ²⁶	2,037	1,676	1,372	231	123	8	(²⁷)	38.0	24.0	11.4	7.3	.6
Soybeans.....thousands of bushels.....	299,279	282,477	298,052	79,242	45,029	41,187	6.9	24.1	18.5	26.5	15.9	13.8
Flaxseed.....do.....	40,236	34,606	30,174	4,177	5,575	354	.5	9.9	8.2	10.4	16.1	1.2
Cottonseed.....thousands of short tons.....	4,105	6,286	6,190	210	382	211	(²⁸)	4.3	7.5	5.1	6.1	3.4
Vegetable oils (a): ²⁹												
Peanut oil ³⁰million of pounds, crude basis.....	189	125	83	49	32	2	(³¹)	30.7	33.4	20.0	25.7	2.9
Soybean oil ³²do.....	2,454	2,444	2,536	803	274	94	1.7	17.2	15.3	20.5	11.2	3.7
Cattle hides (c).....thousand.....	17,863	19,797	20,508	372	1,138	2,381	3.2	5.0	2.0	2.1	5.7	9.0
Calf and kip skins (c).....do.....	8,253	8,765	11,612	274	794	1,481	1.7	8.9	4.2	3.3	9.1	12.8
Leaf tobacco (a) ³³millions of pounds ³⁴	2,030	2,332	2,255	524	584	498	37.2	25.5	27.0	25.8	25.1	22.1
Raw cotton ³⁵thousands of running bales.....	9,968	15,072	14,952	4,117	5,519	3,048	28.6	32.6	36.3	41.6	36.6	20.4
Hops (a) ³⁶millions of pounds.....	68	63	61	14	12	14	11.9	24.5	27.0	24.7	19.3	23.3
NONAGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES												
Fish canned (d):												
Salmon ³⁷thousands of pounds.....	206,871	222,967	214,289	2,060	1,428	2,277	11.7	5.5	.6	1.0	.6	1.1
Sardines, including pilchards and herring ³⁸do.....	306,223	162,962	76,481	129,982	40,145	10,305	49.2	59.3	44.3	42.4	24.6	13.5
Leather and manufactures: Boots and shoes ³⁹thousands of pairs.....	470,619	509,011	497,689	4,233	4,825	5,159	.7	1.1	.7	.9	.9	1.0
Rubber products:												
Synthetic rubber (e).....millions of pounds.....	1,893	1,780	2,013	21	50	51	(⁴⁰)	1.7	1.7	1.1	2.8	2.6
Passenger car, truck, and bus tires (casings) (f).....thousand.....	83,465	90,411	96,150	1,491	1,560	1,530	2.0	2.2	1.3	1.8	1.7	1.6
Passenger car, truck, and bus inner tubes (f).....do.....	67,249	65,073	74,514	934	1,039	817	1.6	1.8	.8	1.4	1.6	1.1
Cigarettes (g).....million.....	418,892	435,549	423,097	16,808	16,352	16,249	3.7	5.1	3.7	4.0	3.8	3.8
Textile manufactures:												
Tire cord and fabric, cotton and rayon.....thousands of pounds.....	603,913	530,980	520,185	39,151	17,289	14,886	2.7	9.2	6.4	6.5	3.3	2.9
Cotton cloth and duck, total ⁴¹millions of square yards.....	10,312	9,593	10,232	774	749	610	4.4	10.1	5.3	7.5	7.8	6.0
Duck.....do.....	414	417	314	14	13	11	5.3	6.1	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.4
Sheetings.....do.....	2,306	2,139	2,171	68	77	62	3.9	6.7	2.4	3.0	3.6	2.8
Printcloth.....do.....	4,006	3,929	4,265	346	362	274	4.3	11.8	6.4	8.6	9.2	6.4
Denims.....do.....	341	371	391	25	22	31	6.9	6.7	5.2	7.5	6.0	7.9
Cotton tapestry, upholstery, and drapery fabrics.....thousands of square yards.....	187,328	207,077	231,527	6,980	8,967	8,986	.9	3.9	3.2	3.7	4.3	3.9
Woolen fabrics ⁴²thousands of pounds.....	298,860	284,119	264,967	2,565	1,032	680	.1	.9	.7	.9	.4	.3
Broad-woven fabrics of synthetic textiles ⁴³millions of square yards.....	2,787	2,675	2,800	176	193	198	1.6	8.6	4.9	6.3	7.2	7.1
Hosiery (h) ⁴⁴thousands of dozen pairs.....	163,490	163,291	159,614	7,523	6,569	5,845	.9	3.8	4.1	4.9	4.0	3.7
Forest products:												
Turpentine (a) ⁴⁵thousands of barrels.....	709	694	665	209	111	82	29.6	17.7	23.1	29.4	16.2	14.6
Rosin (a) ⁴⁶thousands of drums.....	2,137	2,049	1,721	941	572	357	31.6	24.2	27.8	44.0	27.9	20.7
Lumber, total (i) ⁴⁷millions of board feet.....	37,914	37,810	39,091	986	727	643	4.3	2.0	1.3	2.6	1.9	1.6
Softwood.....do.....	30,203	30,047	30,906	865	596	513	3.7	1.9	1.3	2.9	1.9	1.7
Hardwood.....do.....	7,711	7,763	8,185	121	162	130	6.7	2.3	1.6	1.6	2.1	1.6
Paper:												
Book paper, uncoated.....millions of pounds.....	3,221	2,965	3,260	36	34	23	(⁴⁸)	2.0	.9	1.1	1.2	.7
Paperboard ⁴⁹do.....	23,537	21,822	24,924	452	298	345	1.2	1.0	.9	1.9	1.4	1.3
Writing paper ⁵⁰do.....	2,187	1,991	2,027	71	64	48	3.2	4.1	3.1	3.3	3.2	2.4
Course paper.....do.....	7,254	6,476	6,844	147	177	107	1.4	1.1	1.2	2.0	2.7	1.6
Sanitary and other tissue paper.....do.....	2,946	2,716	2,976	42	34	43	2.3	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.4

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—United States exports of leading commodities in relation to production, 1939 and 1949-53—Continued

[Letters in parentheses refer to sources of data; explanation of sources follows footnotes]

Commodity and source of data (a-t)	Production			Exports								
	Quantity or value			Quantity or value			As percentage of production ¹					
	1951	1952	1953	1951	1952	1953	1939	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
NONAGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—continued												
Nonmetallic mineral products:												
Coal: (i)												
Anthracite..... thousands of short tons..	42,670	40,583	30,023	5,956	4,592	2,724	5.0	11.6	8.8	14.0	11.3	9.1
Bituminous..... do.....	533,665	466,841	453,000	56,722	47,643	33,760	2.9	6.4	4.9	10.6	10.2	7.5
Petroleum and products: (j)												
Crude petroleum..... millions of barrels..	2,248	2,290	2,360	29	27	20	5.7	1.8	1.8	1.3	1.2	.8
Motor fuel and other light products ² do.....	1,141	1,193	1,292	33	29	30	7.0	3.5	1.8	2.9	2.4	2.3
Kerosene..... do.....	136	132	130	6	7	6	11.7	1.8	1.1	4.4	5.3	5.0
Fuel oil, total..... do.....	945	976	984	44	53	50	9.7	2.4	2.7	4.7	5.4	5.0
Gas oil and distillate fuel oil..... do.....	476	520	532	20	31	30	18.9	2.9	2.6	4.2	5.9	5.6
Residual fuel oil..... do.....	469	454	452	24	22	20	4.9	2.0	2.8	5.1	4.9	4.4
Lubricating oil..... do.....	61	56	53	17	15	12	33.6	27.1	26.3	27.0	27.5	23.3
Paraffin wax..... millions of pounds..	1,348	1,213	1,394	348	273	288	50.1	30.8	24.9	25.8	22.5	20.7
Petroleum asphalt ³ thousands of long tons..	10,763	11,414	11,755	164	346	248	4.0	2.6	1.4	1.5	3.0	2.1
Petroleum coke..... do.....	3,389	3,236	3,858	775	744	645	17.2	14.4	14.2	22.9	23.0	16.7
Other nonmetallic mineral products:												
Portland cement (j) ⁴ thousands of barrels..	246,065	249,091	264,023	2,933	3,174	2,539	0.9	2.2	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.0
Sulfur (j) ⁵ thousands of long tons..	4,988	5,141	5,224	1,288	1,304	1,242	28.1	29.9	26.2	25.8	25.4	23.8
Glass containers (k) ⁶ thousands gross..	114,738	114,100	121,468	3,062	2,676	2,774	(⁶)	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.3
Refractories ⁷ thousands of dollars..	313,863	289,490	310,819	29,719	30,649	25,629	7.2	10.8	7.7	9.5	10.6	8.2
Carbon and graphite products ⁸ do.....	150,778	156,664	(⁸)	8,688	10,972	8,686	15.6	(⁸)	6.5	5.8	7.0	(⁸)
Metals and manufactures:												
Iron ore (j) ⁹ thousands of long tons..	116,230	97,973	118,600	4,329	5,121	4,252	1.9	2.9	2.6	3.7	5.2	3.6
Iron and steel-mill products, total (l) ¹⁰ thousands of short tons..	78,929	68,004	80,152	3,379	4,278	3,202	7.2	8.3	4.1	4.3	6.3	4.0
Iron and steel bars..... do.....	12,938	11,968	13,483	198	260	177	4.0	4.8	1.0	1.5	2.2	1.3
Plates and sheets..... do.....	34,496	29,101	35,690	1,389	1,483	1,310	7.6	6.6	4.1	4.0	5.1	3.7
Tinplate and terneplate ¹¹ do.....	4,516	4,183	4,602	621	599	497	14.0	16.4	11.7	13.8	14.3	10.7
Structural shapes, heavy..... do.....	4,922	4,138	5,022	327	275	296	6.7	12.4	6.3	6.3	6.7	5.9
Rails, including splice bars and tieplate bars..... do.....	2,398	1,941	2,501	137	215	240	4.3	10.8	6.8	5.7	11.1	9.6
Wrought iron and steel tubular products ¹² do.....	9,312	8,280	9,859	650	695	699	5.7	11.8	7.1	7.0	8.4	6.1
Castings and forgings:												
Cast-iron pressure pipe and fittings ¹³ do.....	1,950	1,303	1,277	39	42	27	(¹³)	4.7	1.8	2.0	3.2	2.1
Steel forgings ¹⁴ do.....	1,827	1,886	2,042	34	33	24	(¹⁴)	2.1	1.3	1.8	1.7	1.2
Advanced manufactures of metal:												
Metal cans ¹⁵ do.....	3,805	3,842	4,082	37	47	33	(¹⁵)	1.1	.8	1.0	1.2	.8
Hand tools including machine knives ¹⁶ millions of dollars..	504	467	(¹⁶)	44	48	43	12.5	(¹⁶)	7.8	8.7	10.2	(¹⁶)
Nonferrous metals: (j) ¹⁷												
Aluminum, total ¹⁸ thousands of short tons..	913	1,009	1,322	15	12	23	19.0	6.0	2.9	1.6	1.2	1.7
Primary ¹⁹ do.....	837	937	1,252	15	12	23	23.1	6.5	3.2	1.8	1.3	1.8
Copper, total ²⁰ do.....	1,665	1,592	1,716	152	195	156	32.4	13.0	10.1	9.1	12.3	9.1
Primary ²¹ do.....	1,207	1,178	1,293	152	195	156	41.6	18.4	14.0	12.6	16.6	12.1
Lead, total ²² do.....	587	613	(²²)	2	3	1	13.2	.3	.5	.4	.5	(²²)
Primary ²³ do.....	418	473	474	2	3	1	15.6	.4	.6	.6	.6	.3
Zinc, primary ²⁴ do.....	882	904	920	44	63	24	2.8	8.2	2.2	5.0	6.9	2.6
Machinery:												
Electrical machinery and apparatus:												
Storage batteries ²⁵ millions of dollars..	381	372	(²⁵)	10	9	9	3.1	(²⁵)	2.3	2.7	2.5	(²⁵)
Primary batteries ²⁶ do.....	111	130	(²⁶)	17	14	13	13.5	(²⁶)	10.1	15.1	10.4	(²⁶)
Power and distribution transformers ²⁷ do.....	358	408	(²⁷)	15	15	11	2.7	4.6	4.6	4.2	3.8	(²⁷)
Household appliances:												
Refrigerators (m)..... thousand.....	4,075	3,570	3,775	562	469	466	6.3	4.6	4.3	10.8	13.1	12.3
Home-type freezers (m)..... do.....	1,050	1,140	1,200	62	22	40	4.0	1.9	1.2	1.8	1.9	3.3
Washing machines (m) ²⁸ do.....	3,373	3,168	3,516	62	61	80	4.0	1.9	1.2	1.8	1.9	2.3
Vacuum cleaners (o) ²⁹ do.....	2,729	2,842	2,778	18	26	56	1.9	1.0	.6	.7	.9	2.0
Ranges (m)..... do.....	1,400	1,060	1,300	14	15	22	2.1	.6	.3	1.0	1.4	1.7
Radio receiving sets (p)..... do.....	12,627	10,935	13,309	505	408	361	5.3	3.4	2.1	2.8	3.7	2.7
Television receiving sets (p)..... do.....	5,385	6,096	7,215	505	107	152	5.3	3.4	2.1	2.8	3.7	2.7
Radio receiving tubes ³⁰ millions of dollars..	242	273	(³⁰)	15	11	13	9.1	(³⁰)	3.0	6.0	4.1	(³⁰)
Electric lamps..... million.....	2,341	1,748	2,248	87	72	76	(³¹)	4.0	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.4
Telephone and telegraph equipment ³² millions of dollars..	619	764	(³²)	24	30	39	3.9	4.1	5.4	3.8	3.9	(³²)
Insulated wire and cable ³³ do.....	1,097	1,266	(³³)	15	22	21	1.5	(³³)	1.7	1.4	1.7	(³³)
Industrial machinery: ³⁴												
Internal combustion engines, except automotive and aircraft..... millions of dollars..	932	1,173	(³⁴)	116	115	103	9.6	(³⁴)	13.1	12.4	9.8	(³⁴)
Industrial trucks and tractors..... do.....	285	322	(³⁵)	24	25	25	(³⁵)	10.5	9.0	8.6	7.8	(³⁵)
Machine tools (q) ³⁶ do.....	629	1,065	1,156	67	123	118	47.9	30.1	21.1	10.7	11.5	10.2
Rolling mill machinery and parts..... do.....	158	185	(³⁶)	55	50	59	28.9	(³⁶)	53.5	34.9	27.1	(³⁶)
Construction and mining equipment..... do.....	1,413	1,592	(³⁷)	264	348	334	19.1	(³⁷)	19.2	18.7	21.8	(³⁷)
Graders..... do.....	84	89	63	25	29	20	50.0	30.9	26.6	29.8	32.8	31.0
Oilfield machinery, tools, and equipment..... do.....	462	492	(³⁸)	80	86	70	37.0	26.6	16.2	17.3	17.6	(³⁸)
Textile machinery..... do.....	499	308	(³⁹)	108	79	70	10.9	30.1	23.2	21.6	21.4	(³⁹)
Sewing machines and parts..... do.....	148	136	(⁴⁰)	33	26	23	32.6	(⁴⁰)	16.5	22.3	18.9	(⁴⁰)
Food products machinery ⁴¹ do.....	384	349	(⁴¹)	57	55	46	10.5	(⁴¹)	14.1	15.0	15.8	(⁴¹)
Ball and roller bearings and components..... do.....	626	606	(⁴²)	25	32	26	2.9	6.8	3.5	4.0	5.3	(⁴²)
Office appliances ⁴³ do.....	746	770	(⁴³)	121	90	89	19.2	(⁴³)	14.9	16.2	11.7	(⁴³)
Typewriters and parts ⁴⁴ do.....	158	152	(⁴⁴)	30	21	19	29.0	(⁴⁴)	16.9	19.0	14.0	(⁴⁴)
Calculating and accounting machines and cash registers ⁴⁵ do.....	424	456	(⁴⁵)	77	60	60	22.4	(⁴⁵)	16.6	18.2	13.1	(⁴⁵)
Printing machinery and equipment ⁴⁶ do.....	206	177	(⁴⁶)	36	29	30	18.7	(⁴⁶)	19.7	17.5	16.1	(⁴⁶)
Agricultural machinery and implements, total ⁴⁷ do.....	1,188	1,071	(⁴⁷)	140	139	136	11.3	13.1	11.0	11.7	13.0	(⁴⁷)
Implements of cultivation ⁴⁸ do.....	270	232	(⁴⁸)	34	29	21	14.4	16.1	13.6	12.6	12.4	(⁴⁸)
Harvesting machinery ⁴⁹ do.....	460	420	(⁴⁹)	45	54	62	16.9	10.2	8.4	9.8	12.8	(⁴⁹)
Combines..... number.....	109,019	81,511	(⁵⁰)	14,695	16,452	17,117	12.7	11.3	9.6	13.5	20.2	(⁵⁰)
Tractors: ⁵¹												
Tracklaying type..... millions of dollars..	260	281	329	95	104	148	39.4	46.1	38.9	36.6	37.2	45.1
Contractors wheel type..... do.....	55	60	44	6	12	16	18.0	24.7	22.7	10.7	19.5	37.2
Other wheel type, except garden..... do.....	703	556	547	131	95	91	18.0	24.7	18.7	18.6	17.1	16.7
Transportation equipment:												
Passenger cars ⁵² (r)..... thousand.....	5,315	4,316	5,118	247	167	186	6.0	3.1	2.3	4.6	3.9	3.0
Motor trucks and coaches ⁵³ (r)..... do.....	1,280	1,037	1,075	224	163	139	22.3	11.8	11.6	17.5	15.7	12.9
Complete civilian aircraft ⁵⁴ millions of dollars..	89	197	244	18	25	90	(⁵⁴)	21.6	43.6	20.0	12.8	36.6
Locomotives ⁵⁵ do.....	599	539	(⁵⁵)	29	37	48	4.8	(⁵⁵)	8.8	4.8	6.9	(⁵⁵)
Passenger railway cars, except self-propelled ⁵⁶ do.....	34	23	(⁵⁶)	13	2	(x)	(⁵⁶)	(⁵⁶)	3.6	39.2	8.2	(⁵⁶)

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 3.—United States exports of leading commodities in relation to production, 1939 and 1949-53—Continued

[Letters in parentheses refer to sources of data; explanation of sources follows footnotes]

Commodity and source of data (a-t)	Production			Exports									
	Quantity or value			Quantity or value			As percentage of production ¹						
	1951	1952	1953	1951	1952	1953	1939	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	
NONAGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—continued													
Chemicals and related products:													
Phenol (s).....thousands of pounds.....	388,429	387,761	378,478	21,097	22,290	15,161	3.0	10.2	4.5	5.4	6.6	4.0	
Colors, dyes, stains and color lakes ² (s).....do.....	200,101	184,269	(³)	22,521	12,180	13,394	10.5	19.7	11.3	11.3	6.6	(⁴)	
Color lakes and toners.....do.....	40,109	35,666	(⁵)	3,077	2,367	3,178	(⁶)	10.5	6.3	7.7	6.6	(⁷)	
Sulfur black.....do.....	11,410	9,205	(⁸)	3,026	1,053	762	(⁹)	26.9	25.7	26.5	11.4	(¹⁰)	
Synthetic indigo.....thousands of dollars.....	4,919	4,383	(¹¹)	599	214	58	(¹²)	23.6	19.8	12.2	4.9	(¹³)	
All other dyes and stains.....thousands of pounds.....	130,304	122,833	(¹⁴)	15,816	8,502	9,384	(¹⁵)	23.2	12.6	12.1	6.9	(¹⁶)	
Biological products ¹⁷millions of dollars.....	87	80	(¹⁸)										
Medicinal chemicals ¹⁹do.....	423	376	(²⁰)	281	221	217	(²¹)	(²²)	²³ 12.8	²⁴ 14.5	²⁵ 11.8	(²⁶)	
Pharmaceutical preparations ²⁷do.....	1,425	1,417	(²⁸)										
Penicillin (s).....billion oxford units.....	318,622	342,326	378,337	83,972	75,531	102,815	(²⁹)	24.6	31.2	26.4	22.1	27.2	
Acetylsalicylic acid (aspirin) bulk (s).....thousands of pounds.....	13,481	13,312	13,649	2,169	1,576	1,253	(³⁰)	13.7	10.6	16.1	11.8	9.2	
Insecticides and fungicides for agricultural use ³¹ (t).....millions of dollars.....	271	219	(³²)	50	42	32	8.9	(³³)	12.2	18.5	19.1	(³⁴)	
DDT (a).....do.....	39	33	(³⁵)	15	16	11	(³⁶)	39.5	24.7	37.6	47.6	(³⁷)	
Copper sulfate (j).....short tons.....	106,944	94,508	72,692	43,129	43,421	32,659	33.8	40.1	34.5	40.3	45.9	44.9	
Plastics and resin materials ³⁸millions of dollars.....	1,129	1,137	(³⁹)	88	72	80	13.2	(⁴⁰)	6.9	7.8	6.3	(⁴¹)	
Calcium carbide.....short tons.....	775,284	703,241	793,335	6,934	4,416	5,616	2.5	1.7	.9	.9	.6	.7	
Sodium carbonate, calcined (soda ash) ⁴²millions of pounds.....	10,916	9,527	10,606	310	212	331	2.7	1.8	1.5	2.8	2.2	3.1	
Sodium hydroxide (caustic soda).....thousands of short tons.....	3,106	3,031	3,262	274	208	132	12.5	8.6	5.3	8.8	6.9	4.0	
Synthetic anhydrous ammonia.....millions of pounds.....	3,554	4,104	4,573	12	31	30	2.1	.3	.7	.8	.8	.7	
Chlorine.....do.....	5,036	5,217	5,592	29	86	47	1.2	.7	.4	.6	.7	.8	
Carbon black (j).....do.....	1,677	1,604	1,611	433	293	359	38.8	24.8	28.9	25.7	18.3	22.3	
Paint, varnish, lacquer, and filler ⁴³millions of dollars.....	1,400	1,377	1,402	34	29	30	2.2	(⁴⁴)	2.0	2.4	2.1	2.1	
Phosphate rock ⁴⁵ (j).....thousands of long tons.....	11,095	11,324	(⁴⁶)	1,727	1,429	2,101	25.3	14.0	17.9	15.6	12.6	(⁴⁷)	
Asphalt roofing materials ⁴⁸thousands of squares.....	77,050	75,642	74,199	1,693	1,342	979	1.4	1.8	1.3	2.2	1.8	1.3	
Photographic equipment ⁴⁹millions of dollars.....	549	619	(⁵⁰)	47	44	51	11.5	(⁵¹)	8.8	8.6	7.1	(⁵²)	
Pens, mechanical pencils, and penpoints ⁵³do.....	119	118	(⁵⁴)	14	11	16	10.3	(⁵⁵)	10.5	11.9	9.8	(⁵⁶)	

¹ Data on which percentages are based for 1939, 1949, and 1950, are available in the June 30, 1952, and July 27, 1953, issues of Foreign Commerce Weekly.² Carcase weight equivalent.³ Production data include only factory production and exclude tallow produced on farms or by local butcheries or small renderers.⁴ Excludes dry cream, buttermilk products, and milk products for animal feed.⁵ Solid nonfat content, converted from gross product weight.⁶ Not available.⁷ Gross weight.⁸ Production data are for crop harvested in the preceding calendar year. Exports cover the approximate period in which the crop was marketed, that is, a fiscal year ending in the year shown, as follows: Year ending June 30: Barley, wheat, dried ripe peas, apples, apricots, fresh grapes, peaches, pears, prunes, plums, canned fruit, dried fruit, peanuts, flaxseed, and cottonseed. Year ending July 31: Rice and cotton. Year ending Aug. 31: Dried ripe beans, raisins, peanut oil and hops. Year ending Sept. 30: Corn, grain sorghums, and soybeans including soybean oil. Year ending June 30, Sept. 30, and Dec. 31: Leaf tobacco, depending on marketing periods for the several types.⁹ Export data include grain equivalent of malt.¹⁰ Export data include grain equivalent of meal and grits.¹¹ Export data include brown, broken, and brewer's rice, rice screenings, and rough rice in terms of milled rice.¹² Milled rice equivalent.¹³ Export data include grain equivalent of flour made wholly from United States wheat.¹⁴ Excludes soybeans, mung beans, garbanzos, and California blackeyes.¹⁵ Cleaned equivalent.¹⁶ Excludes cowpeas and chickpeas.¹⁷ Includes apples, applesauce, apricots, berries, cherries, grapefruit segments, peaches, pears, plums, prunes, fruit salad, and fruit cocktail.¹⁸ Cases of 24 No. 2½ cans.¹⁹ Excludes dates.²⁰ Production data are for crop from bloom of preceding year, harvest completed in the year shown. Export data cover fiscal year ending August 31 for fresh grapefruit, and fiscal year ending October 31 for fresh oranges and canned citrus fruits and juices.²¹ Export data include juice, juice concentrates and grapefruit segments in terms of fresh fruit.²² Includes tangerines. Export data include juice and juice concentrates in terms of fresh fruit.²³ Export data include canned and dried fruit in terms of fresh fruit.²⁴ Production data cover only commercial apple areas.²⁵ Export data include oil in terms of oilseed equivalent; data for 1952 and 1953, however, exclude some secondary oils not reported by kind.²⁶ In the shell equivalent.²⁷ Export data for 1952 and 1953 exclude secondary oil.²⁸ Export data for 1952 and 1953 exclude secondary oil, except deodorized and hydrogenated.²⁹ Farm sales weight.³⁰ Production data are for pack of preceding calendar year.³¹ Includes footwear and house slippers of leather and other materials except rubber. Manufacturers' shipments data represent production.³² Data are for cotton broad woven goods, excluding specialty items, such as tire fabrics, tapestry, upholstery, and drapery fabrics, pile fabrics, table damask; blankets towels and toweling; bedspread fabrics; and knit goods.³³ Export data include knit fabrics in 1951.³⁴ Data are for rayon broadwoven goods, excluding specialty items, such as tire fabrics, pile fabrics, and drapery and upholstery materials.³⁵ Data include hosiery of silk, synthetic fibers cotton, and wool, except exports exclude the small item of wool hosiery. Manufacturers' shipments represent production.³⁶ Data are for crop year ending Mar. 31.³⁷ Export data include sawed ties and beginning 1952 also include bawn ties.³⁸ Data exclude bristles, Bristol board, and building board.³⁹ Production and export data for 1952, and exports for 1953 exclude papereries.⁴⁰ Data include motor fuel, natural gasoline, blending agents, naphtha, solvents, and other light finished products.⁴¹ Export data include heavy road oil not included in production.⁴² Export data include some finishing cements not included in production.⁴³ Mine shipments represent production.⁴⁴ Manufacturers' shipments represent production.⁴⁵ Net shipments excluding intraindustry transfer, represent production. Castings are excluded. Large shipments to United Kingdom, mainly in the form of ingots, account for most of the increase in exports in 1952.⁴⁶ Exports include long ternes and waste-waste tinplate.⁴⁷ Excludes fittings.⁴⁸ Total shipments (shipments for use by the same company, or an affiliate, subsidiary, or parent company, and for sale to other companies) represent production.⁴⁹ Shipments for sale of commercial steel forgings represent production.⁵⁰ Shipments (in terms of steel consumed in the manufacture of cans) represent production. Exports are packers for cannery type cans.⁵¹ Export data include hand-operated dies which are not included in production.⁵² Exports exclude the small item of ores and also manufactured products.⁵³ Total production includes primary production from domestic and foreign ores and secondary production from old scrap including imported scrap.⁵⁴ Primary production from domestic and foreign ores.⁵⁵ Exports consist largely of imported copper which has been refined in the United States; data exclude insulated copper wire and other manufactured products.⁵⁶ Refined primary production from domestic and foreign ores.⁵⁷ Total production includes primary production and pig lead recovered from scrap, largely from old scrap; antimonial lead is excluded.⁵⁸ Primary slab zinc production from domestic and foreign ores; secondary production from old scrap zinc is relatively small.⁵⁹ Manufacturers' sales of standard-size appliances represent production.⁶⁰ Production data exclude rebuilt machines and machines designed primarily for home workshops, laboratories, etc. Exports exclude "special category" items.⁶¹ Export data exclude food wrapping and packaging machinery.⁶² Export data include used and rebuilt typewriters.⁶³ Production data include fare boxes and registers; these are excluded from exports.⁶⁴ Production data include a small quantity of engraver's materials and equipment; these items are not included in exports.⁶⁵ Production and export data represent factory sales other than to Federal Government agencies. Export data include complete vehicles whether shipped as such or as parts for assembly abroad and do not take account of the considerable item of "parts for assembly abroad" which are used in combination with parts made outside the country, especially in Canada.⁶⁶ Export data exclude commercial cargo transports.⁶⁷ Production and export data include railway, switching, mine and industrial types, new and rebuilt; exports include used locomotives also.⁶⁸ Production data exclude rebuilt cars; exports include used and rebuilt in 1951.⁶⁹ Sales represent production.⁷⁰ This figure somewhat understates the percentage exported. The total obtained by adding the value of shipments of the biological, medicinal chemical, and pharmaceutical industries, on which this percentage is based, overstates the actual production to the extent that the biologic and medicinal chemical industries furnish materials for the pharmaceutical industry.⁷¹ Export data include weed killers in 1951; including this item the percentage exported in 1952 would be 20.9.⁷² Production data exclude relatively small amounts produced by the electrolytic process.⁷³ Phosphate rock sold or used by the producers represents production.⁷⁴ Includes asphalt prepared roofing and saturated felts, excludes tar saturated felts.⁷⁵ Export data exclude "special category" items.

SOURCES OF DATA

Export figures except those covered by notes (a), (k), and (r) are from foreign-trade reports of the Bureau of the Census.

Production figures except those covered by notes (a) to (j) and (l) to (t) are from Bureau of the Census. Monthly figures for many of the commodities appear in the Survey of Current Business.

(a) Agricultural Marketing Service. Export figures are based on data reported by the Bureau of the Census.

(b) Agricultural Marketing Service.

(c) Estimated.

(d) Fish and Wildlife Service.

(e) Business and Defense Services Administration.

(f) Rubber Manufacturers' Association, Inc.

(g) Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

(h) National Association of Hosiery Manufacturers.

(i) National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.

(j) Bureau of Mines.

(k) Total shipments and direct exports reported by the Glass Container Industry to the Bureau of the Census.

(l) Net shipments, American Iron and Steel Institute.

(m) Manufacturers' sales, "Electrical Merchandising."

(n) Manufacturers' sales, American Home Laundry Manufacturers' Association.

(o) Manufacturers' sales, Vacuum Cleaner Manufacturers' Association.

(p) Estimated by Radio-Television Manufacturers' Association.

(q) 1953 estimate based on National Machine Tool Builders' Association's index of shipments.

(r) Manufacturers' sales and exports, Automobile Manufacturers' Association.

(s) Tariff Commission.

(t) Shipments of Insecticide and Fungicide Industry, Bureau of the Census plus sales of benzene hexachloride, Tariff Commission.

TABLE 4.—Coverage of United States exports in export production ratios (shown in table 3), by commodity groups, calendar year 1953

Commodity group	Exports in millions of dollars		Percent of total exports	
	Commodity totals	Commodities covered in table 3	Commodity totals	Commodities covered in table 3
Total	15,626	7,704	100.0	49.3
Agricultural commodities	2,843	2,427	18.2	15.5
Meat products	60	42	.4	.3
Animal fats	129	112	.8	.7
Dairy products	80	63	.5	.4
Grain and products	1,059	1,023	6.8	6.5
Vegetables	99	27	.6	.2
Fruits	143	109	.9	.7
Oilseeds and vegetable oils	176	153	1.1	1.0
Hides and skins	37	32	.2	.2
Tobacco, unmanufactured	339	339	2.2	2.2
Cotton, unmanufactured	521	517	3.3	3.3
Other agricultural	200	10	1.3	.1
Nonagricultural commodities	12,783	5,277	81.8	33.8
Special category, type I	1,720		11.0	
Nonagricultural, excluding type I	11,063	5,277	70.8	33.8
Fish and products	17	8	.1	(1)
Leather and manufactures	47	16	.3	.1
Rubber products	144	70	.9	.4
Cigarettes and other tobacco manufactures	64	58	.4	.4
Textile manufactures	840	311	4.1	2.0
Cotton manufactures	329	182	2.1	1.2
Synthetic textile manufactures	220	127	1.4	.8
Forest products	280	137	1.8	.9
Lumber	65	65	.4	.4
Nonagricultural commodities—Continued				
Forest products—Continued				
Paper and products	125	54	0.8	0.3
Nonmetallic mineral products	1,273	1,076	8.1	6.9
Coal and related products	346	335	2.2	2.1
Petroleum and products	691	641	4.4	4.1
Other nonmetallic mineral products	236	100	1.5	.6
Metals and manufactures	1,050	775	6.7	5.0
Iron ore	32	32	.2	.2
Iron and steel-mill products	557	557	3.6	3.6
Casting and forgings	24	12	.2	.1
Advanced manufactures of metals	253	55	1.6	.4
Nonferrous metals including ferroalloys	176	118	1.1	.8
Copper	95	95	.6	.6
Machinery	2,931	1,628	18.8	10.4
Electrical machinery and apparatus	801	243	5.1	1.6
Industrial machinery	1,537	874	9.8	5.6
Office and printing machines and parts	119	119	.8	.8
Agricultural machinery	136	136	.9	.9
Tractors, parts, and accessories	341	256	2.2	1.6
Transportation equipment	2,457	678	15.7	4.3
Automobiles, parts, and accessories	1,416	540	9.1	3.5
Aircraft	881	90	5.6	.6
Railway transportation equipment	109	48	.7	.3
Chemicals and related products	819	456	5.2	2.9
Other nonagricultural products	1,341	69	8.6	.4

¹ Less than 0.05 percent.

Washington: Cultural Center of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in his program Person to Person, Edward R. Murrow interviewed, last November, the distinguished American, Lillian Gish. She devoted practically all of her time to advocacy of the establishment of a Ministry of the Fine Arts as a department of the Federal Government with a Secretary of Cabinet rank. She argued that we are now coming of age in cultural matters, and such an agency is a part of the government of practically all British and European countries.

In his message on the state of the Union the President declared that—

In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal advisory commission on the arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Fed-

eral Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation. I shall also propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country.

A number of bills have been introduced in the 84th Congress to advance the proposals outlined above, some of which have already reached the hearing stage. The gentleman from New York, EMANUEL Celler; the gentleman from Montana, LEE METCALF; the gentleman from New York, ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE M. RHODES; and myself have offered the American National Arts Act, which was referred to the House Education and Labor Committee for its consideration.

A second bill, creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, theater and fine arts, and mass communications center, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives. Hearings have already begun on this bill before a special subcommittee whose chairman is the able gentleman from Louisiana, JAMES H. MORRISON.

The broadest kind of support has developed for this bill which would give the Nation's Capital the cultural facilities it has lacked for 155 years, facilities possessed by large and small European cities and by many cities in our own country.

Legislation to make Washington the cultural center of the world has been introduced by the gentleman from New York, EMANUEL Celler; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE M. RHODES; the gentleman from Minnesota, ROY W. WIER; the gentleman from Connecticut, ALBERT P. MORANO; the gentleman from New York, ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.; the gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN A. BLATNIK; the gentleman from Arkansas, OREN HARRIS; the gentleman from New Hampshire, CHESTER E. MERROW; the gentleman from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.; and myself.

Among the many distinguished witnesses who have testified in support of the proposed legislation are Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, legislative chairman, General Federation of Women's Clubs, and Robert W. Dowling, chairman, board of directors of the congressionally chartered American National Theater and Academy. I include excerpts from their testimony here for its great informational value:

EXCERPT FROM THE STATEMENT OF MRS. A. PAUL HARTZ, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, WAVERLY, VA.

If the cultural endeavors of a people are a measure of their stature, the passage of H. R. 1825 brooks no delay. This bill which would create a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the Nation's Capital of a civic auditorium with connected facilities making it a center for music and the fine arts is a first step toward overcoming a serious cultural lag.

Appreciation of fine arts knows no national boundaries. It is in this realm that we can hope for the greatest understanding among the peoples of the world. A building dedicated to the purpose and living expression of fine arts in the District of Columbia might well symbolize the cultural bonds which give the greatest promise of lasting peace.

In this day of uncertainty there is a continuing battle for the minds of men and we must properly gage not only our military and economic strength but our cultural strength as well. If the final victory is to go to the forces of freedom, we must not ignore this significant endeavor. Our failure to project to other countries our appreciation of our cultural heritage is a serious handicap as we compete with the Soviet Union in the cold war.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs urges the passage of H. R. 1825.

STATEMENT OF MR. ROBERT W. DOWLING, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

Mr. Dowling. It is a privilege to speak with you about this. It has been very dear to my heart and to the interests of ANTA for many, many years.

I would like to call attention to something pertinent to the question of whether we cannot have a place where foreign visitors, painters, sculptors, and others can exhibit their works here in America.

This year the State Department gave me the privilege of organizing an exhibit of American art in Paris during April, May, and June.

The French Government put at our disposal 5 national theatres, their opera house, Comedie Francaise and others, where we display American painters' works and sculpture and where our Philadelphia orchestra will perform in the opera house, the ballet of New York and 2 plays and the musical comedy "Oklahoma."

There is no proper place for such a performance in Washington. If we were to have reciprocal visits—and I am frequently asked when I have visited national theater groups from Salzburg, Austria, and all the way to Scandinavia and through the rest of Europe, "Where would we play if we came?" or "Where would our works be shown—our paintings and sculptures?"

We have the privilege of owning some theatres in New York and I am familiar with the problems of booking and I think we plan to bring the Shakespeare Theatre from Stratford next fall.

It is very difficult to know whether we can play them. They cannot play in Washington because the National Theater has an open system of booking which takes place for 2 weeks at a time but when they come to us they will have performed in New York where theaters are customarily booked from October or November to June and July and sometimes longer.

It is very difficult to hold out the 2 or 3 weeks that a national company visiting from Europe can perform. We brought the Greek National Theater to New York and we would like to get a theater—the right kind of a theater—and every single seat was taken for every performance.

I call your attention to the fact that although we may have 30 theaters in New York and 2 in Washington and other cities have 1 or 2 or 3 theaters, there is no com-

parable place where foreign artists and companies and national theaters can visit and perform. And as our State Department has now placed in the hands of "ANTA" the International Exchange Program in which we are sending performers to Asia, South America, Central America, and Iceland, and European countries, we have no place to invite them in returning our visits. It is very vital to our cultural exchange program that we have such places.

Therefore, we urge you gentlemen to guide this bill through to a point where it can have the benefit of the Commission's more thorough study of the problem.

I have no other point to raise unless you have some questions.

Mr. MORRISON. I understood you to say there was a private program the United States was putting on in Paris and that they wanted to reciprocate and wanted to come to Washington but that the facilities were not here to receive them.

Mr. DOWLING. That is true. Not only for Paris but for European countries, countries even that are semibehind the Iron Curtain—Yugoslavia, where we are now sending our ambassadors and culture. If they were to come here we would have no place for them to use.

Mr. MORRISON. I was quite impressed with the point you raised that we were sending entertainment to different parts of the world. It is just as important in one sense to have them go there and to have theirs come to the United States. You made that point and they cannot come here because we do not have the facilities to house them here?

Mr. DOWLING. That is right. They always ask me when I visit those countries. While we would like to play in your National Theater and I have to say, There is not any except one we lease in Washington which is not a national theater but just a commercial venture.

Mr. MORRISON. It is national in name only.

Mr. BROYHILL. No questions.

Mr. MORRISON. Thank you very much for your contribution to the committee.

Progress Has Its Problems in Ozarks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been raising a rumpus from the beginning about the closing of so many of our fourth-class post offices. I thought I had used some good language in my protest and still think I have. However, it cannot compare with that of my friend, Otto Ernest Rayburn, of Eureka Springs, Ark., in the district which I am honored to represent, who has this to say in the Arkansas Gazette of February 13, 1955:

PROGRESS HAS ITS PROBLEMS IN OZARKS

(By Otto Ernest Rayburn)

ONLY TRADITION SUPPORTS THE COUNTRY POST OFFICE

The little country post office of the Ozarks is passing out of the picture and it is with deep regret that we see it go. The Government at Washington contends that the fourth-class offices in isolated areas do not pay off. That is true. But it is also a fact that no post office—first, second, third, or fourth class—pays its way. All must be subsidized for the convenience of the people. The tendency at present is to replace the

little fourth-class offices with motorized rural routes. This may be a progressive step from the standpoint of economy, but it is a blow at tradition, and the folks back in the hills don't like it.

Several years ago a poetic tribute to the country post office, by J. A. Dunlap, was printed in Ozark Life magazine. It has nostalgic appeal to all who know this rural institution as a social center. Here is the poem:

"The post office stood in the back of the store Behind the old stove and the crude cuspidore, The old stove was burnt to a dull, dingy brown, And the cuspidore welcomed the men of the town. When mail time arrived, the whole town was there, The matron, the merchant, the maiden, so fair, Then back in the office distinctly we'd hear, Them sorting the mail full of trouble and cheer. And when the old window went up with a wham, We crowded around in a sociable jam, All eager to hear from the folks that we knew Or hoping perhaps for a check overdue; A place for a smile, but no place for a frown The post office stood in the dear old home town."

The little post office in the Ozarks serves the people in many ways. It is frequently located in the back of a general store where folks come to trade and loaf, to swap news and tell tales. It is convenient to stop at the store for a twist of tobacco or a poke of salt and pick up the mail. If one wishes to send a money order to the mail-order house is isn't necessary to stand out in the weather and wait for the carrier. The post office does not have a big turnover, but it helps the merchant in his struggle to make a living and serve the people. The rural route may save the Government a little money, but it is "robbing Peter to pay Paul." The convenience of the people should be Uncle Sam's concern.

In many sections of the Ozarks, motorized rural routes are impracticable because of the condition of the roads. Many of the smaller streams are not bridged. During the rainy season and in winter sleet and snow, the carrier is slowed down and the patron may have to stand by his mailbox for hours to get a money order or to sign for a registered letter. Parcel-post delivery is impractical because the mailboxes are not large enough to accommodate large packages.

The social setup of our rural communities has been greatly disturbed in recent years by modern innovations. First came the consolidation of schools and the community center was destroyed. Many rural churches are now struggling to survive as a lot of people prefer to drive to town to attend services. Now the post office must go in the name of economy. Progress has its price and the oldtimers who hate to see tradition disturbed wonder if it is worth it.

The 37th Anniversary of Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 37th anniversary

of Lithuania's independence, and I am happy to have the opportunity of paying tribute to the people of that gallant little nation. During her brief period of independence, from 1918 until 1940, she made great progress in economics and education, and outstanding achievements in commerce, agriculture and industry. It was with a deep sense of satisfaction that we watched this young republican government honorably fulfill her obligations as a member of the family of free nations.

Unfortunately, this period of freedom came to an abrupt end when, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Army marched in and took over. Since that day, her people have endured untold hardships at the hands of the aggressor. The American people have never recognized the incorporation of the free Republic of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. We have the highest respect for this noble people who are deprived of so many freedoms as a country behind the Iron Curtain and a genuine interest in her welfare. Her spirit has not been crushed, and her present bondage will be an inspiration for future generations to carry on with that indomitable spirit that has brought her through so many trying situations in the past. It is the hope of all of us that one day soon Lithuania will again throw off the yoke of the oppressor and take her rightful place among the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Juvenile Delinquency and the American Clergy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Judge Julius H. Miner is a distinguished member of the circuit court of Cook County, Ill., who has made an excellent study of the problem that has been troubling the Congress and the Nation for many years. His address recently given entitled "Juvenile Delinquency and the American Clergy" will be of much value to the Members and accordingly, I am pleased to include it in my remarks. The address follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND THE AMERICAN CLERGY

(Address delivered by Judge Julius H. Miner, circuit court, Cook County, Ill., before the Chicago Methodist Ministers Association, at the Chicago Temple, October 4, 1954)

I am grateful for the privilege of addressing you on the subject of juvenile crime. It is our major national problem. It is so menacing our general welfare that the American clergy of all denominations should help to mobilize every resource to alleviate this critical condition.

Crime in the United States is perilously on the upswing. Year after year the appalling tide of criminality continues to rise. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover reported that 1,788,612 serious crimes were committed in 1950; 1,882,160 in 1951; 2,036,510 in 1952, and 2,159,080 in 1953. He also reported recently

an 8.5 percent rise in the national crime rate in the first 6 months of 1954 as compared with the same period in 1953. He estimated that during the first 6 months of this year the crime of murder, manslaughter, rape, and assault to kill was committed every 4.3 seconds. These figures indicate that 1954 will be a record crime year. Criminologists predict 4 million major crimes annually by 1960.

Mr. Bertram B. Beck, director of the Special Juvenile Project in the United States, said: "The problem of juvenile delinquency has been underestimated, not overestimated. The juvenile crime rate is one of the most alarming threats in our Nation today." He likened it to "cancerous cells on the social organism which, unless combated, can spell destruction for the entire being." There has never been a parallel to this depravity in the history of our Nation.

It was reported at the Mid-Atlantic Conference on Correction, held in New York, that this country leads the world in crime. The population of State and Federal prisons has increased 7 times as fast as the national population in the last 25 years. This calamitous condition approaches national disgrace and disaster.

According to FBI reports, law enforcement and all phases of crime costs our Nation \$20 billion annually, an average of \$495 yearly per family. Mr. Robert H. MacRae, director of the Welfare Council, figures that Cook County, Ill., spends \$2,958,000 a year to maintain juvenile delinquents in corrective institutions. Mr. Hoover declared that for every dollar we pay for education we spend \$1.82 to combat lawlessness, and for every dollar contributed to churches \$10 goes to fight crime.

United States Senator ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, chairman of a subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency, reported on November 11, 1953, that "1 million children between the ages of 10 and 17 will get into trouble with the police this year, and by 1960 that figure may well reach 1,500,000 each year." He said that in Washington, D. C., juvenile delinquency has risen 60 percent in 1 year, and in the Nation 30 percent since 1948. The rate of offenses by juvenile criminals in Manhattan is more than three times that of the average for all cities in the Nation, according to reports by the National Federation of Settlement and Neighborhood Centers.

We read daily of teen-age sluggings, auto thefts, mob riots, sex orgies, narcotic addictions, and other grave offenses. Juvenile crime appears no longer confined to any social class or type of neighborhood. It has spread everywhere. Last year an estimated 500,000 boys and girls were brought to the attention of American juvenile courts. At least twice as many were handled by police without being referred to the courts, and no one can estimate the number of thousands who escaped the attention of legal authorities. According to the Illinois State Bureau of Identification, out of a total of 80,772 crimes, juveniles committed 36 percent of the murders, 67 percent of the robberies, and 69.5 percent of the burglaries.

Mr. John Meegan, superintendent of the Chicago Parental School, reported recently that local juvenile delinquents today are comparatively younger and are committing acts of greater violence than ever. According to FBI records, this is true everywhere. Younger patients are going into clinics for treatment of venereal diseases, and sex problems now are found in the 7th and 8th grades. The number of young unwed mothers has increased 88 percent since 1945. A youngster recently arrested in Manhattan was asked how many of his young friends were using drugs. He replied, "Forty or fifty, about half girls."

Four Chicago youngsters admitted stealing 14 cars in 2 weeks. One pleaded guilty before Judge McSweeney for snatching a

purse to settle his gambling debts. More than 500 teen-age hoodlums broke loose in 1 of New York's worst riots, terrorizing passengers and ransacking subway stations. A Chicago juvenile was shot and others were injured as 50 youths wrangled in a brawl between 2 neighborhood gangs. Two young girls, 14 and 16, admitted to the West North Avenue police 47 burglaries, robberies, and sluggings. One of them pulled a pistol on her stepfather. Seven New York young boys were jailed for whipping and burning a 14-year-old girl. Four Brooklyn youths, 15 to 18, committed two vicious murders for the thrill of it. I sentenced two juvenile rioters to the penitentiary for murder. These few cases are cited merely to illustrate the general run of juvenile delinquencies.

Senator HENDRICKSON said that in reply to a questionnaire circulated by the sociology department of a prominent college, many of the students said they believed that stealing and robbing may be anti-social, but did not constitute grave crimes; that there is nothing particularly wrong in violating sex codes, and they brushed aside lying and cheating as not delinquent.

It is generally conceded that our educational system needs a complete revision in the light of criminal tendencies among youngsters, particularly in its disciplinary policies. There has been much too much pampering of children by teachers as well as by parents. Many a hot seat applied in time over a parent's knee might have forestalled a hot seat in the electric chair. In a recent article Mr. Hoover urged increased parental responsibility and augmented disciplinary power of schoolteachers.

A variety of causes and reasons are assignable to this deplorable situation—too few and underpaid police and teachers—illegal sale of liquor and dope—war tension and hysteria—overindulgence of children—racial differences—salacious literature—inadequate housing—immorality and intemperance at home. Mr. Hoover also emphasized, "There can be no real doubt, it seems to me, that the movies, television and comic books are purveying violence and lust to a vicious and intolerable degree."

Juvenile delinquency and adult crime cannot be solved independently of each other. Corruption in high office and general lack of respect for law and order are top contributors. Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., formerly our Nation's head tax collector, was sentenced to prison for 5 years for income-tax evasion. Scores of congressmen, mayors and other prominent public officials have been convicted for flagrant violations of their respective trusts. Many exclusive clubs and organizations operate with immunity slot machines and other gambling devices. Gambling is illegal wherever it is practiced.

Whatever the reasons, our social forces have failed. While there is an overpowering realization nationally of the juvenile crime trend, authorities do not know how to meet the challenge. Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court, charged that "our Nation is plagued with unprecedented juvenile delinquency, gangsterism, and shocking crimes followed by long-delayed punishment, or by none." It is generally conceded that increased crime has overwhelmed and overcrowded our corrective and law-enforcing agencies. The apathy and indifference of our citizens toward the ever-mounting crime rate has been most disheartening. A United States Senate subcommittee investigating juvenile crime admitted publicly, "The Nation is losing its fight against juvenile delinquency."

What a tragedy. Is the American clergy also willing to admit defeat?

Our Nation is being crushed by crime. With all the well-intentioned committee investigations, with all the genuine efforts by schools and civic and social agencies, lawlessness continues to skyrocket. We are all faced with the challenge of finding a solu-

tion. Laws alone will not check teen-age crime. We cannot investigate, legislate, or adjudicate crime out of existence. What constructive preventive measures are there then to check the moral decadence of our youth? It troubles every parent, every judge, every educator, every criminologist, and every member of the clergy. The solution, if there is one, lies in the home and with the churches. Its prevention looms up as a religious enterprise.

One thing is certain. These millions of criminals, adults, and juveniles alike, are victims of spiritual starvation. All their evils, cruelties, and injustices are violations of the fundamental principles of God whom they have either abandoned or failed to know and worship. The laws of God and men are inextricably entwined. Consequently, they flaunt His commandments and violate our codes. They scorn tradition and defy society. Irreligion has obviously become the major contributing factor to our national juvenile crisis.

Having sat in judgment on thousands of offenders in the criminal court, murderers, robbers, rapists, burglars, etc., I have observed that over 85-percent of the criminals were nonchurchgoers. Six of them made peace with God as they mumbled prayers on their way to the electric chair. I have also presided over the divorce court for 5 consecutive years and have commiserated with more than 120,000 litigants over their domestic difficulties and those of their children. Here, too, I have found the same high percentage of nonchurchgoers. Mr. Hoover reports even a higher rate. Out of 8,000 delinquent children called to his attention only 42 attended Sunday school regularly. This is not a coincidence. Other judges as well as the files of reformatories corroborate these ghastly statistics. Jails are crowded when many of our churches are not.

Criminals are not born. They are reared in an era which has discarded morality. We worship the golden calf and ignore the Golden Rule. We place too much emphasis on material and too little on spiritual values. While our economy is busily attuned to the art of mass production, we are permitting mass youth destruction. As our scientists and engineers are making amazing progress in their fields, we are lagging in ethical understanding.

The Reverend Luther B. Osborne, of San Antonio, Tex., whose son was charged with murder, told his congregation last May, "I think more in terms of parental delinquency than of juvenile delinquency. Everyone of us, including myself, was too busy, too preoccupied with material things and selfish motives, to give youngsters the attention, care, and love they needed." He omitted even then religious inspiration.

Although public opinion is inclined to indict youth alone, the real fault lies elsewhere. Before a youngster has committed a crime, some adult has been guilty of a worse offense in neglecting to guide him properly. The flood of crime is the inescapable result of someone's failure to teach God's word to these potential juvenile delinquents, and to the current young violators doomed to be our next bumper crop of hardened prisoners. A study of 1,336 records of juvenile delinquents in Cook County revealed that 979, or 73.3 percent had subsequent criminal records. Mr. James V. Bennett, Director of Bureau of Prisons, told a senatorial subcommittee that 70 percent of the population of Federal prisons have a history of past offenses, and more than 50 percent of the prisoners have been juvenile offenders. He said, "Beyond every adult prisoner there is a shadowy image of a juvenile delinquent."

The American clergy is deserving of high tribute for many glorious achievements. It is difficult to pinpoint the responsibility for the neglect in teaching religious precepts, but the church cannot deny a share in the

failure. If it has not failed, it has not taken advantage of opportunities to fulfill its mission. Certainly, the duty initially rests upon the parents, but someone had previously overlooked training the parents in their own youth, and here again the finger points in some degree at the church. Our public and private schools are constitutionally relieved of any responsibility for religious training.

Naturally, it is essential to build up a spiritual structure at home. The parents are culpable when they fail to provide the right moral and religious atmosphere in their home. A home built on religious concepts is a fortress against crime. It has been frequently emphasized that families who pray together stay together. In religious homes children learn the necessary virtues of honor, decency, respect, and love of God and country. A child who is not disciplined at home, and does not learn obedience and authority from his parents, is ready prey for most evil influences.

What is needed uppermost is more enlightened parents to create better homes and take proper care of their children. The deplorable conduct of many parents is directly responsible for the breakdown of their children's morals and character. An 11-year-old boy who confessed starting a fire in a tenement which killed 7 persons and injured 9, admitted to me in my chambers that his father gave him cigarettes and whiskey. In New York, two lovestruck teenagers were turned over to forgiving parents after a wild spree on which they squandered almost \$10,000 in one week. In Milwaukee, a 14-year-old girl, masked and armed with a pistol, calmly helped her brother rob the Laona Wisconsin State Bank of \$11,000, and then escaped in an auto driven by her mother.

In Evanston, the young son of the president and dean of a theological seminary, confessed burglarizing a gasoline service station and stealing \$125. When informed, the reverend dean said his son had previously moved to the YMCA because "he thought he would be better off if he did not live at home."

What is more sorrowful, American home life is breaking down. About 3 out of 10 marriages wind up in divorce courts, and the rate is climbing shockingly. The March 1948 Report of the National Conference on Family Life at the White House said, "Our divorce laws are a mess. They are rotten. They aggravate a condition that is already cancerous. No language can be too strong. The judges are bitter about their impotence under existing procedures. Social workers view the legalisms and fictions of divorce with an unconcealed scorn; the press and periodicals treat the divorce laws, including the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States with outspoken contempt."

The major causes of juvenile delinquency are emotionally demolished homes. According to Mr. John Meegan of the Chicago Parental School, 85 percent of his wards come from broken homes. Other juvenile institutions report from 62 percent to 87 percent. More divorces are granted in America per capita than in any other nation on earth, an average of 500,000 annually, not including at least as many separate maintenance decrees, and even more casual separations. In 1953, 31,980 marriage licenses were issued in Los Angeles County, while 15,668 divorces became final. We must stem this rising tide of divorces. Broken homes are the cesspool of juvenile crime. More than 380,000 youngsters are orphaned annually by our obsolete and brutal divorce laws which have not been changed materially in a century.

There are too many homes where religion is regarded as outmoded. There are too many parents who lack the educational and moral qualifications for bringing up families; too many fathers and mothers who have drifted away from religious services and into taw-

erns; or they seek other personal pleasures, without serious regard for their children's interests. There are 19 million working mothers in the United States today, and naturally, many of their children are exposed to temptations toward delinquency and crime.

The challenging need for aggressive inspirational leadership by the church in these absentee and unqualified homes is both incalculable and imperative. It is not enough to stand aghast and to say the fault lies solely with the parents. The clergy must help equip and inspire parents for their crucial role. Many parents need help with each other and with their children. Home training can never offer an adequate substitute in the religious education of a child for the planned instruction of the Sunday school, and every parent will acknowledge it.

Although the home is the most effective bulwark against delinquency, it must be reinforced by the church. Children of these millions of spiritually collapsed homes need help, and the churches can serve them well by instilling integrity and religion into their spiritually starved souls. Religiously trained children do not readily succumb to criminal temptation. Religion inspires love, not hate; integrity, not dishonesty; truth, not falsehood; law obedience, not crime.

The strengthening effect of religious training is indispensable, we know, if our children are to be law abiding. An ounce of religious direction is worth a pound of penal correction. Religion promotes that sense of moral obligation, the lack of which causes our high rate of delinquency. Warden Joseph Ragen of the Illinois State Penitentiary at Stateville, admonished, "We must return the youth to a knowledge of his proper relationship with God, and we must teach him how this relationship can be established in his daily life." Mr. Hoover, our greatest authority on crime and delinquency, makes similar recommendations, and even more emphatically, he said, "When we live close to God and believe He guides us, we get a deep and genuine conviction."

Irreligion is definitely undermining the American family. Religion is a vital factor in happy homes. The parents need spiritual guidance. Love of God holds the family steadfast. Religion demands stability in marriage. It inculcates tolerance and understanding so vital to successful home life. It embraces atonement for sin and respect for our fellow men. In the church the members of families generate love, character, sacrificial service, and self-discipline. There we find an inward reinforcement, a clearer vision of duty, a fresh faith, and renewed courage. We go into church wavering and walk out strengthened and inspired.

Church attendance is the last glimmering hope of America in its battle to curtail crime and juvenile delinquency. According to the Yearbook of American Churches for 1954, although 99 percent of the American people believe in God, only 59 percent of all Americans are church members. Conversely and tragically, 41 percent have no church affiliations. Benson Y. Landis, editor of the Yearbook, notes that statistically there is one church for around every 325 members, but only 1 clergyman for some 500 members. "This points up a continuing shortage of pastors and a lag in effort to fill thousands of vacant pulpits." Many clergymen confide that the church attendance is much smaller than the 59 percent membership indicated. Records disclose that 27 million American youths receive little or no religious training. Is it any wonder that 85 percent of our law breakers and 85 percent of our home breakers are strangers at the house of worship?

There is a woeful lack of constructive direction in family and youth problems. What an opportunity for all faiths to launch a crusade on a nation-wide scale to lead all our people to God and prayer! On this fundamental

principle we all can and should cooperate. It would bring about a greater sense of harmony among all religious forces, and impress upon them that they must stand together in this common cause to assure the survival of religion itself.

It will require more than an engraved invitation to bring the absent parents and children to the churches. We all resist insurance salesmen, but we buy insurance by the billions to protect our families. Devout parishioners and clergymen will have to sell their most attractive policy to insure the preservation of homes and the saving of youngsters from lives of crime. Religion should be easy to sell because the premium is purse cheap and the benefits are boundless, yet requires modern scientific salesmanship with an organized and intelligent appeal. Having ideals is not enough. They must be put into practice to build better citizens. Our present plight will not resolve itself automatically. We must take the offensive. This battle will be won if we have the determination to win.

Of course, we cannot expect a comprehensive change in our moral concepts within a year or two, but the trend must be established if the change is ever to be brought about. The task may not be as difficult as it first sounds. Faith is a contagious thing. Nothing can beget faith as effectively as seeing it all around us. The reward is priceless—the ultimate reconversion of America into a God-fearing and law-abiding homeland.

The clergy must impress indelibly that there is more to life than expensive cars, fancy clothes, horseracing, and nightclubs. There is conscience, brotherly love, integrity, and devotion. We must once more gage success in terms of services to our fellow men. Prevention of delinquency involves community concern for the needs of all children, on both sides of the tracks; the poor, the crippled, the white, the black, and those on relief. They are all God's children. The fundamental way to check delinquency is to help children to be healthy, happy, secure, and occupied. Youth is our greatest national asset. It must be guarded and developed for carrying on the ideals and the faith of our fathers.

Religious leaders must take advantage of the opportunity to fulfill His divine purpose. They must constantly inspire, direct, and guide our creative instincts into desirable channels. Far too many churches are used only 1 day a week, instead of being converted into carefully planned and well organized music, education, and community centers. They should provide, on a year-around schedule, constructive and attractive programs, and extend their facilities to parent-teacher and other group meetings. They should organize youngsters' summer camps, athletic leagues, wholesome competitive indoor and outdoor sports, debates and cultural events. They must serve wavering families through premarital and postmarital counseling, friendship clubs, conferences, and so forth. Yes, some few churches do, but too many consider the efforts too involved, futile, or beneath their dignities. It is one thing to talk of ecclesiastical principles, another to put them into daily dynamic action.

The clergy has the responsibility for seeing that religion takes a determined stand in the work of all organizations dealing with juveniles and families. There is a craving hunger for moral leadership, and it is both logical and essential for the churches to assume it. They should initiate, develop, inspire and cooperate with all groups for the betterment of community efforts to attract and protect youth, and counsel parents. They should not only inspire but demand appropriate and beneficial legislation and administration toward that end. They must

urge their parishioners to elect honest and competent public officials to help restore respect and confidence in Government. Who has a greater right than the clergy? Who is better qualified? Who has a more vital interest in youth and the family? Who can better organize public opinion against destructive influences, be they comic books, movies, etc. Who will dare challenge your leadership? You hold a mandate. Use it. Democracy and religion go hand in hand.

Ours is a Nation founded in the glorification of God. The Bible has been the creative force from which has sprung the freedom of our people. If we neglect that, we lose the source of our liberty. We must initiate a revival and an expansion of faith and spiritual values.

Communism has definitely sought a total demoralization of our youth. Its evil aim is to destroy the moral and spiritual fiber of our younger generation. It incites them to gross immorality, to practice sabotage and to establish a revolutionary system. It encourages them to repudiate their superiors and directs them to renounce their patriotism. It is inconceivable that 21 American prisoners of war turned their coats to show a red lining and thereby abandoned their native land. All religiously trained youths must have rebelled against them.

The difference between the two systems is not only a faith in individual enterprise, but also faith in God. Mr. Harrison Salisbury reported recently in New York Times that Russia is still telling its people that it is a waste of time to go to church, and that man can acknowledge no God but the State. Does not that make it your fight for the survival of all religions? May we never wonder, through complacency, how we lost our religious freedom. William Penn said, "Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

Only cooperation among religious groups, standing together against faithlessness, can meet the threat of atheistic communism. Communism can be offset by the intensified awakening by religious leaders to reach out to every American. Religion has heretofore permeated our way of life and has guided the actions of our greatest leaders. In a plea to the entire world to pray for peace, President Eisenhower said 2 weeks ago, "We are firm in the belief that faith is the mightiest force that man has at his command." History has proved that over a long period of time, a people's vitality and strength are in direct proportion to their morality and religious practices. Many nations have recovered from economic depressions, but none have survived moral disintegration. As long as the teachings of the Bible are practiced by our people, we can be confident of our future.

There is an urgent need for the mobilization of the American clergy of all faiths. A spiritual resurgence is our greatest hope. I plead with you to summon an American Council of Churches of all faiths in this perilous hour when our concepts of freedom and of God are being savagely challenged. It is momentous for you to organize a religious crusade here at home. No church can shirk this God-given duty. It will make a profound impact upon all of us. It will inspire people in all walks of life. The American clergy must influence thinking in a world saturated with a distortion of truth, demagoguery, and rampant crime. On this national conference may well depend our future. In the words of the Great Emancipator, "We hold the power and bear the responsibility. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth."

I fully believe that we can and will meet the difficult tests which lie ahead. Ours is still the greatest and noblest land with a glorious destiny, if we retain our faith in God.

Two New Ladies in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include herewith the following article by William E. Bohn, from the New Leader, New York City, of February 14, 1955:

TWO NEW LADIES IN THE HOUSE

(By William E. Bohn)

We have long been accustomed to a small and decorous delegation of women in Congress. In the Senate, MARGARET CHASE SMITH has established a reputation as our most energetic and independent female legislator. In the House, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, have long since won reputations for quiet effectiveness. But, as an old advocate of woman suffrage, I must confess that I have been disappointed with the modest part which women have played in our national parliament.

When I was told that there are 16 Congresswomen in the present House, I naturally sat up and got interested. This is the most numerous delegation ever sent to Washington. Nine out of the group are Democrats and seven are Republicans. I have become acquainted with only two of them—and it has proved an interesting experience. The boys who drew the cartoons of the suffragettes in the old days would feel ashamed of their performance if they could see these two legislators. Both of them are good looking, charming, well dressed, and gay.

I asked both whether the women Members have a tendency to flock together. They smiled and denied any special preference for female society. But they reported that they had often been entertained as a group since coming to the Capital, and they had found the other women agreeable and interesting. They naturally do not try to avoid them.

Mrs. EDITH GREEN, who represents the Third District of Oregon (Portland), graduated from the State university, did graduate work at Stanford, and taught school for 11 years. But when she comes around the desk in her sunny office to welcome you, you would not believe it. Since she left the classroom in 1941, she has been head over heels in educational promotion activity. Most of the time, she has been legislative representative for either the Parent-Teachers Association or the Oregon Teachers Association, the State section of the National Education Association.

Getting into politics from the school-teacher angle proved a useful experience. Mrs. GREEN learned all the quirks of politics and politicians, but, at the same time, she got acquainted with leading citizens all over the State. She found out, too, the economic interests of various groups and sections. Though she developed the broadest sort of interest in all phases of the State's welfare, I suppose it is only fair to say that the drive for more and better education is still basic in her mind. There will be a White House conference on education next fall, and this lady from the Northwest is setting her sails for it right now.

She said: "We have talked and talked and talked. We have had conferences and conferences and conferences. It's about time to get some action." I mentioned the fact that Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health,

Education, and Welfare, is preparing a bill to appropriate \$25 million of Federal money to aid the educational systems in the 48 States. The lady's lips curled a bit derisively. "That would be just about enough," she said, "for Multnomah County." There is one thing which we can be sure of. On this issue of Federal aid to education, the new legislators—and not only the women—will be heard from. "More than a hundred billion for roads," said the lady from Oregon, "and 25 million for schools, I think we will have to do that problem over again. Maybe some people will have to be kept after school till they learn what it is all about."

Like her fellow Oregonian, Senator NEUBERGER, Mrs. GREEN is determined to do what she can for the development and public control of waterpower. As she puts it, "The very life of our people depends on the development and industrial use of power. The lumbering industry is seasonal. We have no coal. It has been impossible for manufacturing to develop. We have all sorts of unused natural resources. People in other parts of the country hear about Oregon and move out there—only to find that there is not enough for them to do. Waterpower is the very basis of our life. We must know under just what conditions it will be produced and how much it will cost."

Mrs. GREEN's PTA experience proved to be first-class training for her political campaign. The main feature of it was a distinctly feminine stunt. She delivered addresses, of course, to all the regular organizations in her district—trade unions, service clubs, chambers of commerce, churches, etc. But a good deal of her time and effort was spent on coffee hours. Women all over the district would invite 25 or 30 of their friends in for coffee and cake. The candidate would attend a half dozen or more of these meetings each day, mornings as well as afternoons.

The great advantage of this type of campaigning, Mrs. GREEN reports, was that it gave the voters a chance to talk back. They would get acquainted with their candidate, object to her ideas, tell her about their own, and question her about her plans. It is a really honest and democratic way to do things. It is small wonder that Mrs. GREEN is taking her place in Washington with a feeling of confidence. She knows the folks back home.

It was on the advice of the lady from Oregon that I visited the lady from Michigan. They form a mutual-admiration society—and they are both right. Mrs. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, who comes from Detroit, is taller than Mrs. GREEN, dark, striking, and distinctly persuasive. She is a successful lawyer, and in every move and word distinctly represents the businesswoman type. She was born in Missouri, graduated from the State University, and then took her law degree at the University of Michigan Law School. As was natural in the Detroit area, her first job was with an automobile-insurance company. And it was natural, too, that with the outbreak of World War II she should shift from this occupation to a place as contract negotiator for the Army.

She held this job until 1946. Then she opened her own law office and was soon joined by her husband, Hicks G. Griffiths, and by G. Mennen Williams, now Governor of Michigan. But she remained head of the firm. In 1953, she served for a time as judge in one of Detroit's criminal courts. The police and court attendants were troubled lest the lady be bowled over by the kind of people and language with which she would have to deal. But she came through with flying colors.

The new Congresswoman has served two terms as a member of Michigan's lower house. In 1952, she was defeated in a race for Congress, but the experience gained in that campaign led to her later success. It was in 1952 that she gained a national reputation for her house-trailer campaign. With a staff

of young ladies who were changed every day, she drove a large trailer from block to block, inviting the neighbors in to partake of soft drinks and talks things over. The itinerant meeting place seated about 25 people—and it was nearly always filled.

Mrs. Griffiths was astonished at the number of men whom she found at home during the morning and afternoon hours. And they all seemed pleased to take part in curbside talkfests. Often they would ask: "Who drives this big, awkward thing through this city traffic?" When Mrs. Griffiths modestly replied that she did, almost all of them would answer: "Well, you can have my vote."

These meetings were very much like the coffee hours which played such a part in Mrs. GREEN's campaign in Oregon. They gave the candidate and the citizens the chance for intimate give and take. During the campaign this energetic woman met and talked with 40,000 residents of her district. This sort of campaigning makes for honesty. Mrs. GRIFFITHS refrained from promising great things. Conscientiously, she emphasized that there are 435 Representatives in the House, each one anxious to do something for his home folks, so that each one cannot expect too much.

But Mrs. GRIFFITHS' constituents know that she is energetic and will work hard. They are well acquainted with what she did in the legislature and they take it for granted that she will go on pulling for the same sort of things. She worked, for example, for a law to insure better flour for the people of her State. She has fought for the conservation of natural resources, for the improvement of the courts, and for better control of public utilities. Though people do not expect any miracles, they feel sure that she will work effectively for every sort of progressive measure.

After talking with only two women Members of the House, I have no right to make sweeping statements about what our lady legislators will do. But I may be pardoned if I indulge in a little speculation. After hearing Mrs. GREEN talk about her coffee hours and Mrs. GRIFFITHS describe her neighborhood adventures with the trailer, I wonder whether these ladies are heralding a new political technique—a way of getting elected that is more honest and decent than the old ways—and I feel tolerably sure that these 16 women in the present House will cut more of a figure than their predecessors ever have in times gone by.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, today is a memorable day for all people of Lithuanian descent. It is Lithuanian Independence Day.

It is a day of mixed emotions for these gallant and freedom-loving people.

They are happy at the thought that on February 16, 1918, after 123 years under Russian rule, the people of Lithuania cast off the Russian yoke and proclaimed Lithuania an independent kingdom, and proceeded to organize their own government.

Nine months later, in November 1918, Lithuania became an independent republic and continued to enjoy happiness and freedom for more than a decade.

All this was accomplished as the result of a great nationalist political and cul-

tural revival which took place in spite of all Russian efforts to obliterate Lithuanian national sentiment.

The people of Lithuanian descent are sad today because Lithuania's hard-won freedom was again taken from her in 1940 when Soviet troops marched in and, again by force, placed Lithuania under the Russian yoke and have held her people in practical slavery ever since.

We in America, and I am sure all other freedom-loving people, have not forgotten the unfortunate plight of the Lithuanian people.

We want them to know that we support them in their fight for freedom. We are not unmindful of the fact that under present circumstances they can do little for themselves; that the present government of their country is not one of the will of the people but rather one that has been imposed upon them by force.

We have not forgotten their valiant fights of the past against tyranny and dictatorship and we entertain a fervent hope that the day will soon come, as it did in 1918, when the great people of Lithuania will rise in their wrath and again break the Soviet yoke that has been placed around their necks.

It is up to us, who enjoy freedom and liberty, to do all we can to help Lithuania regain her independence; to ratify the Genocide Convention without further delay; to help her displaced people find asylum in the United States and other free countries; to bring them hope through the Voice of America and other available means; and to continue investigation by congressional committees of Soviet seizure of Baltic States and Soviet crimes against the Baltic peoples.

This we should do as all of these means lead ultimately to the restoration of Lithuanian independence.

Trade Barriers Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about United States tariff restrictions. The truth of the matter is that the other countries of the world impose far more onerous restrictions, particularly on United States goods.

The following tabulation of import and exchange permits required in foreign countries, prepared by the Bureau of Foreign Commerce as an aid to exporters, has been revised as of January 1, 1955.

These regulations apply primarily to goods of United States origin and to other goods payable in United States dollars.

In many countries foreign goods may not be imported unless they are covered by import licenses, which must be obtained by the importer. In some cases the import license must be granted before the order for goods is placed. In various countries the importer also is required to obtain an exchange permit before payment for the import may be made.

Country	Is import license necessary?	Is exchange permit required?
Afghanistan	No; but a declaration or customs permit must be obtained from border officials.	No; but permission to remit foreign exchange to exporters abroad must be obtained from the Government bank.
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	Yes	Yes.
Arabian Peninsula areas: Saudi Arabia	No; except for International Wheat Agreement (IWA) shipments.	No; except for IWA shipments.
Aden, Bahrain, Qatar, Trucial Oman	Yes	Yes.
Kuwait, Muscat and Oman, Yemen	No	No.
Argentina	No; except for certain products subject to import quota.	Yes; permit granted only for "listed" products. Application should be filed prior to confirmation of purchase order.
Australia	Yes	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Austria	Yes; for most commodities.	Yes.
Belgium-Luxembourg	Yes; either a regular import license or a declaration license.	No separate permit required.
Belgian Congo	Yes; combination import license and exchange authorization is required for all imports except shipments valued at \$100 or less, provided goods are not intended for resale.	Yes.
Bolivia	Yes; copy of permit or its number must be given to consul to obtain legalization of documents.	No; import license authorizes purchase of exchange but is not a guaranty that exchange will be granted.
Brazil	Yes	No; exchange for imports is sold at auction.
British colonies, not specified elsewhere	Yes	Yes; import license generally assures release of foreign exchange.
Bulgaria	Yes	Import license automatically assures foreign exchange.
Burma	Yes; except for Government imports.	Yes.
Cambodia	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Canada	No; except for a few commodities.	No.
Ceylon	Yes; either a general license for commodities under open general license, or an individual license for other commodities.	Yes.
Chile	Yes; must be obtained prior to shipment of goods and copy must be sent to exporter.	Yes; in form of notation on import license.
Colombia	Import license takes the form of registry certificate issued without quota or other form of restrictions. In addition, certain food products and raw materials are subject to a prior import license from the Ministries of Agriculture and Development.	No; registry certificate carries the right to foreign exchange.
Costa Rica	No	Yes; for imports with official exchange. No permit required for imports with free-market exchange.
Cuba	No; except for wheat and wheat flour, rice, tires and tubes, red and pink beans, potatoes, condensed milk, and butter.	No.
Czechoslovakia	Yes	Import license automatically provides for allocation of necessary foreign exchange.
Denmark	Yes; with few exceptions.	Yes; for goods subject to license, copy of license with customs certification of importation takes place of exchange license.
Dominican Republic	No; except for wheat and wheat flour, rice, fertilizers, radio transmission apparatus.	No; but all applications for foreign exchange require Government approval, which is granted automatically for bona fide commercial transactions.
Ecuador	Yes; one copy must be presented in order to obtain consular legalization of prescribed documents.	No; import license carries the right to foreign exchange (Central Bank of Ecuador).
Egypt	Yes; unlicensed imports are subject to confiscation.	Yes.
El Salvador	No	No.
Ethiopia	No; except on products subject to export license in country of origin.	Yes.
Finland	Yes	No separate permit required; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
France	Yes; obtainable for "essentials" only.	No separate permit required; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
French overseas territories, not elsewhere specified, except French Somaliland.	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
French Somaliland	No	No.
Germany, Federal Republic (including Western Berlin)	Yes; also procurement authorization except for items on dollar import free list.	Yes; import and payments license combined on one document.
Germany, Soviet-Occupied Zone	Yes; the Government monopolies for foreign trade are the only importers.	Yes.
Greece	No; except for a few luxury items.	No; but applications for foreign exchange must be approved by the authorities who determine whether imports will be financed by procurement authorizations of the Foreign Operations Administration or by the dollar resources of the Bank of Greece.
Guatemala	No; except for wheat and wheat flour, strong boxes, and certain safety vault doors.	No.
Haiti	No; except for wheat quota imports and tobacco products.	No.
Hashemite Jordan Kingdom	Yes	Yes.
Honduras	No; except for alcohol.	No.
Hong Kong	Yes; for dutiable, strategic, or short supply goods.	No.
Hungary	Yes	Yes.
Iceland	Yes; except for items on "special conditional free list" and a limited number of staples.	Yes; except for "special conditional free list" imports.
India	Yes; either a general license for commodities under open general license, or an individual license for other commodities.	Yes; however, foreign exchange is automatically released upon presentation of validated import license to exchange bank.
Indonesia	Yes	No separate permit required; combined import license-foreign exchange permit necessary.
Iran	Yes; but only to release goods from Customs; prospective imports must come within annual or supplemental quotas.	Yes.
Iraq	Yes; goods exported before license is obtained are confiscated.	Yes; permits are obtained through licensed dealers.
Ireland	For a few products only.	Yes.
Israel	Yes	Yes; import license usually carries right to foreign exchange.
Italy	Yes; from Italian Exchange Office except for list A goods (mostly industrial raw materials which require only bank "benestare").	No separate permit required.
Japan	Yes	Some commodities as announced by Japanese Government from time to time, require allocation certificate; in other cases import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Korea, Republic of	Yes	Application for import license must be accompanied by certificate from Bank of Korea stating that applicant has sufficient foreign exchange cover on deposit.
Laos	Yes	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Lebanon	Yes	No.
Liberia	No; except for arms, ammunition, used clothing, pharmaceuticals, and rice.	No.
Malaya, Federation of	Yes; only certain items may be imported directly from hard-currency sources. Licenses to import nonsterling area goods via Hong Kong are issued provided certain exchange regulations are observed.	Yes; for direct imports. For imports from hard-currency areas via Hong Kong, no permit is necessary, but payment must be made in a sterling-area currency and shipment effected on a bill of lading issued in Hong Kong.

¹ Includes Bermuda, British West Indies, British East Africa, British West Africa, British Guiana, British Honduras, Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, and minor colonies, protectorates, and trusteeship territories.

Country	Is import license necessary?	Is exchange permit required?
Mexico.....	Yes; for an extensive list of articles.....	No.
Morocco.....	Yes; with exception of goods imported "sans devise," i. e., shipments financed by importer with his own funds held abroad.	Yes; except for goods imported "sans devise."
French Zone.....	Yes.....	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Spanish Zone.....	No.....	No.
Tangier (International Zone).....	Yes.....	No separate permit required.
Netherlands.....	No; except for certain luxury items.....	Yes.
Netherlands West Indies.....	Yes.....	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
New Zealand.....	Yes.....	No; import permit authorizes purchase of exchange.
Nicaragua.....	Yes.....	No; foreign exchange is automatically made available in currency specified in import license.
Norway.....	Yes.....	Yes; however, foreign exchange is automatically released upon presentation of validated import license to exchange bank.
Pakistan.....	Yes.....	No.
Panama.....	No; except for tomato paste, tanned cattle hides, wheat flour, baby chicks, hatching eggs; a few items are, however, subject to quota restrictions.	Yes.
Paraguay.....	No.....	No.
Peru.....	No.....	No permit as such; exchange allocated to importers semi-annually for each of 5 classes of imports. Letters of credit opened against allocation considered as exchange licenses.
Philippines, Republic of the.....	No.....	Yes.
Poland.....	Yes.....	Yes.
Portugal, including the Azores and Madeira.....	Yes.....	Yes.
Portuguese Colonies.....	Yes.....	Yes.
Rumania.....	Yes; only certain items may be imported directly from hard-currency sources. Licenses to import nonsterling area goods via Hong Kong are issued provided certain exchange regulations are observed.	Yes; for direct imports. For imports from hard-currency areas via Hong Kong no permit is necessary, but payment must be made in a sterling area currency and shipment effected on a bill of lading issued in Hong Kong.
Singapore.....	Yes; limited largely to essential raw materials.....	Yes; special exchange rates are fixed for many import products.
Spain, including the Canary Islands.....	Yes.....	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Spanish Colonies.....	Yes.....	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Surinam.....	No; on majority of goods imported from United States; import license still required on such commodities as automobiles, coal, and certain agricultural products.	No separate permit required. Foreign exchange, including dollar exchange, is automatically made available if the import license specifies payment in such currency, and if the license is registered with a foreign-exchange bank within 2 months after issuance.
Sweden.....	Import licenses are required for certain agricultural products, various industrial raw materials, and some types of vehicles and machinery. Also, special import authorizations must be obtained for most animals and fowl, shellfish, and bees, beeswax, and honeycombs.	No.
Switzerland.....	Yes; for hard-currency imports.....	No.
Syria.....	Yes; except none for mining supplies.....	No; but a "certificate of payment" issued by Bank of Thailand or authorized bank or company is required.
Taiwan (Formosa).....	Yes.....	1 application suffices for both import permit and exchange control purposes.
Thailand.....	Yes.....	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange up to amount expressed in local currency in relevant import license.
Turkey.....	Yes; with exception of few specified goods, all imports are subject to license. Imports from all countries of a long list of "unessential" items are subject to special licensing restrictions.	Yes; granted automatically following issuance of import license.
Union of South Africa, including Southwest Africa, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland.....	Yes; except some foodstuffs, raw materials, fertilizers, etc.....	No; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
United Kingdom.....	Yes.....	Yes; all exchange is allocated by U. S. S. R. State Bank upon receipt of import license.
Uruguay.....	Yes; Importing Government agencies are responsible for securing own permit.	No.
USSR.....	No; except for approximately 25 tariff items.....	Yes; import license carries right to foreign exchange.
Venezuela.....	Yes.....	No; but Government maintains strict control over foreign exchange allocations.
Vietnam.....	No; individual import license abolished July 1, 1952; since that time only licensed import firms are allowed to carry on import operations.	
Yugoslavia.....		

Address by G. Joseph Minetti, Member,
Maritime Board, Before the 36th Annual Meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association in St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by G. Joseph Minetti, member of the Federal Maritime Board:

Flying from the eastern seaboard of the United States into the rich Mississippi Valley is a thrill never to be forgotten.

From the clouds one can view the great drainage system of the Mississippi River, one of our Nation's basic resources, an asset of fabulous worth, whose great value defies estimate. This majestic river links this great grassroots heartland of America with the rest of the world.

In the history of our country, the territory of the Mississippi was once considered a distant area of little concern to people elsewhere. It was a pioneer place, many days away from the early eastern coast colonies, along pathways beset with peril. Not so today, for the problems of the Mississippi Valley, its trade, its commerce, its production, its people, are of national concern to every citizen.

As a member of the Federal Maritime Board, I come to you charged under the law to be diligent in the development and maintenance of an American merchant marine adequate for commerce and national defense. I shall discuss today the broad aspects of the American merchant marine and what it means to the trade and the security of America with particular emphasis on international trade and its effect on the areas within the valley where this mighty river flows. I shall explore with you the possibilities that atomic propulsion holds for our ships of the future, and will report in brief on the program of the Federal Maritime Board for the year 1956.

I am much impressed with a recent study made by the Committee of American Steamship Lines which shows that workers, farmers and industrialists in Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan, in the entire Mississippi Valley, depend upon foreign trade and the American merchant marine that makes this trade possible. This

maritime study, as do all economic studies of recent years, points up one fact about this world in which we live, that "no man lives alone." Isolation from the influences of international trade is not possible in this modern world.

The job of the worker, whether he be skilled or unskilled, depends upon imports and exports that must be handled by ocean-going ships. The prices a farmer receives for his crops are sensitive to international trade volumes. The sales revenues of the industrialist are directly reflected in overseas business. Our raw material supplies and prices are affected by imports aboard ocean-going vessels.

This study has uncovered some very interesting and startling facts about the dependence of the Midwest on the ships of our merchant marine. Let me cite a few:

There are about half a million autoworkers in Ohio, Indiana and Michigan, many others in Illinois, Wisconsin and Missouri. In 1952, exports of automobiles, trucks, unassembled cars, parts and accessories totaled nearly \$1 billion, a great portion of which ended up in the form of wages and salaries for the autoworkers. Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana, as you know, account for about two-thirds of all motor vehicles manufactured, and their share alone of the total auto exports ran to something like \$650,000,000.

One passenger car and truck out of every 20 that came off the assembly line in America

went to a foreign country. Certainly it is important to the American auto workers on the assembly line that ships stand ready to distribute our finished products abroad.

Also, we must depend on ships on the other end of the assembly line to bring an astonishing number of different raw materials from foreign lands that go into the construction of the modern automobile. The list runs into the scores and includes everything from the rubber in the tires on which your automobile rests to the chrome and fixings which make the modern auto the beauty it is. Altogether, between 250 and 300 materials from 60 foreign countries go into the gleaming vehicle you drive today across the Nation's highways.

This Mississippi Valley area is one of the world's great dairy centers. Do ships mean anything to dairy farmers? Let us look at the record.

More than \$11 million in processed milk left Wisconsin, Illinois, and Missouri farms and traveled across ocean trade routes. Cuba and the Philippines imported the bulk of this amount, buying almost all of the evaporated and condensed milk shipped abroad by United States farmers. Venezuela purchased 75 percent of American farmers' dried milk exports. It is expected that this trade will increase. The biggest markets for processed milk are to be found in the tropical areas of the world. The vital link to these areas for American farmers and dairymen is the American-flag merchant fleet.

Let me point out other vital areas of agricultural export. Over one-half of our rice crop, two-fifths of our wheat crop, and one-quarter of all the cotton and the tobacco that is grown in this country are exported annually. Exports are also important for soybeans, barley, lard, tallow, raisins, prunes, grain, and many other farm commodities. Statistics show that the value of American agricultural exports, since the year 1945, has been equal each year, to about one-eighth of our annual cash farm income. These exports account for the disposition of the commodities produced on over 40 million American farm acres each year, this means that one-tenth of our croplands, 1 acre in every 10, is producing for foreign consumption. The services of the American merchant marine are certainly required to deliver these goods.

Here I should like to discuss with you a matter of vital importance, a matter of survival to the American merchant marine, the matter of subsidy to put the American merchant marine on a parity with foreign operators. It is of immediate concern to everyone in the Mississippi Valley, its plants, its farms, and its factories. It is of vital concern to everyone in the United States and to our allies and friends abroad for without a subsidy our American merchant marine would be driven off the trade routes of the world.

The American merchant marine is an American business that sails the seven seas of the world. As it plies the routes of the globe, it comes into competition with the ships of other nations. It must find a way to meet that competition or it must cease to exist, and we cannot, at our peril, permit the American merchant marine to be driven off the high seas.

Our ships are American products, built to the exacting standards of American engineering. They must meet rigid Coast Guard regulations. The conditions under which the crews live and operate the ship are American standards, the highest in the world. We want our American seamen to earn decent American wages and to take a proud part in the affairs of our American communities that call for the highest standard of living on the face of the globe.

No enemy of our country has ever been able to drive the American merchant marine off the ocean. However, we know from sad

experience that the competition of ships sailing under standards which are not equivalent to ours, manned by underpaid and underprivileged crews, operated at un-American standards of feeding and living, can bring about an economic situation in which it would be impossible for the American merchant marine to profitably operate.

On a trans-Atlantic run, a C-2 vessel flying the American flag will pay out in wages some \$25,913 per month while a Norwegian ship on the same run will have a payroll of only \$5,741 for the same period.

Likewise in the matter of crew feeding. The daily cost of meals on an American vessel is \$1.75 per man. On the competing Norwegian freighter it amounts to only \$1.44.

In the matter of repairs, for each dollar that an American operator must pay out to keep his ship safe and in proper running order, his Norwegian competitor is called upon for only 61 cents in expenditure.

The matter of shipping subsidy is much akin to the problem of parity that is so well known in your Mississippi Valley farming communities. I am sure that there are many here present who recall the days when the American farmer was forced, by economic necessity, to sell the product of his sweat and toil at a price below the cost of production. When we indulged in such economic suicide, it was not the farmer alone who suffered—our Nation went on the economic skids and depression blackened the face of our fair land. Our Nation cannot live without the product of its fields and farms. We must assure that output, as we assure water, fuel and transportation. In the field of our farm economy we have adopted the principle of parity and it has been a sustaining influence upon the entire American business community.

Under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, there are two types of subsidy, the operating-differential subsidy and the construction-differential subsidy.

The adoption of the principle of subsidy assures that American ships, built in American shipyards, manned by loyal American crews and operated by American citizens, will continue to serve American trade and industry. The Congress of the United States has weighed this grave problem and in its wisdom passed the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and established therein the principle of subsidy to meet the situation forthrightly and realistically. Let me discuss with you first the phase of this subsidy problem that falls into the category of operating-differential subsidy.

Let me make one thing crystal clear. There is nothing in the subsidy laws that assures a profit to any ship operator. This is a common misconception that is too widespread. Under the laws of subsidy, the Government enters into a contract with an American ship operator and says to him, if you will serve an essential foreign-trade route of the United States, sail on it with regularity, and foster the commerce and trade that the American business community finds necessary, then we will take certain steps to see that you will not be driven off that route by the competition of foreign ships, paying lower wages, feeding cheaper food, and providing living quarters that do not come up to American standards.

The Government says to the American shipping operator: If you will fulfill your part of the contract, we will figure the difference that it costs you to operate your ship at the American standard and the lower price that it costs to operate a ship that competes with you and does not meet that standard, and we will pay the difference on the subsidized items of wages, subsistence, insurance, maintenance and repairs, and stores and supplies.

That makes it possible for the American merchant marine to operate over routes that are essential to our trade and commerce and bring in the raw materials that are needed

in our industries and in the maintenance of our defenses. It means that American ships will be ready to deliver the finished products that we must sell abroad.

But the subsidy contract is not a one-way street. Since the shipping company that is operating under subsidy will receive tax dollars, it must guarantee certain things and meet certain conditions that are of benefit to all the citizens of the United States. First, the shipping line must agree to offer a regular service over the route it serves that meets the needs of American businessmen engaged in international trade. Next, the line must operate over the route with vessels that are a credit to the American merchant marine and meet the specific needs of the trade area. For example, if there is need for tanks to bring back liquid latex, then a vessel must be provided that has such tanks. If the need of the trade calls for refrigerated space for the shipment of meat or other perishables, then the vessel must have the necessary reefer capacity.

And that is not all of the obligations to the general welfare that the subsidized operator must undertake. He must make provision for the replacement of his vessels so that the American merchant marine will continue to serve our Nation on the high seas in the years to come. Therefore, the subsidized operator is required to set up special funds for the purpose of replacing the vessels he is operating when they become obsolete, usually within 20 years.

There are at present 282 vessels of all types sailing under the American flag that are the recipients of subsidy benefits. Conservatively, it has been estimated that their replacement cost would be about \$2.8 billion.

The Maritime Administration looks to the operators to see that the replacement provision is carried out.

That is still not all of the story. When the subsidized operator earns in excess of 10 percent on the capital necessarily invested in his business, he is "in a recapture position." That means, in simple English, that when the subsidized operator prospers to the extent of 10 percent of the earnings on his capital, the operator returns to your Government the money that was paid out in subsidy. It is a too little known fact that in the first period of 10 years in which subsidy was paid, 5 shipping firms were in a 100-percent recapture position and repaid into the Government all of the subsidy funds that they had earned in serving America's essential trade routes.

Another phase of subsidy is in the field of construction-differential subsidy. Here we face another complex problem directly related to shipping and the coastal States but with implications that stretch into the Mississippi Valley and into every hamlet and town of our great Nation.

The specialized tools and skills of brain and brawn that must be assembled for the purpose of producing a modern ship represent a great national asset in much the same way that the fertile fields of this lush valley represent national wealth which we must not allow to erode. The skilled shipwrights, architects, builders, welders, cutters, and outfitters who have the know-how to turn metal into a living ship are men of specialized skill who draw good American wages and live at the high American standard that is today the envy of the world. It costs more to build a ship in an American yard, much more than the same tonnage would cost if produced in Japan, in England, or in Germany. Since the oceans of the world are a broad highway, a ship could be built anywhere and floated to delivery. If we permitted the dollar sign to be the sole criteria of where ships were to be built, unfortunately the American shipbuilding industry would be forced to shut down. Our concern for the defense of our country would not permit us to allow such a turn of events to

take place. We must maintain in America the skills and tools that are necessary for the production of ships, and the device to accomplish that is the application of the principle of construction-differential subsidy.

Under this principle, the Government says to people who wish to build merchant ships, "If you will have your ships built in an American yard, rather than a foreign shipbuilding center, the difference in cost will be met by the Government." In this way we keep our shipyards open and active against the eventuality that we may once more be forced to call upon them to expand their production for the purpose of protecting all that America holds dear and cherishes.

To maintain in peacetime a nucleus of shipyard workers capable of expanding to meet planned mobilization demands in the event of a national emergency, we must provide continuous employment for a labor force of approximately 36,000 shipyard workers. To assure that its skills will not be dissipated, our shipyards should construct at least 60 seagoing merchant-type ships or their equivalent each year. The new ships resulting from such a program will replace the existing merchant fleet in about 20 years and remove the threat of block obsolescence.

For the fiscal year 1956 we have asked Congress to authorize a shipbuilding budget of \$102,800,000, most of which is aimed squarely at overcoming this threat of block obsolescence. This would be the first phase of a 10-year move to overcome that very real "bogey man" which haunts our maritime future.

We hope to sign contracts for the construction of five such replacement ships over the coming fiscal year. We have already made a successful start in working out agreements with steamship operators who hold subsidy contracts to spread out their ship replacement schedules so as to help overcome block obsolescence and to insure far more regular shipbuilding activity. We are prepared to encourage replacement by adopting for dry cargo operators similar inducements now being offered tanker operators, whereby it would be possible to trade-in to the Government some of the usable present freight vessels to improve the quality of our Reserve fleet. We hope to build 5 such replacement freighters this year, and take into the Reserve fleet 5 older but valuable ships in return.

Our current plans also call for four more passenger ships, all scheduled for service in the Pacific.

Another portion of our proposed shipbuilding budget for 1956 will be earmarked for a very significant new move in the defense plans of our Nation. We have designed three "mobilization type" ships—to be producible in large numbers in the event of mobilization needs.

As I stand here in this Mississippi Valley and think of its great wealth, I recall the historic days when this was a pioneer area. It took courage, fortitude, and faith in the future of America to come out here through the wilderness to build and farm, to plan and dream. Although we respect tradition at the Federal Maritime Board, we refuse to be bound entirely to the past, and we persist in demanding advance and progress for the American merchant marine.

I expect that many of the ships of our merchant marine, to be constructed between 1960 and 1965, will be propelled by atomic power. It has been authoritatively reported to the Congress that the day of the atomic-powered surface vessel will come very fast, and that the potential of the maritime application of atomic power is far beyond anything we've ever dreamed. Tests of the world's first atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus* have been outstanding.

Here in a nutshell the panorama of American maritime progress is spread out for us. Last year, the finest submarine we could pro-

duce had limited range and cumbersome refueling problems. Today, the *Nautilus* is able to girdle the globe without refueling. Who knows what the morrow may bring?

In our lifetime we saw the T-2 tanker, with its 10,000-ton capacity and its 14-knot speed, hailed as an advance. Today we talk in terms of 35,000-ton supertankers, with a minimum speed of 20 knots. Our tankers of the future can be expected to be large and capable, through atomic application, of steaming extremely long distances without refueling.

In the coastwise trade we will see a tremendous growth of special purpose ships. Plans are being pushed for the completion of first roll-on roll-off ship for the military. This will permit vehicles to come aboard and stow themselves under their own motive power. The ship will take on and discharge rolling vehicles through a ramp in the bow of the ship and through special ramp-ports in the side of the vessel.

The application of this principle will find wide commercial use. Plans are being made now for vessels that will carry upward of 220 truck trailers along our coasts. This means of transportation is expected to reduce the mounting operating costs of truckers over the coastal highways.

The Federal Maritime Board feels that one of the great contributions it can make to the future of the American merchant marine lies in the field of experimentation with advanced forms of propulsion and with new devices for handling cargo to speed turnaround and increase the earning ability of ships. In keeping with the American spirit of pioneering, we will leave no stone unturned in giving full consideration to what the atom can mean to the American merchant marine.

In the cargo handling phase of marine transportation, there will be considerable improvement in ship to shore cargo handling facilities with special emphasis on speeding special types of cargo. Correlation among all phases of transportation and modernization of port facilities can be anticipated which will lower cargo handling costs and decrease port time.

The future will find ships becoming much more specialized to suit trade requirements. I foresee an increase in the construction of large bulk carriers to take care of the increasing needs of our industries for the import of large quantities of ore.

As we stand here in this Mississippi Valley, we, as Americans, must turn our eyes abroad for the sources of supply that permit us to live in the complex civilization we have built. The United States is the world's largest consumer of raw materials, so large that we can no longer supply our own needs. Grim as it may seem to a people long accustomed to abundance of natural resources, we are now dependent upon foreign imports not only for luxuries but also for vital necessities.

The United States is the world's largest user of basic resources. With only 7 percent of the world's population and the same proportion of the land area of the free world, we consume about two-thirds of all the petroleum, almost 60 percent of the rubber, more than half of the magnesium, iron ore and zinc, and almost half of the copper and lead. More than 2½ billion tons of materials are used every year to support our high standard of living, an average of almost 18 tons of material a year for each person in the United States.

Our country's import balance of raw materials exceeded its export balance for the first time in the 1940's—a milestone in our development as a Nation. In 1945 we began to import petroleum. In 1935 we began to import zinc, and in 1936 copper.

Indeed, upon close examination, the idea of American self-sufficiency has always been, to a considerable extent, a myth. The magnitude of this myth is clearly shown in the case of metals—the base of any industrial

civilization. We are, in part at least, dependent upon foreign sources for every metal which we use, except magnesium and molybdenum, and, gentlemen, only the American merchant marine can assuredly keep this vital beltline of supply open across the oceans of the world.

Growing dependence upon imports has brought with it concern over the prospect of an emergency in which we might be cut off from resource countries. It is this concern that gave rise to our stockpiling of critical materials.

America has been a land of ever-expanding frontiers. As a young and vigorous Nation, our industrial and economic futures still lie ahead of us. We who guide the destinies of the American merchant marine must keep in mind that we are planning and providing for an America of tomorrow which will be a greater America than the Nation we know today. The United States at this point has 161 million people. There are more than 200 million Americans in sight for 1975. The America of the future is to be an America with rising needs of all kinds; and that means rising opportunities for the farms and the factories of the Mississippi Valley and for the American merchant marine.

Your Government stands ready to encourage businessmen and consumers, to help create the favorable atmosphere of confidence in the country's economic growth and future to which the American merchant marine wishes to make its contribution in prosperity and security.

Once more we stand on the banks of the Mississippi as pioneers, not in the same sense as the early settlers who came here to conquer territory, but as adventurers and explorers of a dawning era we are pioneering in the application of atomic energy to fulfill the dreams and the needs of mankind.

It is an era of still undreamed hazards, vast adjustments and momentous decisions but we are sure that within the lifetime of those of us within this room we shall see, in this field of the atom, the application of American genius equal to that of the Wright brothers in the air. New Edisons and new Moses, Whitneys, and Fultons shall find the ways and means to successfully and economically apply to the best interests of mankind this new basic power of the universe that now lies slumbering within our hands.

I am sure that the faith of America will find a way to make our new era one of peace and plenty and the American merchant marine will be in the vanguard of that era.

Featherbedding and Railway Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 8, 1955, issue of *Christian Economics*:

FEATHERBEDDING AND RAILWAY LOSS

During the 2 years ending May 1953 the railroads obtained permission to stop operating 314 passenger trains ending annual operating losses of approximately \$17,500,000. During the 15-month period ending August 1954 an additional 183 losing trains were discontinued at an annual saving of \$5,200,000.

It is often difficult for a railroad to obtain permission to discontinue a train. Labor and

the local communities served usually oppose it, and losing trains and small branch lines are often compelled to continue operation year after year at heavy loss to the railway company.

According to a report of a special committee on cooperation, formed in 1949 and representing the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners of the 48 States, some seven or eight hundred additional railway trains are operating at heavy loss and should be discontinued.

Little can be done about solving the railway problem unless and until Government intervention is eliminated and the cooperation of labor is secured. Among other things the "Special Committee on Cooperation with the I. C. C. in the Study of the Railroad Passenger Deficit Problem" above referred to, has the following to say about labor's attitude in connection with lower cost operation of this essential service:

"Although the current average speed of passenger trains—including all stops at intermediate points—is almost 40 miles per hour, the daily rates of pay continue to be based on an assumed average speed of only 20 miles an hour—thus materially increasing the cost to the railroad of the actual work performed. This type of wage agreement has loaded wage costs so heavily on the passenger trains that these costs alone have often been the decisive factor necessitating the discontinuance of operation of trains which could have continued to run with a crew cost more reasonably related to the service rendered. Many passenger trains on which the railroads were required to maintain 3 crews under the provisions of these agreements (or pay as though 3 crews were used) could have easily been operated with only 2 crews without any of such crews being on duty longer than 6 hours. Yet, because of the flat refusal of the railway operating brotherhoods to consider any modification of these obsolete contract terms, the trains were forced into discontinuance with the resultant loss of the jobs of all 3 crews where 2 of such crews could have remained in service. . . .

"Even worse has been the attitude of railway labor in connection with the proposed operation of individual self-propelled cars in substitution for regular trains. In certain instances where our state commissions have been forced to permit the total discontinuance of standard trains, it would have been possible for this type equipment to take over and adequately provide the service needed by the public. However, the extraordinary demand of railway labor for a full crew on this one car so inflated the indicated direct operating expenses that the proposed substitute service was rendered economically impossible."

Such practices reduce railroad service, greatly increase its cost, stimulate other forms of transportation and in the end reduce the number of people gainfully employed in the industry and raise the cost of living for us all.

Efficient railway transportation at prices the people are willing to pay is essential not only for prosperity but for national defense. Years ago many of our railroads were injured by abuses in connection with their capital structure. This has long since ceased. Today, featherbedding such as that quoted above and of many other varieties, is greatly increasing the cost of railway transportation and injuring these common carriers which are so essential to the life of the Nation.

An alert public opinion and the willingness of men to live and work in accordance with higher moral standards seem to be the only way of solving this vexing problem. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye ever so to them" (Matthew 7: 12) is the only way that men can achieve economic well-being and retain and improve their freedom and self-government.

A Decent Break for Postal Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement presented by me to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Tuesday, February 15, 1955:

I appreciate this opportunity to present my views to this committee in support of a substantial pay raise for postal employees.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2158, which would provide for an increase of 10 percent or \$400, whichever is greater, for all employees in the field service of the Post Office Department retroactive to August 23, 1954. This bill, as you know, is similar to H. R. 1592, introduced by Congressman MORRISON, and a number of other bills introduced by Members of Congress both on and off this committee.

I do not believe anyone seriously can question the need for adequate pay increases for employees in the postal field service at this time. The simple fact is that they are underpaid. They are underpaid in contrast with employees in private industry discharging similar duties. They are underpaid in contrast with the rates of pay prevalent in the postal field service prior to the Second World War. The pay scales of the loyal, hard-working men and women carrying out the vital but unsung tasks of the Post Office Department have not kept pace with the rapidly rising cost of living. In fact, postal workers have fallen further and further behind in the struggle to have and enjoy decent food, decent housing, and all of the many things that go into the standard of living of the average American of which the Nation justly is proud.

I have read persuasive statistics describing the plight of the mail clerk, the letter carrier, and all of the many other postal workers endeavoring to make ends meet, and the figures are impressive. But, more than that, I have talked to many of them personally, and I have received their letters by the hundreds, each telling a personal story of the ever-pressing grip of financial need. In my own State of Washington the fact is that almost two-thirds of rank-and-file postal workers are so hard put to make ends meet that they either hold outside part-time jobs or have found it necessary to put their wives to work.

Postal workers, like other Government employees, cannot strike to back up their claims for adequate pay scales, as can employees in private industry. They cannot go to work for a competing firm which offers higher salaries, because no such firm exists. They must come to us, the Members of Congress, lay their case on the table, and ask for fair treatment. This they have done. This committee held extensive hearings last year, in which every phase of the postal-pay problem was explored thoroughly. Additional hearings are now in process this year, and again the story is being told. I think it incumbent on us to act, and act promptly; each day's delay merely prolongs the need. We know the facts; we have only to make up our minds as to what rates of compensation are fair in the light of the facts and act accordingly.

I support the formula of a 10-percent increase or \$400, whichever is greater. And I think the increase should be made retroactive to the end of the last session of Congress, which is when a pay-raise bill should have taken effect.

A higher increase than this formula provides could easily be justified by any standard normally used in determining a reasonable wage rate—by comparison with workers in other industries, by contrast to the relative purchasing power during some earlier period, by studying the change in productivity and average workload. Application of the formula would not restore, for example, the purchasing power of the average postal employee to the level of 1939. A higher increase could be justified in good conscience; to grant less, in my opinion, would be unjust.

The principal alternative proposal before this committee is contained in H. R. 2987, introduced by the distinguished chairman, and similar bills. I think the increase in salary scales which would be provided by this bill are not enough, particularly in the lower grades, where the need is greatest. While I recognize the need for increasing the level of remuneration for those assuming the greater responsibilities for the operation of the postal service, I think that our first and basic obligation is toward those in the lower grades who are struggling to keep up the pace. I think the formula I support will help to accomplish both objectives.

My principal concern today is with the problem of providing adequate pay scales for postal workers, but I should like to add the additional comment on H. R. 2987 that I feel it hands over to the Postmaster General too sweeping an authority in the matter of postal reclassification, job assignment and the employment of substitute and replacement personnel. Congress has, in my opinion, certain obligations in these areas which cannot be abdicated in favor of the judgment of the politically-appointed head of the Post Office Department, whoever he may be.

We often are inclined to take the postal worker for granted. The letter we drop in the mail chute or deposit in the convenient corner box always reaches its destination. The letter carrier always delivers our mail and our periodical reading matter. The clerk always is at the window to sell us stamps or to provide any one of a hundred other services. Their very competence puts them out of mind. They come to us now asking for a decent break. I think they have earned it; I think they deserve it; and I think in good conscience we have no choice but to give it to them as rapidly as possible.

Is Our Constitution Subordinate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 8, 1955, issue of Christian Economics:

IS OUR CONSTITUTION SUBORDINATE?

Is our American law on contracts superseded and invalidated by the Charter of the United Nations? Four judges of the United States Supreme Court say yes, and 4 say no. The vote of one judge is all that saved this body of American law from becoming subordinate to the U. N. Charter.

We are not here concerned with the merits of the case. We are greatly concerned over the imminent possibility that American law and the Constitution of the United States may be, indeed perhaps already have been, set aside, nullified and superseded by the

U. N. Charter, and such agreements as hereinafter may be made under it.

A cemetery had refused an Indian woman the right to bury her late husband in one of its lots. These lots had been sold under a contract, including a clause restricting their use to people of the Caucasian race. The widow contended that this clause had been voided by article 55C of the U. N. Charter. This article provides that member nations shall "promote universal respect for, and observance of, fundamental human freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

One may sympathize with the position of the widow without jumping to the conclusion that all American law and the American Constitution should be made subordinate to the U. N. Charter. In some instances court decisions have already sustained the superiority of the U. N. Charter over American law. Only the opinion of one justice prevented the confirmation of this precedent by the Supreme Court.

Not many Americans seem to realize that unless we adopt the Bricker amendment or its equivalent we have ceased to be a sovereign nation, have lost our Constitution and our system of jurisprudence.

Veterans of Foreign Wars and Daughters of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the speech of Mr. Jack F. Dusenbury, commander of the North Carolina Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars, made on January 7, 1955, before the Joseph McDowell Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution at Hendersonville, N. C. Mr. Dusenbury points out the similarity of the history and ambition of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Daughters of the American Revolution. I feel it will be of interest to the Members of the House as well as to the respective memberships of the two organizations:

It is my pleasure and privilege to address this regional conference of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I speak in behalf of more than 23,000 men and women who are members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and their Ladies' Auxiliaries in North Carolina. As department commander of the VFW, I extend to you heartiest greetings from all our members.

And joining me in those greetings is Mrs. Dovie L. Penney, of Wallace, N. C., president of the Ladies' Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Your organization and ours have many parallel interests. Our histories are quite similar.

The DAR is 9 years older than the VFW. Your first chapter was organized at Washington, D. C., on October 11, 1890, with 18 members. Your first president-general was Mrs. Caroline Scott Harrison, wife of United States President Benjamin Harrison.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars was founded 9 years later—in 1899—when 12 men who had come out of the Spanish-American War, organized their first unit in Columbus, Ohio,

followed closely by others in Denver, Colo., and other States.

The DAR purposes and those of the VFW, are expressed in the constitutions of our two organizations. They are very much alike.

The objects of the DAR are to perpetuate the memory of the spirit of men and women who achieved American independence. Also you are dedicated to the preservation of American patriotic traditions, also to extend the institutions of American freedom and to foster patriotism and aid in securing for mankind the blessings of liberty.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary likewise are pledged by their constitution to function as patriotic, historical and educational organizations—to foster true patriotism and to maintain and extend the freedom institutions of our country.

Furthermore, we obligate ourselves to champion equal rights and justice for all men and women, and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies in time of peace or war.

Membership in your organization and mine is limited. The DAR requires that its members be the direct descendants of the men who saw active service in the American Revolutionary War.

Membership in the VFW is limited by congressional charter to the men who have served with the United States Armed Forces in combat zones outside the continental limits of our country. Each of the 1,200,000 Veterans of Foreign Wars members has been decorated by the Federal Government for his foreign service.

In our ladies auxiliaries there are more than 400,000 wives, mothers, daughters, and sisters of those men. Together these VFW and auxiliary members total more than a million and a half persons living in every State of the Union, also in Alaska, Hawaii, the Panama Canal Zone, and elsewhere.

You who belong to the Daughters of the American Revolution and we of the Veterans of Foreign Wars see eye to eye in many respects. We are aiming at the same goal. That goal is preservation of American history and ideals—the strengthening of American liberties—and the defense of our way of life in every way possible through the patriotic leadership of our respective organizations.

Fulfilling those purposes requires all of us to keep mighty busy. Since the founding of our organizations we have had many things to do. We have had to keep vigilant, flexible and constantly working. Action has been the keynote because there have been many, many challenging changes since the 1890's.

The tempo of our lives has speeded up immeasurably. The requirements of everyday living have multiplied and quickened. The relationship of our Nation to other nations has grown more complex. International tensions are far greater today than in the 1890's. Our national security is in more critical balance today and—perhaps most important of all—our freedoms are threatened now as never before.

What does all that mean to us? Well, one thing is certain—it means we cannot afford to settle back into any rocking chair complacency. We dare not relax into any degree of smug satisfaction of being venerable patriotic leaders by virtue of our long service.

I mean that the Daughters of the American Revolution—although 64 years old last October—can afford to be that old only in experience and wisdom.

The same rule applies to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We cannot maintain leadership among veterans organizations solely on the strength of our 56 years experience.

No; this is not an era in which age and experience alone counts for very much. Everything is developing too rapidly and the pace set by the younger generations

press too closely to allow much consideration for mellowed age.

If we should settle back to reminisce we would quickly find ourselves alone. The world would leave us behind. Today's young people are marching steadily forward. Also events are developing and moving on. If we dared to rest the DAR and the VFW would very quickly fade and be forgotten.

Therefore, we must keep up with contemporary events and peoples. We have to. There is an awful lot of very urgent work for us to do today. The ideals we represent—although rooted far in the past—must be kept alive. They must be nurtured. They must be kept as new, as vigorous, and as attractive today as they were in 1776 and 1899. Yes, there is much work for us today, tomorrow, throughout 1955, and on into the years to come.

Now, I'm not inferring that either the Daughters of the American Revolution nor the Veterans of Foreign Wars is actually falling behind the procession. In fact there is little danger of that if your organization and ours continue keeping their memberships ever green. That means we must enlist every eligible in each succeeding generation. Then we must impress upon those new members the great need of their help toward interpreting our proclaimed ideals and our objectives into practical application.

There are strong evidences that you are well aware of your patriotic obligations. Latest records show that the Daughters of the American Revolution sponsors outstanding Junior American Citizenship Clubs in the schools of 25 States. Also you list many other equally important patriotic projects in the DAR pamphlet entitled "Highlights of Program Activities."

You are driving vigorously to impress upon the minds of all Americans—young and old—the full significance of our Nation's initial struggle to gain and maintain its freedom way of life.

That is also true of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies' auxiliary. Our members are likewise driving hard—here in North Carolina and across the country—to create stronger appreciation and a more widespread, positive practice of the basic American freedom principles.

We can sum up those principles very briefly as freedom of opportunity for all, right of individual enterprise, and the united defense of all we have inherited by virtue of the heroic men and actions which your organization and mine commemorate.

We honor the patriots who have defended America. The Daughters of the American Revolution keep alive the stubborn fires of independence. You declare that the men—and women, too—of the American Revolution are worthy of perpetual honor—and you give that thought action by reflecting honor upon those who are the descendants of the first American war veterans.

My organization makes the same declaration—and for the same purpose—with respect to all those who have fought for American independence in many wars during the past 179 years.

The VFW is truly an ever-green organization because its membership includes the young veterans of each succeeding generation. It may not be an enviable position to proclaim, but it is true nevertheless, that as long as men must take up arms in defense of American freedoms there will always be more young members in the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

You are all aware how drastically times have changed. The pace and pressure have increased greatly. Three big wars within the past 38 years have imposed a costly price for freedom. The price has been paid in lives, anguish, and money.

More than 2 million men have been battle casualties in all wars since the American

Revolution. The First and Second World Wars and the Korean conflict took the heaviest toll.

Today more than 20 million war veterans are living in the United States. They represent a goodly proportion of our entire population. They are the frontline reserves of American manpower. They are trained and ready to again answer the call to arms—if that becomes necessary.

Meantime those living war veterans are busily working for the peacetime strengthening of America. Here in North Carolina and throughout the Nation VFW men and members of their ladies' auxiliaries are cooperating to make effective a multitude of community-building projects.

They are working on the theory that democracy begins at home and that home means the cities, towns, and neighborhoods wherein we rear our families, conduct our business, enjoy our social contacts and develop our characters.

Proceeding on that premise the Veterans of Foreign Wars men and women have created 1,000 types of community service. Last year their posts and ladies auxiliaries sponsored more than 504,000 programs in 9,000 cities. During 1955 the VFW workers expect to sponsor close to 1 million community-service projects.

Those community-service activities are designed to broaden the education of our children, help schools, colleges, and churches, initiate patriotic activities and to assist needy persons. Those are some of the ways the Veterans of Foreign Wars work for a stronger nation during peacetime.

Peacetime? Yes; technically we are at peace now. No major battles are being fought. However, with communism just beyond the horizons around us we cannot afford to relax in any comforting belief that there is no danger. The threat to American security is definitely present and pressing.

There is imperative need today for clearer thinking—more level-headed analyses—more careful planning and much positive action by every loyal citizen—especially by such patriotic leaders as the DAR and the VFW. Today's challenge is greater than it has been at any time in our national history.

Your organization and mine are directly challenged because we have proclaimed our purposes. We're squarely on record as obligated to provide the all-important leadership in the very necessary campaign for stronger allegiance to our Government, our Constitution, our laws, and to our flag.

That is your job and ours today and tomorrow.

I pledge to you who are members of the Daughters of the American Revolution the full and earnest cooperation of all VFW men and women here in North Carolina. Whenever we can help for our Nation's sake, we who are the Veterans of Foreign Wars offer ourselves and our patriotic services.

The Failure of the So-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been in operation now for 20 years, and the devices to obstruct the flow of American exports into 40 nations has increased and not reduced these barriers.

There are more barriers today than ever before.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Henry Gemmill, which appears in the February 16, 1955, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

TRADE WAR: FRIENDLY NATIONS FIGHT EACH OTHER WITH EXPORT SUBSIDIES AND STIMULANTS—ILL WILL OVER YANKEE SALES OF BUTTER, ORANGES—FRENCH SUBSIDIES HIT \$235 MILLION—IS IT A SENSELESS RACE?

(By Henry Gemmill)

PARIS.—America is locked in a war with its own allies—a war of export subsidies and stimulants.

The Netherlands and Denmark dispatched sharp notes to the State Department a few days ago, declaring that United States efforts to dispose of 10 million pounds of surplus butter by cutrate auctioning to foreign bidders is nothing less than dumping—likely to cause "grave" damage to other butter-exporting countries.

But both the Dutch and the Danes are themselves showing out exports with a variety of government aids. The Netherlands Government, for instance, more than a year ago decided to give its exporters this guaranty: If they would tackle the United States and Canadian markets with sales campaigns, the government in return for a small premium would pay as much as half of advertising and market analysis expenses not covered by profits on ensuing exports.

And the Danish Government has promised its exporters who participate in an insurance scheme that it will bear up to half of any loss in the global export of goods on consignment. Last year the Government increased the total liability it is willing to incur under this and other export guaranties to 350 million kroner, or about \$52 million.

A RECENT RUSH

Governments have rushed into subsidization—or schemes very similar to it—during the last 2 years as world markets have become saturated with manufactured goods and farm commodities, on the theory that any little extra kick might help to close an export sale. These programs wear a hundred disguises, appearing as tax rebates, governmental money lending, guaranties against trading risks, currency-retention devices, barter deals, double-price systems, provision of cheap raw materials to manufacturing exporters—and, in the case of the United States, "foreign aid."

Each government usually insists that most of its own particular contrivances are not subsidies at all—so the diplomats who haggle over them customarily avoid use of that ugly word; the presently accepted jargon is "artificial aids to exports."

These experts, and there are a number of them professionally occupied in Paris, say it is impossible to calculate the global cost of this warfare, for too much of it is concealed. But France alone in 1955 is budgeting about 100 billion francs (better than \$285 million) for some of the more obvious aids; this sum represents about one-quarter of the anticipated deficit in the ordinary French budget this year.

Every auto shipped out of France carries with it a subsidy. The French steel industry, though now one of the most modern in the world, collects its export subsidies on a monthly basis. When the French farmer exports a bushel of wheat and gets, say, \$1.70 for it, he collects in addition a subsidy of something like \$1.25.

But before sneering at the fiscal ineptitude of the French, Americans are warned by the experts, it should be recalled that the United States Government is also running a deficit—influenced a bit by the fact that every bushel of wheat shipped out of the States carries with it a subsidy paid by the taxpayer. At

the moment this runs around 60 cents a bushel.

WE MUST

Each government is inclined to believe that its own artificial aids are required by special circumstances. When challenged, as they have been by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation headquartered here in Paris, the French officials contend they have given their workers so many social-security benefits that their producers' costs and prices are entirely out of line with the rest of the world, and they must subsidize to export at all.

When challenged, as they have been at the current Geneva session of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), the United States contends its farm program has lifted its agricultural prices entirely out of line with the rest of the world, so it too must subsidize to export at all. And so it goes—even the Greeks and the Turks insist they must subsidize, explaining to questioning governments that otherwise they could not possibly sell their dried fruit in competition with the subsidized exports of America.

But many of the private producers whose wares are getting all this governmental help have grown weary of it, even fearful. The International Chamber of Commerce has told GATT a "general condemnation" should be adopted. On this far side of the Atlantic the most outspoken critic of artificial export aids is the Council of European Industrial Federations, which represents national business groups similar to America's National Association of Manufacturers.

A SENSELESS RACE

"We are unanimously agreed upon the undesirability of a senseless race between countries for ever bigger incentives which are concealed subsidies," the Council formally resolved as long ago as 1953, when the surge was already quite apparent. The Council argued that competitive subsidization cancels out the advantages expected by each of the warring nations, and the result is only "increasing prices or taxation in the producing countries."

Last year the Council, under British impetus, adopted a resolution expressing even greater alarm, warning of great dangers to the improvement in the economies of European countries. It declared ominously that it may not be possible in certain countries to delay pressure for the introduction of new countermeasures for more than a very limited time.

Global use of subsidies is still increasing. Just this month, for instance, Brazil announced a boost in payments to its coffee exporters, so that for every dollar earned they now get not only the official exchange rate of 18.36 cruzeiros but also a larger sum, 18.70 cruzeiros, as bonus. The reason: Colombian coffee was underselling Brazilian.

The Geneva GATT conversations on export subsidies seem to be getting next to nowhere, and the American position as stated by Assistant Secretary of State Samuel Waugh appears in opposition to banning them. The United States Government, he says, is merely prepared to discuss the desirability of appropriate limitations. As for America's own subsidies of agricultural shipments, he says they should not unduly interfere with normal marketings.

EUROPE MAKES A TRY

But within Europe, at least, the first really strenuous effort is now being made to hold the synthetic export-boosting to present levels and, in time, to reduce it.

Through the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, most West European lands have agreed this year that until September 1956 they will "refrain from further extending or introducing any other measures of artificial aid to exporters," or at least those deemed to "have the effect of distort-

ing normal conditions of competition"; and by the end of this year they promise to discontinue certain specified practices such as direct subsidies, currency retention schemes which involve a bonus on exports, and kickbacks on the social-security taxes of exporting industries. Many stimulants, such as the British remission of its purchase tax for off-island shipments, are not outlawed under this pact. But some countries—notably Germany—will be making a real retreat.

A major holdout, however, is France. Other continental nations are watching her competitive trade policies and those of the United States, so it is considered quite possible that most all the Europeans may re-enter the subsidy sprint when their agreement expires in September of next year.

Meanwhile, the United States is doing some watching of its own. Its customs officers are empowered to take punitive action against dumping of goods in the United States by foreign countries; a Treasury representative has just returned to Washington after taking a hard look at the French subsidies, but his recommendations are not yet known here.

America's own subsidies are so carefully handled that they do not constitute dumping, the Government insists. But other countries are not always convinced. For instance, American subsidies on just one commodity—oranges—have been denounced during the current GATT session in Switzerland by representatives of Italy, South Africa, Greece, Australia, Cyprus, and the British West Indies. Efforts of the United States Foreign Operations Administration to relieve miner unemployment at home by heavy foreign-aid shipments of coal have drawn frowns from some of Europe's coal producers.

THE WEAPONS OF WAR

What are the weapons in this war of artificial export aids? Here are some of the principal ones, with a few recent and current illustrations:

Simple subsidies: These are less used than one might expect, especially by the subtle Europeans. The Germans have been paying an "ausfuhrvergütung" on exported brandy. The Canadians have been doling out \$1 per ton on shipments of Alberta and British Columbia coal to all lands except the United States. Belgium has been advancing funds for traveling expenses, offices, the sending of samples, and other costs that Belgian exporters and manufacturers incur in prospecting distant foreign markets in North and South America, Asia, and the Congo. The Turks have been using a two-price system for raisins, with those sent abroad being cheaper.

The United States has been paying subsidies off and on for many years; the International Wheat Agreement, which bestows a certain blessing upon them, goes back well before World War II. But most of the United States wheat shipments now subsidized are outside that pact, and a variety of new subsidies have recently been put in motion—some of them not so simple after all.

For example, the last session of Congress ordered the Commodity Credit Corporation to start selling its surpluses abroad—not for dollars but for whatever foreign currencies might be offered. In the process, the legislators decreed, losses to the American taxpayer can be run up to \$700 million. A month later they decided to authorize another \$350 million worth of such transactions, as part of a military measure, the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

Such subsidies are now getting rolling. Last month, for instance, 15.6 million bushels of wheat and 50,000 bales of cotton were peddled to the Yugoslavs for dinars; it was a \$41 million deal—with the Commodity Credit Corporation agreeing to pay, among other things, a \$3 million shipping bill. A few days later the Turks were told they could have \$12.4 million worth of oats, bar-

ley, and wheat, and pay for it in lira. The British have been dickering to get some tobacco and pay for it in sterling.

What does the Government do with these foreign currencies? It can spend them, under the law, for everything from munitions to the financing of international educational exchange.

Tax rebates: Huge incentives are granted in this fashion. The Germans have been offering a whole series. There is the "ausfuhrhandlervergütung," returning to the producer the turnover tax he has paid on export goods; there is the "umsatzsteuergleichsetzer," which refunds a compensatory tax; and there are other kickbacks from income and corporate taxes.

Italy has been granting rebates of its general tax on earnings to exporters of a long list of items, including typewriters, sewing machines, motorcycles, autos, accordions, machine tools, ironwork, and hats. Belgian export producers have been exempted from cumulative sales and production taxes running as high as 12 percent. Stiff purchase taxes are remitted on export goods by Britain and Holland.

France is probably the leading tax rebater, giving back to many of its export producers the production taxes, sales taxes, and staggering social welfare taxes which they otherwise must pay.

Some American exporters manage to cut their corporate income taxes by 14 percentage points after qualifying as "Western Hemisphere Trade Corporations," as defined by the United States Revenue Code, and this undoubtedly helps them to battle European competitors in markets south of the border. The American Government, like most European ones, refunds the tariff paid on raw materials which go into exported wares. Even these customs kickbacks can become intricate; Belgium gives free admission to dies imported on loan for the manufacture of export goods.

Loans and guarantees: The most familiar example is the United States Export-Import Bank, established two decades ago but increasingly active in lending money for export deals which private lenders steer clear of. During the last couple of years it has also begun guaranteeing loans made by private financial institutions, and issuing insurance against such dangers to exports as revolutions and expropriation. It boasts of operating at a profit.

Most European lands have adopted similar schemes and institutions to push exports with governmental credit. The Swedes, for instance, have their Exportkreditnämnden. The Dutch have a private but Government-backed Nederlandsche Credietverzekering Maatschappij N. V., and the Belgians have both a Cofinex and an Institut de Reescompte et de Garantie.

Some systems give guaranties which go far beyond orthodox credit risks. The French Government guarantees its exporters against internal price changes. The Irish Government has established a special company called Coras Trachtála Teoranta to make promotional guarantees on exports to the dollar area. Promotion guarantees, covering the risks of developing markets through costly advertising and market research, are issued also by such nations as Norway and the United Kingdom.

Barter deals: The Germans employ these when trading with underdeveloped countries and in opening up new markets. The United States Secretary of Agriculture last year was empowered to barter surplus crops abroad for strategic and other materials.

Raw material supply: The French have a scheme known as IMEX which funnels imported raw materials to firms which will make them up into goods for export. British domestic steel prices are fixed by the Iron and Steel Board at levels lower than export steel prices; some foreign critics complain

this helps British makers of autos and other wares produce and export cheaply.

Currency retention: This form of export stimulant is one which has diminished in importance here in Europe, partly because the International Monetary Fund has worked against it and partly because the free market value of currencies has come closer to official exchange rates. When the idea was at its height, the dollar was worth far more than it was rated under official exchange rules, and any exporter granted currency retention rights could keep the dollars he earned from his sales and use them to great advantage. Some of these schemes have lingered on longer than most.

The Italians have been letting their exporters retain use of half the dollars and free Swiss francs they bring in. The French have been using two different systems permitting, rather indirectly, the retention of some hard-currency earnings.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address given by the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania at Chicago, on February 13, 1955:

STATEMENT BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL OF LITHUANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 37TH OBSERVANCE OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA, FEBRUARY 13, 1955, CHICAGO, ILL.

The 37th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania (February 16), and the 12th year of the occupation and domination of Lithuania by Soviet Russia affords an opportune time to present the case of Lithuania to the people of the United States, and to ask a pertinent question of the Soviets: Did you (Soviets), make false representations at the time of signing the treaties of peace and nonaggression with Lithuania and the other Baltic states, or are you making false representations now in proposing "peaceful co-existence" with America and other countries? Or are you renouncing Czar Ivan's and dictator Stalin's aggressive imperialism and returning to the domain of law and justice?

The Soviet rationality and respect for law and decency was manifested in the treaties of the early 1920's: the Peace Treaty (July 12, 1920) with Lithuania states in article I:

"Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent state with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and in a spirit of free and good will renounces all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her."

The nonaggression pact of September 28, 1926, articles 2 and 3, provides:

"ARTICLE 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other.

"ART. 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party."

The Mutual Assistance Treaty of October 10, 1939, reaffirms the principles of the above two treaties and ostensibly speaks for co-

existence between Lithuania and the Soviet Union; the preamble states:

"For the purpose of developing the friendly relations established by the peace treaty of July 12, 1920, and based on the recognition of an independent state existence and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the other party:

"Recognizing that the peace treaty of July 12, 1920, and the pact of nonaggression and peaceful settlement of conflicts of September 28, 1926, continue to form a firm basis of their mutual relations and undertakings."

The seventh article of the treaty provides "realization of this treaty should not affect in any way the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, in particular their state organization, economic and social system, military measures, and generally the principle of nonintervention in internal affairs."

In addition to the above, shortly after the signing of this treaty, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs Molotov, in presenting the treaty to the Supreme Soviet of Soviet Russia for ratification, said:

"This treaty of mutual assistance in no way implies any interference of the Soviet Union in the affairs * * * of Lithuania, as some foreign newspapers are trying to infer. On the contrary, this treaty strictly stipulates the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states and the principle of non-interference in each other's affairs."

The term of the treaty was 15 years. And yet, before 8 months had elapsed, it was flagrantly violated—Lithuania was seized by the Soviet Union in June 1940. Law and decency were superseded by aggression, destruction, and genocide.

After seizing Lithuania, Russia deposed Lithuania's legal government, replaced it with an illegal puppet regime. That puppet regime was and is illegal and without authority from the people or the Constitution of Lithuania. It reigns by terror and through the Soviet armed forces. The people are deprived of human and property rights—they have been degraded to the level of horses or oxen.

Despite all this, the Lithuanian nation did not and will not approve the anti-Lithuanian and illegal acts of Russia and her puppets. Citizens of Lithuania and the entire Lithuanian nation have demanded and are demanding total independence for Lithuania—factual as well as juridical. The legal representatives of Lithuania, the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania, the underground, various Lithuanian immigrant organizations, about three million people in Lithuania and more than one million abroad—in fact all patriotic Lithuanians—denounced the Soviet occupation and spoliation of Lithuania, and are working for the freedom of Lithuania.

The United States Government and the American people have defended and are defending Lithuania in every way. The State Department made its forceful and honest declaration the second day (July 23, 1940) after the treasonous and illegal vote of the so-called People's Diet to incorporate Lithuania in the Soviet Union. This declaration states:

"The devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small republics—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion."

Note that it clearly states that Lithuania's independence and territorial integrity are being annihilated by a neighbor—not by the Lithuanian nation, as the Soviets and their agents claim. The declaration states further:

"The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of

force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak."

America adheres to this policy and demands freedom for Lithuania and the other Soviet-enslaved nations. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is destroying Lithuania and the other two Baltic States, is deporting and liquidating their peoples because they are not Communists, do not want to be communized and enslaved, because they want to be free and independent, as states and as peoples: with their own governments, homes, farms, businesses, national institutions, and the right to the pursuit of happiness, without the intervention of foreign police or regimentation; because they want to exist and coexist as free and independent nations.

Lithuanians and the other Soviet-oppressed peoples regard America as their eventual liberator, and the Soviet Union as their present enslaver. They are ever grateful to America. They despise their enslaver, Soviet Russia.

The Soviet Communist boss Nikita Khrushchev recently said: "We believe, as Lenin said, the solution of disagreement of two systems lies in coexistence." A few days later, Foreign Minister Molotov spoke in Hitlerlike fashion, assailed the United States of America and its allies as "blood-saturated imperialists," threatened them with atom bombs, and demanded that "the United Nations condemn the United States as an aggressor and call for the withdrawal of its troops from the Formosa strait area." The speech was virulent, militaristic, and slanderous. We trust that, in due course of time, it will be answered. A Lithuanian proverb is very apt: "Kuo pats kvep, tuo kita tep." (He who smells bad blames it on another.) The words of Molotov: "Blood-saturated imperialist and aggressor" fit Soviet Russia like a glove. One of the victims of Soviet imperialism and aggression is Lithuania. She was violently seized by Russia and is being mercilessly bled by it. Over 500,000 Lithuanians were murdered or deported to Siberia by the Soviets. The Lithuanians remaining in Lithuania are in a virtual prison and slave-labor camp. They and all Lithuanians demand and urge that the United Nations and others demand that Soviet Russia stop annihilating Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians; that Soviet Russia withdraw its troops, terroristic police, and political agents from the Baltic States, and thereby erase the stigma of imperialistic aggression, restoring the sovereign rights and self-government to the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and enabling them to coexist as free and independent nations.

Selective Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to all Members for extension of remarks on H. R. 3005, I would like to state for the record that illness prevented my being present on February 3 to vote for the passage of this bill. The large vote by which it was passed speaks for the importance in which it is held

and the unanimity of feeling of the Members of the House for its merits.

The world situation is one that calls for sacrifice, courage, and determination. We are faced with the inevitable requirement of maintaining an Army, a Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps for the indefinite future, of not less than 2,850,000. Our military experts have estimated and testified to the fact that voluntary enlistments cannot provide this number, essential to our national defense.

I believe that continuation of the draft for 4 years allows long-range planning for our Military Establishment, which is essential. I believe it also allows long-range planning for our youth, though it in nowise changes their period of service.

In the light of world conditions, this is necessary legislation—essential for the preservation of our Nation and of the free world.

National Negro History Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, February 13 marked the beginning of National Negro History Week, an observation fostered to recognize the contributions made by one of the principal cultural groups in America.

Inaugurated in 1926 by the late Dr. Carter G. Woodson, noted historian and president and founder of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, because of the complete lack of information in our educational institutions on this subject, the underlying purpose is to promote understanding and unity between peoples through presentation in strict historical fashion of the cultural accomplishment of Negroes in civilization and history.

The observation of National Negro History Week at this time has a more pronounced significance than ever before. We know that paramount in our world today is the issue of unity between the peoples of the world. Through the daily continuation of its program of disseminating information, based on thorough historical research, to educational and social welfare institutions, the association makes its contribution to world history by aiding America in the task that is before it to promote true racial integration and, thereby, demonstrate its declared concepts of human freedom and equality.

The association's program, as stated by its founder, Dr. Woodson, is not merely to emphasize Negro history, "but rather the history of the world void of national bias, race hate, and religious prejudice." He adds:

The case of the Negro is well taken care of when it is shown how he has influenced the development of civilization.

An excellent, although by no means all-inclusive, summary of that influence was given to us by an unknown poet, who said:

"I am somebody.

I am a poet in Langston Hughes.

I am a creator of rhyme in Paul Lawrence Dunbar.

I am a Christian statesman in J. H. Jackson.

I am a diplomat in Ralph A. Bunche.

I am a celebrated entertainer in Nat Cole, Eartha Kitt, and Harry Belafonte.

"I am somebody.

I am somebody. I am a soldier in Gen. B. O. Davis, Jr.

I am courage in Crispus Attucks.

I am a humorist in Timmie Rogers and Eddie Anderson.

I am a leading soprano in Dorothy Maynor and Leontyne Price.

I am a world-famous tenor in Roland Hayes.

I am a renowned baritone in William Warfield and Robert McFerrin.

I am a contralto in Marion Anderson and am a member of the Metropolitan Opera Co.

I am a beautiful and talented woman in Lena Horn and Dorothy Dandridge.

"I am somebody.

I am somebody. I am an athlete in Lennie Ford and Goose Tatum.

I am a sprinter in Eddie Tolan.

I am an intelligent pen in the hand of Frank Yerby.

I am a college president in Rufus Clements, Charles S. Johnson, and Mordecai Johnson.

I am a fighter in Thurgood Marshall.

I am a breaker of world records in Jesse Owens and Mal Whitfield.

"I am somebody.

I am somebody. I am an orator in Howard Thurman.

I am a preacher in C. T. Walker and L. K. Williams.

I am a composer in Nathaniel Dett.

I am an actor in James Edward.

I am a boxer in Jimmie Carter and Archie Moore.

I am a knockout punch in Joe Louis.

I am a baseball player in Jackie Robinson and Roy Campanella.

I am a home-run hitter in Larry Doby and Willie Mays.

I am a world-famous pitcher in Don Newcombe and Ruben Gomez.

"I am somebody.

I am somebody. I am a scientist in George Washington Carver.

I am an industrial educator in Booker T. Washington.

I am a Congressman in William L. Dawson, Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., and Charles C. Diggs, Jr.

I am an advisor to the President in J. Ernest Wilkins.

I am a champion for world peace in Charles H. Mahoney.

I am a publisher in Louis E. Martin, Carl Murphy, and John H. Johnson.

I am the originator of the blood bank in Charles Drew.

I am a pathologist in Julian Lewis, and I am a chemist in Percy Julian.

I am the first successful operator on the human heart in Daniel Hale Williams.

"I am somebody.

I am somebody. I am a marksman in Dorie Miller.

I am a registrar of the Treasury in L. B. Toomer.

I am loyalty in the Armed Services.

I am insight in Sojourner Truth.

I am an advocate of justice in Walter White.

I am a leader in A. Phillip Randolph.

I am a builder in Walter A. Rife, and I am an architect in Paul Williams.

"I am somebody.

I am somebody. I am a moulder of character in Nannie Burroughs.

I am a banker in R. R. Wright and L. D. Milton.

I am a certified public accountant in Jesse Blayton and Richard Austin.

I am a sculptor in Henry O. Tanner and I am a cartoonist in E. Simms Campbell.

I am a businessman in Charles C. Diggs, Sr., and Sidney Barthwell.

I am a grand specimen of womanhood in Mary McLeod Bethune and Mary Church Terrell.

"I am somebody.

I am somebody. I am an insurance executive in C. C. Spaulding.

I am a biologist in Justis Howard.

I am a historian in Carter Woodson and J. A. Rogers.

I am a leader in education in Charlotte Hawkins Brown.

I am a beautician in Mesdames Walker, Washington, and Malone.

I am a trustee in slavery. I protected my master's wives and daughters while he fought to keep the chains of slavery about my body.

I am a bishop in W. A. Fountain and George Baber.

I am a ball of fire in Richard Allen.

I am a laborer in John Henry.

I am a true Christian, for indeed, I practiced the religion of Jesus at points better than my master from whom I learned it.

I am somebody!"

Appraisal of the Tariff Problem With Relation to Textiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement by Mr. Henry R. Heimann, executive vice president, the National Association of Credit Men, which gives a dispassionate and conservative appraisal of the tariff problem with relation to textiles:

FEBRUARY 15, 1955.

DEAR MEMBER: Tinkering with tariffs could be a dangerous economic and political pastime. Like the boy who takes apart a watch to see what makes it tick, only to find when he tries to reassemble it that he has more parts than will go into the case, so, too, tariff makers can mess up the works.

In the history of our own Nation we have had some tariff laws that were indefensible. They constituted monopolistic protection and could never be justified under any evaluation of fairness and equity to the rest of the world. In recent years the pendulum may have swung too far in the opposite direction, and today unfortunately it seems to be swinging even farther. Several suggested tariff changes could do irreparable damage to some of our most important industries. Some suggested tariff increases might be fully justified in the light of new conditions. It would be well, therefore, that the greatest of care be exercised and that all parties of interest be heard before changes up or down are made effective. We do not wish to build a fence around America, and we do not need to do so, but we do not intend to

extend an open invitation to manufacturers abroad, in nations of very low wages, to come in and destroy our standard of living or to cripple some of our major industries.

There is a new element in the tariff picture that apparently is not too well in mind. Heretofore we were able to offset the great disparity in wages paid here and in some of the competing countries seeking a free-trade entry, because of our more modern plants and equipment, methods of distribution, and our greater per capita production. It would appear at times that too many people discussing tariffs have failed to take note of the fact that some of the other countries now competing with us have considerably modernized their equipment, and indeed have plants and facilities as well as distributive systems that are equal to ours. Under these conditions it is no longer possible for American business with its high wage schedule to compete with efficient foreign competitors operating under low-wage rates without some measure of protection which is necessary to maintain the standard of living our workmen now enjoy.

Let us take a look at the cotton textile situation. One of the larger sources of competition is the Japanese textile and cotton industry. How many people realize that the Japanese textile industry today is practically new; that its plants and equipment are modern in every respect; that it can produce almost as efficiently as we do in the United States in our textile industry. The average wage paid in Japan to its textile workers is less than 15 cents per hour. The average wage in the United States in the textile industry is \$1.30 an hour. Under these conditions you see what the textile industry of America is up against, unless it has some tariff protection.

There is little wonder, therefore, that in the last few years the Japanese exportation of textile goods to this country has increased tremendously. In fact, their production capacity is so high at the present time that they are not injudiciously crowding their exporting program. They may feel they are getting a lion's share of the business over here and they do not particularly care to stir up a tariff controversy. Give them credit for being astute and realizing that to do so could jeopardize the advantage they now hold in the textile markets.

NEVER GOOD BUSINESS TO SET ASIDE EARNINGS TO BUILD COMPETITORS

You can readily sympathize with the American textile manufacturer who has been taxed to build up this Japanese industry. He has had to pay a very heavy earnings tax, and a part of the money the Government exacted from him has been used for foreign aid. The foreign aid bill has been paid for in part by the very companies that now must compete with the beneficiaries of their tax payments to this Government.

Stated simply, in the competitive program of business it is never considered good business judgment to set aside a part of your earnings for the purpose of building up a competitor. Such an altruistic position would disrupt all business, including the competitor's. The inflow of Japanese cotton goods in the last 3 months of the year has been enormous. That inflow has been largely due to our help in rehabilitating or reconstructing the Japanese textile industry.

Textiles affect many segments of our economy. The agricultural interests are very much interested because we grow cotton. Here we have a surplus which constitutes a tax burden upon our people. The possibility of reducing the surplus of cotton is not very favorable so long as we continue this high importation. The cotton farmer like the textile manufacturer has a heavy stake in the textile business.

MILLION AND QUARTER WORKERS IN HIGHLY COMPETITIVE INDUSTRY

We have approximately 1,250,000 of our people working in the textile industry. They

constitute a large segment of our manufacturing working force. They are not overpaid as to wages when the American standard is considered, but, as stated previously, the wage payments made to American workers are approximately 8 to 10 times higher than those paid in Japan to textile employees. Are we to move into a period of unemployment in this industry with its attendant cost? Are we getting ready to take a third bite out of the textile companies' dwindling earnings for the purpose of maintaining unemployment payments to idle employees?

Another point that could be made in the interest of a very careful stop-look-and-listen policy as to textile tariffs is the fact that the textile industry in America is highly competitive. Tariffs, therefore, in textiles cannot be said to maintain a monopoly because there is no such thing as monopoly in the textile industry. Nor do we have a monopoly in textile skills. Nor does our Government permit cartels. Nor do our reciprocal trade agreements apply to Japan.

Everybody recognizes that a reasonably free flow of trade and exchange of goods and services should be the objective of the world at large. There must, however, be certain limitations to free trade—particularly when you have various standards of living in various countries. Unless you have such limitations in effect the tendency will be to pull down the entire framework of standards of living of the world at large. The objective of a free and full exchange of goods and services is to build up the standard of living. Until such time as wage payments or standards of living abroad are improved, it seems a certainty that adequate protection must be given in the textile industry by way of tariffs.

MANY OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCE PROBLEMS OF EXPORTING COUNTRIES

There is another misconception about tariffs, namely, that they are the sole cause of the financial, economic and social problems arising in certain exporting countries. This is not true. There are many other factors that are equally, if not more, important to a sound national economy. One is a sound budget. Another is the absence of exchange restrictions. Another is the cost and efficiency of business and the government. Another is a decent wage standard. Unfortunately, the eyes are focused on the tariff and there are many who believe mistakenly that you can cure the economic ills of any nation, such as Japan, by simply removing tariffs on its exports.

From an economic point of view, it is well to go easy on any tariff readjustments. We must carefully weigh all the facts in a given situation. We must always keep in mind that our objective is to maintain our high standard of living. We want to help the rest of the world, but the rest of the world must likewise learn to help itself. Unless it does so, our intended help will boomerang and tear down the living standard we have established. This would not help but, quite the contrary, would have a very serious effect on other nations.

NEED CALM JUDGMENT IN TARIFF ADJUSTMENTS OF OTHER NATIONS TOO

I have used the textile industry merely as an example, because the problem is so immediate in that industry. The textile industry has had a difficult time for several years. Its problems, however, will be increased if it is not given a measure of protection against foreign cheap labor competition. It is an industry too vital to our own economy, to our defense program, to our agriculture, to our wage earner, and to the people who have invested capital in this industry to put it up against the type of competition that results from the cheap labor in certain eastern countries. Most textile stocks are selling in this boom market far below their book value.

I mentioned Japan's wage rate, but note that in India the textile wage is even less than Japan's 15 cents per hour. Even in great Britain the textile wage averages but 40 cents an hour. In Switzerland it is 43 cents; in France 38 cents; and in Germany 32 cents. Let us hope, therefore, that calm and mature judgment will be used in any tariff readjustments, not only in the textile field but in other industries that face a comparable problem.

BIG VOLUME OF STATE AND LOCAL TAX-EXEMPT BONDS MAY RAISE INTEREST RATE

For a number of years we have had sharp competition in the sale of bonds and promises to pay between the Federal Government and private industry. For the years ahead a third very active competitor is entering the field. The volume of State and local tax-exempt issues that are to be marketed in the next few years is tremendous. State and local governments are on the eve of a very heavy spending program. Their tax-exempt bond issues to cover much of their increased expenditures will compete not only with the Federal issues but also with private financing needs of business. The effect may well be to increase interest rates slightly. It depends upon what the managed money authorities do in the situation. If more credit is pumped into the tremendous reservoir of synthetic credit then there will not be too much of a change. If the natural law of supply and demand is ever allowed to operate occasionally, then interest rates will look up.

After all there does come a time when available funds for investment become scarcer and that time may not be too far off. It is not because the accumulation of investment funds is not going on at a heavy rate, but it is because of the tremendous demand for funds. The inflationary factor wherein the dollar-purchasing power has been so reduced makes it necessary for business to do much outside financing.

In the year ahead it is estimated that business may charge off as much as \$15 billion in depreciation charges. These charges, of course, strengthen the cash position of business. In addition, business ought to have \$7 billion in retained earnings with which to pursue its expansion and normal business program. Despite these vast sums business finds itself in the position of needing additional money to meet the ever-growing demands and to expand in keeping with its industry. Even the very largest of companies, as will be observed from the financial pages, find it necessary to go into the money market to keep abreast of our expanding economy. Much of the money is procured outside the banking fields. That is why the banking loans to business do not wholly reflect the business demands for credit. Many believe it would be better if more of business credit needs could be handled through regular banking sources. That would be better for the banks and consequently for the Nation as a whole. However, some of the loans are not satisfactory banking loans because of their length of maturity. In recent years this has given rise to considerable banking competition beyond the industry.

ELIMINATING TAX EXEMPTION WOULD BOOST LOCAL RATE ON BUSINESS, INDIVIDUAL

With the growing tax load the attractiveness of tax-exempt bonds is going to become more evident day by day. No doubt this may cause some agitation that this type of security be made taxable. Here again, however, too few people realize that a tax-exempt bond reflects the tax exemption. If the tax-exempt feature of a State or local bond were eliminated and the funds of States and local political subdivisions were made subject to a tax, and if this could be constitutionally done (which is questionable), it would simply mean a higher tax rate against business,

agriculture and the individual in the States, cities, or counties issuing the bonds. What it would mean is an increased local tax on the various groups of businesses and on the individual because the local government would have to pay a higher interest charge. It would also mean a greater return of taxable funds to the Federal Government because in such event the interest collected would be taxable.

History does not indicate that an increase in the flow of tax money to the Federal Government is quickly reflected in a lower Federal tax bill. Usually there are new needs discovered for the increased flow of money, and the tax rate (as will be well demonstrated during the current congressional session) remains constant despite Government receipts. In the end, therefore, if you tax State and local bond interest, John Q. Public would just have a larger tax bill or a bigger debt he eventually would have to pay with taxes.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. HEIMANN,
Executive Vice President.

The Federal Service: Its Problems and Its Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am submitting herewith copy of an address entitled "The Federal Service: Its Problems and Its Future," delivered by the Honorable James C. Worthy, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, before the American Society for Personnel Administration, Society for the Advancement of Management, and the National Capital Chapter of the Civil Service Assembly, on January 28, 1955:

THE FEDERAL SERVICE: ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS FUTURE

(Address by Hon. James C. Worthy, Assistant Secretary of Commerce.)

I. INTRODUCTION

I am very proud of the opportunity to address this joint meeting of three distinguished organizations. Whatever differences there may be in the membership, professional specializations, and systems of concepts and techniques as between your three groups, all of them have one characteristic in common—a focus on and a concern for the human problems of running the Federal Government. Each of your organizations has made significant contributions to the efficiency of Government operations and to the integrity of the career service. Your membership rosters constitute a "Who's Who" of leaders in the field of management and administration. I salute you for what you have done, and wish you Godspeed in your continuing efforts.

I appreciate your inviting me here today to discuss some of the problems of the Federal service as they appear to a relative newcomer to Government who is now on his way back to private business. My status in this respect gives me a perspective which may have a certain value. For whatever they may be worth, I would like to share with you some of the observations I have made during the past 2 years.

Personal point of view

I want to be perfectly clear that what I shall have to say represents solely my own thinking and that none of the proposals I shall make are to be considered as in any way official. They represent merely the ideas of one individual on the verge of re-entering private life. I trust you will view them in that light and accept them as sincerely directed toward improving the Federal service.

First of all, let me say it has been a great privilege to be a member of the Eisenhower administration and an officer of the Department of Commerce. I accepted the invitation to come down to Washington because I believed so implicitly in the principles represented by the President and by Secretary Weeks. I have never had occasion to regret that decision. Friends at home have commented on what they sometimes refer to as my willingness to accept the sacrifices of public service. I have always assured them that no sacrifice was involved. Quite the contrary: these 2 years have been the most stimulating and rewarding of my entire life, and I shall always be thankful that this opportunity was given to me.

I shall always be thankful for the friends I have made here, in high positions and low; friends who have made my task easier and my life richer. I have come to have a tremendous respect, not only for the appointive officials of this administration but for the members of the career service. I hope that as I go back to private life I will be able to help correct some of the mistaken impressions which prevail in certain quarters about the kind of people who work for the Government. I can say in all sincerity that for hard work and patient devotion it would be hard to find their equal in any line of endeavor.

II. SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVERNMENT WORKERS

The question is often asked of me as to how people in Government differ from those in private business. By and large, of course, they do not differ: Government people are a representative cross section of the American people as a whole, with all their diversity and all their strengths and weaknesses. But in the professional and higher administrative levels of Government service I think there are certain characteristics which at least in respect to emphasis tend to distinguish the typical Government employee from his counterpart in private industry.

Generalizations about people are always hazardous, but I think it can be said that the typical upper level career employee tends to look somewhat more to the satisfactions of the job itself and somewhat less to the monetary rewards of that job than the typical employee in private industry carrying comparable burdens of responsibility. Whereas the business executive defines his status and measures his progress to a considerable extent in terms of his income, his opposite number in government is inclined to give greater relative weight to his job as such and to his professional achievement on that job.

I do not mean to imply that the government worker is not interested in the size of his paycheck. In many cases, in fact, his somewhat sharper focus on job satisfactions may represent an adaptation to a situation in which financial rewards are more difficult to achieve than in private industry. Whatever the origin of the attitude, the fact remains, I think, that there is a difference, at least in degree, in the respective orientations of the man in government and the man in industry.

Implications for administrators

This generalization has important implications for the government administrator, particularly to the administrator who comes into government from private industry where he

has been accustomed to rely heavily on monetary rewards for energizing and directing the efforts of his organization. For one thing, the government pay system is too cumbersome and inflexible to permit it to serve as a useful tool for this purpose, and the businessman cum administrator must learn to rely on other means.

Of greater significance is the fact that failure to appreciate the extent of the government worker's ego-involvement in his job may lead the new administrator inadvertently to destroy or seriously impair the primary incentives available to him to promote high-level performance and efficient operation. The government worker will exert himself to the utmost, if necessary under severe difficulties, if he feels that those in authority recognize the importance of what he is doing and are giving him the support he needs. But if the value of his work is questioned—or, worse, if he is attacked directly or by implication as an unnecessary burden on the public payroll—he is deprived of the chief incentive he has for diligent, conscientious effort.

This does not imply by any means that a new administrator should accept without question all the activities he may inherit; neither does it imply that functions once established need be continued indefinitely. Indiscriminate approval loses its value here as in all human affairs. What is needed is a selective, judicial approach; an attitude of evaluating functions on their merits, of seeking to eliminate the less essential in order to strengthen the more essential, of concentrating on the most important things to be done and providing the circumstances, the atmosphere, the support which will enable them to be done better. This is the kind of approach the Government employee will understand and respond to, and the administrator who uses it can count on a loyal, enthusiastic, and productive organization.

Efficiency in Government

Because of the many impediments to efficient operation in Government, it is important that this characteristic of the Government employee be recognized and utilized. Most of these impediments to efficiency are inherent in the nature of Government service.

There is, for one thing, the high rate of turnover at the top. I was looking the other day at a picture taken about 2 years ago of the secretarial officers of the Department of Commerce. Of the 7 men in the picture, 4, including myself, are no longer there and have been replaced by newcomers. The situation in other departments, I imagine, is fairly comparable and is not by any means unique to this administration. I could not help wondering as I looked at that picture what would happen to a private business concern if it experienced a like degree of turnover in its top staff.

This kind of turnover places a severe strain on any organization. Government, as an on-going institution, has adapted itself over the years to absorb this strain. It has built-in resiliencies that enable it to weather the comings and goings of those at the top. Experienced civil servants develop techniques of self-protection that help them adapt to change in policies and personnel; those who fail to develop such techniques are not likely to survive for long.

These are natural adaptations to the realities of Government life; they are essential to a reasonable degree of continuity of function. But they take their toll in efficiency. When so much of the organization structure has to be designed to provide resiliency to change, when so large a part of the efforts of key personnel must be devoted to self-protection—or equally important, when so much initiative is stifled for fear of unnecessary exposure—it is little wonder that Government operations are often inefficient as compared to private industry.

Challenge to Administrators

The Government administrator, however, has it within his power to offset these impediments in substantial degree. He has available, for the tapping, a tremendous source of energy and enthusiasm in the job-oriented attitudes of the typical career employee. Give the career employee leadership as to the direction you want him to go, recognize the importance of what he is doing, see that he has the support and facilities he needs, do what you can to remove roadblocks and encumbrances in his way—and you will be amazed at the effort and productivity you will call forth. Under these circumstances Government operations can more nearly approach the efficiency of private industry. But the task requires high orders of understanding and administrative skill.

III. COMMONSENSE IN ADMINISTRATION

In this general connection, I would like to say a few words about the organization of administrative functions in the Federal Government. There has been a vast proliferation of administrative activities in recent years. Budget and management staffs, personnel staffs, organization and methods staffs, general service staffs, and so on have often grown more rapidly than the agencies of which they are a part. Typically, too, when cut-backs have been necessary the administrative staffs have been cut back less severely in proportion to the professional and program staffs. Both the growth of the administrative staffs and the tenderness with which they are treated when appropriations are reduced are justified in terms of the presumed contributions of such staffs to efficiency of operations.

Expansion of administrative staffs

It is easy to argue that an extra budget analyst can save many times his salary, or an extra personnel man can help improve employee morale, or the centralization of common services can save payroll. All these things may be true—in balance and moderation. But I have the feeling that in some cases we may have gone too far. The pendulum has swung widely since the reports of the first Hoover Commission called attention to the need for improved administrative management in the Federal service. The organizations represented here today have greatly aided in that swing. And because of the strategic position the administrative staffs have come to occupy in most major agencies, they have been able to expand and strengthen their functions, often at the expense of the program areas.

I think a time has come for stock-taking. Above all, I think the time has come for a re-evaluation of the role of the administrative functions.

One reason administrative staffs have grown as they have has been the tendency to elaborate and extend administrative controls. A parallel factor has been the tendency to centralize functions. If the approach is in the direction of control and centralization, there is no limit to the extent to which the administrative staff can grow; but the cost in terms of the effectiveness of the organization as a whole can be very great indeed.

A service approach

In the Department of Commerce we have tried to develop a different point of view. We have tried to minimize the control aspects of administrative functions and to promote maximum decentralization. In particular, we have tried to emphasize the service aspects of the administrative jobs. We have tried to get across the idea that none of the administrative functions—whether personnel, budget and management, organization and methods, or whatever—has any value in its own right, that it is useful only to the extent that it contributes to the achievement of program objectives.

In our view, the purpose of the administrative staff is not to devise and police controls, except as positively required by law or regulation, but rather to assist program staffs in finding their way around difficulties and to provide them with the professional advice and services they need to do their jobs more effectively. Under this concept, administrative staffs can be kept small but their value to the organization can be greatly enhanced. And the job satisfaction of the administrative people themselves can be enriched and deepened accordingly. I submit there is far more basis for pride in helping a bureau or a division solve a knotty problem than in issuing a reprimand for deviation from some procedural detail.

As professionals in the several functional branches of administration, I urge you to consider carefully the role and orientation of your administrative organizations. I feel very definitely the need for strengthening administrative management in the Federal service, but I think we ought to consider carefully the means we employ for that purpose.

IV. THE PROBLEM OF PATRONAGE

I should like to turn now to another subject which also, in my view, requires considerable reevaluation. I refer to the subject of patronage and its relation to the career service. No other topic—except possibly that of security—has generated so much heat and so little light during these past 2 years.

Whatever other fruits it may have enjoyed from its victory in 1952, the Republican Party has been bitterly disappointed in the matter of jobs. The party had been out of power for 20 years. There had not only been little or no Federal patronage during all that time, but party leaders and workers recalled vividly what happened in 1933 when the Democrats succeeded the Republicans in office.

Recollections of 1933

They recalled the arbitrary dismissals of career employees suspected of the taint of Republicanism—such as the removal from the civil service of 376 "higher paid technical and professional positions" in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and the en bloc replacement of incumbents by loyal Democrats. They recalled the thousands of Democrats who found their way into Federal employment in the years following 1933 and the difficulty of getting a job without Democratic endorsement.

They recalled the vigor with which Jim Farley handled his job as patronage boss and his frankness about what he was doing and why. They recalled that as late as 1948 Jim Farley had written: "While many criticize the spoils system, I have always felt that it is just as easy to find a good Democrat as a good Republican or vice versa and that the party in power should reward its own."

Disappointments of 1953

Remembering these things, the leaders and workers of the Republican Party looked forward to the turnover in office 2 years ago with relish and anticipation. But they were sorely disappointed; and if they have grown bitter, they can be understood. It does little to assuage their bitterness to point out that there are a number of very important differences between 1933 and 1953. But if we are to deal intelligently with the problem, we had better understand what those differences are.

I had the fortune—or misfortune—of serving in the first years of two new political administrations: with the NRA and its successor agencies from 1933 to 1936 and with the Department of Commerce from 1953 to 1955. I am therefore in a position to see quite vividly some of the sharp contrasts between the two periods.

Greatly extended civil service coverage

For one thing, the coverage of civil service is much more extensive in the latter period than it was in the former. When the Democrats took office in 1933, 80 percent of all Federal jobs were under civil service. But by 1936 civil service coverage had been reduced to about 60 percent, partly through removing certain jobs from civil service but more importantly through specifically exempting the newly created emergency agencies. As against about 40 percent of all Federal jobs available for patronage purposes before the end of President Roosevelt's first term, only 15 percent are so available now. Whatever this may represent in the way of a desirable strengthening of the merit system, it also represents a formidable restriction on freedom of appointment.

Growth of Government under Roosevelt

Of much greater importance, however, was the fact that 1933 saw the beginning of the rapid buildup in the size of the Federal establishment, whereas 1953 saw the initiation of a sharp trend in reverse. During President Roosevelt's first term, new agencies were created in quick succession and the need for Federal workers grew by leaps and bounds.

I can remember the hectic buildup period of NRA during the summer of 1933. We had few administrative regulations in those days, but I can remember one of them: No hiring on Fridays. This rule was necessary simply because the recordkeeping machinery could not keep pace with the rate of hiring. So each Friday people from the chief clerk's office went through the organization taking a census of all those hired during the preceding days of the week. Other agencies faced with similar problems of rapid growth no doubt employed a variety of expedients, but I have always thought of this one as illustrating vividly the great wealth of jobs available at that time. And I can assure you from having lived through it that the Party then in power made full use of the political opportunities thus afforded.

Contraction of Government under Eisenhower

The situation faced by the new Republican administration when it took office in 1953 was sharply different. Instead of entering on a period of great expansion, President Eisenhower set in motion the economy program which had been one of the important Republican pledges in the preceding campaign. Instead of more jobs there were fewer. Instead of rapid, large-scale recruitment, widespread reductions in force were the order of the day. During the first 2 years of the Roosevelt administration, Federal employment increased by 141,000. During the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, Federal employment decreased by 200,000. In the Department of Commerce alone, regular, full-time employment was cut back 23.3 percent during our first year in office. Thus, even in the relatively few job categories which remained outside civil service the opportunities for patronage were meager indeed.

Buildup of pressure

But memories of what had happened in 1933 persisted, and discontent within the Republican organization rose to fever pitch. Pressure on the administration became extreme. I think it is to the everlasting credit of the President and the men around him that, in the face of this pressure, they have kept and maintained their strong position of safeguarding the merit system. I shudder to think of what might have happened had less courageous and less forthright men been at the helm.

But the pressure remains and the problem persists, and the entire subject is becoming

increasingly confused. I think the time has come for a fresh and objective reappraisal.

A large part of our present confusion comes from failure to distinguish between two quite different things: the need of a new administration to gain control of the machinery of Government and the need of the party in power for jobs to reward the party faithful. These two needs have only in common the fact that both involve jobs and both involve people. Otherwise, they are entirely different in nature and must be satisfied by entirely different means. Let us consider each of them in turn.

Controlling machinery of government

In order to gain control of the machinery of Government, it is necessary for a new administration to control only a relatively few jobs. These are the key positions in the organization, the positions which are truly policy determining or policy influencing and the incumbents of which are close enough to the working processes to insure the faithful adherence of the staff to the program directions laid down.

In this connection, it is important to remember that by far the greater part of all governmental activities are devoid of partisan content. What has the work of the Bureau of Standards or the Patent Office or the Bureau of the Census or the Office of Business Economics to do with which party is in office? The level of their appropriations may rise or fall in accordance with the dictates of administration policy, the scope of their activities may expand or contract accordingly, and there may be certain changes in program emphasis. But the work itself is nonpolitical.

So long as the top staff in such agencies is professionally competent and properly cooperative with the new administrative group their personal politics is beside the point—assuming, of course, that they comply fully with the restrictions of the Hatch Act. In considering the number of jobs a new administration needs to have at its disposal to insure control of the governmental machinery, this largely nonpartisan nature of by far the greater part of the federal establishment needs to be kept in mind.

Support for administration policies

Even in activities where there is an appreciable degree of partisan content, the number of jobs that must be controlled still is relatively small. It has been my observation that the great majority of Federal workers—I can say this confidently at least with respect to the employees of the Department of Commerce—are conscientiously supporting the policies and programs of this administration—as I am sure they conscientiously supported the policies and programs of our predecessors in office.

Unfortunately, there has been a certain amount of confusion on this point, and it has sometimes been overlooked that, if people are to support a particular program or policy, they have to know what that program or policy is. One of the difficulties faced by the new administration when it came into office 2 years ago—and I am sure it is a difficulty experienced by any incoming administration—was that many of the new officials had to learn their way around in their new jobs. They had, of course, a general idea of the kinds of work performed in the bureaus and offices for which they were responsible and they had fairly clear-cut notions of the directions they wanted to go. But they often were not familiar with detailed issues and it took time for them to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the pros and cons of various alternative lines of action.

Under these circumstances, in the early months of this administration people down the line were sometimes lacking in clear-cut policy direction. But the work had to go on, and in the absence of specific instructions

to the contrary they were likely to continue along much the same lines as under the prior administration. Thus it happened that the new administrators were sometimes confronted with actions or proposals for action with which they were in disagreement, and it is easy to understand that in some cases they developed the feeling that their career staffs were undercutting and second-guessing them. But this was only a passing phase. As the new administrators gradually worked out their own policy positions, as they made clear to those under them the directions they wanted to go, the career staffs swung in solidly behind them and are giving them their loyal, wholehearted support.

Few jobs required for control

Thus, even in activities with substantial partisan content, it is necessary to control only a relatively few jobs to control the machinery of government. Effective control is not secured by reaching far down into the organization, but by making sure that the few really key jobs are filled, not merely by people loyal to the administration but by people with a sure grasp of the problems of the organization and the ability to provide clearcut goals and positive leadership. Given this, there need be no fear of lack of control.

By and large, I think the schedule C system has proved reasonably adequate to assure effective control of the governmental machinery. In the Department of Commerce we have not been granted all the schedule C authority we asked for, but, for the most part, we are fairly content. It might interest you to know that of our approximately 41,000 permanent full-time jobs only 86 are in schedule C. I think this gives some indication of the quite small number that are needed for purposes of control.

V. SUSTENANCE OF THE PARTY SYSTEM

But there is another and quite different need that must also be met. This is the need for jobs to nourish the American party system. For this purpose greater numbers and quite different categories of jobs are required than those embraced under the schedule C concept.

Nature of party system

The genius of this country is political. That genius is expressed in our unique party system no less than in our unique Constitution. The distinguishing characteristic of American political parties is that they are nonideological—there are far greater differences of ideological position within each of the two great parties than there are between them. This characteristic has important implications for our political system. It means, among other things, that many conflicts are resolved within the framework of the parties themselves rather than in struggles between the parties.

In countries when parties are largely ideological, as in England, the conflicting ideological principles of the parties makes the resolution of issues difficult. Under our system where the differences are chiefly within and not between the parties, issues can be debated much more clearly in terms of their individual merits; precisely because the ideological factors are fuzzy they interpose fewer difficulties to the reaching of agreement. The American process is seldom neat and orderly and few interest groups are ever entirely satisfied with its results. But neither is any interest group ever wholly alienated. The American party system is probably the most effective means ever devised by man for handling the political problems of organized society.

Necessity for patronage

Under ideological party systems, the common interest of ideological position helps hold the party machinery together and keeps it functioning. Under the American system, some other unifying and sustain-

ing factor is necessary. Historically, this factor has been patronage.

I think we have failed in this country to appreciate this peculiar characteristic of the American political system. I think that in our enthusiasm for extending the scope of the merit system we have come dangerously close to denying our political parties the sustenance they need to retain their health and vitality.

We have been misled, I think, by false analogies between our and the English civil service systems. We have gone on the implicit assumption that if the merit system is good it should be continually expanded until, ideally, it covers all Federal employment. But we have failed to realize that the English can afford a universal merit system because their parties are ideological and consequently have little need for patronage whereas there is serious doubt that our parties could survive for long in their present form without adequate patronage. Many of the difficulties of the Republican Party today are directly traceable to what may be best described as 20 years of malnutrition.

In our indiscriminate pursuit of the ideal of a universal civil service we may have gone too far. I think we need to take another look at what we have done in terms of its implications for the party system.

Characteristics for political recruitment

Let me make this very clear: I am not suggesting we turn the clock back; I am not suggesting we expose either Government employees or the public to the evils of a revived spoils system. What I am proposing (and remember, I am speaking only for myself) is that we make a careful analysis of Federal employment for the purpose of identifying certain jobs whose nature is such that they can be filled without material loss of efficiency, and perhaps even with gains in efficiency, by the selection of applicants referred by the party in office.

I am not suggesting that such jobs be filled by Republicans simply because they are Republicans (or by Democrats simply because they are Democrats) but that they be filled by properly qualified persons referred by the political party in office. The emphasis, in other words, is not simply on party label but equally on fitness and capacity.

One requirement would be that jobs designated for this purpose be such that their effective performance would not be seriously impaired by fairly frequent turnover. Most of them should be in the field, close to the grassroots for these have by far the greatest political value. They should be the kind of jobs which lend themselves to efficient recruitment through the channels of party organization. For certain kinds of jobs, in fact, it should be possible to secure just as well qualified people through political referral sources as through competitive civil service examinations, often with a definite improvement in efficiency of recruitment and quality of selection.

Quite definitely, jobs designated for this purpose should not be those requiring specialized technical or professional skills; not only are such jobs of little value politically, but it is essential for orderly and efficient government that they be filled entirely without reference to political considerations. For the same reason, jobs involving special public trust, such as those in the Internal Revenue Service, should be excluded for it is essential that the public have confidence that the decisions of such officials are not susceptible to pressures of any kind, political or otherwise.

Other specifications, both of inclusion and exclusion, could be spelled out but these, I think, suggest the general approach.

Need for study

I shall not be so unwise at this time as to try to identify any specific jobs which

might be set aside in this kind of special reserve. It is the essence of my thought that the problem be studied very carefully with the needs of the party system in mind as well as the requirements of efficient management. I venture to suggest that in the interests of contributing to the strength and vitality of the party system we could afford to risk a slightly lower level of efficiency on certain kinds of work than we might otherwise try to achieve. On the other hand, I am convinced that if we have capable management, and if the jobs are properly selected for the specific purpose here in mind, filling them with applicants referred from political sources may well result in increased efficiency and better performance. The competitive civil service is not necessarily synonymous with maximum efficiency.

Also, let me be clear that I am not necessarily talking about a large number of jobs. Actually, the number which might remain outside the merit system might very well be no more than the total outside the merit system today. But they would be better distributed. They would be excluded from the merit system because they have characteristics which peculiarly fit them for this special purpose. Their status would be well-defined and the conditional tenure of their incumbents well understood.

Benefits to merit system

Such a program would not only greatly strengthen our very special party system, it would also be a boon to the merit system itself because it would channelize along safer lines the tremendous political pressures which otherwise build up whenever there is a change in the party in power.

We have seen something of such pressures during the past 2 years. You can be sure that they will recur with equal or greater force the next time there is a change in party. If these pressures are not relieved by wise and well-considered measures there is always the danger that they may reach a point where "something has to give," and the resulting explosion may do irreparable harm to the merit system.

There is no necessary conflict between the merit system and the selection of politically referred applicants. Both serve highly essential purposes, and their roles can be reconciled. The two are in conflict now because we have failed to take into proper account the very real—and, let me emphasize, legitimate—needs of the American party system. But this can be corrected by identifying certain carefully selected jobs and making it quite clear that there is nothing wrong in filling them with applicants referred by the party in office.

It should be made equally clear that appointments to all other jobs, except those in the schedule C category, would be made absolutely without reference to political considerations of any kind. By carefully distinguishing between the characteristics and methods of administering the two systems, they could work side by side in much greater harmony than now prevails and could serve their respective purposes much more usefully.

VI. REORGANIZATION OF PERSONNEL FUNCTIONS

I should like to turn now to another subject which likewise, I think, needs reappraisal. I refer to the need for more effective organization of the executive branch for efficient management of personnel, especially in the higher levels. I recognize that I am venturing onto controversial ground and repeat that the opinions expressed, whatever they may be worth, are entirely my own, and I accept sole responsibility for them.

Administrative difficulties

Many of the administrative difficulties of the Federal service have their origin in three main points:

1. The Civil Service Commission, over a period of years, has been called upon to per-

form two quite different and in many ways basically conflicting functions. On the one hand, the Commission is called upon to protect the interests of career employees; on the other, it is called upon to serve as the staff arm of the Chief Executive in personnel management matters. The first is an employee interest. The second is a management interest.

2. The President, as Chief Executive, is responsible for providing central leadership in the executive branch in personnel management. To date, however, no President has ever had an adequate staff for positive and progressive personnel management, nor one with full jurisdiction over all executive personnel matters.

3. Personnel management in the departments and agencies needs to be strengthened through strong central executive leadership within the framework of regulations established for the career service and through almost complete decentralization of authority and responsibility for actual personnel operations to the departments and agencies themselves.

Let me elaborate these points a little further.

Conflicting functions

First of all, the combining of two basically conflicting functions in the Civil Service Commission is an open invitation to schizophrenia. In this respect, the experience of private industry is illuminating. Some companies have established personnel departments for the stated purpose of representing the interests of workers to management and the interests of management to workers. Where serious efforts have been made to apply this concept, the results have been highly unsatisfactory to both workers and management, and the personnel director has usually wound up with a bad case of ulcers and thoroughly discredited on both sides.

It should be axiomatic that no single individual and no single agency can properly represent both management and workers. At some point the wholly legitimate requirements of management come into conflict with the wholly legitimate interests of workers, and regardless of whether the personnel director takes a stand on one side or the other or seeks to temporize, his effectiveness is lost and his influence dissipated.

Second, it seems to me essential that all functions involving central executive leadership in personnel management in the departments and agencies be vested in the Executive Office of the President and that the President be given a staff adequate to discharge his responsibilities in the important field of personnel management.

Realignment of responsibilities

This requires, in my opinion, a far-reaching realignment of responsibility for personnel functions. As I see it, the Civil Service Commission can best achieve its historic mission of establishing and maintaining a strong career service if it is relieved of responsibility for administrative operations and concentrates on providing the framework for the career service principally through (1) establishing appropriate regulations and standards for such a service, (2) inspecting personnel management activities in the agencies, and (3) adjudicating employee appeals. These functions are the very heart of establishing, maintaining, and protecting the career civil service.

A proper realignment of functions also requires, in my opinion, a strong executive personnel agency in the Executive Office of the President. The functions of such an office should be: (1) to develop and formulate general personnel policies within the framework of laws and regulations established by Congress and the Civil Service Commission, (2) to stimulate, assist, and review personnel management in the depart-

ments and agencies, and (3) to carry on certain types of personnel activities, especially those involving high-level executive positions, which can only be conducted effectively from the Office of the President.

Bureau of Personnel

Such an agency might be called appropriately the "Bureau of Personnel." It should be a part of the Executive Office of the President, should report directly to the President, and should have a status coordinate with the Bureau of the Budget.

Some of the functions which should be performed by the new Bureau of Personnel are now performed by the Civil Service Commission. Others are now performed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in his capacity as the President's Adviser on Personnel Management. Still others are now performed by a variety of individuals and offices scattered about in various places. Finally, some of the functions which should be performed in the interest of effective personnel management are not now being performed at all or are being performed only on a rudimentary level. Grouping all of these phases of personnel management into a single strategically located agency in the Executive Office of the President would unify and strengthen personnel management in the executive branch and provide the President the facility he needs for exercising leadership in this crucial area of governmental operations.

Progress in other areas of management

Such a realignment would be in keeping with the best developments in organization in the recent history of other phases of management. The Bureau of the Budget has been able to do a far more effective staff job for the President since its reorganization in 1939 and transfer from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President. Great improvements in administration have been achieved in a number of agencies through adoption of corporate forms of organization, business-type budgets, and comptrollership systems of controls. Accounting systems have been greatly improved under the joint accounting program of the Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the General Accounting Office, and commercial-type audits represent a big step forward over the traditional Government-type audits.

In a number of subject-matter areas, moreover, rulemaking, inspectional, and appellate activities have been separated from operating functions with a substantial improvement in organization and operations. I need only refer, for an example, to the very desirable clarification of functions and organization in the field of civil aeronautics, where we have a Civil Aeronautics Board (the CAB) to establish the framework of regulations for civil aviation activities and a Civil Aeronautics Administration (the CAA) to carry on necessary operations such as aviation safety, Federal airways operations, airport engineering, and the like.

Personnel arm of President

As I see it, the Bureau of Personnel in the Executive Office of the President would serve as the personnel arm of the President, with no confusion as to its orientation toward more efficient management practices. It would develop and formulate general policies within the framework of civil-service laws, regulations, and standards; and provide central leadership, assistance, and review for the personnel organizations and programs of the various departments and agencies in terms of the needs of efficient management.

The Bureau would engage only such activities as cannot be efficiently decentralized to operating departments and agencies. Personnel operations should be streamlined and decentralized to departments and agencies far more than they have up to the pres-

ent time, particularly in the field of recruitment, examination, and related matters. With more effective guidance from a Bureau of Personnel in the Office of the President, it could be expected that better personnel management would develop in the departments and agencies. The improvements thus achieved should in turn make possible a far greater delegation of authority and responsibility than perhaps would be wise at the present time.

In addition to providing strong leadership and guidance to operating departments and agencies in the executive branch, the Bureau of Personnel would perform various functions of a staff nature for the President. I need not catalog all the useful functions the Bureau might perform, but I would like to mention 1 or 2 which may be of special interest.

High-level executive placements

One of the most important of such functions is that of executive placement in high-level jobs of a policy-determining or policy-influencing nature. In general, these jobs are about equivalent in type and level to schedule C jobs and above. Jobs of this nature obviously have important implications not only from the standpoint of executive management but also from the standpoint of political relationships.

The first requirement for effective organization of any kind is that key positions be filled with people properly qualified to perform their tasks. A related requirement is that adequate means be provided to assure orderly replacement with equally competent people in face of the turnover that always takes place.

I have been struck, these past 2 years, not only with the great difficulty of securing properly qualified people for higher level Government positions but also with the problem of assuring effective utilization of the personnel available. An agency head, faced with the loss of one of his top officials, is in a very difficult position. He is an extremely busy man. The demands on his time and attention are such that he can give little thought to locating a good replacement, and the probabilities are strongly against the right man just happening to come along at just the right time. In consequence, many important positions are in danger of being filled on a basis of accident or expediency, and many good men are passed over merely because no one happens to think of them in a particular connection at a critical moment.

One of the primary functions of the Bureau of Personnel as I see it would be to provide an executive placement service to the President and to high officials of the Government. Suitable rosters should be developed and kept up to date of persons within the Government and of persons outside the Government who are well qualified for various types of key positions and who should be considered for them and if necessary persuaded to accept them. Very often, the person needed for a particular job is a most reluctant candidate indeed.

Optimum use of talent

Executive talent is always a scarce commodity, and one phase of the executive placement function should be to assure optimum use of the talent actually on hand. I am very sure that many of the people already serving in this administration are qualified for higher responsibilities than those they now hold. Means should be provided for identifying such people and for indicating the kinds of higher responsibilities for which they should be considered. The bureau of personnel should periodically appraise the work of all policymaking officials, not only to bring to light any hidden talents already on hand but to discover weaknesses and inadequacies which should be

corrected by replacement or other suitable administrative action.

With rosters thus developed, the Bureau of Personnel would be able to render a highly useful service to the President and to the heads of the various executive agencies. As vacancies occur, the director of the bureau could do the staff work of reviewing the qualifications of all potential candidates, both from within government and without. He could then present a small but highly select list to the agency head, who would make the final selection. Without in any way restricting the range of choice of the agency head or encroaching on his responsibility, a service of this kind would save him an appreciable amount of time and worry. And it would tend to greatly improve the quality of selections. The basis of selection would be considerably broadened and there would be greater assurance that the best qualified person available is actually appointed. The resulting improvement in management and direction of the key affairs of government could be very great indeed.

Orientation of new officials

One of the serious needs of Government is some more effectively organized means for instructing new high-level appointees on the problems they will face in taking over their new responsibilities. Any retail store on F Street does a better job of making sure that a new salesgirl gets a good start than does the Government with respect to a new assistant secretary. Every secretarial officer of this administration with whom I have talked has expressed the wish that some way, some how, he could have been warned about some of the pitfalls he had to discover the hard way or could have been given certain basic information about how government works and about how he could most effectively take hold of his new responsibilities.

The Bureau of Personnel, as I see it, would not only play a key role in the selection and appointment of new high-level officials, but would also be responsible for seeing that they get off to a good start.

Closely related to executive placement and orientation is executive training and development. The Bureau of Personnel should undertake to plan out and operate a governmentwide, interagency program of training and developing promising young executives for key positions in the future. Unless we do this, we are failing to make maximum use of the potential talent we already have available in the Federal service. Drawing on the experience of industry, I think it can be safely said that the only successful way to run such a program would be from the Office of the President.

College recruiting

Another function of the Bureau of Personnel should be the direction of college recruiting, on which the quality of future management depends in large degree. From my experience in private business, I know that we must keep a continuing influx of promising young college graduates each year, in order to maintain competent management. In the company to which I am about to return, it takes about 8 years to train a good store manager through various intermediate assignments and positions. The company relies heavily on recruiting able young college graduates each year. It knows from experience that if it fails to recruit sufficient trainees in any given year, it is in for trouble 8 years or 10 years later, when it will be looking for good store managers and can't find them to the extent it needs them.

Shocking deficiencies

On a conservative estimate—to my mind unrealistically conservative—about 8,000 new college graduates a year are needed in Government service. Currently, I understand, we are actually recruiting only about 2,000 a year. I can imagine what such a deficiency would do to a private industry; its

implications for the future competence of Government operations are shocking.

The Government's whole college recruiting program must be completely overhauled, with a view to competing more effectively with private business firms and professional organizations in attracting a better share of the cream of each year's crop of college graduates. This means, among other things, that we must be able to offer them not only a decent salary, but recruitment without burdensome procedural requirements. We must also provide a carefully managed program of opportunities to show what they can do, promotion as rapidly as they show their ability and as rapidly as they would be advanced in private industry, and reasonable protection from the vicissitudes of reductions in force and similar disturbances of tenure for a stated period of years (perhaps as long as 10), provided, of course, their performance and progress are satisfactory.

Strengthened functions

There are many other ways in which the Bureau of Personnel could strengthen personnel management in the executive departments and agencies. The main point is simply this: As a management agency, it should—and could—focus attention more sharply on the several problems with which government is faced in achieving efficient and economical personnel management. It should—and could—help us to distinguish mere tradition and form from real and current operating needs, and thereby help us to devise more realistic and effective solutions to our personnel problems.

I have tried to give some indication of the broad lines along which, in my view, the personnel activities of the Federal Government should be reorganized. I think our present arrangements are inadequate because conflicting roles and responsibilities have been allowed to grow up over the years within the Civil Service Commission which compromise it in its function as a regulatory agency and severely handicap it as a management arm of the President and the executive branch. I have tried to suggest a means for eliminating this conflict and for strengthening both functions. I do not expect ready acceptance of these proposals, but I hope they may provide a basis for further thought and discussion, out of which may come an effective solution for one of the really serious problems of government administration.

VII. CONCLUSION

I fear I have talked much too long. But I had some things I wanted to say, and I am grateful to you for providing me the occasion to say them.

I want to say only one thing further.

It has been a great privilege to serve under the leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary Weeks. It has been a great experience to be here in Washington these last 2 years. One of the fine things about that experience was getting to know the people in the Department of Commerce and people such as yourselves in this room with a common interest in the problems and the future of the Federal service. I shall think of you often. Good luck to you all.

Security of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which

appeared in the January 31, 1955, edition of the New Republic magazine.

This address, printed with some deletions for reasons of space, was made by former United States Senator Harry P. Cain, of Washington, and presently a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board:

SECURITY OF THE REPUBLIC

On January 15, 1955, Harry P. Cain, Senator from Washington from 1946 to 1952 and since then a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, addressed a meeting of Republicans in the Fifth Congressional District in Spokane. "I am here as a proud Republican," said Mr. Cain, "but I am speaking as one who feels that his basic allegiance is to the Nation."

Mr. Cain first praised the work of the Subversive Activities Control Board in terms we believe to be just. He then spoke of his six enjoyable but hectic years in the United States Senate. "Its only conceivable drawback," he noted, "was an exaggerated emphasis on work of every possible kind rather than an output of thought. I readily confess," he stated, "that I attempted to accomplish too much for too many people in too many directions all at once. In attempting all this I lost sight of some fundamentals which I have returned to focus during the past 2 years."

In presenting the reflection of 2 years Mr. Cain declared his willingness to live indefinitely under the conditions and demands imposed by the conflict against communism. He expressed his view that given intelligent world leadership the United States would eventually win this conflict. He cited as his major concern, whether at the conclusion of the conflict freedom and justice would govern the United States.

Promising that his address would not contain a single unreasonable, insupportable, or destructive political reference, Mr. Cain analyzed the fundamental problems raised by the Federal security program. With some deletions made for reasons of space this speech is printed below:

"No one among us denies that the present is an age of peril. Were we in disagreement about this, we could reach agreement about nothing.

"Most of those in authority in each political party refer to the present and the years of our immediate future to be an intended period of peaceful coexistence with our enemies. It makes me much more alert and less gullible to think of these years as being coexistence with conflict. Call these years what you will, they will be demanding of a national preparedness and readiness in the armed services, which will long continue the draft or some counterpart, on the farm and throughout industry, sufficient to call for hard sacrifices and participation by all of us.

"This knowledge doesn't bother or perplex me. I accept it willingly. Like you, I am not living in the past or in the future. We must contribute in some real measure to the age in which we live.

"As between our material strength and that of the Soviet Union, I see no particular hazards or defeat in store for the United States. I can only believe as I do that our present leaders and those to come will pursue every intelligent avenue for reconciling our differences with the leaders of international communism short of war. I must remain convinced, as I am, that we shall prevail and survive through any war which may be forced on civilization. In this sense and as a citizen, I have no fear of the Soviet Union whatsoever.

"My only major concern is with what we are to be when international communism's ambition for world domination has been defeated in one way or another. Will we or those who follow us be able to say after the conflict has run its course that through its years, even though they be a hundred, we

Americans and our Government have maintained and left untarnished our self-respect?

"Will we then be able to reassure the rest of the world that America remains a place in which the individual is free because his Government and those in authority in every walk of life have been just?

"As for myself, justice or equity and freedom or liberty are the two evidences of human progress and hope which distinguish representative governments and their peoples from those directed by tyrants, dictators, and despots. Other differences are only skin deep and hardly worth mentioning.

"I want no victory over the godless forces of oppression which does not include the preservation of these assets without which a free people die and wither away.

"Here we are confronted with the greatest challenge of our time. Now is when we must inquire about and make certain that in working to become victorious across the seas, we are permitting no domestic enemies or any acts of cowardice, shortsightedness, arrogance, or stupidity to assault or cripple our bastions of freedom here at home.

"How often do you hear it said that, because of our overwhelming fear of communism, we are blindly or blithely destroying the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? How often do you hear it said that muddleheaded if well-intentioned dreamers are so enamored of liberty in the abstract that we are doing too little or nothing meaningful in opposing the conspiracy which seeks to drive freedom from the earth?

"I listen each day to those who frantically espouse each of these premises. In my judgment, neither contention is even remotely correct, but there are far too many citizens who believe one or the other of these contradictory courses to be true.

"In our struggle to survive as free men and women, we must keep three elements in balance. They are justice, security, and freedom. It seems apparent to me that none of these elements can stand alone and that no two can operate successfully without the other.

"In the years of our past, we have lived by the dictates of freedom and justice. We have known what they were and we have long taken their blessings for granted. We can't say as much about internal security. In terms of time it is reasonable to say that our Nation didn't recognize the pressing need for an internal-security system prior to 1947, a mere 8 years ago.

"In March of 1947, our Nation departed from the more tranquil life and times of the past. A Government program was established to examine into the loyalty of those many individuals who serve the Federal Establishment as employees.

"This was followed by the Internal Security Act of 1950, which created the Subversive Activities Control Board and other domestic security activities. Then came the adoption of the Federal employees security program in April of 1953. As its predecessor loyalty program did, this program requires that every civilian employee or applicant for employment in the executive branch of the Government submit to an investigation for loyalty, but it goes much further than loyalty and considers a number of other factors like excess drinking, sex perversion, and bad company which affect the Nation's security. In addition to these far-reaching measures, the last, or 83d Congress, stiffened up most of the statutes dealing with espionage, counter-espionage, and sabotage. You may now, for example, be executed as a spy in peacetime.

"When you add all of this to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the Smith Act, various rulings by various Attorneys General, the continuing and vigilant activities of congressional investigative committees, and the investigative processes of the Civil Service Commission, you have in absolute fact today an internal security system of practi-

cally all-inclusive dimensions. With the exception of wiretapping authority, would you establish much more were you an autocratic ruler in our land?

"More than a year ago, when our present security system was but several months of age, the President said:

"In this country if someone accuses you, he must confront you; he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry will impose."

"In his state of the Union message, Dwight Eisenhower said what I believe he means literally:

"We shall [he said] ferret out Communist subversion while carefully preserving our traditions and the basic rights of our citizens."

"These assurances that justice will determine security decisions represent the only foundation strong enough to support a domestic security system for the United States. In no other fashion can we build a system we can trust or live with and any other system will shortly become identical with what we so rebel against in the Soviet Union and fought so hard against and vanquished so completely in Hitler's Germany.

"Let us never forget that in an effort to keep our Nation secure at home, we have constructed an apparatus which can destroy us if we don't watch out.

"Since April of 1953, the Nation has been living with Executive Order 10450, which looks into the loyalty and security reliability of millions of our citizens who are employed by or seek now and in the future to be employed by the Federal Establishment. The cornerstone or guide within this order is that no individual shall be employed by or work for the Government unless his or her retention is clearly consistent with the national interest.

"What have we learned out of this unique and new experience?

"The most encouraging lesson is an admission by many responsible persons in executive and legislative authority that we suffer most from a lack of experience with the security program we have created. I know but few who think the administration of the system has been adequate to the reasonable requirements of freedom. I know but few who believe the system is an adequate answer to the reasonable demands of internal security.

"I was impressed on Wednesday of this week when the District of Columbia Bar Association publicly announced that a special and continuing committee of its leading members has been established to provide legal representation for Government employees who become involved in security cases. This service will be provided without any cost whatsoever to those employees who are unable to obtain counsel of their own choosing or who are without funds to retain an attorney.

"But to be impressed by this development is not sufficient. Never before in our history has it been thought necessary to provide protection from the outside free of charge, for the individual against possible and unwarranted abuse and condemnation by his Government. If any steps will cause us to stop and think, this is it.

"My own considered view is that our security system has worked well and fairly on the average but that conspicuous and inexcusable examples to the contrary have occurred much too often. It isn't persuasive that we should be complimented because we seldom err. Our Nation can't long tolerate a system which doesn't soon eliminate the possibility for errors which are disastrous to anyone like you or me when they arise. I want you to think about three instances in which our internal security apparatus has failed completely in one respect or another

in its mission of balancing the requirements of freedom with the demands of security.

"The first: The case of Wolf Ladejnsky has the more recently been in the public's eye. In reflecting on this sad matter, I speak as a part of that 'outraged citizenry' to which Dwight Eisenhower made proper and pointed reference.

"The Ladejnsky case points up practically every weakness which we can find or trace in our prevailing security system. It includes evidences of the shortsightedness, ruthlessness, smugness, and brutality of bureaucracy at their worst.

"Wolf Ladejnsky was naturalized a citizen in 1928. He became a public servant for the Government in 1935 and has been on the Federal payroll ever since. During these 20 years, his written record of service has been noted for its reliability and competence and for his intelligent contributions to our Nation's fight against international communism. Ladejnsky was a powerful fighter in the forces against oppression and slavery long before many among us were conscious of the problem. In his years of service, no supportable question against Ladejnsky's loyalty was ever raised.

"So far as I know, Wolf Ladejnsky has never been faced by any accuser, nor has he been confronted with any charges. He became unwittingly a cause célèbre because some eager beavers and Johnny-come-latelys in our necessary effort to keep America strong couldn't take the time to talk with him or to relate the points in question to 20 years of a man's private and public life.

"Ladejnsky was saved because he had friends in high places who have known him intimately through the years and because nameless outraged citizens cried aloud in their indignation.

"It isn't everyone who can call on a Douglas MacArthur, a WALTER JUPP, and members of both parties in both Houses of the Congress. Men and women of smaller reputations might only consider themselves caught in a trap without knowing where to turn for help or an opportunity to state their case.

"I shed bitter tears for a political reason as well. The case of Wolf Ladejnsky hasn't been solved with finality. There has been no retraction or apology over his being labeled a security risk. Great agencies of our great Government proclaim the man's loyalty and need for his splendid services. Another equally great department is silent and seemingly content to let a cloud on a citizen's priceless reputation hang on.

"You will hear more about Wolf Ladejnsky. Your political opponents will demand, with justification, I can't deny, that a full explanation of the circumstances and details be spread on the public record. This was our job to undertake. We were the ones who blundered. It was for us to explain the manner in which the injustice and contradiction occurred in order that you citizens would be reassured that no similar injustice would happen again. The measure of our collective and individual character is always determined by the way in which we admit our weaknesses and by the steps we take to correct them.

"The second, Victor Havris, of Detroit, was a master sergeant stationed in Europe in 1953. At the age of 32 he had 14 years of loyal service behind. It was thought by someone that the young man's father had been a Communist. It was developed through a hearing conducted by an Air Force security board that Victor Havris, at the age of 12, had been taken by his father, now dead, to some Communist Party meetings. There was no evidence or charge that young Havris was a Communist or a fellow traveler or that he had ever attended any Communist gathering since he was 12 years old.

"Because of the disclosure that young Havris had been led by the hand of his

father to a Communist meeting, he was declared to be a security risk and faced dismissal from the Air Force.

"This recommendation was overruled by a special board which was appointed to re-examine the case. A Democratic Congressman from Michigan was the one who prevailed upon the Air Force to delay and re-examine its dismissal decision.

"The third: Milo J. Radulovich was a first lieutenant in the Air Force who was not on active duty when questions about his being a security risk were raised in 1953. No doubt about his loyalty was intimated publicly. The case against Radulovich, who was a physics student at the University of Michigan under the GI bill of rights, was based on accusations that his father, John Radulovich, had read pro-Communist publications and that his sister, Mrs. Margaret Fishman, had marched as a picket in pro-Communist demonstrations.

"For these reasons, ouster proceedings were initiated against Milo Radulovich. This intended action was concurred in by the board of three colonels who first heard the case and by every staff level until the question was laid before the Air Force Secretary.

"When Milo Radulovich, age 26, heard that his reputation had been restored by the Air Force Secretary, he said: 'It's just like having your future handed back to you. Just to say thanks isn't enough. I never expected it; I'm kind of bowled over.'

"It's time that we begin to worry when a young American, age 26, expresses surprise that he was dealt with justly by his Government.

"I now offer to you some recommendations and suggestions which perhaps are durable and lasting in their value.

"(a) There is a pressing need for the adoption of some method which will guarantee that important or unreconcilable differences between heads of departments in the loyalty and/or internal security fields will be referred for decision to a higher authority.

"No internal security system can become effective, understandable, or reasonable unless its standards and the procedures for implementing them are national standards.

"In the Ladejinsky affair, one standard was advanced by the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration while a fundamentally contradictory standard was supported by the Agriculture Department. This incredible result bewildered employees throughout the Government and confused people within our country and all around the world.

"If there isn't one national policy which is advocated and supported from the very top, there can't be any system or understanding or order at all.

"The higher authority in question could be the Chief Executive or some high-ranking official to whom such a task is assigned or to a commission which certainly would include within it private citizens for whom the Nation has the fullest measure of respect and confidence in their characters and judgment.

"(b) We must employ a more meticulous care in the selection of security officers. Because of the scope and newness of the problem, some are assigned to judge others who are simply not qualified for these most difficult of all assignments.

"Above all else, the Nation's need is for security personnel who can tell the difference between disloyalty and nonconformity; between treason and heresy.

"Every Government worker must be loyal and reliable but there is no reason why they must be rigidly orthodox in their thinking. There is every reason to encourage the iconoclast as well as the conformist to serve the Republic on the public payroll you taxpayers support.

"Whether in or out of Government, the orthodox mind, because of its strength and

singleness of purpose, maintains and preserves progress, but the dreamer and the nonconformist make progress. The opportunity to be different, while being strictly loyal, is a climate we ought to take pains to develop.

"I consider the security officer to be the cornerstone in our fight to remain strong and free. Any misfits or second-raters among them are more dangerous to our future than the subversives they endeavor to catch. These are the people who indict the innocent without reason and overlook the guilty for lack of knowledge, training, and experience.

"Were I appointing a security officer, I would select no one whose background didn't include a sound and wide knowledge of the theoretical advance and practice of communism since the times of Karl Marx and this same individual would be required to have an equal knowledge and understanding of our Constitution, its Bill of Rights, the movements which produced the Declaration of Independence, and the history of the United States.

"(c) Under Executive Order 10450, the function of a security hearing board is to conduct hearings on security cases and offer their decisions to the head of a given agency for him to accept or reject as he thinks best.

"The members of these hearing boards are generally chosen from the top level of the administrative working force. The rather large number whom I know personally are conscientious, competent and desirous of being fair.

"Their liabilities are few, but important. They have no tenure of office and they lack a feeling of independence because they are subordinates and subject to the directions of superiors. Another sizable fault is that a majority of them have had no previous experience with hearings and the kind of testimony with which these hearings deal.

"These security hearing board members lay no claim to being professionals. They started as rank amateurs and it will take time for some to learn their new business and longer for others. I can only recognize their inexperience to be a perplexing problem. I constantly wonder whether professional hearing examiners could better keep the balance we seek between security and justice.

"(d) It might be advantageous to separate the personnel function from the function of internal security. It often happens that the job-suitability interviewer or the processor of personnel forms is called upon to make at least a preliminary judgment on questions of loyalty and security.

"Why shouldn't the interviewer or processor pigeonhole an application which indicates that the applicant has been a member of organizations alleged to be subversive? These organizations may not be subversive or perhaps they weren't before they went out of business years ago. No one is likely to encounter any future trouble by shelving a troublesome-looking application. Many a personnel officer will react to security questions as he would to poison. He wants none of either.

"Too much has been said about Government employment being a privilege and not a right. Of course, it's a privilege. Why labor the obvious? All an applicant is entitled to is a fair and impartial break. He or she does have that right to be judged competitively and fairly on their job qualifications. Their security status could be judged subsequently by an authority in that field.

"We must be alert always to avoid procedures, forms and attitudes which stimulate the advancement of mediocrity in any way within the Federal structure.

"(e) We must increasingly learn to tailor security to the job. An individual may be unsuited for the strictness of security demanded by a particularly sensitive assign-

ment. This does not necessarily imply that the individual couldn't fill many other important assignments with credit to himself and the Government. Our operations and the living in the past never called for such an exercise of good judgment as does the present. If this were Russia, we wouldn't bother much about this exercise. Because we live in America, we must be bothered constantly.

"(f) The basic criterion in Executive Order 10450 ought, I think, to be reexamined in the light of every development in the last 20 months.

"This criterion, that an accused applicant or employee must meet the test that his employment is 'clearly consistent with the interest of the United States' would and does, where literally applied, constitute a burden which can hardly be borne by anyone. It almost makes the employee affirmatively prove that the national interest requires the retention or continuation of his services. Who among us could do that?

"I believe that the phrase 'clearly consistent' has been the source of much of our trouble and that the cases previously referred to, and others like them, were instigated by it.

"'Clearly consistent' can easily be construed to mean without doubts, real or fancied, of any kind. It can be read to mean that pure hearsay or malicious gossip or unsupported allegations constitute doubts to be resolved in favor of the Government. To my knowledge it has been so read.

"Such an interpretation implies that a domestic system of absolute security is both desirable and possible. In point of logic and commonsense, it cannot be either possible or desirable.

"Any system through which men and women are judged must provide the judges with room for judgment and discretion.

"Instead of the rigidity of 'clearly consistent' we might better work toward the latitudes included in language like this:

"'No person should be dismissed or denied employment from the Federal service as a security risk unless it is affirmatively found that his retention or employment is reasonably inconsistent with the national interest.'

"I am not suggesting that an established doubt should not be resolved in favor of the Government. It should be so resolved. What I am suggesting, and what our Nation ought to demand, is that the doubt about an individual be first established before it is resolved against him.

"Let the Government judges assume their rightful responsibility for establishing their doubts about any individual to be valid and most of the fear and skepticism concerning our security system would disappear overnight.

"In expressing this conviction, I am thinking about you and what you are entitled to should you endeavor to join or remain within the Federal establishment.

"(g) The general public has a tendency to consider loyalty and security as being one and the same thing. That doesn't follow. A loyal person can be a security risk and a security risk can be truly loyal. Obviously, a disloyal person is a risk.

"We should, I believe, be more specific in our use of the term 'security risk.' Drunkards, perverts, drug users, gossipers, and those who insist on keeping bad company may well be security risks while being loyal. We ought to make this distinction clear. When a person is fired as a risk, the reason for their being so considered ought to be stated.

"A person who drinks too much can often recover from that indiscretion and build a new life—if given a chance. The risk dismissed for being disloyal will remain disgraced for life.

"Here again we should be trying to strengthen our Federal structure without

unnecessarily destroying individuals in the process.

"Espionage agents will be found among the disloyal. These are the ones we ought to try the hardest to discover. When we do, we ought to execute them. Risks who are otherwise loyal will not often be found in this category. We ought to treat them accordingly—without needless embarrassment or harassment.

"A while clique of spies could hardly do as much damage to us as could our failure as a government to have confidence in our people. Any government, to deserve to survive, must deserve the respect of its citizenry. A government is under no compulsion to be less severe in punishing crimes against the state, but that government is under every compulsion to extend consideration and just treatment to every citizen. He or she must be treated as what they actually are—the fiber and substance from which a free nation derives its strength and purpose.

"Some wise man in the early days of our beginning, perhaps it was Franklin, said: 'I give you a Republic if you can keep it.'

"That's what I've tried to talk about, as a citizen—how to keep it."

Moral Treason in East-West Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, early in the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 1, both Mr. Charles E. Wilson and Mr. Harold E. Stassen declared themselves in support of American trade with the areas of the Russian Communist empire. Their reasoning and motives on behalf of Red trade are still very vague and cloudy, and should be the object of challenge on the part of every Member who appreciates the resultant political perils that would beset us in the event that the current campaign for American participation in East-West trade should succeed.

The testimony of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, before the Ways and Means Committee on this crucial issue, sets forth the major reasons for our rejection of the Wilson-Stassen proposal. It challenges the Red trade advocates to justify the often used distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods in relation to the totalitarian economy of the Russian Communist empire, and clearly demonstrates the moral and political qualities of the Red trade proposal. Moreover, it points out the foolhardiness of the so-called Benson plan now being considered for virtually dumping American surplus foodstuffs behind the Iron Curtain of the Communist empire.

Every Member should carefully read the contents of this testimony and seriously consider its recommendations concerning this issue. To serve this objective, I insert this statement in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MORAL TREASON IN EAST-WEST TRADE

(Testimony of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

In these concluding moments of the hearings I deem it a privilege to be given this opportunity to testify on certain vitally important aspects of H. R. 1—the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955—which, by way of contrary opinion, have been alluded to in the testimonies of two members of the administration who appeared before this committee in the initial stages of its proceedings. Proper and sound consideration of these elements is so crucial to the strategic interests of our country that the rationally ordered points of a program of action as submitted below cannot be too strongly emphasized.

Because of the patent need of concentrating our studied attention on these fundamental aspects, it is not my purpose here to elaborate any personal observations or opinions on the overall advisability of the legislation now being considered. However, I would like to point out that extreme care and caution should be taken in pursuing a legislative course that suggests at this time the adoption of a national policy directed at a general reduction and eventual elimination of tariffs. The criteria for the judicious exercise of this care are surely not to be found in the counting of proponents and opponent noses nor in the relative amounts of high-sounding clichés, which often shield much fallacious argumentative content, nor even in comparative sets of particularist statistics presented as "proofs" of given points. Instead, ultimately they can only reside in certain rationally formed guides of thought attuned to a synthetic approach to the problem of expanded free world trade in the historical circumstances that surround us today.

At this point I should like to submit for the record and the careful examination of the members of this committee a compact readable summary—the free trade ideal—of studies which I had undertaken in the intelligible light of this flexible approach. Furnishing an economic rationale of the tariff as an effective instrument of countervailing power to conserve the multiple sources of our expansive domestic (regional) activity, it treats of all the essential arguments that have doubtlessly been presented here in support of this bill, and also explains fully the grounds underlying the opinion stated above.

THE IMPLICATION OF EAST-WEST TRADE

From the viewpoint of a total politico-economic understanding of this measure, what is by far more serious and perilous than the somewhat uncertain general effects of steadily reduced tariffs is its couched implication of East-West trade. This implication in what is loosely characterized as trade liberalization has already been underscored for public notice by two testifying members of the administration, and its ominous ramifications in the entire area of American foreign relations, jeopardizing the very posture of American world leadership, are exceedingly grave matters that should be of the utmost concern to this committee in the final formulation of this bill. For not only are the arguments offered in support of such trade specious in character, not only is the general understanding upon which they rest adequate cause for heavy doubt toward other kindred opinions of these advocates, but also, perhaps most outstanding of all, their self-contradictory position partakes by its own nature of moral treason itself.

The naive tendencies reflected in the reasoning of these East-West trade advocates are reminiscent of the politico-economic mentality that prevailed during the UNRRA period. In sharp contrast, however, at no

time can they be found in the maneuvers of Moscow which consistently regards trade, along with almost everything else, as a weapon designed to serve its higher goals of Communist aggression. To our long-run detriment it would most advantageously employ this weapon in order (a) to secure basic consumer goods for the relief of its troubled areas in the empire now undergoing genocidal consolidation, (b) to exploit commercial media for the further expansion of its conspiratorial activity, (c) to intensify the economic dependence of free nations on Communist sources of supply, and (d) to facilitate the further allocation of resources for war preparations. At this very moment, for example, the passive resistance of courageous peasants in Hungary, Ukraine, Poland, and elsewhere are reaping some measure of harvest in economic and political concessions as a result of the widespread food problem in the Russian Communist Empire. Are we intent upon relieving Moscow of these growing pressures from within by supplying it with foodstuffs through trade and, in effect, cooperating with it to stifle the sources of patriotic resistance in the empire?

THE FALLACY OF STRATEGIC AND NONSTRATEGIC GOODS

The main notion by which the Red trade advocates seek to justify their patently vague statements and position is the distinction drawn between strategic and nonstrategic goods.¹ The evidence shows that in almost every instance they appear to be hard put as to where the clear line of demarcation exists. The fundamental truth of the matter is that with reference to a totalitarian economic environment, such as the Russian Communist empire, which enjoys an unusual degree of shiftability of human and material resources, this distinction is a crass fallacy. As every competent observer of this empire knows, its environment has been and will doubtlessly continue to be a species of war economy. Consequently, regardless of the type of good, any degree of importation bears strategic importance to the overall planning of this chronic war economy, and where consumer goods are involved, be they foodstuffs or manufactured items, the general economic plan for sustained political Communist aggression, both within and outside the empire, is easily implemented through the reallocation of resources.

By ignoring this simple principle of elementary economics are we preparing to plunge foolhardily into a scheme that might well eventually seal our own doom? This fallacious distinction has served as a smoke-screen for the trading activities of some of our major allies whose long record in international relations is punctuated by the absence of moral principle, not to speak of pragmatic foresight, where transient economic gain is easily realizable. Judging by the prepared trend of thought on the part of some of our own officials, one can venture to say that in the event of so-called liberalized trade in the free world, this smoke-screen will be rationalized on grounds other than ostensibly limited markets in the free areas. Aside from the paramount fact that both the free and unfree peoples of the world hold us in esteem for the moral and political principles that have shaped our great tradition, pragmatic prudence alone should recall to us the historical lesson that twice in this century the morally indefensible policies of our two major allies have led them to the brink of national disaster, only to be saved by our intervention. These policies have not changed; indeed, they are gradually contaminating ours, but who in the end can save us?

Footnotes at end of speech.

MORAL TREASON IN EAST-WEST TRADE

The very premise of the distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods exposes the advocates of Red trade to the charge of moral treason. If one soberly reflects for a moment on this, the only premissal reason for the distinction, fallacious as it is in itself, is that we do not regard Moscow and its empire as a friendly political unit. Many declarations of our President and Secretary of State clearly define it as a potential military enemy and an active moral and political enemy. The facts bearing this out are overwhelming, and in the language of any rational person, trading with an enemy is treason.

Flimsy comments from officials or private lips as to what are strategic or non-strategic goods will remain only as arbitrary utterances until adequate logical and moral grounds of justification for the distinction itself are provided. I venture to say there are none. Moreover, when it is argued, in the words of one Cabinet Member appearing before this committee, that Red trade "will help the peoples of those countries to eliminate their antagonism or their fear of our country, and establish some friendly relations with them . . .," then we can really begin to wonder as to the state of knowledge and understanding on the part of some of our officials regarding the Russian Communist empire. Apparently they have not yet read the monumental, authoritative reports of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression to begin to appreciate the factually founded distinction between the puppet governments of Moscow and the captive peoples of the various enslaved nations who embrace nothing but hope, trust, and friendship for our country. Trade will aid their tyrannical masters in deepening the roots of their captivity, not them in their hope of eventual liberation.

BUTTER FOR GREASING THE IRON CURTAIN,
NOT FOR MANGANESE

It is significant that in the course of the committee's questioning on what constitutes a nonstrategic good, the item of butter was first and exclusively raised in reply. Indeed, the additional remarks of the two testifying administration members give credence to the speculation that the administration is favorably considering what has come to be known as the Benson plan on food surpluses, which, in the initial case of butter, calls for virtual dumping in the Russian Communist empire. There is also growing evidence of an organized effort to push the immoral cause of Red trade along these lines and to inveigle the support of farm groups in an appeasement scheme accommodating the fixed dependence of our agricultural surplus problem on continuous Communist purchasing. The subsidization of Communist guns with United States butter would only be the start before the plan takes on cumulative impetus.

What convolutions of thought mixed with questionable motives have produced this weird concoction of politico-economic enterprise, it is not easy to say, except, perhaps, that the opiate of peaceful coexistence is already having effect. A rational person would point to the many friendly peoples in impoverished areas of the free world where our surplus food would be most gratefully received, but it appears that aid to the Kremlin in solving its serious farm production problem and contributing to its empire consolidation efforts takes precedence.

We have been wasting our many moral, political and diplomatic weapons in this struggle with an enemy who is admittedly bent upon our destruction, and now our economic weapons are to be brought into disuse with the initial bonanza of manganese for butter. The fact that numerous Communist goods are mined and processed by slave labor seems to be of no consequence

in the accounting of the Red trade advocates. How one could reconcile these trade proposals with professions of faith in the eventual liberation of the captive peoples in the slave half of the world is, to put it mildly, incomprehensible. Indeed, a true adherence to such faith should impel us to utilize our surplus butter in greasing the hinges of the Iron Curtain in order to open it wide for carefully selected American distribution teams, accompanied by a corps of newsmen, with complete freedom of disposition among the peoples. By this humanitarian program, restricted to this item, we would be confirming their real faith and loyalty in us rather than supposedly eliminating through misdirected trade some mythical antagonism or fear of our country.

RECOMMENDED STEPS ON H. R. 1

In the light of this statement and its major treatment we earnestly urge (a) that a clear and unmistakable separation of trade issues between the slave Communist world and the free world be made and (b) that a prohibition be specified against any trade whatsoever with the Russian Communist empire, which would prevent the execution of such ventures as the so-called Benson plan. In acting upon these recommendations this august committee would be translating into positive action some of the remarkable findings of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression which the Congress in its preceding session saw fit to establish for purposes like these. In short, you would be translating into the body of this legislation the spirit of morality and unblemished political principles that still animate the soul of every American patriot and captivate the imagination of the peoples of the world.

¹ e. g., Hon. Charles E. Wilson, statement before House Ways and Means, Jan. 18, 1955, p. 5; answers of Hon. Harold E. Stassen in exchange with Representative H. Boggs, Jan. 19, 1955, committee record.

² Hon. C. E. Wilson in exchange with Representative KARSTEN, committee hearings.

Extension of the Sugar Act of 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the following memorial from the Montana Legislature calls attention to the need for prompt consideration of the extension of the Sugar Act of 1948 which expires next year.

Legislation is necessary during the current session of Congress so that the sugar industry can go ahead with its current operations and future plans with a minimum of uncertainty. If the act is not extended in 1955, sugar beet farmers will not know at planting time what the provisions of the Sugar Act will be at the time they market their crops. In the past 50 years the sugar beet growers have more than doubled their beet yield per acre and tripled their sugar yield. This has been accomplished by farm management and modernization programs making the best use of long range scientific investigations. Continuation of these worthy programs make the need for action this year necessary.

But, as the memorial points out, exten-

sion of the act is not enough. The new quotas must recognize the increased consumption and increased demand and give American sugar producers, both beet and cane, an additional share of this new market.

Demand has increased by a million tons since the last passage of the Sugar Act. This demand is continuing to increase at the rate of 100,000 tons per year. Yet the quota for domestic producers is the same as it was in 1948. In revising the quotas the American producers must be given an additional share in this new demand.

The various sugar acts since 1934 have been good for our Nation, the market has been stabilized and production has been kept plentiful enough so that the industry and the consumer alike have benefited.

We import more than half of the sugar we consume. We are sharply curtailing the production of crops of which we have a domestic surplus and which we need to support. I find it hard to justify curtailment of acreages of a crop where our domestic production only meets half of our national needs. The Montana Legislature declares that it is in the national interest for us to immediately renew the Sugar Act and to provide the American sugar beet growers with their just and equitable share of the market which the increased consumption and growth of the Nation has provided. I am sure that Congress will also find it in the national interest.

The memorial follows:

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senators of Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and ORVIN B. FJARE, Representatives in Congress from Montana, and to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States requesting Sugar Act of 1948 be continued in force and the quota of domestic beet sugar be increased.

Whereas under the Sugar Act of 1949 sugar marketings from domestic areas of the United States and its territories are limited to 4,444,000 tons of a total present national consumption of 8,200,000 tons; and

Whereas these fixed quotas established for our own domestic production have no regard for increases in the population, and

Whereas foreign areas, principally Cuba, have been allotted all of the increase in sugar consumption resulting from population increase, or other factors, which consumption requirement as determined by the United States Department of Agriculture increased from 7,200,000 tons for the calendar year 1948 to 8,200,000 tons for the calendar year 1955, and may be expected to continue to increase at a rate of more than 100,000 tons per year, and

Whereas the domestic producers in Montana and in other States are as a result restricted in their privilege to grow sugar beets and sugar cane as indicated particularly in the determination of proportionate shares allotted to Montana sugar beet growers for 1955 crops to a total of only 50,980 acres, which has reduced such acreage permitted to be planted by 8.7 percent from the acreage actually planted during the preceding year of 1954 and has created hardship on the farmers of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring) That the Sugar Act of 1948 be continued in force but that the quota of do-

mestic beet sugar be increased to the extent it will have a fair and equitable share of the increased consumption and in the additional sugar required to meet the growth of the Nation and the needs of its people; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States of America, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressman LEE METCALF, Congressman ORVIN B. FJARE, and to the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

GEO. M. GOSMON,
President of the Senate.
LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 5, 1955.

J. HUGO ARONSON,
Governor.

The Admission of Scientists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill relating to the admission into the United States of scientists and others, in an attempt to eliminate restrictions placed upon them which have caused serious loss to the body of our scientific information and to the enrichment of our cultural life.

Defects in the present procedures for the issuance of nonimmigrant visas have prevented the participation of aliens in meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States—such as scientific, scholarly, trade, and industrial conferences, employment in temporary research positions and the conduct of commercial, industrial, or professional transactions. The contribution of such aliens to the advancement of scientific and scholarly knowledge by their participation in such meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States is essential to the national defense and the furtherance of the industrial, technological, and cultural leadership of the United States. Such aliens are invited to such meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States by learned institutions and societies of national renown who, by their invitation, vouch for the character and learning of such aliens. Such meetings, conferences, temporary employment, and other transactions in the United States do not involve access to information the dissemination of which would prejudice national security.

The importance of the contribution of such aliens has, heretofore, not been sufficiently recognized in the procedure for the issuance of nonimmigrant visas to such aliens.

The text of the bill which I have introduced is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (a) 15 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 169; 8 U. S. C. 1101) is amended by addition of the following paragraph:

“(J) An alien having a residence in a foreign country which he has no intention of abandoning, who is invited by an institution, organization, or governmental agency, to take part in a scientific, technological, artistic, sport, or other cultural conference or meeting in the United States, or to occupy temporarily a teaching or research position at an institution of learning or research, or to take part in an industrial, technological, scientific, or cultural transaction which is temporary in nature: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall establish and maintain in consultation with the Office of Education of the United States and make public from time to time a list of such institutions, organizations, or governmental agencies, which may, under regulations issued by the Attorney General, invite such alien, and which shall have agreed to the Attorney General the termination of attendance or visit of such alien.”

SEC. 2. Section 212 (d) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended to read as follows:

“(2) The provisions of paragraph (28) of subsection (a) of this section shall not be applicable to any alien who is seeking to enter the United States temporarily as a non-immigrant under paragraph (15) (A) (iii) or (15) (G) (v) or (15) (J) of section 101 (a).”

Another Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, there has been nationwide comment in the American press on the remarks of our able Democratic leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Boston, with reference to his opposition to proposed cuts in our Army manpower.

As one who has long been an advocate of a strong national defense, I am more than happy to have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD the editorial which appeared in the Boston Traveller on Friday, February 11, 1955, which clearly states the views of Mr. MCCORMACK:

ANOTHER LOOK

When House Democratic Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, says he thinks the administration should take another look at the proposed Army manpower cuts, he is voicing an opinion shared by large segments of both major parties.

“It could be a terrible thing for our country,” says MCCORMACK, “if the President is wrong.”

It would be terrible indeed. It would be tragic, and it could be fatal.

At the present time there are about 3 million men in the Armed Forces. The administration plan is to cut this figure down to about 2,850,000 by next year, with most of the cut in the Army.

There has been quite a lot of argument about this proposed cut, with most of the opposition coming from Army Chief Gen. Matthew Ridgway.

But this week President Eisenhower had assumed full responsibility for the decision and it appeared that the cut was going through.

In all fairness to President Eisenhower, we think he is the man most capable of making the decision, and we're glad he had the courage to do so.

But it is also true that the President worked out this policy on the basis of world conditions as they were several months ago.

Since that time a very critical situation has developed at Formosa and there has been a world-shaking change of command in the Kremlin.

The logical question that Representative MCCORMACK and his colleagues are asking now is: “Do these events make a difference in our manpower needs?”

The President and his advisers say “No.” MCCORMACK and his group say they don't really know, but that they think a reappraisal is justified.

This request for a reappraisal seems reasonable, and the administration has nothing to lose by granting it.

The one thing that most observers agree on about the Kremlin shakeup is that it forecasts a tougher and more militant Russia. It's a new ingredient that should be added to our manpower policy before a final decision is made.

Twenty-three Years of Experience With Our First Socialist Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, we have had 23 years of experience with our first socialist experiment—that much-touted TVA. I have been criticized for characterizing TVA as socialistic. However, my opinion conforms with that of the authorities. The Chattanooga (Tenn.) Times of February 15, 1934, quotes Norman Thomas as saying:

The TVA is the only genuinely socialistic act (in the New Deal)—a flower in the midst of weeds.

TVA is owned and operated by the United States Government; that is to say, TVA is a communal of public-owned property acquired by taking private property amounting to \$2 billion mostly from the people of 41 States, for the alleged communal benefit of the people in parts of 7 other States. Such immoral taking of private property never fails in the end to blight a people who take it. The proof is already apparent in Tennessee. She has suffered a reduction in production and commerce and, therefore, in the well-being of her people since the advent of TVA.

The United States Chamber of Commerce has compared Tennessee with 10 Southeastern States which use private power. In 1930, before the advent of TVA, the population of Tennessee ranked fourth among the 10 States. In 1950 she still ranked fourth.

In 1933, just a year prior to operation of TVA, the receipts from farm marketing ranked Tennessee fifth, while in 1950 she dropped to eighth place.

The retail sales payroll in 1935 put Tennessee in third place; in 1948 she had dropped to fifth place.

Retail sales in 1929 had Tennessee in second place; in 1948 she had dropped to fifth.

In value added by manufacture Tennessee ranked third in 1933; fourth in 1947. In gross postal receipts she ranked third in 1933; down to fourth in 1951.

In all the categories examined Tennessee has fallen behind in productivity. In only one area has Tennessee improved her rank among her neighboring States and that was in per capita income and per capita taxes paid. But that increase was caused by subsidies and doles paid by the United States Government; not from improved production. One hundred and eight million dollars have gone down there annually mostly from other States to pay 22,796 TVA employees an average of nearly \$5,000 apiece plus millions in doles granted by the Federal Government. Without the Federal payroll and subsidies and doles Tennessee would not have enjoyed an increase in per capita income but would have suffered a serious decline. She is now a taxeater and not a growing tax producer as compared to the other States.

The most startling failure of TVA is that it does not produce sufficient power for the people it serves. So TVA never will be able, selling electricity at half price, to earn enough to expand to meet the need of a growing community. That's why Tennessee growth is slowed up. There is a shortage. What value is low-priced electricity when it cannot be had at any price? This is the universal characteristic of socialism everywhere.

Besides all this, TVA is completely exempt from all taxes. It does not contribute a dime to national defense, not even toward the salaries of the President and the Congress that does all these nice things for it. Finally, TVA was made ashamed by the complaints of the local people in the adjoining municipalities that educated the TVA children, provided police and streets and hauled away their garbage free of taxes to them. So TVA condescended to volunteer to make a contribution of about a tenth of what it should toward the expenses it had thrust on its neighbors. But it way decide to quit at any time.

Had TVA paid taxes at the same rate paid by private power companies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, such taxes would have amounted to about \$80 million; resulting in a loss in operations of about \$57 million. If TVA were required to pay interest on the appropriations granted it by Congress that loss would have been increased by another \$24 million, which figure does not include the \$10 million more for amortization. Thus if TVA were run as an honest business enterprise, its books on June 30, 1953, would not show a credit balance of \$19 million but a deficit balance of \$91 million. Yet, even with that deficit representing a subsidy paid by the Nation's taxpayers, the TVA system cannot produce enough cheap power to satisfy the demands of the consumers it was designed to serve.

There is no similar shortage of power in other parts of the country where private companies are the suppliers. The reason for this is that the private power companies, being run on sound and

honest business principles, have anticipated the increased demand for electrical energy. At this time the private power companies are undertaking a \$2.5 billion expansion program of their facilities.

The original excuse for the law creating TVA, viz, to control floods and to aid navigation on the Tennessee River, has turned out to be a joke and a fraud of extensive proportions. Instead of stopping floods it has actually permanently flood 660,000 acres—an area as big as Rhode Island—out of a million acres it owns and controls. This great Tennessee River bottom, according to Army engineers, would not seriously flood more than once in 500 years. The bottom lands did sustain some overflow in the spring, as most river-bottom lands do. It benefited the land by leaving a fertile sediment. Crops thrived. Annual production was about \$27 million. That is now all destroyed, and there is water, water everywhere.

Let us not dwell in detail on alleged improved navigation by deepening the Tennessee River, except to say that this was also a device to hide vast sums that should have been charged to cost of power. As a navigation scheme it has failed because it is cheaper to ship by rail.

There is another loss that is even more important than the \$2 billion that have been poured into this monumental blight of Tennessee and drain on the other States. The people of Tennessee lost their political freedom when they became dependent on TVA. Their Governor is compelled to come to Washington, hat in hand, predicting dire consequences for his people if the dole is shut off. The people of Tennessee must live under whatever rules Congress promulgates and those rules affect not only the rates charged for power, but touch every aspect of the State's economy as has been pointed out. They have lost their productivity. They may not buy power elsewhere as private companies are excluded from the TVA reservation. They have lost their economic freedom, their know-how to provide power for themselves—competition is dead. In the words of Herbert Hoover:

They have surrendered the control of their resources and energy to a Federal bureaucracy.

TVA cuts the price of power to a loss figure so as to buy the votes and support of its consumers in the rankest kind of political corruption. It exempts itself from taxation and by more political corruption forces its competitors to pay approximately 23 cents out of every dollar to help pay taxes TVA customers should pay but do not.

Even the little schoolboys now define TVA as "a river that flows through 7 States and drains 41." They were drained again in 1954 for the 22d year. TVA will be coming up to the public trough again in 1955. But Tennessee knows that no scheme to buy votes as crazy and incredible as TVA can last. This administration has already given fair warning. So Mr. Robert M. Metcalf, Jr., vice president of Guaranty Mortgage & Trust Co., of Memphis, Tenn., comes up with this remedy.

He suggests that the power-generating facilities of TVA be sold to the people in the area which it serves. This would result in relief for the taxpayers of the remainder of the Nation and at the same time give to the people of the TVA reservation exclusive control over the agency upon which they are completely dependent for their power. Perhaps even more important than these immediate tangible gains, is the fact that such a sale would represent a reversal of the largest, most clear-cut Socialist step the United States has ever taken.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, February 13, 1955, the Worcester, Mass., Lithuanian organizations celebrated Lithuanian independence day with an appropriate program held in the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, at 12 Vernon Street.

Guest speakers included Petras Viscinis, of Brockton, Mayor O'Brien, and Withold A. Bernot, president of the Lithuanian Naturalization Club.

Rev. Justin Steponaitis, curate at Our Lady of Vilna Church, gave the invocation.

Represented on the committee in charge of the celebration were the following organizations: Lithuanian Aid Association, Branch 1; Lithuanian Citizens' Club; American Lithuanian "Sandara," Branch 16; Lithuanian "Bendruomone," Worcester Branch; "Ateitininkia" Alumni; St. Casimir's Society; Lithuanian Women's Club; Lithuanian American Alliance, Branch 57; St. George's Society; Old Folks Aid Society, and St. Ludwig's Society.

The members of the celebration committee were: Mykolas Zemaitaitis, president; Pranas Paulinkonis, Vincas Mitrikas and Lionginas Leknickas, vice presidents; Jonas Palubeckas, secretary; Povilas Babickas, financial secretary; Jonas Dvareckas, treasurer, and Juozas Pupka and Alexsas Zilinskas, assistant treasurers.

In connection with the celebration, I have been asked to include the addresses delivered by myself and a most prominent Lithuanian American, Anthony J. Miller, Esq., over radio station WNEB in Worcester, Mass.

The addresses follow:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY RADIO ADDRESS
DELIVERED BY ANTHONY J. MILLER, Esq.

As a Lithuanian American, I am very glad to have a part in this commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

This annual program is dear to the hearts of all Lithuanians and their friends, because it is held to recollect that day of February 16, 1918, which marked the end of well over a century of suffering under a hostile, foreign rule.

Thirty-seven years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny.

In this year of 1955, our observance is unfortunately, shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

The world does not know all the terrible details of what has happened and is happening to Lithuanians behind the dark impenetrable Iron Curtain. However, we do know that behind that dreadful Iron Curtain hundreds of thousands of God-fearing Lithuanians have been liquidated, martyred for their patriotism, their religious faith, their steadfast resistance to tyranny.

Hundreds of thousands of good Lithuanians have been torn from their families and their homes for service as slaves in Siberia. It is slave labor the Kremlin is using to equip Russia for further expansion, for further despotism, for further persecution, and, perhaps, even for war, and a substantial part of the slave force has been kidnapped from Lithuania. We grieve for the terrible catastrophe that has befallen our native Lithuania.

Under ordinary circumstances, this anniversary commemoration ought to be a day of rejoicing for all Lithuanians and Americans of Lithuanian descent. But how can we rejoice when our people are suffering under the oppression of Communist tyrants? How can there be gaiety when Lithuania is burdened with the miseries of Kremlin tyranny? How can there be gladness when pagan totalitarianism darkens every Lithuanian street and byway? We cannot be happy on this occasion, but we can hope and we can pray.

Lithuanians have had times of trial frequently in our history. In days gone by, many foreign tyrants have dominated the freedom-loving Lithuanians. Although these tyrants may have been temporarily able to destroy the liberties of the Lithuanian people, they were never quite able to destroy the dreams of independence in the minds of Lithuanian patriots, nor could they wipe out the aspirations for freedom everlasting in their hearts. Those dreams and aspirations were, in time, fulfilled. After the First World War, the Lithuanian people realized the hopes which they had long cherished, and on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their national independence.

In the 2 decades that followed, Lithuania flourished. While Lithuanians happily enjoyed their freedom, they made good use of it, too. They improved their economy, and with the passing years grew ever stronger and wiser in the ways of self-government and democratic living. Their future appeared bright, when suddenly came the war of the giants.

First invaded by Soviet forces in 1939 and later crushed between massive military machines of powerful Nazi Germany and gigantic Soviet Russia, Lithuania suffered successive occupations by these two totalitarians. In the end it was the Red armies of Stalin which won, and planted the emblem of the hammer and sickle where the yellow, green, and red tricolor once had flown. By force and fraud Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union.

The painful years that have ensued are recorded in infamy. The deportations, the enslavements, the destruction of political freedom and economic initiative are facts which have trickled through to the free world despite the curtain of silence behind which the Communists try to hide the countries they have overrun.

But we Lithuanian Americans know that the people of Lithuania are of stout heart.

We know that faith and hope cannot be muffled in Lithuanian breasts. Inevitably the time will come when the tyrant's grip will weaken, when freedom will win over enslavement, and sorrow will be turned to joy.

The American people and Government have refused to recognize the Soviet Union's annexation of Lithuania. In many ways America is informing the world of Soviet misdeeds in Lithuania, and is mobilizing the moral force of world opinion against the oppressors, in the hope that Lithuania's day of freedom will be hastened and that the Kremlin's rule of misery and hatred will be forever overturned. With the utmost sincerity I express to all Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans my hope and prayer that that happy day will be soon.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD D. DONOHUE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

It is an honor for me to once again join with the patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent here in my district, as well as those throughout the country, in commemorating the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

On this occasion I feel it is most fitting to recall how deep are the roots of Lithuania independence and national courage for, indeed, it is the vigor of those roots which keep your native democratic tradition alive and indestructible.

The first independent Lithuanian state was organized more than six hundred years ago. It grew into a flourishing kingdom, one of the most prominent in Eastern Europe. The Lithuanians then, as now, were a God-fearing people devoted to the peaceful development and prosperity of their country.

However, because of the geographic position which Lithuania occupied, at the crossroads of two cultures, those of the East and the West, Lithuania was the victim of frequent raids and invasion by more powerful and ruthless neighbors. Eventually she was forcibly annexed by Russia in the 18th century and cruelly deprived of her independence as a nation.

Despite this disaster, however, the spirit of Lithuanian freedom and courage remained as strong as in the glorious days of the early kingdom. The most inhuman attempts of the Czars to wipe out every last vestige of Lithuanian culture were doggedly resisted. The brave people of Lithuania were biding their time to seize the opportune moment to again declare their liberty. That moment arrived 37 years ago following the collapse of Czarist Russia during the First World War.

The years following World War I were years of great hope for the independent Lithuanian nation. The little Baltic nation made astounding progress; she became a model republic. However, before her efforts could achieve full fruit, the catastrophe that swept all of Europe, starting in 1939, brought a tragic end to the Lithuanian republic.

Once again Lithuania, with other Baltic States, was illegally seized by the Soviet Union. In the confusion and immensity of the great world conflict, the misfortune of Lithuania and her neighbors was heedlessly overlooked. However, in more recent times, I am happy to say, it appears the free powerful nations are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of this gallant country.

In the 13th and 16th centuries, Lithuania was a stronghold of Western European civilization, on the dividing line between the East and the West.

Today the Baltic States still form a well-spring of western civilization. The ideas and ideals of the West continue to live in Lithuania, but they are under constant assault by the Kremlin dictators. Indeed, as we know, the whole Christian free world is now engaged in a death struggle with Communist atheism. To keep ourselves ade-

quately armed and prepared for any open warfare is, of course, necessary. However, the only way in which the civilized world can finally survive and conquer pagan barbarism is to recognize and preserve the Christian principles of peaceful living that the Lithuanian nation has been practicing for over six centuries. Our world cannot expect to remain Christian if we permit the godly glory of Lithuania to be strangled by tyrannical hands. The tradition and heritage of your native country serves as an inspiration to a confused and hesitating world.

When she was an independent sovereign nation, Lithuania gained the highest respect and admiration of all peoples as a wonderful example of self-government by those to whom the cause of freedom was sacred and precious.

Today we find Lithuania in the 15th year of her enslavement under the yoke of tyranny and oppression. Her proud people have been robbed of their independence by the armed might of Communist aggression. Terrible crimes have been perpetrated against the Lithuanians. Yet courageously adhering to the ideals and principles of the Christian freedoms they once possessed Lithuanians at home and abroad have refused to give in to despair. Through many centuries of repeated invasions and persecutions by despots and tyrants the Lithuanian God-given determination to be free and independent has never been extinguished, and you and I know that it never will.

Because of the present subjection of the people of Lithuania to Communist tyranny, this cannot be a day of rejoicing. Yet, because of the indomitable courage of the Lithuanians, it can be and is a day of tremendous hope.

Awaiting their day of liberation we can by these meetings remind your brave people that they are not forgotten; we can here resolve never to be reconciled to their fate, and pledge that we will never bargain with their temporary Communist masters to confirm their captivity.

At the same time we join in prayer that God in His infinite wisdom may speed the day of the deliveration from Communist tyranny and that the beloved Lithuanian people may soon be restored to their rightful place of honor in the family of free Christian nations.

Cradle of Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. James G. McNett, of Williamstown, Mass., and one of my constituents, has long been an admirer of President Abraham Lincoln. She has studied his writings and background extensively and has written a play, *Cradle of Glory*, based on Lincoln's early life in Indiana, which has been produced by our Armed Forces for presentation to our servicemen overseas.

As the epilogue of her play, she used a speech of Lincoln's made by him at a reception in Indianapolis on February 11, 1861, when he was en route to Washington to assume office.

It is timely and appropriate and is an inspiration to each of us in our daily living.

At Mrs. McNett's request, I intended inserting it in the *RECORD* on February 12, Lincoln's birthday. However, since the House was not in session on that day, I would like to quote it at this time:

In all trying positions in which I shall be placed, and doubtless I shall be placed in many such, my reliance will be upon you and the people of the United States; and I wish you to remember, now and forever, that it is your business, and not mine; that if the union of these States and the liberties of this people shall be lost, it is but little to any one man of 52 years of age, but a great deal to the 30 millions of people who inhabit these United States, and to their posterity in all coming time. It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you, is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?

**One Bank Merger Begets Another—
Bankers Trust and Public National
Now Merge—Public Hearing Should be
Held Before Any Bank Merger Ap-
proval—Chase-Manhattan Merger Will
Control Over One-Fifth of All New York
City's Deposits**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the text of a letter I sent to the superintendent of banks of New York State, the Honorable George A. Mooney:

Hon. GEORGE A. MOONEY,
Superintendent of Banks,
State of New York,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR Mr. MOONEY: Before the ink is dry on the agreement to merge the Chase National Bank, the Bank of Manhattan Co. and the Bronx County Trust Co., we hear an announcement of still another gigantic merger between the Bankers Trust Co. and the Public National Bank, which would result in combined deposits of over \$2,500,000,000 and resources of \$2,800,000,000.

The Chase, Manhattan, Bronx County Trust merger would become the second largest bank in the United States. It would mean that this combination would control 20.9 percent of all New York City's commercial deposits. This percentage figure is inordinately large and has disturbing aspects when it is remembered that there are sixty other financial institutions vying for the banking business in this area. The merger will accentuate the comparative weakness of the smaller banks remaining in the area, and will make it difficult if not impossible for them to compete.

In making a decision on this merger, one cannot disregard the fear for the future which this merger creates among the smaller institutions in New York City. Certainly they should be consulted and their views be made known regarding the advisability or

inadvisability of bringing this new banking goliath into their midst.

May I suggest that before such a merger is consummated a public hearing be held at which the views of all those parties interested, as well as members of the legislatures, National and State, and important members of the public may be heard. A vital public issue is involved.

Doubtless you are aware of the subtle implications made in recent press releases to the effect that official sanction for this merger will be a mere procedural form. It was stated in the *New York Times* of February 9, for example, that "As a matter of efficiency and prudent planning, attorneys for the two banks" would not set a date for stockholders meetings without having ascertained in advance "the attitude of the banking department" and that the "Setting of the dates of the meetings would indicate that the superintendent had found nothing illegal in the proposal to merge and has no objection." Does this mean that the merger is a fait accompli and that your consent is a mere matter of form and thus quite assured? I am certain you will not treat so lightly a merger of such economic consequence and that you will deny such news reports.

In the interim why should not public hearings be held to aid in making a decision?

This is a matter of momentous public concern. The interests of the banks in question are not the only interests involved. I would be pleased to appear at such a public conference. The hearing, as indicated, would help you materially in rendering a decision.

Now on the heels of the Chase, Manhattan, County merger, the announcement of another huge merger between the Bankers Trust and Public National is made. One gigantic merger seems to beget another gigantic merger. This merger will give us the eighth largest banking institution in the country. The public must be alerted to the dangers inherent in these combinations. The merger trend now developing points up the need for a complete and judicious appraisal of all the facts that are pertinent to this problem, so that no hasty or unwise decision will be made which is detrimental to the banking system of our country and to the people generally.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on this 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter which I have sent to the Lithuanian American Information Center:

MARY M. KIZIS,

Director, Lithuanian American Information Center, New York, N. Y.

DEAR Miss KIZIS: Let me take this opportunity to salute Lithuanians all over the world on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of their nation's independence.

I salute the Lithuanian American Information Center for its continuing efforts to remind the world of the sad plight of your former homeland. I salute the almost 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent, who can never forget the principles that fostered

the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence, and, more especially, the people of Lithuania, who will never be satisfied with their present undemocratic, externally enforced government.

I take this opportunity to remind the people of Lithuania that freemen everywhere support their desire to regain the right of self-determination. We must continue to support the American policy of nonrecognition of the Russian annexation of Lithuania.

I will wholeheartedly support further efforts on the part of the Voice of America to attempt to spread the truth throughout the Communist-dominated world. In line with these ideas we should all join forces to liberalize our immigration laws and offer refuge in the United States to displaced persons from all countries.

Again, congratulations on this memorable day in the history of a free people.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Second Look at the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the last congressional campaign, Hermann B. Deutsch, one of the more articulate radio commentators in the New Orleans area and associate editor of the *New Orleans Item*, had something to say which made plenty sense to me.

At the time I heard the broadcast I asked Mr. Deutsch for a copy of his remarks with the intention of bringing it to the attention of the House at the earliest possible date.

The delay has been my fault, but after reading these observations and keeping in mind the time when they were made, I am sure you will agree with me that the thinking and the conclusions of Mr. Deutsch are indeed timeless.

Here is the broadcast as given over radio station WWL in New Orleans, Loyola of the South:

SECOND LOOK AT THE NEWS

A very good evening to all of you out yonder in a blessed free land where you and I and the neighbors will be Mr. and Mrs. The-Most, come Tuesday. Why? Because we'll be jam-packed in a curtained polling booth with a throng that really is The Most.

Of course, you may not be with us. Perhaps you're like the mule who ran full tilt into the side of a barn not because he was blind but because he didn't give what on the air we call a hoot. Perhaps you're content to remain a faceless nobody, so it's your privilege not to join the splendid host who invite you to share what they won and held for you. If that's how you feel about it, you certainly have the right to shrug aside something millions of less fortunate people would give the very blood out of their veins to possess.

Let's take a look at those who invite you to join them in a curtained booth where there's a voting machine or maybe just a shelf with a pencil or rubber stamp where you can mark a paper ballot. You wouldn't think your hosts could all find room in that tiny cubicle where the world's mightiest sovereign—Their majesties, the citizens of

the United States of America—have their uncontradictable say on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each even-numbered year. But they can and do make room not only for themselves, but for you.

Some of them are right sizable, too, like that son of a Yorkshire-born planter, a young Church-of-England communicant named Washington. He tops 6 feet by a goodish bit, and can vault right over his big white horse by placing just one hand on the saddle. The two beside him are a 19-year-old French Catholic, Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert Du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, and a Liverpool born Jew named Robert Morris.

Just behind them stands a chap named "Fletcher, or Kraus, or Gonzales, or Koshivskovich, or Napolitano," or whatever; the name doesn't matter, really, because you pay more attention to the sackcloth rags swaddling the feet which left bloody footprints in the snows of a place called Valley Forge than you do to his features.

Another of the shining company awaiting you in your polling booth is John Peter Zenger. He's a German-born colonist who is accompanied by his lawyer, a man named Andrew Hamilton. Between them, they established the principle of press freedom for you in connection with the newly founded New York Weekly Journal in 1733. That laid the basis for a famous remark by an Albemarle County aristocrat named Thomas Jefferson who said that, given the choice between a land with a free press and no laws, and one with laws but no free press, he would unhesitatingly choose the former.

If you choose to join him and the others in that wonderful group of Americans, you'll also find among them a truculent Tennessean named Andrew Jackson. That he whopped the living daylight out of a conquest-avid foe at Chalmette below New Orleans in 1815 is important, to be sure. But it is no more important than the fact that he did it with a motley array of fighting men which included such superbluebloods as Omer Villerre, and a supercutpurse whose real name may actually have been Jean Lafitte, though he was born of God alone knows what parentage, and died and was coffined God alone knows where. Incidentally, Andy Jackson also had the help of a son of the Dutch rabbi who had established in Rhode Island the first Jewish congregation in this country. The son's name was Judah Touro. He had come quite penniless to New Orleans and lost most of one thigh when he was wounded at Chalmette while serving as ammunition carrier. But he survived to become one of the South's wealthiest and most generous philanthropists. Among other donations, he made the final contribution to complete the fund for a monument at Bunker's Hill in time for old Dan'l Webster himself to deliver the dedicatory oration.

In the polling booth, you'll likewise rub elbows with men named Lee and Grant who fought on opposite sides for the selfsame thing—your freedom to vote as you please on every first Tuesday after the first Monday of each even-numbered year's November. Men named Lazear and Hill will be there, too. After the shooting war in Cuba had ended, they volunteered to become human guinea pigs in Walter Reed's great experiment, proving the principle that conquered yellow fever for all time to come. Some of those who, without the stirring thunder of the battlefield to spur them on to heroism, thus gave their lives, assured you another sort of freedom and safety.

Along with the soldiers, you'll also meet in the polling place men named Eli Whitney and Robert Fulton and Henry Ford and Eluthere Irene du Pont de Nemours and Franklin and Altgeld and Morse and Edison and Rockefeller and Firestone and Wright.

Each of them contributed to the concept that is given its finest expression when you join that jam-packed assembly in your polling booth, and is smirched when you willfully fail to do so.

You will find men who built harvesting machines and precision lathes and transistor hearing aids; homegrown geniuses like a lanky Missourian calling himself Mark Twain, and foreign ones like Frederic Auguste Bartholdi, who designed and fashioned a statue to be called Progress for the Suez Canal. However, the canal's snooty directorate turned it down—and did they ever goof in doing so. Because that same statue was then presented to this country where we know it by its formal title of "Liberty Enlightening the World" or, more simply, as the Statue of Liberty.

Your polling booth companions aren't all oldtimers. Among them is a sergeant of Italian ancestry named John Basilone who received the Congressional Medal of Honor just in time to go to his death in another furious battle; a general of Dutch Colonial stock, Roosevelt by name, who lies buried on a cliff overlooking Omaha Beach near the village of Coleville-sur-Mer on the French channel coast; two lieutenants named Colin Kelly and Meyer Levin who died in the same Flying Fortress of which the former was pilot and the latter bombardier; but they did not die until after they dropped the bomb that blew to the bottom of the Philippine Sea the first of the capital ships Japan was to lose to a foe she had thought to overwhelm by a single surprise assault.

You'll also rub elbows with four chaplains who stood on the deck of a torpedoed troopship as the vessel was sucked slowly down into the insatiable North Atlantic. These 4, intoning Catholic and Protestant and Jewish supplications to the same all-compassionate throne of grace, laid down their lives in the faith of their fathers, that 4 more young soldiers might find room in boats and on rafts than might otherwise have been rescued.

The polling booth you'll enter on election day is not only crowded. It is also noisy. You will hear a mighty chord as you exercise the right its individual notes assured for you. True, the chord does sound like a great "amen" even though—and God be thanked for it—the chord has not been lost. It has only been neglected by some folks who are so mentally and morally small and warped that they remain deaf to one of the finest harmonies ever produced on earth. They close their ears to it by staying at home on election day.

What are the diverse strains of which that harmony is blended? The roar of traffic along a city street, the thunder of airplane motors, the chirp of crickets at nightfall along a hedgerow, the hum of a powerplant's dynamo, the cacophony of a jazz band, the slow creak of a wagon wheel in a train that is plodding ever westward to settle a wilderness, the songs a soldier sings as he marches to battle: Continental infantrymen mockingly turning against the Redcoats a jeer by adopting it as their very own march—an impudent composition we know as Yankee Doodle; the Green Grow the Rushes, O, which the soldiers of Scott and Taylor sang on the road to Chapultepec, so that to this day, Americans are known there as green-grows, or gringos; Tenting Tonight, Lorena, and Just Before the Battle, Mother; There'll Be a Hot Time and Goodby Dolly Gray and Just as the Sun Went Down and Where Do We Go From Here, Boys, and Mademoiselle From Armentieres and Don't Sit Under the Apple Tree.

There is also the ring of a hundred thousand hammers as rails reach out across the wilderness in spite of every obstacle; hammers that beat muskets not only into plowshares, but into cotton gins and bulldozers and combines, into the framework of an

Empire State Building and a United Nations Secretariat, into the Oakland Bay Bridge, and the Hudson River tubes; into motorcars and sewing machines and radios and electric iceboxes—the ring of hammer upon anvil in every forge of freedom.

If you concentrate a bit, you will also distinguish the voice of a Fourth of July orator as he repeats the words of an immortal Declaration; of a group of schoolchildren repeating in unison the pledge of allegiance to a banner that symbolizes government of the people, by the people, and for the people; of the voice that put into words man's aspiration toward freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of thought, and freedom of worship—yes; and right along with those deathless phrases the crackle of just two sharp words: "Play ball."

Clearly distinguishable, as well, are ritual and litany and prayer: Hail Mary, Our Father which art in heaven, and Hear, O Israel, as well as the myriad variants which express the aspirations of innumerable other sects amid the pomp of vaulted cathedrals, synagogues, and abbeys, as well as from little wooden chapels among the pine forests of the mid-western basin, the fir-clad ranges of the Pacific slope, the mesas of the Southwest, the bearded live oaks of the Deep South.

Let me tell you something, something I would like to call to your attention not boastfully or in unbecoming pride, but simply as a fact. In my home parish of Jefferson, here in Louisiana—and by parish I mean exactly what you outside of Louisiana mean when you say "county"—there is actually no real contest in the forthcoming election. Our congressional Democratic candidates are unopposed. There is little or no difference of opinion among us about the constitutional amendments coming up for a referendum.

Yet we'll be there on Tuesday. We'll cast a big vote. We'll do it, the neighbors, and I, simply because that's our day to be not merely Mr. and Mrs. Whoozis, but Their Majesties, Mr. and Mrs. American Citizen. It'll be crowded as all get out in that polling booth, but think of the singing splendid company we'll be a part of when we add to the swelling chord to which each of them has contributed an element of the world's mightiest harmony our little meed of resolution, of gratitude—yes, and of prayer, each after the fashion of his own choosing and the faith of his fathers, and perhaps something about those dead not having died in vain.

And so, to all of you out yonder in a blessed free land where we can be Mr. and Mrs. The-Most on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of each even-numbered year's November, this is Hermann B. Deutsch bidding every one of you a very good, good night.

United States, Not States, To Get Most From Tideland Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the last political campaign there was a deliberate attempt on the part of certain individuals running for elected offices to falsify and mislead the American voters concerning the Submerged Land Act which was passed in the 83d Congress and supported by a majority of the Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a copy of an article which appeared in a December issue of the highly regarded news magazine, *U. S. News & World Report*:

UNITED STATES, NOT STATES, TO GET MOST FROM TIDELANDS OIL

Tidelands oil is going to turn out to be a bonanza for the Treasury in Washington, far less so for the States that fought so hard for the title to these lands under the Gulf of Mexico.

It appears now as though the Federal Treasury will end up at least \$6 billion richer because of tidelands development. The States of Louisiana and Texas will be lucky if they get \$1 billion.

This twist of fortune results from the wording of the law that turned over part of the tidelands to the States and the oil development that now is going on. In writing the law, Congress gave Texas title to lands extending 3 leagues, or 10.5 miles, offshore, while Louisiana was given title to lands 3 miles out. The rest of the Continental Shelf, stretching out as far as 100 miles, was reserved to the National Government. Louisiana, however, is claiming title to lands going out to 27 miles.

It is these lands reserved to the Federal Government that now are turning out to be most attractive to the companies that are searching for oil. These lands also are believed to contain almost eight times as much oil as the lands now held by the two States.

Federal officials, in fact are surprised at the prices they are getting for drilling rights in the submerged lands. They recently asked for bids on 199 tracts of about 5,000 acres each off the Louisiana coast. They expected to get about \$50 million for the lot. Instead they got \$121 million for only 97 tracts. The other 102 tracts were withdrawn because of the conflicting claims to title from Louisiana.

So far, the Treasury is getting \$144 million for leasing only 462,000 acres—less than 3 percent of the submerged lands mapped as potentially oil bearing. So, just for drilling rights alone, the Federal Treasury now is likely to get at least \$1 billion when the whole area is leased.

Royalties too: In addition, the Government will collect 16½ percent of the value of all oil produced. The Geological Survey estimates that oil in these lands amounts to 11.5 billion barrels. At today's prices, that means a return of at least \$5 billion in royalties.

All of this money is now destined to go into the general fund of the Treasury. Once, however, Congress came close to setting aside offshore-oil revenues for the benefit of the Nation's public schools. That proposal passed in the Senate but was blocked in the House. Later the "oil for education" plan was shelved in the conflict over giving tidelands to the States. This plan now is expected to be revived.

Whatever is done with the money, it now is clear that one of the most extensive oil hunts in history is about to get under way, and the Federal Government will get the lion's share of the public benefits. The \$144 million that the Federal Treasury already is offered for a fraction of the tidelands, contrasted with the \$65 million realized from leases by Louisiana and Texas, is an indication of what lies ahead.

More than 30 oil companies now are active in the hunt for oil. Before they are through, they expect to locate at least as much oil under water as that already proved in the coastal plain of the Gulf States. This dry-land area is known to contain 11 billion barrels of oil and 67 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. New discoveries are still being made.

Drills go deeper: The advantage to the Federal Government results from the grow-

ing ability of oil companies to drill farther out from shore and in ever-deepening waters. Not so long ago, a 60-foot depth of water was considered the limit. This seemed to give the Gulf States all the breaks in tidelands development. But now Continental Oil Co., with associates, is preparing to drill in 97 feet of water off Grant Isle, La. Gulf Refining Co. has leased a Federal tract that lies under 164 feet of water. And oil engineers and shipbuilders have designs for seagoing platforms that will operate at 200-foot depths.

These developments have changed the basic conception of oil possibilities. The offshore area once was thought to embrace no more than 25,000 square miles. Now the estimates are double that figure, with most of the area under Federal control.

Underwater explorations are being stepped up by recent finds. Magnolia Petroleum Co. and associated firms brought in a new well on a submerged salt dome 30 miles off the Louisiana coast. The same companies made another strike 18 miles offshore. Another group also opened a new field 30 miles out, and Phillips Petroleum Co. located a natural-gas well in still another area. Shell Oil Co. has made a strike close to the 3-mile limit off Louisiana, and Standard Oil of Texas has brought in a discovery well near Corpus Christi, Tex., in State-owned waters.

At the moment at least 22 wells are being drilled in Federal waters alone. This drilling is expected to double in the next year as more and better platforms, tenders, and barges are built.

However, it is not cheap to explore for undersea oil. A typical company usually invests \$3 million in seismographic surveys alone, just to find indications of oil. Then anywhere from \$2 million to \$10 million goes for drilling equipment. Another \$1 million may be needed to drill a well to a depth of 10,000 feet, where most of the oil is found.

These costs can be justified only if large amounts of oil are discovered. As one company executive says: "It looks like we'll have to learn to walk away from small discoveries."

Billions of barrels: Actually, the companies expect to find a lot of oil. One estimate is that, within 5 or 6 years, explorations will turn up 6 billion barrels of new oil reserves, plus 15 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Official estimates indicate that the whole submerged area, State and Federal, will add 13 billion barrels to the Nation's present proved reserves of 34 billion barrels. Underwater oil off California may add another 2 billion barrels. That adds up to enough oil for about 20 years, at last year's rates of United States production.

Most of the oil hunting is being conducted at present off the Louisiana coast. In the waters off Texas, drilling difficulties are reported to be much greater because of high winds and rough waters. Two recent drilling ventures in this area were failures. Nevertheless, oil-company executives rate their prospects off Texas as good and are planning on more extensive drilling. They expect to solve their problems as they gain more experience.

Eye to the future: The emphasis at present is on locating reserves. What most companies want primarily are reserves for future production, not oil that is to be marketed now. Reserves are a guaranty that oil producers will stay in business for many years ahead. Also, before undersea oil can be marketed, pipelines must be laid to link offshore wells with refineries on land. To date, 1 pipeline has been laid stretching out 17 miles from the Louisiana coast. This is to be lengthened soon to 48 miles.

Signs are, therefore, that the actual marketing of tidelands oil will not be undertaken on a large scale for some years. That means large royalties to the States and Federal Government will not be realized either, until some time in the future. However,

there seems to be little doubt that eventually a very large public revenue will be realized from offshore oil and that more than 85 percent of it will flow into the coffers of the Federal Government.

Address of Secretary of Labor Before the New England Governors' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address of the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James P. Mitchell, before the New England Governors' Conference, Boston, Mass., on November 18, 1954:

I appreciate this opportunity to speak before this distinguished group. Your conference is in the best tradition of our American heritage. It is an effort through cooperative endeavor to promote the well-being of the people in your area. This approach commands the respect and admiration of all of us.

The great natural resources of New England, the ingenuity and industry of its management, and the skill and resourcefulness of its workers would seem to make it a most attractive and profitable place for industrial enterprise. In addition, the high degree of labor-management harmony and the maturity of the relationships between workers and employers would seem to be conducive to high production and successful operations. Consequently, when some companies closed their New England plants or let them become obsolete and built or expanded in other areas, you tried to find out why and to correct your difficulties and attract new industries.

I have reviewed many of the studies of the New England economy. From this I have concluded that you are trying to solve problems with the intelligence, initiative and resourcefulness for which you have always been noted. As a result of the work of conferences such as this, the efforts of the New England council, the studies which you are promoting, and the local efforts to attract and expand industry, I see a bright future for this region.

The whole history of our country has been one of change, growth, and progress. That is the process now going on in New England. I note that you are diversifying your industries and shifting into production of the new products of this electronic age. No longer is the future of your area tied as closely to its traditional industries, some of which are experiencing a long-term decline.

You lost the village blacksmith to Detroit, and some of the textile mills to the South, but in their place you are expanding your transportation equipment industries, your electrical machinery manufacturing, your jewelry and silverware industries, your aircraft plants, your fabricated metal products factories, and your recreation and resort facilities. Each new age has found you meeting its challenge. You may be justly proud of your past and fully confident of your future.

The industrial transition which you are undergoing will undoubtedly be faced by other sections of the country from time to time. The problems you are meeting as employment in some industries declines and the lessons you are learning to increase employ-

ment in other industries can be studied with profit by every region of the country.

The entire country has recently been going through a period of changeover from high-level defense production to a more normal economy. This changeover has been superimposed in New England on a regional transition which had been building up for a long time and which has been accelerated since the end of World War II. In 1939 two-thirds of the region's manufacturing employment was in the soft-goods industries, but in 1954 just over 50 percent of the workers are producing nondurable goods. There has been a great increase in the production of electronics and other electrical equipment, fabricated metals, and transportation equipment, and considerable decline in the textile industry which employed 281,000 workers in September 1939 and only 173,000 in September 1954.

Since the end of the war there has, as you know, been a nationwide decline of employment in the textile industry, although not as great a drop for the country as a whole as for the New England region. The overall decrease has been due in part to the shift to the synthetics and in part to improvement in techniques of producing the conventional cottons, woolsens, and silks which began in the 1920's. Output per man-hour in the decade 1929-39 increased by 41 percent in woolsens and worsteds, by 46 percent in cotton goods, and by 131 percent in silk and rayon. Increases in productivity slackened during World War II, but the recent installation of new types of textile machinery has greatly increased output per worker since 1947.

The essence of the New England economy is its ability to utilize its outstandingly able labor force and its mature labor-management relations. New England's record in labor-management relations, as measured by the number of man-days lost through strikes, continues to be excellent. For example, in 1953, only 4.9 percent of the Nation's man-days of idleness from work stoppages were in New England, whereas New England has 7.1 percent of the Nation's nonagricultural employment. This same favorable record has existed in nearly every postwar year.

New England, in common with the rest of the country, has an interest in taking steps to eliminate unemployment. This is a problem which can best be solved at a local level. The Federal Government can make some contribution but cannot do the job alone.

Like other areas, New England has benefited from the procurement activities of the Federal Government. For example, from July 1 through November 13, 1954, at least 70 contracts, each of one-half million dollars or more, were awarded to firms located in New England. These large contracts had a value of over \$208 million. They covered such diverse items as cartridges, propeller assemblies, helicopters, aircraft engines, barracks, woolen cloth, sonar sets, electronic equipment, mine sweepers, parachutes, shoes, wire, chemicals, amplifiers, antennas, rifles, coal, plastic dinnerware, automatic screw machines, a hospital, a radar gunnery trainer, a warehouse, a submarine, and spare parts for aircraft.

In the first 10 months of 1954, the value of Federal contracts awarded for highway construction was over \$5¼ million in Connecticut, over \$4¼ million in Maine, over \$16½ million in Massachusetts, almost \$6 million in New Hampshire, over \$2¼ million in Rhode Island, and over \$4½ million in Vermont.

I cite these figures only to indicate that I believe New England is getting its share of Federal expenditures and to express the hope that this has been helpful to your economy.

While there has been a recent decline in unemployment, we in Washington are not complacent about the unemployment situation. We are determined to take all possible

steps to promote job opportunities. We are trying to make sure that all of our policies—legislative and administrative, financial and operating—promote the economic welfare of the American people. I am sure that you in your own areas have the same objectives and are working toward the same end.

There are many areas in which we can work together for the benefit of the people of your region and the Nation as a whole. These include the Federal and State programs to promote the social and economic welfare of the American people.

Many Americans are concerned about the growth of Federal bureaus and programs in recent years and the pressures to add still more functions that will make the Government bigger.

No one seriously suggests that the role of Government in today's dynamic economy should fail to keep pace with the changing times and the altered needs of the American people. But we must continually ask ourselves whether the governmental action that will do the job best may not actually be, in many instances, that of the State or community which is most familiar with the particular problems of the citizens who live there.

In a letter to the Congress, on March 30, 1953, President Eisenhower pointed out that "the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary responsibilities of State and local government. It has led to duplication and waste. . . . The maintenance of strong, well-ordered State and local governments is essential to our Federal system of government."

However, until our State and local governments take positive and well-considered steps to meet the demands of their own citizens for the performance by government of necessary functions, the pressures on the Federal Government to do what the local governments could do but have not done will continue. As in the past, such pressures will encourage the further expansion of Federal regulation and control in these areas.

Consequently, it will be to our mutual advantage to explore today those areas in which further State action is desirable.

The New England States pioneered in State minimum-wage legislation. Massachusetts passed the first law in 1912. Currently, all of your States but one have minimum-wage laws, although one is limited to its coverage to a single industry. New England not only set the trend in minimum-wage legislation, but also in covering men under such laws. Connecticut was the first State in the Nation to take this action. New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island soon extended their laws likewise to cover men. The pattern set by the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act in giving wage protection to both men and women has been more commonly accepted in this New England area than anywhere else in the United States. Of the 5 laws now covering men, 4 are in this area. Likewise, this area has followed the pattern of the Federal act in establishing a statutory minimum. Three of your State laws establish a statutory minimum rate; and Connecticut was the first State to meet the 75-cent minimum rate set by the Federal act.

Despite the great progress that has been made, there is still work to be done in this area. I hope that this region will work toward having in every State minimum-wage legislation that sets a realistic statutory minimum rate and covers men as well as women workers.

Workmen's compensation is one of the areas in which this Department is intensely interested. Under the leadership of Under Secretary Larson, who is an expert in this field, we hope, with the cooperation of the States, to make real progress and to strengthen this most important program for working men and women.

When workmen's compensation laws were first passed, they contemplated benefits approximating two-thirds of the worker's wages when he was incapacitated from an occupational injury. Now due to rising wages and increased cost of living, weekly benefits fall far below this standard. Likewise, many employees are not covered at all because of the exemption of small employers. In the 6 New England States, for example, all laws exempt employers with less than a specified number of workers, ranging from less than 3 to less than 8. The average weekly earnings of factory workers in the United States are over \$72. Only 2 of the 6 New England States—Connecticut and Massachusetts—provide a maximum weekly benefit of \$40 or more for temporary total disability. For the other 4 States, the maximum ranges from \$25 to \$33.

In many other areas, we need to strengthen our workmen's compensation laws. The need for coverage of occupational diseases as well as injuries resulting from accidents is obvious. Three of your States (Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine) limit such coverage to a specific list or schedule of diseases. With new industrial processes constantly being developed and exposing workers to new hazards, it is essential for workmen's compensation laws to provide for full coverage of occupational diseases, as is now done in more than half of the States.

This is another area in which there is still room for progress in New England.

By and large, the unemployment insurance laws of the New England States compare favorably with those in other jurisdictions. The basic maximum weekly benefit amounts range from \$25 to \$30. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, where recognition has been given to family responsibilities, the maximum weekly benefit is greater for the individual with dependent children—up to \$45 in Connecticut, and limited to the individual's average weekly wage in Massachusetts.

Of the New England States, New Hampshire is the only one which nearly approaches the President's recommendations for an improved unemployment insurance program so far as duration of benefits is concerned. All eligible individuals may receive benefits for 26 weeks if they continue to be unemployed through no fault of their own. In Maine and Vermont, all eligible claimants are entitled to uniform duration of 20 weeks. The remaining 3 States provide for a maximum of 26 weeks but many workers are entitled to fewer weeks of benefits, depending on their earnings in the prior year.

In the New England States other than New Hampshire, the percentage of maximum weekly benefits to average weekly wages ranges from 38.1 to 45.2; in Connecticut and Massachusetts, individuals with dependent children receive a higher percentage of their average weekly wage. The majority of claimants in New Hampshire would receive benefits up to one-half of their average weekly wage only if its benefit formula were changed from one in which the weekly benefit is based on a fraction of a full year's wages. This is due to the fact that use of a fraction of a full year's earnings tends to depress the weekly benefit because of the inclusion of weeks of less than full-time earnings as well as weeks of no earnings. Maine, with a maximum weekly benefit of \$27 and uniform duration of 20 weeks, is hampered by its type of benefit formula so that only 21.6 percent of insured claimants in 1953 were eligible for the maximum weekly benefit amount.

As you can see, this is another area deserving of your careful consideration. This is particularly true because of the increasing attention being given to stabilization of income. This type of income security is sometimes called the guaranteed annual wage. Actually, in many cases unions demanding

a guaranteed annual wage are really looking for supplementary unemployment compensation. Improved unemployment-insurance systems would help alleviate this problem.

One of the major problems in the field of economic security is maintaining the income of individuals and families when the wage earner is ill and unable to work. The need of workers for income maintenance during periods of unemployment caused by illness is possibly even greater than their need for income when the unemployment is due to lack of work.

Yet while all States have statutory provisions for unemployment insurance, only four provide their workers with statutory protection against loss of wages due to non-work-connected disabilities. Of the 4 States, the 1 in New England—Rhode Island—is the pioneer. In other New England States the legislatures have considered disability insurance. Connecticut and Massachusetts have given it active consideration over quite a period. Vermont is 1 of the 6 States which has modified its unemployment insurance law to permit an unemployment claimant to continue to receive benefits even though he becomes unable to work during an uninterrupted period of unemployment, provided that he does not refuse work which would have been suitable if he had not become sick.

The importance of disability benefits to the workers in a State is indicated by the fact that in 1953 Rhode Island paid \$12.6 million in unemployment insurance benefits and \$6.2 million in disability benefits.

The field of temporary disability insurance is worthy of further attention. It is an area in which protection is needed and State action is warranted.

I should like to stress the importance of a strong, coordinated State labor department to the States' efforts to meet their responsibilities to the wage earners within their borders. A State labor department should administer labor laws, but it should do much more. It must provide the planning and leadership that are vital to achieving the objectives of a growing economy, good labor standards, safe work places, and the minimizing of industrial disputes. Only through such a strong labor department can these objectives be carried out with the flexibility required by our changing social and industrial developments.

A labor department is the agency of State government to which workers and employers should be able to turn for advice and help in meeting everyday problems of employment and in planning for the future. The New England area is fortunate that it has had functioning labor departments over a very long period. I can think of nothing that I would consider more important in terms of the welfare of the wage earners of your State than to strengthen that agency of your State government that gives leadership in the conservation of the State's human resources.

There is a great need for State facilities to provide effective mediation and conciliation services in labor-management disputes. Generally speaking, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service limits itself to labor-management disputes which threaten a substantial interruption of interstate commerce. Unless the States step in, there is a no-man's land in other labor disputes where no mediation services are offered.

State agencies are particularly well qualified to help settle labor disputes. They are in the best position to understand the local problems and the local interests involved. The local community suffers the toll of labor disputes more than any other area and, therefore, settlement is primarily the interest of the State.

Unfortunately, many States do not provide active mediation services, making it impossible for them to bear the responsibility

which is properly theirs. The active services include certain New England States, but there is room for improvement here as in other areas. Three of the States in your region have what could be called fully effective State mediation and conciliation services. In the other three States, you obviously have room for some progress.

All of the New England States have basic safety laws and an agency charged with administering those laws. Four (Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont) have delegated full authority to the administrative agency to draft rules and regulations to carry out the intent of your basic safety law and to provide the flexibility required to keep pace with rapidly changing industrial processes. One State (Connecticut) has no such general authority, and in the other one (Maine) the authority appears to be somewhat limited.

Experience shows adequate industrial safety for employees can never be achieved unless regulatory authority is given to promulgate safety codes, and that authority is actually used to build a solid foundation on which a safety structure can be erected. Now, I do not mean that safety code enforcement is all that is involved in a good safety program. If that were so, your inspectors would only need to be good policemen. They must be much more than that. They must be highly trained technicians, skilled in the best accident-prevention methods and able to put their knowledge to use.

Every worthwhile safety program is based on the premise that a safe and healthy place to work is provided the employee. Everything else—training, supervision, and employee cooperation—that enter into the program must follow. And a trained staff, working with an adequate safety code structure, can do a great deal to show the employer how to provide a safe work place.

I believe you will wish to look into this problem. Where you lack basic legal authority to carry on good safety programs, you will want to remedy that as soon as possible and strengthen your State resources for the promotion of occupational safety on every front. Every dollar spent in accident prevention will yield high dividends in reduction of costs resulting from occupational accidents and in the conservation of the Nation's greatest resource—its workers.

The Labor Department's Bureau of Apprenticeship is charged with promoting apprenticeship and industrial training. I have instructed this Bureau to encourage management and labor to expand their efforts in improving the skills of the Nation's work force. All of us know that this is extremely important to our economy at all times. I have also directed the Bureau of Apprenticeship to encourage State agencies to assume more leadership and more responsibility in the promotion of sound apprenticeship programs.

As you know, each of the New England States has an active apprenticeship agency. However, improvements can be made. Two-thirds of the New England States do not have active State staffs and therefore are not in a position to give the necessary promotional and technical assistance to the people in their industries.

I strongly urge you to evaluate what is currently being done in your States and to improve and intensify training efforts to expand the skills of the entire New England work force.

I particularly urge you to consider the importance of adequate training programs for the young people of your States who are for the first time entering employment. Attention should be given to the special supervisory problems involved in their training and emphasis should be placed on application of safety rules.

All levels of Government should be concerned not only with apprenticeship training but also with the many other very important types of training. We in the Labor Department are in the process of launching a new program to encourage effective training for all workers. The responsibility for developing the skills of employed workers lies with management and labor. The role of the Federal, State and local governments is only to assist and help. This role is important, however, and deserves our fullest support.

We have gone a long way in the United States in correcting child-labor evils since the early days when so many workers in mines and factories, including the growing textile mills of New England, were young children. New England was the pioneer in seeing the evil of child labor and in enacting legislative remedies. It was in Connecticut in 1813 and Massachusetts in 1836 that the first child-labor laws were passed. But as child-labor protection has become a nationwide movement, New England as a region has lost its lead. The nationally accepted standard of a 16-year minimum age for employment during school hours has been met by only 4 of the 6 New England States (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island). Rhode Island is the only State in this area to set a maximum 40-hour work-week for boys and girls under 16 and Connecticut the only one with a maximum 8-hour day and 48-hour week standard for those 16 and 17 years of age.

In the early days of our Nation farmwork was a family activity, but now the widespread practice of depending upon seasonal hired laborers has made the protection of children working in agriculture one of our greatest needs. We have made too little progress anywhere on this front. For example, among the New England States not one applies to agricultural employment a 16-year minimum age for employment during school hours, and only Connecticut has a 14-year minimum age for limited agricultural work outside school hours.

Much remains to be done by the New England States to provide the basic child-labor protections that are generally accepted today as necessary to safeguard the educational opportunity of our youth and advance constructive employment opportunities for young people when they are ready to join the Nation's work force.

We all know that despite our professed beliefs in the equality of man, certain groups among us are discriminated against because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. When this discrimination affects a person's opportunities for employment, it is particularly pernicious. The freedom to earn a living without being discriminated against is as important to the individual as the better-known civil rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. Freedom of speech, assembly, and religious worship may seem to be empty phrases to a person who is deprived of his chance to make a living because of the color of his skin, or the way he worships God or because his ancestors were members of a particular national group.

As you know, there has been a long struggle for the enactment of Federal legislation to meet this problem. One of the arguments against Federal legislation in this field is that this matter should be dealt with by the States. To lend validity to this argument, however, the States must take some action to eliminate this injustice to large numbers of their people.

Here in New England three of the States, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island have acted. These States have statutes against discrimination in employment which have demonstrated that State action along this line can be effective. The annual reports of the State agencies administering

these laws indicate that they have succeeded in reducing discrimination in employment. They have opened up employment opportunities where members of some groups have previously been barred.

I commend to the attention of other States the experience of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island in meeting the problem of discrimination in employment.

There are two significant population trends which I believe I should discuss with you before closing. First is the bumper crop of World War II babies now going through the school systems of the Nation and soon to be candidates for their share of employment opportunities. Second, and of real concern to the New England area, is the increasing representation of older workers both in the general population and in the labor force. People 45 and older have increased from 17.8 percent of our population in 1900 to 28.4 percent in 1950. They will comprise nearly 50 percent by 1975.

Studies conducted in selected areas through State employment security agencies have established clearly that, in spite of the present high levels of production and employment, older workers are at a distinct disadvantage in obtaining new employment. Unless the economy achieves considerable further expansion, the large number of young people born in the 1940's who will reach working age in the 1960's will create much heavier competition for jobs.

It follows, then, that unless hiring and retention practices of employers detrimental to the interests of older workers change before the 1960's, an excessive number of older people will suffer unemployment and dependency. In this respect, New England faces a particularly acute situation. Great concentrations of older people tend to be found in the older industries. This is true in the case of textiles, which have in the past represented such a large part of New England's industrial endeavor, and it is true also in the metal trades, which account for much employment in this region.

In recognition of the impact of these problems in your States, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut have established committees on the aging which are given earnest attention to constructive actions that may be taken. I share their concern. We at the Federal level are also working on this problem. It will take the best cooperative efforts of all of us to find the solution.

Thank you for permitting me to discuss with you some matters of mutual interest. These are some of the many areas in which we can work together for the benefit of the people of New England and the country as a whole. I hope that you will call upon me whenever the Department of Labor can be of assistance. You may be assured of our earnest desire to cooperate with you on behalf of the general welfare.

Proprietors of the House—Democrat Rayburn and Republican Martin, Alternating as Mr. Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from the current issue of Life regarding our be-

loved present and past Speakers of the House:

PROPRIETORS OF THE HOUSE—DEMOCRAT RAYBURN AND REPUBLICAN MARTIN, ALTERNATING AS MR. SPEAKER, OPERATE WITH SKILL, WARMTH, AND FIRMNESS TO GET WORK OF CONGRESS DONE

(By Robert Coughlan)

In the grandiloquent corridors of the House wing of the National Capitol, obscure among the intaglied marbles and gilded ceilings and spacious vistas and heroic canvases of battle scenes and founding fathers, there is a small alcove containing a pair of private suites. In one of these, by tradition, sits the Speaker of the House with his staff; in the other, which adjoins it, sits the Minority Leader with his staff. Between them lies a formal rancor and an obligation to plot each other's ruin.

One day last December the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, chieftain of the House Republicans and hence Speaker of the preceding session, emerged from the Speaker's office into the corridor. At nearly the same moment the Honorable SAMUEL T. RAYBURN, leader of the Democrats, whose victory in November's election made him Speaker-to-be, emerged from the Minority Leader's office.

Here was a historic confrontation: the two great rivals, their positions soon to be reversed as the fruit of a bitter campaign, that reversal signified when RAYBURN (with what sweet malice one can imagine) would depose MARTIN from the Speaker's office and relegate him and his party's hopes to the humiliation of the minority leader's office in which RAYBURN had chafed these past 2 years. Surely there would be hot looks between them, perhaps hot words, or worse.

This is what happened.

"Joe," said Speaker-designate RAYBURN, looking at Speaker MARTIN with querulous affection, "Ah'm tired of all this shiftn' around. What do you say, we each keep the same room we got now?"

"You're the Speaker, Sam," MARTIN replied with a warm smile. "Whatever you say."

And so, as the new Congress opened this January 5, people wanting the Speaker of the House had to look for him in the minority leader's office, and the other way around. It wasn't protocol and it wasn't parliamentary, but for SAM RAYBURN and JOE MARTIN it was practical and that's what counted.

Elsewhere in the world, at about this same time, France's National Assembly was preparing to strangle itself in new extremes of factionalism. English laborites were serenading Sir Winston Churchill with catcalls. Olenhauer, leader of West Germany's Social Democrats, was refusing any understanding with Chancellor Adenauer; while in the United States, the Senate, often referred to as "the responsible body," was gingerly feeling its collective head and wondering what was in the stuff it had been drinking for the past 2 years; what with the Bricker amendment, the McCarthy mess, and the Republican leader sniping at the President who was also head of the Republican Party, it had made an inglorious record.

MARRIAGE OF OPPOSITES

The Members of the House, the body designed constitutionally as the "popular branch," could look back on a decorous and productive session and forward to one that promised to be equally so. The House seemed to have become in fact "the responsible body." And the reason, when one stopped to think about this anomaly, lay to a large extent in the nature of the House leadership—not a little in that eclectic and congenial spirit which sacrificed form and avoided the dusty nuisance of moving day. With RAYBURN and MARTIN, or MARTIN and RAYBURN, whichever way the die fell, the House could settle down to the things to be done with the homespun

comfort of a fat man slipping into a pair of old shoes.

RAYBURN and MARTIN—SAM and JOE, for each has got rid of the second syllable of his first name—have been compared with the proverbial old married couple who have lived together so long that, in spite of spats and opposing opinions firmly held, they have almost blended their identities. Some maintain that they even have grown to look alike, but this idea is spoiled somewhat by their complexions and hair. RAYBURN is almost totally bald; MARTIN has kept a heavy shock of unruly hair which even now, at a little distance, gives the illusion of being black. However, they are of a size, about 5 feet 7 inches, and share the gentle rotundity of their years. MARTIN is 70 years old; RAYBURN is 73; MARTIN has served in the House for 30 years, and as leader of the Republicans there for 16 of them; RAYBURN has served for 42 years, and as leader of the Democrats for 18 of them; MARTIN slurs his "r's" in a northeastern accent and RAYBURN in a southwestern one; both speak in rather clipped sentences and sound a good deal alike; both are unmarried and each has a sister who keeps house for him back home.

In fact, except that RAYBURN likes fishing and MARTIN likes baseball, and that—as MARTIN says, "Sam's a born and bred Democrat from Texas and I'm a born and bred Republican from Massachusetts, and we'll always have that between us," and "We've got different economic ideas, but we're not too far apart on that, either," RAYBURN and MARTIN are almost an overlapping image of that very important personage, "Mr. Speaker."

"Mr. Speaker" is the second most important elective official in the United States. Since 1947, when he was put ahead of the Secretary of State, he follows the Vice President in the line of succession to the Presidency. But he far exceeds the Vice President in his power and his influence over legislation. As for Senators, SAM RAYBURN disdainfully says, "I'd rather be Speaker of the House than any 10 Senators."

POWER OF THE PURSE

Mr. Speaker's powers are so great as to defy exact calculation and yet so amorphous as to defy exact definition. Since the House holds the Nation's purse through its constitutional control over appropriations, and the Speaker is the House symbolized, he is a man for whom all executive departments must feel that tenderest of emotions—financial. Since he strongly influences committee appointments, all House Members must look to him for a chance to get ahead. Through his control of the intricate parliamentary machinery of the House, he can expedite or delay bills, encourage or cut off debate. By the simple device of not seeing a Member who is trying to be recognized, Mr. Speaker can leave him forever mute. Yet the Speaker cannot be a tyrant. His rulings can be overturned and his power, like that of the Government itself, must derive from the consent of the governed.

There was a time when this was not so. Back in 1890 Speaker Thomas Reed, driven to it by the fractious habits of the Members, rigged the Rules Committee to consist simply of himself, his two deputies and two members of the opposition. The latter being always outvoted 3 to 2, and the Rules Committee having the say-so as to which bills could reach the House for a vote, the opposition found itself completely throttled. The Reed autocracy continued for 20 years, on through the regime of the famous "Uncle Joe" Cannon of Illinois, who was such a despot that the Members finally revolted and in 1910 stripped the speakership of most of its powers, taking special care to liberate and enlarge the Rules Committee. Later speakers rebuilt much of the power Cannon had lost, but it was a gradual process and the power was of a different quality, based

on changes in the times, the country and the House of Representatives itself.

JOE MARTIN remembers that even in 1925, when he first took his seat, "not 1 man in 50 paid much attention to what was happening in Congress. We didn't have any really big issues to worry about or for the country to worry about. We'd only be in session about 9 or 10 months altogether out of the 2-year term." Then, in 1930, began the time of troubles—25 years of them, so far—and "what Congress did affected everybody in the country." As a result Congress itself changed: The average Member who might have run "just for the experience and the prestige it would give him in his law practice or newspaper job back home" now ran probably because he had convictions. This naturally made a difference in the techniques of leadership.

When they consider it politically necessary, both RAYBURN and MARTIN know how to issue pointblank orders. But this is usually a last resort. "Times have changed," MARTIN says. "You can't browbeat a Member of Congress any more. They've got to have confidence in you to follow you." And RAYBURN says, "You've got to lead with kindness and with good reasons," adding, "I never criticized Cannon, or Reed for that matter. They worked with the rules they had, and if you're a strong man you don't back off from the power that's given you. But things are a lot different now. They've got to want to follow you, and you've got to fix it so they'll be thinkin' of reasons why they should instead of why they shouldn't."

Thus Mr. Speaker in modern times has become a representative's representative, a politician's politician, manifesting—since people generally get the kind of Government they deserve—both the virtues and shortcomings of his constituency, the House. Who and what are these 435 people?

SAM RAYBURN was musing aloud not long ago about what makes a Congressman. He has seen about 3,000 of them come and go, an average turnover of 150 seats a term. He said, "They're as good a cross-section of the American people—the best of the American people—as you can find. You can tell a whole lot about the people of a district by the kind of fellow they keep sending here. For instance, one man came to me. He was from a pretty rough district, a lot of uneducated people. He said to me, 'I don't belong here. I don't know what's going on here and I never will. But you'll never get rid of me because I'm just like my folks.' And he was, too."

"But these representatives have been selected. They've been honored—it's an honor to be elected to anything by the people. Now, they're no smarter than a lot of other people where they come from. I don't doubt at all there's people smarter than they are. But let me tell you one thing about smartness—when you've got commonsense, you've got about all the sense there is. And I shouldn't say this, because this House has been so good to me, but they're the best jury I ever saw a man tried before. When a new man comes here, the others want him to make good. They're pulling for him. If he makes a good job on his first speech or in his committee, they're glad. But if he falls down or makes a fool of himself, he's got a strike against him, and if he keeps on doing it they'll just have nothing more to do with him—and why should they?"

"Of course," he went on, "it takes a while for a man to learn and get established and gain his full influence. He don't reach his full usefulness his first term or two. And the worst thing a district can do for itself, if it's got someone here doing his job, is to keep changing its Congressman."

"A man makes a record here about the way he does in business, or the law, or anything else: it's hard work that makes the difference."

JOE MARTIN, talking on the same theme, summed it up this way: "It's a pretty shaa'p test they put you through. A man has to demonstrate commonsense, courage, honor and ability, and he can't mind hard work. There's another thing you can't overlook. If a feller is going to keep comin' back, he's got to service his district. That's what they send him for. A man can be a statesman, but if he's going to be one he'd better have a pret-ty good sec-re-tary to see about all the little humdrum things back home."

THOSE ROLLING WAVES OF SENTIMENT

Honor, devotion to work, commonsense—if these are Mr. Speaker's prescription for success in Congress, they are also the qualities that Congressmen mention most often about RAYBURN and MARTIN. In the slippery defiles of politics it is honor that counts most: and again and again one hears the phrase, "SAM and Joe are men of their word." Or, as Lew Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House, put it recently, "They keep their commitments. No matter how rough it gets, they don't run out. They don't run." In that regard, RAYBURN says simply, "There's no degrees in honorableness. You are or you aren't."

Mr. Speaker, the representatives' representative, must also have fairness, tact, and tolerance. RAYBURN says, "A Speaker has to be fair. Otherwise they'll tear him to pieces. That's because so much House business is done by 'unanimous consent of the Members,' and all it takes is one fellow who thinks he's been done wrong to stand up and say 'I object.'"

Of fact, MARTIN says, "You've got to try to build up good will. You can't operate unless the Members like you."

Of tolerance, RAYBURN says, "There's bound to be differences of opinion in the House. That's what it's for—for the Representatives of all these different districts and sections to come here and argue it out, with fairness to everybody. But you've always got to figure, when you differ with somebody, your opponent has just as much sense as you have, just as much patriotism, and just as much right to his ideas—so he may be right."

Yet all these qualities together are not enough for successful leadership. The decisive element, which when added to the others can lift a man to the Speakership, is an understanding of the human relationships, fears and ambitions which permeate politics and make it an art—a feeling for the situation. RAYBURN says, "You can't really say how you lead. You feel your way, receptive to those rolling waves of sentiment. And if a man can't see and hear and feel, why then, of course, he's lost."

This quality may be initially a gift of nature, but it also requires nurture. MARTIN and RAYBURN have spent their lives in politics, and it will be useful to look back to some of the times when they were learning to see and hear and feel.

JOE MARTIN was born on November 3, 1884, in an unassuming, knocked-together two-family frame house two blocks off the main street of North Attleboro, Mass., a small (population now 12,000) New England town of ordered social life and careful thinking. To this day, almost the worst thing MARTIN can say about a man is "He doesn't take time to walk around the block before he makes up his mind."

His father was a blacksmith whose earnings may have averaged about \$15 a week. Joseph Jr., as the eldest son of 8 children, learned very soon how to work, not simply for his own spending money but to help support the family. He had all sorts of part-time, schoolboy jobs, including selling one of the North Attleboro newspapers, and later reporting for it. He was an all-round boy in school, a good student, such a good short-stop that he later played semipro ball, and the next most popular member of his class. As he recalled recently, "The girls put me

up and the boys put up another can-dee-date. I voted for him and lost by one vote. I never made that same mistake since."

Naturally he wanted to go on to college, but although he was offered a scholarship at Dartmouth he felt it his duty to work and give the younger children their chance. With his help the youngest boys, Ed and Al, went through Dartmouth. In the Yankee tradition of North Attleboro, especially in those times, hardship was not any cause for discontent with society but simply for sober ambition. Joe saved what little he could, and by 24 it amounted to \$1,000. With that and with money borrowed from his friends among the local businessmen, he bought the North Attleboro Evening Chronicle. He is still its publisher, although he has been on holiday from it almost ever since.

Joe ran for the State legislature in 1912 simply because, "I was a newspaper man and I thought the training and inside knowledge would help me in my job." But the State leaders liked him, there was a 3-way factional quarrel going on in the party and Joe found himself in a position he was to occupy many times from then on: he was the only one to have the confidence and liking of all factions, and so he was given the job in question, which was to run the reelection campaign of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. This was a success. Local Republicans put him up for Congress. He lost the primary—the first and last time he was defeated in a contest for public office—but then the winner died, and the district committee selected him as their candidate. He won and came to Congress on March 4, 1925.

With his twinkling deep-blue eyes and methodical habits the freshman Congressman gave an impression both friendly and reassuring and he got along well from the start. "Fortune makes a difference in the way you get ahead," he says and cites the facts that he was lucky enough to be assigned to the important committees on Foreign Affairs and on Rules and that he knew Calvin Coolidge. This was a real distinction because not many people in Washington knew Coolidge or much about him. But Martin had served under him in Massachusetts when Coolidge was president of the State senate and could answer people's questions about this Yankee sphinx who suddenly had become President. So, he says, "Prestige attached to me automatically."

As a footnote to history, it should be mentioned that Martin found Coolidge "really a warmhaated man when he liked you" and also that Silent Cal could be "downright garrulous when he was among friends and got on some topic that struck his interest."

Well sponsored, friendly, and utterly conscientious, MARTIN impressed his party's leaders and at the same time achieved the essential in a system based on seniority: He kept getting himself reelected. Although his district takes in some industrial areas and normally has only a moderate Republican majority, and although his outlook and voting record remained so conservative that he has often been called reactionary, his service to the district in all the little humdrum things and his tireless grass-roots campaigning made him unbeatable. In 1939 he became minority leader by unanimous vote.

The House had long since become his life and his blood. He took quarters in a little suite at the Hay-Adams House, a comfortable and sedate hotel across from the White House, but this was less a home than a place to sleep. Work was everything, from 8:30 a. m. when he sat down at his table in the House dining room for his abstemious breakfast of melon, whole-wheat toast, and coffee, to be joined by his whip and other senior Republican Members, or perhaps by lesser Members with favors or bills of privilege to ask him about; or, from time to time, perhaps by SAM RAYBURN on a matter of intra-

party interest. MARTIN says, "Breakfast helps me keep track of my committeemen. And you can drop a word about this or that thing . . . people like to know what's going on, you know."

The day's business well laid out over the coffee cups, MARTIN would go to his private office at about 9:30, from there (when he was Speaker) to the Speaker's ornate formal office at 11:45 to brief the press, to the House Chamber at 12, and through the session for however long it might last. And then, almost always, to one or more of the parties where his official presence was desirable, there to chat a while, tell a few stories, and hold a cocktail which he put to his lips occasionally without drinking. (He has been called "the greatest marathon nondrinker in Washington.")

His power grew steadily in all sorts of ways. Through many small and not-so-small favors: posing with a can of somebody's local brand of applesauce or somebody's local Queen of the May; relaxing party discipline to let somebody vote against a party bill that would do him harm in his special situation at home (and, according to his critics, letting his deputies take the brunt of enforcing discipline when the party's solidarity had to be held). Through the responsibilities he took and the successes he made: he ran the Republican congressional campaign in 1938, the Republican National Committee in 1940 (although the candidate was Willkie, and MARTIN's heart was not in it), and chairmanned national conventions.

He traveled to every State except Mississippi and into most of the congressional districts until, he says, "I know some of the districts better than the people who represent them and I know their problems in their local situations. So that gives them confidence. I have all this experience behind me; in that way leadership builds on itself." His name was seldom on a piece of legislation and he was never to be noted as a profound political thinker. But behind the modest, homespun manner and often rumpled and harried appearance, there developed a consummate political technician. Even Roosevelt admired him, although he attacked him strongly in the famous Martin, Barton, and Fish campaign speeches.

"You know," MARTIN reminisced recently, "Franklin Roosevelt, not withstanding 'bein' a Democrat, liked me very much. One day Steve Early came to me and said, 'Jox, the Boss likes you very much. He says that of all the Republicans he knows, he'd rather have you on his team.' This was at the time he was drawing in Republicans into his Cabinet. All I said was, 'Too bad he never can.' Much later Charles Edison asked me if it was true, as he had heard, that Roosevelt had offered me the job of Secretary of the Navy before he got him. I said it was news to me. But then I suddenly realized that's just the way Roosevelt would work, sendin' Steve Early to sound me out that way and I suppose that's a job he had in mind to offer me."

Throughout the years, too, a warm friendship grew with SAM RAYBURN. The two men, so alike in so many ways, were perhaps most alike in their visceral feeling of pride and responsibility for the House and what it symbolized. MARTIN and RAYBURN, firmly and loyally committed to their parties' programs as they were, still knew that practical politics at all levels demands compromise. During the course of a day they saw each other often, visiting back and forth at their adjoining offices, consulting informally "back of the rail" at the rear of the House Chamber, carrying on an endless political warfare always tempered with mutual respect. When at last the long Democratic reign was broken in the congressional election of 1946 and JOE MARTIN took over the gavel from his old friend on January 3, 1947, RAYBURN addressed the new House as follows:

"Today I have the high privilege and great personal pleasure, if it had to come, of presenting to you your Speaker, my friend, your friend, the friend of mankind, a man of unquestioned character, of demonstrated ability, with a great, fine heart and with fairness; and I predict for him a career such that history will record him as one of the great presiding officers who have occupied this position."

As events turned out, this was the first move in a game of musical chairs that has been going on ever since and which JOE MARTIN, at the opening of the Democratic 84th Congress, said "makes me think of an old ditty that went something like this: 'Off again, on again, gone again, Finnigan.'" Last month, when the gavel most recently changed hands, MARTIN said: ". . . I am off again and in a few seconds I will be gone again. . . . Mr. Speaker, do not become too attached to this chair. Nineteen hundred and fifty-seven is just around the corner. Seriously, it is a very pleasant duty that has been assigned to me today to present to you . . . a man of fairness . . . your Speaker and my Speaker, Speaker RAYBURN."

A BOYHOOD AMBITION

This is RAYBURN's sixth full term as Speaker. He has already served 2 years longer than Henry Clay, whose record he surpassed on January 30, 1951, during the 82d Congress. As he took over the House this time from MARTIN, it was with the easy custom of a muleskinner picking up the reins of a 10-span team; and he cracked the whip at once, with a little lecture to the new Members about getting to work on time. With justice, RAYBURN feels proprietorship over the House. And no doubt his return to the speakership gave him a very deep personal satisfaction. It is a role not only which he has filled with historic distinction, but one which he picked out for himself before most of the present Members of the House were born.

SAMUEL TALIAFERRO (a family name on his mother's side) RAYBURN was born 73 years ago in Roane County, Tenn., the eighth of 11 children of a Confederate cavalry veteran who had served under Lee until Appomattox and who never stopped hating Yankees. He was a farmer, and poor. When small SAM was 5, the family moved to Fannin County, Texas, where there was good cotton land to be had. Usually there was enough to eat, but only through the endless, exhausting effort of every member who was big enough to handle a hoe. SAM had already learned how, back in Tennessee, at age 5.

The family and neighborhood conversation was of crops and weather and politics, in about that order, and SAM very early knew that the Democrats were God's people and that the greatest Democrat of all, very probably, was the Honorable Joseph Weldon Bailey, Congressman from the Texas Fourth District which included Fannin County. When SAM was 10, he read in the papers that Bailey was going to speak in Bonham the next week. He borrowed the family horse and rode the 12 miles to Bonham and there—literally a barefoot boy with cheeks of tan, overalls and all—listening in trembling admiration to the great Bailey, his ambition was formed. He knew that someday he would be a politician. By the time he was 13, he had his life planned: he would become Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

When he was 17, SAM left the farm to go to the East Texas Normal College at Commerce, 15 miles away. Twenty-five dollars, nearly all the money the family had, was pressed into his hand in the final handshake by his father. For the rest of his living he swept floors, rang the college bell and milked a cow. He earned his teaching certificate that year, taught in a country school the next year, returned to normal school for more

education, went back to teaching school and then, having reached the age of 24, decided it was time to get on with the next stage. He ran for the State legislature and was elected. This not only put him into politics but gave him access to the University of Texas law school, which is at Austin.

He served in the legislature and studied law in his spare time, living on his \$5 a day legislative pay. He was reelected twice, and in his third term was made speaker of the Texas House, the youngest man (29) ever to hold the office. In the last year of that term, Joseph Weldon Bailey, who meantime had gone on to the United States Senate, retired, and his successor as Fourth District Representative filed to succeed him. SAM in turn filed for the Fourth District vacancy and won. Thus he came to Congress on March 4, 1913, to occupy the former seat of his old hero and to start the last and hardest part of fulfilling his boyhood dream.

A PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE

It took him 27 more years to do it, years stretching from the beginning of Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom to the last period of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal. Small, not very handsome, not a frequent speaker, he remained unknown to the country at large for a good many of those years. But among his peers and superiors he very soon attracted attention. Wilson noticed him and saw to it that he was put on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There he stayed for 24 years, becoming the ranking minority member during the Republican era and then, from 1933 to 1937, the chairman.

Those 4 years saw the New Deal created; and RAYBURN, who had become enormously well informed on matters in his committee's purview, fathered a large proportion of the New Deal's enduring works, including the Railroad Holding Company Act, the Rural Electrification Act, the Securities Act, and the Federal Communications Act. He had to fight through much legislative shot and shell in the process. In 1937, a wise and weathered veteran, he emerged to become Democratic majority leader and then, when Speaker William Bankhead died in 1940, to succeed at last by acclamation to the speakership.

Behind these barest bones of a fabulous career in a historic era there lay, naturally, a whole library of events, episodes and anecdotes. A few items can be selected that shed some special light on his character, as well as on the nature and situation of "Mr. Speaker." For instance, how much of a New Dealer was he?

Frank McNaughton, an old friend, wrote this about him from the perspective of 1943: "He has never gone overboard on economic or social nostrums [or] for anything but the collective wisdom of the peoples and the virtues of Congress as their representatives. . . . To his intimate friends he has described himself as a 'progressive conservative or a conservative progressive.' . . . It would be accurate to describe RAYBURN as a 60 or 65 percent New Dealer."

A few weeks ago, reminiscing about those years, RAYBURN said, "There never was any 'rubber-stamp Congress.' I'd go up to the White House, and other leaders from the Congress, and we'd talk it out with Roosevelt with frankness and openness. Sometimes I might not agree with the decision. But if I find myself with 4 other men and they're 4 and I'm 1, I'm going to go along with the 4." And he added, using words almost identical with MARTIN's on the same theme, "You can't be a leader, and ask other people to follow you, unless you know how to follow too."

To lead "with kindness and with good reasons" has never implied, so far as RAYBURN is concerned, the use of any of the small, standard deceptions of political hucksterism. He has never tried to be "popular." There is a

compact dignity about him and a certain air of withdrawal that makes excessive familiarity unthinkable. His temperament is rather saturnine, his tongue can be sharp and his face was set long ago in morose lines. He has been known to be vindictive. He can lash out with mulish temper, as more than one correspondent has learned, and—like MARTIN—he has grown a bit cantankerous with age. But he is a genuinely kind and warmhearted man.

A former Washington correspondent tells how, some years ago, the depths of this kindness were revealed to him: "One of our daughters died. The next morning SAM was at our front door. He said he had just come to help out in any way he could. Understand, I was fairly new in the bureau and I wasn't very important to my paper, and I certainly wasn't important to SAM in any political way. But there he was. He helped me make coffee and told our other two little girls stories about Texas. I knew he was supposed to go to have breakfast with the President at the White House that morning and at one point I asked him about it. He said, 'Yes, but I called the President and told him I had a friend in trouble.' This story has never been printed."

A CROSSROADS OF HISTORY

In the long, long gallery of RAYBURN's life, some other vignettes should be noted. August 12, 1841, the day the bill to extend selective service came up in the House, RAYBURN, believing that the country was close to war, had put all the power of the Speakership behind the bill, had begged and pleaded with wavering Members for their support. But the isolationists were very strong. "The House," a reporter wrote, "was tense as an overtuned violin string; for days the rafters had echoed with harsh, emotional, sometimes almost subversive speeches." In the late afternoon, RAYBURN started the rollcall, standing close behind the tally clerk to watch the little meter click the ayes and noes. The vote seasawed. At the last click, RAYBURN immediately announced the result, 203 ayes to 202 noes, and thereby, under the House rules, prevented any irresolute Member from jumping up and changing his vote. After allowing a recapitulation, RAYBURN announced that the bill was passed and "without objection a motion to reconsider is laid on the table." There was a tremendous uproar. But RAYBURN made his decision stand and thereby prevented the discharge of 1 million trained men from the Army, which had a total strength of only 1.4 million. Four months later came Pearl Harbor.

January 6, 1943, the day that the 78th Congress convened and that RAYBURN began his second full term as Speaker, Roosevelt called him to the White House, where he learned that he was to see the President alone on a matter of urgent importance. "The problem, SAM," Roosevelt said after a long portentous preamble, "is your age"—at which JOE MARTIN and other congressional leaders crowded into the office singing "Happy Birthday, dear Speaker."

The day, only a little more than two years later, when Vice President Harry Truman was visting at RAYBURN's little hide-away office. It lies on the first floor of the House wing, almost directly beneath the regular Speaker's office, and is headquarters for little, informal, late-afternoon gatherings of his friends in the Government and the newspaper corps, the sociability helped on with a drink or two, the conversation ranging over every topic and all of it off the record. Truman, an old friend, dropped in often. Amid the hum of amiable conversation, there was a sudden, paralyzing shock: a message that the President was dead. Truman left at once.

William S. White, a New York Times correspondent who was present, later wrote of

RAYBURN: "His heavy and very nearly immobile face was still in the shadows and the only movements upon it were the small and barely visible traces of tears. He swept them away roughly. For a long time no one said anything at all. Then Mr. RAYBURN hunched his shoulders and, looking out unseeingly into the dusk, he spoke slowly in short, hard phrases as though talking to himself . . . an oath . . . that SAM RAYBURN—southern Democrat and all—had followed Franklin Roosevelt in life, and that SAM RAYBURN would follow Franklin Roosevelt in death."

And some less dramatic but also symptomatic scenes: RAYBURN in his small bachelor apartment on Q Street, cooking his special chili supper for a few good friends; RAYBURN shoving aside every attempted testimonial to dine privately and quietly on his birthday with an old colleague and his wife from Texas; RAYBURN, standing red faced, proud and embarrassed on the Speaker's dais this January 6, while President Eisenhower interrupted his State of the Union speech at the joint session to say: "The district where I was born has been represented in this Congress for more years than he cares to remember, I suppose, by our distinguished Speaker. Today is his birthday and I want to join with the rest of you in felicitating him and in wishing him many happy returns of the day." The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD's account notes at this point: (Applause, the Members rising.)

On issues, JOE MARTIN and SAM RAYBURN have fought each other every foot of the way. And they have fought with conviction. In an almost classic degree, the two men—the Yankee townsman and the Southern farmer—have symbolized in their own time a whole matrix of sectional and economic antagonisms as old as the Republic. That they are more alike than different, that their rivalry has bred friendship rather than enmity, that antithetical aims should so often have been synthesized in the national interest is a tribute to them and to the democratic process they supervise. To both Mr. Speakers, the country as a whole, along with the House that represents it, could well accord applause, the Members rising.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Golden Anniversary of the Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the United States Forest Service:

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOREST SERVICE

The year 1955 will mark the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Forest Service in the United States Department of Agriculture.

On February 1, 1905, the Forest Service was created in its present form in the Department of Agriculture through the merging of the earlier Bureau of Forestry and the Forestry Division of the General Land Office. Although forestry received the attention of the Federal Government as early as 1876, it was not until the present Forest Service came into being that a rounded national policy for forestry was developed and work began to go forward with long-range objectives to maintain and increase the productivity of forest lands everywhere in the country.

Progress in forestry in the United States during the half century has been great. Working together, private and public agencies have effectively demonstrated the values of organized protection against fire, insects, and disease, and of good management and wise use of the Nation's forest resources. Especially significant have been the advances in research, the development of the national forests, the expansion in activities of the State forestry departments, the development of forestry education, and the big advances in the practice of forestry by the forest industries.

FOR THE PERMANENT GOOD OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE

In the 50 years of its existence, the Forest Service has had a colorful history. Many of its alumni, still living, can recall the early struggles of the infant bureau to promote the then somewhat novel idea of managing forest lands for continuous production, and, in the face of much misunderstanding and antagonism, to develop the public forests for the use and benefit of the public.

The Forest Service came into being when Theodore Roosevelt, ardent advocate of conservation, was President of the United States. Its first chief, Gifford Pinchot, the first native American to obtain professional training in forestry, had previously headed the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture.

The Federal forest reserves, establishment of which began in 1891, had been under jurisdiction of the General Land Office, Department of the Interior. An act of Congress in 1905 brought these reserves into the Department of Agriculture, and paved the way for the establishment of the Forest Service. It followed a recommendation of President Roosevelt that the "forest work of the Government should be concentrated in the Department of Agriculture, where . . .

problems relating to growth from the soil are already gathered, and where all the sciences auxiliary to forestry are at hand for prompt and effective cooperation."

The forest reserves (later to be known as national forests) were established by reservation of certain areas of public domain, mostly in the Western States. At first they were opposed by many who thought that the reserves were to be locked up, thus thwarting the development of local industry and sacrificing the present to the future. But President "Teddy" Roosevelt insisted that "forestry is the preservation of forests by wise use"; that forestry means "making the forests useful not only to the settler, the rancher, the miner, the men who live in the neighborhood, but indirectly, to the men who may live hundreds of miles off down the course of some great river which has had its rise among the forest bearing mountains."

In similar vein, Secretary of Agriculture James Wilson declared that all land in national forests was "to be devoted to its most productive use, for the permanent good of the whole people."

PROGRESS ON A BROAD FRONT

Private forestry

Half a century ago, the owner of a tract of forest land usually aimed at getting an immediate return from cutting and selling the timber, and from selling the cleared land to settlers. Until a small band of pioneer conservationists began to preach forestry, few ever thought of holding and managing woodlands for permanent production.

Today large numbers of owners are managing their forests for continuous crops of timber. These include many of the big lumber and pulp and paper companies with large timberland holdings, as well as many farmers and other owners of small woodland properties.

Several national and regional associations of lumbermen and pulp and paper manufacturers are now conducting programs to promote good forestry practices. A "tree farm" program, under sponsorship of American Forest Products Industries, Inc., now operates in 36 States. In 1954, some 5,000 landowners were reported to be participating, with holdings totaling over 30 million acres of forest land—about 9 percent of all the private commercial forest land in the United States.

State forestry

The first State forestry department was established in California in 1835. Later in that same year Colorado, New York, and Ohio also organized State agencies for forestry work. But 8 years later all of these States but New York had discontinued their forestry departments. It was not until after 1905 that State forestry work really got going. Today nearly all of the 48 States, as well as Hawaii and Puerto Rico, have agencies engaged in forestry activities.

The Weeks Act of 1911, which laid the groundwork for Federal-State cooperation in forestry, was a great stimulus to the development of effective State forestry agencies. The Clarke-McNary Act, passed by Congress in 1924, greatly broadened the basis for this cooperative work.

The State foresters' organizations are now providing systematic protection against fire for more than 374 million acres of State and

private forest and watershed land under the cooperative program. Forty-three States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico are producing and distributing trees to help landowners reforest idle lands or establish shelterbelts; last year some 435 million trees were distributed. Thirty-nine States, with Federal Forest Service cooperation, under the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950, are providing on-the-ground technical assistance to owners of private forests in the management of their woodlands; and assistance on processing problems to small sawmill operators and other processors of primary forest products. States, counties, and municipalities maintain about 26½ million acres of State and community forests and parks. In 45 States and Puerto Rico extension programs in forestry are being conducted through the extension departments of the State agriculture colleges. In these programs farmers are provided with information on the various phases of woodland management and the utilization of farm timber. Thousands of farm youths are carrying on forestry projects in 4-H Club work.

Forestry schools

Professional training in forestry was still a very new idea here in the United States in 1905. The first 4-year professional course in forestry, in fact, had been started at Cornell University only 7 years earlier, in 1898. In that same year, the Biltmore School of Forestry, a private school, was started in North Carolina; it continued until 1912. The Yale Forest School was established in 1900, offering graduate courses in forestry leading to a master's degree.

A few more schools of forestry came into being during the next 3 years. Between 1902 and 1905 regular forestry courses were started at the University of Michigan, the State Forest Academy at Mont Alto, Pa., the University of Maine, University of Nebraska, University of Minnesota, and Colorado College. Harvard University also set up an undergraduate course in 1903, but later moved its forestry work to the graduate school. Before 1905 Michigan and Iowa State Colleges were offering nonprofessional courses that were later expanded into full professional curriculums.

These were the schools that were pioneering in forestry education half a century ago. Most of these institutions then had only 1 or 2 forestry teachers and a handful of students. Today more than 30 universities and colleges in the United States are offering full professional instructions in forestry; more than 21,000 students have completed regular 4-year courses in forestry in the past 50 years; more than 4,000 have earned master's or doctor's degrees in this field.

Federal forestry activities

The work of the Forest Service in the past half century has gone forward along three principal lines: Administration of the national forests, cooperation in forestry programs with the States and private forest owners, and research.

The national forests in 1905 were largely undeveloped, remote back-country areas. There were few roads or other facilities for protection and management. For the most part the forest boundaries were not marked nor even surveyed. Today the national forests are playing a substantial part in the Nation's economy. They are supplying a yearly cut of more than 5 billion board-feet of timber, and the present sustained-yield capacity is estimated to be at least 6.9 billion

board-feet. This allowable yearly cut under sustained yield will become even greater as the basic growing stocks are further built up and as utilization practices further improve. The national forests are furnishing seasonal grazing for some 8 million cattle and sheep. Last year, the national forests reported 35 million visits by persons seeking outdoor recreation. These forests are the home for great numbers of wildlife, including nearly a third of the Nation's big-game animals. They have 81,000 miles of fishing streams and over 2½ million acres of lakes. National forests help protect the water supplies of some 1,800 cities and towns, of more than 13 million acres of irrigated farmland, of more than 600 hydroelectric power developments, and of thousands of industrial plants. As public properties containing basic natural resources, the national forests are managed for continuous production. A policy of multiple use is followed which seeks to maintain a balanced production and use of all the forest resources, and to bring the largest total of returns and benefits in the public interest. Protection and scientific management of these resources are helping to stabilize industries and communities dependent on them.

Even before the Forest Service was established, its predecessor, the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture, was publishing bulletins to encourage good forestry practice, and offering to help private forest owners plan their timber harvest so as to obtain successive crops. Federal cooperation with the States for the protection of State and private forest lands from fire began following enactment of the Weeks Act of 1911. The Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 materially expanded the scope of cooperation in fire control. This act also provided for Federal cooperation with the States in the production and distribution of forest planting stock, and in forestry extension work. Federal cooperation with the States in providing technical assistance to owners of private forest lands and to processors of primary forest products is carried on under authorization of the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950, which superseded the Norris-Doxey Cooperative Farm Forestry Act of 1937.

Research has been a major activity almost since the Forest Service came into being. New methods and practices developed through research in forest and range management and wood utilization have contributed much to the advance of forestry. Research results over the years have been worth millions of dollars to agriculture and industry and to the public as a whole. The Forest Service now maintains nine regional forest and range experiment stations; also forest research units in Puerto Rico and Alaska. The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., established in 1910, is one of the world's largest institutions for research in the utilization of wood.

Several other Federal agencies are also concerned to some extent with forestry matters. The Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and National Park Service of the Department of the Interior have forestry units. Military reservations of the Army, Navy, and Air Force contain several million acres of forest land. The Tennessee Valley Authority administers some forested lands above its reservoirs and carries on activities to encourage good forestry practices by private landowners. In the Department of Agriculture there are forestry phases in the work of the Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and Agricultural Conservation Program Service.

THEN AND NOW

In 1898 Gifford Pinchot and Henry S. Graves, who were to become the first and second Chiefs of the Forest Service, were the

only two native-born, professionally trained foresters in the United States (and they had obtained their training in Europe). By 1912, there were still only about 500 men in the United States with some degree of technical training in forestry. (There were also many early-day forest rangers, lumbermen, and others who began without a technical background, but through their own experience acquired a considerable knowledge of the subject.) Figures from the forestry schools indicate that about 1,000 degrees in forestry are now being granted annually.

In the first decade of this century, the Forest Service was the principal employer of American foresters. In 1912 it was estimated that 60 percent of the professional foresters in the country were in Federal Government work, and that fully 95 percent had been so engaged at one time or another. The Forest Service is still the largest single employer of trained foresters, but it now employs only a small part of the total. The States, municipalities, educational institutions, trade associations, and private corporations have absorbed large numbers of graduating foresters. Many others are in business as consulting foresters. Twenty-five years ago, all private industry in the United States employed less than 200 graduate foresters. Today the forest industries employ some 5,000.

In the fiscal year 1905 the receipts from uses of the national forests were less than \$75,000. National forests receipts in fiscal year 1954 were more than \$67 million.

When the Forest Service came into being, the first Chief Forester, Gifford Pinchot, speedily fused a new organization, youthful in spirit, enthusiastic, inspired by a high purpose and determined to get things done. The work appealed to young men with venturesome spirit, love of the outdoors, and zeal for public service. A new public enterprise was in the making.

But in the western national forests, many a forest officer in those days had to face a hostile local sentiment. He was pictured in newspaper cartoons as an insolent dragoon pitilessly riding down women and children; or he was described as wearing a feather in his hat after the supposed fashion of European foresters, ridiculed as an eastern dude or a bespectacled college professor out of place. It took some time for people in those areas to find out that a forest ranger was not a hireling sent from Washington to interfere in their local affairs, but a person interested in bringing about the orderly use of public resources to aid in the sound, healthy development of the community to which he himself belonged.

In time, the forest ranger came to be a respected figure, sometimes even a romantic hero of movies and novels. Now each year the Forest Service receives several thousand letters from boys who want to know how to become a forest ranger.

In 1905, when a fire occurred in a national forest, the ranger would round up whatever help he could enlist among local settlers, and they would go on horseback or afoot to fight the blaze. Often the ranger would tackle a large fire singlehanded and do what he could with ax and shovel to check the spread of the blaze. Many a fire in the back country burned for weeks or months, until rain or snow finally extinguished it. Today, both Federal and State forest-fire control is highly organized. Radio communication, mechanized fire-fighting equipment, fast automotive and aerial transportation speed and facilitate the control work. In some of the western mountain country, smoke jumpers now parachute to fires in inaccessible forest areas.

Fifty years ago, very little land outside the national forests was receiving any regular

or systematic protection against fire. Today, the State forestry agencies, with private and Federal cooperation, maintain organized protection for more than 374 million acres of State and private forest land. In 1953, area burned was held to 0.7 percent of the area protected. Of the 53 million acres of forest land that still lack organized protection, fires burned 13.5 percent.

MANY HAVE HELPED

The advances made in forestry over the past half century have been the result of efforts by many organizations and individuals along with those of the State and Federal forestry agencies.

It was in response to demands from the American people, expressed through many citizens' groups, that the Forest Service was established half a century ago. The American Forestry Association was one of the earliest of many national and local conservation organizations that have long been active in the promotion of forestry measures. Numerous service clubs, civic organizations, sportsmen's organizations, farm organizations, labor unions, veterans' groups, chambers of commerce, garden clubs, women's organizations, young folks' organizations, and church groups have been actively interested in forest conservation. State forestry associations, composed of woodland owners, foresters, and public-spirited citizens often spearheaded forestry activities within their particular States.

Industrial groups and associations also have been concerned with forestry. National and regional associations of lumbermen and pulp and paper manufacturers have been making fine progress in getting good forestry practices in effect on member companies' lands, and in many cases also are encouraging and facilitating better practice on the part of other woodland owners. Many forest industry concerns are cooperating with the Forest Service and State agencies in forestry research projects. American Forest Products Industries, Inc., sponsors the "Tree Farm" program and the "Keep Green" forest-fire prevention programs now conducted in many States.

The nationwide cooperative forest-fire prevention campaign ("Smokey Bear") is conducted by the State foresters and the Federal Forest Service under sponsorship of the Advertising Council, Inc., with the support of American business, including the advertising industry, and the cooperation of many other organizations.

More than 20 American railroads now employ foresters to help promote better forest practice in the areas they serve. The American Bankers' Association has had a forestry committee. Many county governments have become interested in seeing a better brand of forest management practiced, realizing that the tax base is improved and business and income in the community stabilized when the forests are kept permanently productive.

The schools of forestry in American universities and colleges deserve much credit. Perhaps even more important than the technical training given have been the ideals, the vision, and the enthusiasm for forestry work that these schools have instilled in their students.

Professional standards for forestry have been set by the Society of American Foresters, a professional organization to which most foresters belong.

The foresight and vision of many Congresses over the years is reflected in laws which led the way in formulating American forest policy. From the beginning, forestry has had bipartisan support in Congress. Major advances in the national forestry program have taken place during both Republican and Democratic administrations.

THE NEXT 50 YEARS

Starting almost from scratch at the beginning of this century, American forestry has made remarkable advances in the past 50 years. What men of vision half a century ago saw in the years ahead fell far short of what actually came to pass. They failed to fully foresee the astounding developments that have taken place in science, agriculture, and industry. They could not know that the half century would bring two world wars. All of these things made their impacts on the forests and on the course of forestry.

No more than our predecessors can we today foresee what lies ahead. Perhaps we are on the threshold of new developments in chemistry that will bring many new uses for wood—uses that we can't even visualize today. Perhaps advances in tree genetics will give us new and better kinds of trees, and cause innovations, therefore, in our methods of forest management. The course of the national economy or changes in the international situation may greatly affect supply and demand for forest products.

It is reasonable to assume, at least, that the people of the United States will continue to need the forests and the products and services of forest lands. A growing population and an expanding economy, indeed, should mean increasing demands on the forests.

There is every prospect that the pressure for water will increase. Our per capita consumption of water has multiplied during recent decades. In many part of the country further agricultural, industrial, recreational, and municipal developments depend primarily on increasing the supply of usable water. The forest's function as a protector of watersheds is its most important service in many areas. It is likely to become even more critically important.

There is every prospect, too, that requirements for timber will continue to grow. As the supply of some of the nonrenewable resources dwindles, the substitution of wood products may call for an increased output of timber from renewable forests. The expected large increase in the country's population, the development of new uses for wood, and a rising standard of living may indeed bring a tremendous increase in pressure on the forests for timber products. The food needs of a growing population also may increase the pressure on forest ranges for livestock forage.

The number of recreational visits to the national forests has nearly doubled since 1941, the year of highest prewar use. Continued growth in the demand for forest recreation, including fishing and hunting, seems inevitable. As the complexities of modern living increase, and as the workaday activities of most people become further removed from the field, forest, and stream, the need for healthful and relaxing outdoor recreation will be greater. The spiritual, esthetic, and recreational values of the forests will become ever more precious.

With such ever-increasing demands in prospect for water, timber, recreation, and other products and services of the forests, it may be expected that private forestry will continue to advance, and that the development of the National Forests and other public forests will continue in response to growing needs. It may be expected, too, that a growing realization of the importance of the forest resources will bring a greater appreciation by the people of the need for management and wise use of the forests.

Forestry, then, should go steadily forward. Its potentialities for contributing to national prosperity, security, and progress are very great. Fifty years from now, as today, the strength of the Nation will lie in its people and its resources.

York Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an article from the February 1955 issue of the magazine *Changing Times*. The title of this article, "What a Good High School Should Do," makes me particularly proud, for it discusses the vocational education program in operation at the William Penn Senior High School in York, Pa.

I am certain my colleagues join in my congratulations to the York school officials for the recognition they have received in this national magazine.

The article follows:

WHAT A GOOD HIGH SCHOOL SHOULD DO—HERE ARE THE STANDARDS THAT THE BEST SCHOOLS ARE SETTING—SEE HOW YOUR OWN SCHOOL STACKS UP

Ever wonder whether the high schools in your town, county, or city are doing the job they should be doing?

There's a way to find out. Just get the answer to this question: Are they serving every type of youngster in your community?

The high school of half a century ago was basically a college preparatory school. Preparing students for college is still a major function of the high schools, of course. But they have long since recognized the fact that they must educate many kinds of children besides those bound for institutions of higher learning. They must offer courses for boys and girls who plan to enter offices, stores, and other business establishments after graduation, as well as courses for the student who will go immediately from high school into industry or agriculture. They must even serve large numbers of students who are not sure what they want to do but who must spend their days in school profitably.

The schools must also teach all their students something of good citizenship, homemaking, banking, consumer credit. They must give courses in such varied things as music, art, driving, and plain getting along with people.

They must do all this for bright students who need continued challenging to be kept interested, and they must do it for poor students who need constant encouragement to be kept from dropping out of school. They must do all this, too, for ever-increasing swarms of students. To complicate the problem further, the increase is particularly heavy in the lower registers of academic ability—among kids who once would have gone to work after grammar school but who now go on to high school as a matter of course.

Obviously, to evaluate how effective a high school is in meeting these varied needs of its students, you must take into account the size and type of community and the size of the school itself.

If you live in a small or medium-sized city, yours may be a comprehensive high school that teaches college preparatory, business, vocational and general students all under one roof.

If you live in a large city, it may be that several high schools offer college, business and general courses, while separate technical

or vocational schools specialize in trade and industrial education.

If you live in a rural area, your school may be a small consolidated high school, which, in addition to academic subjects, teaches a number of agricultural courses.

No matter where you live, however, a knowledge of the various kinds of high school curricula—and a look at some of the newer methods of teaching them—can provide a good standard against which to measure the performance of your own school.

Take the different types of courses one by one and see what is being done with them by the better high schools today.

COLLEGE PREPARATORY

It used to be that the college preparatory student took a standard classical course, talked with the principal or a favorite teacher about which college to attend and sent away for a catalog or two. If he took the right subjects and had reasonably good marks, he didn't have much trouble getting into the school that he wanted to attend.

Now things are different. As early as junior high school, many students are set to exploring trades, businesses, and professions to see what may interest them. In high school, those youngsters who plan to go on to college are urged to begin shaping their work toward entrance requirements of colleges and universities as early as the sophomore year.

During their junior and senior years, they are given the opportunity of attending college-day programs, when representatives of various colleges and universities are on hand to answer questions of both students and parents. The youngsters also are urged to investigate scholarship possibilities in case they will need financial assistance of this kind to get through college. Those who plan to apply for scholarship aid are encouraged to begin working toward it at an early date. In a well-run high school today, everything possible is done to eliminate haphazard choice of a college by students in the preparatory classes.

BUSINESS COURSES

The business course, frequently called the commercial course, still is offered for those who plan to enter office work when their high-school days are over. Two or three years of English and 2 years of social studies, including a year of American history, usually are the minimum required cultural courses. In addition, business-bound youngsters have a wide choice of languages, sciences, and other liberal arts electives. Required business subjects include banking principles, commercial law, clerical practice, and business arithmetic.

But there are some important differences between high-school business education today and that of, say, a generation ago. Once upon a time the high-school commercial course was based almost exclusively on typing and shorthand. Business students took these two subjects willy-nilly, and those who couldn't master the work, particularly shorthand, fell by the wayside.

Now, however, high schools recognize that not all business pupils are alike, either in ability or inclination, and that not everybody who wants to work in an office has to be able to take shorthand.

So up-to-date schools usually divide their business curriculum into 2 or 3 programs, or "sequences," designed to offer different subjects to students of differing aptitudes and interests. A typical division of a commercial course might be three programs like this: Stenographic, with emphasis on typing and shorthand, for pupils aiming for stenographic or secretarial work; clerical, with emphasis on filing, business practices, and office procedure, for pupils interested in office work but not in stenographic careers;

bookkeeping, for pupils interested in that phase of business.

Today, also, the alert high school is aware that its commercial course graduates will be going into offices that have all types of mechanical equipment, much of it unknown when mother was a girl. So somewhere in its business curriculum the secondary school tries now to include instruction in the use of as many different business machines as possible—dictation, mailing, duplicating, and others.

There is at least one more major development. In many communities classwork for business students is supplemented by actual office experience. What is being done in York, Pa., a small, prosperous industrial city with numerous business offices, is a good example. Senior commercial students in William Penn Senior High School may, with consent of their parents, elect to devote half their time to classwork and half to on-the-job training. They alternate 1 week of school with 1 week of work. They get paid for their work, and their employers, cooperating closely with school officials, try to see that they get as diversified experience as possible. Many are hired full time by the offices after graduation.

York, incidentally, has gone a step further in its business-education department, adding a course in retail and wholesale selling to the commercial curriculum. The course is offered to junior and senior students, and subjects include salesmanship, store organization, economics of distribution, merchandising, and job problems. In their senior year these students also may take paid jobs for experience, attending class in the mornings and working in local drug, department, and other stores in the afternoons. In other cities similar courses are sometimes offered in vocational rather than business-education departments.

VOCATIONAL COURSES

Vocational courses have for some time included instruction in machine-shop work, electrical work, carpentry, cabinetmaking, auto repair, and other trades. In urban areas where demand is great enough, rather specialized courses, such as cosmetology, now frequently are offered in one of the high schools.

The big advance in vocational education, however, has been the development of specific training for specific jobs, particularly for jobs available in local industries. Sometimes this training is given within the schools themselves. Sometimes it is given outside the schools—in shops and factories under so-called work-experience plans similar to the business-education and retail-wholesale work programs just described.

In York, in what reputedly is the oldest program of its type in the country, William Penn vocational students aged 16 and over may alternate 2 weeks of industrial plant work, with pay, and 2 weeks of class study. They work under apprenticeship agreements, but school authorities keep sharp watch over their duties, working conditions, and progress. Some 40 to 50 York industries cooperate to make the program possible. Graduates of the cooperative industrial courses have risen to become foremen, executives, and even owners of plants.

Schools don't have to be in York or in any other city to develop a program like this, either. Take the case of Rockland County, N. Y., a busy industrial and agricultural area just north of New York City.

Rockland County has 8 small high schools of only 200 to 600 students each. Obviously no single school could do much in the way of industrial or agricultural education on its own.

But with the cooperation of county industrial and business leaders, Rockland County high schools prepare their students for 14 or more vocations, from power sewing to horticulture and landscaping.

An organization called the County Board of Vocational Education and Extension helps in establishing the courses in the five schools that have the necessary space. Any course is available to any high-school student in the county. If a course is not offered in the student's local school, he gets free bus transportation to and from whatever school is teaching the subject. He remains attached to his own local high school, however, for required academic subjects, related industrial theory, and extracurricular activities.

As in the case of college days for college preparatory students, career days are held by many high schools today to acquaint pupils with job opportunities in the area. Representatives from business and industry are invited to visit the schools and to address and to confer with the students. Sometimes the reverse is true, and students visit companies and plants. It's all part of an effort to see that as many round pegs as possible get fitted into round holes.

GENERAL COURSES

What's a general course? Just what its name implies—a kind of educational cafeteria where students are offered an overall sampling of knowledge. Required courses are at a bare minimum—English, history, a little math—and the choice of elective subjects is virtually unlimited. The student can try anything from Latin to industrial arts.

Time was when the general course student was looked down upon as the pupil who wasn't able to do the work in any other course.

It is more widely understood today, however, that the general course serves a very useful purpose. Not all high school children know where their real interests lie, and a program of general studies allows such youngsters time to make up their minds. Instruction is so planned that students may switch to any other course once they uncover a real interest. In York, for instance, general students have successfully changed almost at the last moment into commercial, retail and industrial work, and some have even gone on to college.

OTHER THINGS COUNT, TOO

Does your school have guidance counselors for boys and girls? If it doesn't, it should have. What are guidance counselors? They are specialists in handling the educational and even the domestic problems of adolescents. They check on youngsters whose marks are lower than they should be, listen to students' complaints, solve behavior, social and other personal problems, give job and career guidance, and in general act as confidant and friend to the youngsters. All of them can tell heart-warming stories of kids kept or put on the right track because the door of the guidance counselor's office was open to them.

If your school isn't big enough to afford full-time counselors, maybe it can hire part-time counselors who will also teach. Or perhaps it can join with several other nearby schools and hire guidance people jointly, splitting the cost of their salaries.

Next, what about extracurricular activities? Don't underestimate their value. They are not a frivolous waste of time. Properly handled, athletics tend to create esprit de corps, a sense of loyalty and a sense of belonging, which some educators think is almost as important to children of high school age as the subjects they study. Dramatics, debating, departmental clubs, student government programs, publications and similar activities stimulate student interest in school and develop cooperation, leadership and initiative. So do student bands, choruses and orchestras. All of these things spell breadth of opportunity and development for individual boys and girls and sometimes lead directly to successful careers.

Last, what about your school faculty itself? Kindly, dedicated teachers who know their subjects, know how to get them across and have a genuine interest in their pupils are priceless assets to any school. More than one principal has discovered that a sympathetic teacher who can win his or her students, and get something into their heads at the same time, is the best insurance for keeping them in school.

But good teachers, like anything else of quality, cost money. If you can't get or keep first-rate faculty members in your high school, check the salary scale. If the trouble lies there, ask yourself whether giving your youngsters inferior teachers and instruction is really sound economy.

So there you have it. If your high school is to do a good job, it must first concern itself with the educational needs of all the different kinds of pupils who come to it. It must develop the widest possible variety of courses. It must supplement business and vocational instruction with practical work experience in office, store, factory or farm. It should hold college and career days and have guidance personnel to work with your youngsters. It should have a well-rounded extracurricular program, a pleasant, cooperative atmosphere and the best teachers you can get.

Try measuring your school against these standards. Maybe you will be pleasantly surprised at how thorough a job your high school is doing after all. That will be all to the good. Or maybe you will be able to put your finger on what, if anything, is missing. And once you know, maybe you can do something about it.

Utilization of Surplus Government Property for Educational and Public Health Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement of Robert F. Nolan, supervisor, Massachusetts State Agency for Surplus Property, before the House Subcommittee on Government Operations with respect to H. R. 3322:

I am appearing before you as a representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to record the interest and support of our educational and public health institutions in the successful enactment of H. R. 3322.

I have been employed by the State department of education, vocational division, as a State supervisor for over 18 years and have had direct supervision of the surplus property utilization program for the past 9 years as only one of other administrative duties and responsibilities in the department.

The surplus property utilization program in Massachusetts has been of inestimable value to our educational and health institutions. A total of \$40 million (acquisition value) worth of real and personal property has been donated or acquired by public benefit discount since 1946 for over 500 schools and colleges and over 100 hospitals in the State.

Surplus mechanical and technical equipment no longer needed by the Federal Government has been used successfully by our public and private, nonprofit tax-exempt schools and colleges to stimulate an interest

in science and engineering. Great ingenuity has been exercised by our teachers and their students in using surplus materials in our classrooms. The training value derived from using surplus materials in the educational program is worth many times its value as property sold at auction or as scrap and our trainees very often leave our schools and colleges to enter the armed services or are employed by agencies or contractors involved directly in defense research and production.

During the past several years, substantial aid has been provided our State hospitals and other tax-supported and nonprofit tax-exempt hospitals in the State. Our hospitals have been able to acquire at little or no cost from the surplus property program needed items of replacement and additions to professional equipment and furniture which they would have been financially unable to obtain otherwise. This contribution from the use of surplus has materially affected the accomplishments in the area of patient care and directly facilitates their contribution to the national defense in the training of doctors and nurses.

For the past year the surplus property donation program has been losing huge quantities of very valuable surplus property due to the activities of Federal agencies and departments selling their surplus to salvage dealers rather than making it available to us for distribution to our eligible schools and hospitals. These salvage dealers who were able to acquire such surplus at a small fraction of its original value, realizing the need for this property by our schools and hospitals, have many times offered to sell this same property to us at rates which clearly demonstrate the huge profits involved to the salvage dealer.

We firmly believe that Federal property once procured by the taxpayers should be utilized when needed by education and health institutions for the benefit of the taxpayers and we respectfully request your active support in arranging for the immediate and successful enactment of H. R. 3322.

We further believe that the changes in the basic act as outlined in H. R. 3322 will alleviate some of the present weaknesses and inconsistencies and allow for a closer coordination of agencies which will result in more public benefit accruing to the United States by allowing for further utilization of Federal surplus property.

It should be emphasized that the total needs of all the qualified schools and hospitals in the country would be but a very small percentage of the total quantity available for disposal and any loss in terms of recapitalization will be small when compared to the public gain by the further utilization of the property in our educational and health programs.

We heartily endorse that section of H. R. 3322 which will remove title restrictions on personal property transferred to schools and hospitals. In the past due to a Federal administrative determination, restrictions were placed on personal property which were not only impossible and impractical to administer but also decreased the public benefits that accrue from using the property. To illustrate: At present the Federal regulations require that a school must use a surplus typewriter for 4 years in their educational program before title passes. Obviously some machines used constantly in a school program reach the point where it is not practical or worthwhile repairing them before the expiration of the 4 years and the school is still accountable. After passing through a series of such experiences, school administrators become discouraged at these restrictions and lose interest in the program. In other words, too much redtape.

Our program in Massachusetts has always been closely associated with every major development in the surplus property utilization program for the past 9 years and we

are convinced that efficiency and economy in such a program results from experience based upon a practical approach.

Successful administration and operation of this program requires a close cooperation and team play between the States and the Federal agencies and departments involved. Practically every State in the country now has a substantial investment in personnel and facilities devoted to the problems of: (a) determining the eligibility of educational and health units; (b) as a service agency to these groups we are in a most advantageous position to determine what types and quantities of surplus property are needed and useful in their educational and health programs; (c) establishing good working relationships with all of the Federal storage and disposal officers in order to screen available surplus property; and, (d) arranging for the allocation of surplus property to the States for distribution to the eligible institutions within the States.

Since the States have made such a substantial contribution, it follows that the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the General Services Administration should be allowed sufficient funds to properly staff and strengthen their program so they can function efficiently and provide the services and leadership to match the States' efforts, and thereby make the program more effective.

In conclusion, may I point out that in my 9 years' experience with this program I can report that all of our schools and hospitals have a tremendous interest in this program, and they are constantly requesting us to obtain for them more and more property which they find invaluable in helping them to meet the demands of an ever-expanding program of health and education. We have nowhere near met the needs of our schools and hospitals to date, and I personally believe that even if the program was expanded to 10 times its present size it still would not be sufficient to provide relief for their present requirements, let alone the anticipated expansion to meet their ever-increasing demand for services from the public.

May I express the appreciation of my State and that of the schools and hospitals in the State to your chairman, Mr. McCORMACK, and to this committee for this opportunity to discuss our program. Our schools and hospitals have expressed the sincere hope that you will report favorably on this bill to Congress so as to allow for the improvement of the administration of the program for a better and more effective utilization of surplus Government property for educational and public-health purposes now and for the years to come.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include correspondence which I have had with Hon. Joseph E. Talbot, Vice Chairman, United States Tariff Commission.

I am sure the information contained in this exchange of correspondence will be of particular interest and significance to the many industrial workers in the area which I have the honor to represent:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1955.
HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT,
Vice Chairman,
United States Tariff Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TALBOT: Many people in my Congressional District have written to me and have come to see me personally in order to express their very real and sincere concern over and opposition to legislation which would have the effect of lowering tariffs. Most of the individuals who have contacted me regarding this matter have set forth in considerable detail their opposition to H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, since they have the definite opinion that its passage would have an adverse effect upon their employment opportunities.

You are well aware, I am sure, of the fact that since becoming a Member of Congress I have publicly and privately expressed the view that I consider one of my prime responsibilities to be that of protecting not only the lives but the livelihood of the people I represent. I am determined to continue and intensify the efforts I have made in the past in order to fulfill this responsibility.

I would be very grateful indeed if you could properly advise me as to how the passage of H. R. 1 would affect those individuals who are presently employed in the basic industries in my district. A list of 25 representative industries of eastern Connecticut is attached and I should like to have your comment with regard to each.

I can readily appreciate that my request will necessitate much research and analysis in order to furnish me the requested information; however, I know you have a realization of its importance to me and I would, therefore, be grateful for as prompt a response as is possible.

With all good wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.,

Member of Congress,

Second Connecticut District.

LIST OF 25 REPRESENTATIVE INDUSTRIES OF EASTERN CONNECTICUT

Textiles: Including manufacture and processing of wool, cotton, silk, and synthetic fibers; also velvet, lace, linen, fish nets, fishlines; and cotton, nylon, and silk twine.

Thread: Manufacture of cotton, rayon, silk, nylon, and rubber thread.

Buttons: Manufacture of metal, bone, plastic, and pearl buttons.

Electric goods and electrical parts: Including parts and components for appliances and radio and television receiving and transmitting sets; also electric switches and tuners.

Paperboard: Including manufacture, printing, and processing of paperboard and fiberboard and containers.

Chemicals: Including industrial chemicals, such as resin and plastics, biological chemicals.

Bone and ivory goods: Including piano keys and boards, furniture handles, etc.

Rubber: Including rubber footwear, rubber sheets, molded rubber products, and brake linings.

Tin: Including metal and plastic.

Vacuum bottles.

Screws and screw machine products.

Toilet goods: Including soap, soap powders, cosmetics.

Mechanics' hand tools.

Machine tools and dies.

Cutlery: Including surgical instruments.

Surgical dressings.

Jewelry: Including jewelry and costume jewelry (metal and plastic).

Gun sights.

Printing presses.

Fisheries.

Farm products: Including poultry, poultry products, dairy and dairy products, and potatoes.
Shoes.
Chocolate candy.
Optical goods.
Bricks.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.
The Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SEELY-BROWN: I have your letter of January 26, 1955, with which you enclosed a list of commodities that are produced in eastern Connecticut. You ask that I comment on how the enactment of H. R. 1 would affect the individuals who are presently employed in the production of those commodities.

Under H. R. 1 the President would be authorized to make reductions in duties—

(i) By not more than 15 percent of the rates existing on July 1, 1955;

(ii) By not more than 50 percent of the rates existing on January 1, 1945, in the case of articles not being imported or being imported in negligible quantities; and

(iii) To 50 percent ad valorem or the equivalent thereof in the case of articles subject to higher ad valorem rates or equivalents.

The President would be authorized to reduce duties to the lowest rates permissible under any of the three duty-reducing authorities.

You will note that H. R. 1 would merely authorize the President to reduce duties; it would not make reductions mandatory. It is impossible to say, therefore, what if any changes will be made in the duties on the commodities in the list you enclosed with your letter. However, as the result of a study we made for the Randall Commission, I am able to indicate in general those commodities in your list for which a reduction of 15 percent would provide the lowest rate of duty (these are shown in table 1 enclosed); those commodities, which are not imported or imported in negligible quantities, for which a 50-percent reduction in the rates existing on January 1, 1945, would provide the lowest rate of duty (shown in table 2); and those commodities for which a reduction to 50 percent ad valorem would provide the lowest rate of duty (shown in table 3). The classification of the commodities in your list into these three categories is based upon imports in 1952.

The tables also indicate the ad valorem equivalents (based on imports in 1952) of the present rates of duty on the various commodities or groups of commodities in your list. For some groups of commodities only a range of the ad valorem equivalents of the duties are shown, as it would be impracticable to give the ad valorem equivalent for each commodity in the group.

It should be noted that many of the commodities on your list are also in the list of articles published on November 16 by the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, which will be considered for possible tariff concessions in the pending trade-agreement negotiations with Japan and certain other countries. The commodities falling within each of the three aforementioned classifications will no doubt be quite different after the rates of duty have been changed in these trade agreements.

I trust the information given herein will be helpful to you. I am sorry I could not have supplied the information sooner, but a great deal of time and effort was required in the preparation of it.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. TALBOT,
Vice Chairman.

TABLE 1.—Commodities produced in eastern Connecticut for which a reduction of 15 percent of the present rate of duty would provide the lowest permissible rate under H. R. 1

Commodity	Approximate ad valorem equivalents (based on imports in 1952) of the present rates of duty (percent)	Commodity	Approximate ad valorem equivalents (based on imports in 1952) of the present rates of duty (percent)
Toilet goods: Soap (except castile), soap powders, and cosmetics.	Various 5 to 40.	Textiles, etc.—Continued	
Resins and plastics.	Various 10 to 45.	Nets and nettings made on bobbinet or Meehlin machine.	Various 30 to 45.
Biological chemicals: ¹ Hormones.	12½.	Veils and veillings.	Various 32½ to 45.
Brick.	Various 6 to 12.	Embroidered hosiery.	30, 40.
Optical goods.	Various 15 to 50.	Ornamented gloves and mittens.	45, 50.
Electric goods and electrical parts, including parts and components for appliances and radio and television receiving and transmitting sets, and electric switches and tuners.	Various 10 to 40.	Ornamented corsets and allied garments.	37½.
Printing presses.	12½.	Ornamented wearing apparel.	50.
Machine tools and dies.	Various 15 to 30.	Miscellaneous ornamented fabrics and articles (including lace handkerchiefs).	Various 40 to 53.
Cutlery.	Various 16 to 30.	Hat brails of synthetic materials.	23, 45.
Surgical instruments.	45.	Hats, bonnets, and hoods made of brails principally of synthetic textiles.	45.
Mechanics' hand tools.	22½.	Corsets, n. e. s.	27½.
Screws and screw machine products.	12½, 22½.	Elastic fabric.	20.
Gun sights.	Various 22½ to 45.	Floor coverings.	Various 10 to 40.
Chocolate candy.	Various 3 to 20.	Cotton rags, except for paper making.	25.
Farm products:		Textile waste.	4.
Poultry (except turkeys, dressed or undressed).	Various 2 to 23.	Surgical dressings.	30.
Poultry products.	Various 8 to 35.	Other.	Various 12½ to 45.
Dairy and dairy products.	Various 2 to 25.	Shoes (leather).	Various 5 to 20.
Potatoes.	10.	Slippers (for housewearing).	10.
Fish and fish products, including shellfish.	Various 1 to 45.	Rubber footwear.	17, 35.
Textiles: Manufactures of cotton, flax, wool, silk, or synthetic fibers:		Rubber sheets.	25.
Yarns.	Various 13 to 40.	Rubber thread.	25.
Threads, of cotton, rayon, silk, or nylon.	Various 10 to 30.	Molded rubber products.	Various 12½ to 25.
Fish nets and fishlines of cotton, flax, etc.	Various 25 to 40.	Buttons of metal, bone, and plastic.	Various 6 to 45.
Linen fire hose.	11.	Bone and ivory goods (except buttons):	
Small wares.	Various 12½ to 35.	Bone and horn manufactures.	25.
Table damask:		Ivory manufactures, including piano keys and boards, furniture handles, etc.	17½.
Cotton.	19, 30.	Jewelry, including plastic, and metal articles and parts to be worn on apparel or carried on or about the person.	Various 30 to 55.
Linen.	15.	Thermos containers (vacuum bottles, etc.), capacity over 1, not over 2 pints.	50.
Other woven fabrics, except pile.	Various 10 to 55.	Brake and clutch lining, molded, pressed, or formed (asbestos).	10.
Cotton velvets and velveteens.	Various 23 to 35.	Paperboard, manufacture, printing, and processing of paperboard and fiberboard and containers:	
Other pile fabrics and manufactures of.	Various 20 to 35.	Asbestos wallboard.	12½.
Knit goods.	Various 15 to 58.	Paperboard, pulpboard, leatherboard, and wallboard and manufactures of.	Various 5 to 17½.
Wearing apparel, not knit or crocheted.	Various 5 to 38.		
Household articles.	Various 10 to 55.		
Nottingham lace-curtain machine products.	40.		
Lovers-lace machine products.	35, 45.		
Machine-made lace (other than Levers, Nottingham, and bobbinet-Jacquard).	50.		

¹ Most of the biological chemicals, such as "antitoxins, serums, vaccines, and bacterins," are duty-free under tariff par. 1610 of the Tariff Act of 1930. Hormones are the principal dutiable items.

² Other than described in tables 2 or 3.

TABLE 2.—Commodities of the kinds produced in eastern Connecticut which are imported in negligible¹ quantities for which a reduction to 50 percent of the rate in effect on Jan. 1, 1945, would provide the lowest permissible rate under H. R. 1

Commodity	Approximate ad valorem equivalents (based on imports in 1952) of the present rates of duty (percent)	50 percent of the ad valorem equivalent (based on imports in 1952) of the Jan. 1, 1945 rate (percent)	Commodity	Approximate ad valorem equivalents (based on imports in 1952) of the present rates of duty (percent)	50 percent of the ad valorem equivalent (based on imports in 1952) of the Jan. 1, 1945 rate (percent)
Castile soap.....	10.....	7½.....	Textiles, etc.—Continued		
Chrome brick and shapes.....	25.....	12½.....	Small wares, cotton tubings, lacings, spindle banding, etc.	Various 15 to 30.....	Various 10 to 17½.....
Glazed brick.....	5½.....	3.....	Handkerchiefs and woven mufflers:		
Lenses for spectacles with edges ground or beveled.....	40.....	20.....	Cotton.....	30, 40.....	20, 25, 27½.....
Surgical instruments, knives and saws.....	45.....	27½.....	Silk, not hemmed ²	55.....	27½.....
Turkeys, dressed or undressed.....	23.....	12.....	Wool outerwear, knit or crocheted ³	Various 30 to 67.....	Various 16 to 33.....
Rosefish, fresh or frozen.....	50.....	25.....	Hosiery, embroidered:		
Fish, prepared or preserved, or in oil: ⁴			Cotton.....	60.....	30.....
Sardines.....	30, 44.....	15, 22.....	Wool.....	50.....	32½.....
Anchovies.....	22.....	11.....	Underwear, gloves, and mittens, knit or crocheted: ³		
Smoked pollock.....	15, 44.....	7½, 22.....	Cotton.....	60.....	30.....
Other than antipasto, tuna, bonito, and yellowtail.....	44.....	22.....	Wool.....	40.....	28.....
Miscellaneous pickled or salted fish.....	25.....	12½.....	Rayon or other synthetic textile.....	35, 80.....	18, 47.....
Textiles: Manufactures of cotton, wool, silk, or synthetic fibers:			Wool tapestries and upholstery goods ³	Various 30 to 60.....	Various 23 to 47.....
Cotton yarn (line count).....	20.....	12.....	Ingrain carpets and rugs.....	25.....	12½.....
Wool yarns ²	Various 45 to 75.....	Various 27½ to 45.....	Other manufactures:		
Woven fabrics, n. e. s.:.....			Belts and belting of vegetable fiber, for machinery ³	30.....	15.....
Countable cotton cloth ²	Various 31 to 47½.....	Various 15 to 24.....	Cotton friction tape.....	40.....	20.....
Cotton corduroys.....	30, 50.....	15, 25.....	Cotton ladder tapes.....	20.....	15.....
Woolens and worsteds, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, valued not over \$1.25 per pound.....	58.....	42.....	Miscellaneous fur felt hats and hat bodies.....	Various 40 to 55.....	Various 25 to 35.....
Silk, Jacquard-figured ²	45, 65.....	22½, 32½.....	Wool felts ²	37½.....	27.....
Household articles:			Cotton nets and netting made on a bobbinet machine.....	30, 70.....	22½, 45.....
Cotton sheets and pillow cases.....	20.....	10.....	Plastic buttons, Galalith and other casein compound buttons.....	45.....	22½.....
Cotton napped cloth, Jacquard-figured.....	45.....	22½.....	Manufactures of vegetable ivory.....	35.....	17½.....
Wool blankets and similar articles. ²	Various 64 to 70.....	Various 21 to 38.....	Thermosatic containers (vacuum bottles, etc.). ⁴	Various 50 to 65.....	Various 25 to 32½.....

¹ For the purpose of this tabulation, a commodity was considered to be imported in negligible quantities if the imports of the commodity in 1952 were less than \$5,000.

² Low value.

³ Value bracket established in 1939. Since then, values have increased about three-fold, consequently cloth of this value does not exist in normal trade channels.

⁴ Other than described in tables 1 or 3.

TABLE 3.—Commodities produced in eastern Connecticut for which a reduction to 50 percent ad valorem would provide the lowest permissible rate under H. R. 1

Commodity	Approximate ad valorem equivalents (based on imports in 1952) of the present rates of duty (percent)	Commodity	Approximate ad valorem equivalents (based on imports in 1952) of the present rates of duty (percent)
Cellulose acetate waste.....	165.....	Textiles, etc.—Continued	
Spectacles, eyeglasses, etc. ¹	335.....	Wool felt hat bodies.....	77.....
Cutlery:		Fur felt hats, caps, and bonnets, valued from \$9 to \$24 per dozen, for women and girls.....	Various 66 to 71.....
Pocketknives and pocket knives, valued over 40 cents, not over \$3 per dozen, and blades for.....	Various 80 to 110.....	Hats, bonnets, and hoods made of synthetic textile braids.....	90.....
Scissors and shears (except pruning and sheep shears) and blades thereof.....	90.....	Laces and lace articles, and miscellaneous ornamented fabrics and articles. ²	Various 60 to 90.....
Clippers ¹	115.....	Cotton floor coverings, hit-and-miss rag rugs.....	75.....
Razors and parts (except safety razors) ¹	157½.....	Pearl buttons.....	85.....
Surgical instruments, hypodermic syringes.....	70.....	Cigarette cases, compacts, vanity cases, and miscellaneous metal articles, valued over 20 cents, not over \$5 per dozen, and parts (not gold or platinum), to be worn or carried on or about the person.....	Various 65 to 70.....
Textiles, manufactures of cotton, flax, wool, silk, or synthetic fibers:		Thermosatic containers (vacuum bottles, etc.), capacity over 3, not over 4 pints.....	67.....
Woolens and worsteds ¹	Various 61 to 65.....		
Woolen blankets, hand-woven.....	63.....		
Silk handkerchiefs and woven mufflers, hemmed or hemstitched, and certain broad silks. ¹	60.....		

¹ Low value.

² Other than described in table 1 or 2.

Trade Agreements Extension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, we have normally in the United States an agricultural machine geared to abundant production. The American farmer produces enough for himself and 18 others; crop production per acre has increased 30 percent since 1920 due to

better tools and techniques, more and better fertilizer, insecticides, and fungicides, hybrid corn, improved seed varieties, rural electrification, and the conservation of soil and water resources. Production per animal has increased 50 percent since 1920. The farmer has become one of the most important consumers of the automotive industry.

But American agriculture cannot prosper if it can only produce the food and fiber needed for the people of the United States. Agriculture must export or die. In 1951 we exported around \$4 billion worth of agricultural products. In 1954 we exported a little less than \$3 billion worth. It is necessary that we

regain our export markets. Our markets must be world markets. Our customers must be mankind. If the American agricultural industry is to produce only for the domestic market, it is faced with bankruptcy; industry is faced with shut-downs, the industrial worker with unemployment. It is certainly a fundamental fact in our economy that when the farmer cannot buy, the industrial worker cannot work.

Trade is a two-way proposition. It is fundamentally an exchange of commodities. There is only one way that a person can buy anything and that is through the sale of commodities or personal services. Foreign nations need to sell

to us in order that they may have dollars to pay the American farmer for his surplus production of cotton, wheat, lard, rice, and tobacco.

The extension of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955, without crippling amendments, is of vast importance to the American farmer and to the industrial worker whose well-being is dependent upon the health of the agricultural economy.

The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the objectives of the joint resolution introduced recently in this House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], seeking to promote the teaching in American schools of the differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism.

This joint resolution proposes to establish a commission to study the testimony relating to the theories and practices of communism taken under oath by the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives and by any agency of the executive branch of the United States Government, and, on the basis of this study, to prepare material for a book to give the fullest possible information on Communist theories and practices. The commission would also be authorized to prepare suggested curricula of studies suitable for use in the teaching of courses in schools, colleges, and universities in order to show the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism.

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there is need for instruction in our public schools as well as colleges and universities regarding the encroachment upon democratic institutions by the Communist world conspiracy. Communist techniques have long been employed to capture the mind of our youth. The principal defense of our democratic institutions remains to counteract this menace with the teaching of the truth. Indeed, one of the best means for inspiring confidence in our American Republic is to compare it with such police states as Soviet Russia or Communist China.

The Pennsylvania Bar Association has led the way in urging the teaching of the differences between democracy and communism in our schools by a commendable resolution adopted in the year 1954. The American Bar Association also has taken this problem under advisement. In its 77th annual meeting

in Chicago, in August 1954, Judge Walter M. Bastian, of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, then chairman of the standing committee on citizenship, proposed the following resolution:

Whereas the American Bar Association believes that enlightened citizenship requires intelligent understanding of world problems, free discussion, and courageous thinking: Be it

Resolved, That the facts of the theory and practice of communism be taught in appropriate forms at all levels in all educational institutions of the United States in conjunction with the teaching of the theory and practice of the Government of the United States of America under the Federal Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That this association stand ready to implement the purposes of this resolution by aiding in the preparation of suitable material and otherwise through its standing committee on American citizenship.

Action on Judge Bastian's resolution is still pending before the American Bar Association.

Not only the legal profession, but also the teaching profession has recognized the need for instruction which will compare democracy and communism. In 1953 Dr. Erling M. Hunt, professor of history in Teachers College, Columbia University, declared:

Since the demobilization that followed World War II there has been widespread conviction, somewhat uncertainly implemented, that young Americans should understand the contrasts between democracy and communism.

In supporting instruction to this effect in the public schools, Professor Hunt further said:

So far as communism is concerned, the schools are, I believe, basically responsible for inoculating young citizens against it.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] has well said, there are no generally acceptable textbooks on communism available for use in the public schools. It is difficult to teach a course in the public schools without a textbook on the subject. Lack of adequate textbooks is one of the reasons why the task of alerting students to communism has moved slowly in our elementary schools and high schools. Another reason for this lack of progress has been the hesitancy of teachers to engage in what some critics call indoctrination. Furthermore, the already overcrowded curricula of our public schools seems to defy the introduction of any new subject. In spite of these obstacles, however, the time has come when educators should find space in the curricula of our schools for a serious comparison of American democracy with communism.

In view of the reluctance of commercial publishers to contract for publishing a high-school textbook on communism, the board of trustees of the Institute of Fiscal and Political Education, in November 1954, voted to arrange for the preparation of such a textbook. This project was undertaken as a public service.

The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education holds an absolute charter granted by the board of regents of the University of the State of New York, which was obtained through the good

offices of John W. Davis, former Democratic candidate for President of the United States.

The purpose of the institute, as outlined in its charter, is to promote, solely in the interests of higher and secondary education, the broadest possible public understanding of technical and practical problems in fiscal and political fields by preparing, publishing, and distributing bulletins, pamphlets, studies, charts, and other sources of information and also by disseminating such information through public discussion, through collaboration with institutions of higher learning, by radio and otherwise.

The President of the institute is John Marshall, former First Assistant Attorney General of the United States under President Coolidge and President Hoover. Serving on the board are such educators as Dr. Wilson M. Compton, former president of Washington State College; Dr. Felix Morley, former president of Haverford College; Dr. Forrest H. Kirkpatrick, dean of students, Bethany College; Dr. O. Glenn Saxon, professor of economics, Yale University; and, Dr. John Lee Coulter, former president of North Dakota A. & M. College. Former Ambassador Arthur Bliss Lane is on the board as well as such eminent counselors at law as Donald R. Richberg, Lowell Wadmond, and Henry A. Wise; together with R. A. Hummel, chairman of the board of the Lone Star Cement Corp.; John Payson, vice president of the International Bank of Washington; former Congressman Charles S. Dewey, eminent banker and known, no doubt, to most of you; W. Royce Powell, prominent public relations director; and, the managing director, Harry G. Marquis.

The institute has engaged in several educational projects such as a program known as Washington Service—a series of pictorial booklets on political economy. Among the authors were the late Senators Robert A. Taft, Pat McCarran, and Burnet R. Maybank. Other Senators who expressed their views in this service were HARRY BYRD, STYLES BRIDGES, HOMER CAPEHART, PAUL DOUGLAS, EVERETT DIRKSEN, KARL MUNDT, ESTES KEFAUVER, and ALEXANDER WILEY. I, too, prepared a booklet for this series.

Another interesting and valuable educational program which the institute has undertaken is known as Operation Freedom. This is a series of full color, pictorial booklets dramatizing each section of the Bill of Rights. These pamphlets are used as collateral text material in the study of American history and the American way of life, and are recommended for use in the seventh and eighth grades of elementary schools. They have been approved by municipal school systems in many parts of the country.

I heartily agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] that a great service can be performed by the Commission To Make Available Information as to the Basic Differences Between the Theories and Practices of the American Way of Life and the Theories and Practices of Atheistic Communism. There are, however, two considerations which require attention. First, the study of the Commission is to be limited

to the evidence taken under oath before the Congressional committees and the agencies of the executive branch of the United States Government. But there is a vast reservoir of information regarding the theory and practice of communism aside from evidence taken under oath. Such information includes the writings of Communists and ex-Communists, the reports of many reliable scholars, newsmen, and other observers, and documents of foreign governments. A textbook for the public schools should draw on all these sources.

Second, American education has been, since the founding of the Republic, in the hands of local authorities. Textbooks prepared by a central government are alien to American tradition. Under our American system, each school board in each school district should be free to determine the textbooks which are to be used in the public schools. In other words, competitive scholarship and competitive professional skill should guide the selection of textbooks for the American youth.

The Institute of Fiscal and Political Education proceeded with considerable care in arranging for the preparation of its experimental textbook. In view of the fact that many teachers are unprepared to teach a comparison of democracy and communism, the institute decided to issue both a textbook and a teacher's guide or handbook. Again, in view of the fact that high-school curricula are already overloaded, the institute decided to publish four textbooks; one designed for schools that can give an 18-week course, and 3 other textbooks for courses respectively of 9 weeks, 6 weeks, and 3 weeks. In other words, the institute has attempted to meet the needs of every high-school curricula in the country.

The institute gave careful consideration to the selection of the scholar to whom the task of preparing the textbooks and teacher's guides should be entrusted. It eventually selected Dr. Kenneth Colegrove, professor emeritus of political science of Northwestern University. Several considerations guided this choice. Dr. Colegrove is a distinguished scholar. His professional degree of doctor of philosophy was taken at Harvard University. In recognition of his book on the American Senate and World Peace, Columbia University in 1944, conferred on him the honorary degree of doctor of letters. His books and articles in learned journals on comparative government and international relations are universally esteemed. His record as a teacher of young men and women has been noteworthy. His service to the discipline of political science as secretary of the American Political Science Association has endeared him to the teaching and scholarly profession. In addition, he has had practical experience in the affairs of the Republic, having served as consultant in the Office of Strategic Services during the Second World War, as consultant to Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo immediately after the war, and later as consultant to the State Department.

In another respect, Dr. Colegrove is unusually competent to prepare textbooks comparing democracy and communism. For the past 15 years, he has written the articles on Asia, Communism, Civil Liberty, Democracy, Dictatorships, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the World Book Encyclopedia and its annual supplements, volumes which are widely used in the high schools of the United States. In fact, his comparison of democracy and dictatorships has long been one of the features of this popular encyclopedia for young students. In the yearbook of Collier's Encyclopedia for 1954, another publication extensively used in high-school libraries, he has a leading article on Techniques of Communism.

Dr. Colegrove has brought to the preparation of the textbooks and teacher's handbook a keen appreciation of the needs of high-school students, partly acquired when, before completing his university training, he began his professional career by teaching in an Iowa high school.

At the outset of his project, Dr. Colegrove made a survey of the literature which should be drawn upon in preparation of a textbook and teacher's handbook. Seeking to conform the textbook to the best pedagogical methods, Dr. Colegrove was fortunate in securing the continuing advice of one of America's outstanding educators, Dr. Erling M. Hunt. Dr. Hunt is professor of history and head of the department of the teaching of social studies in Teachers College, Columbia University. He is past president of the National Council of the Social Studies, and former editor of Social Education. He is also coauthor of the World's History, published in 1947, with a revision in 1954, by Harcourt, Brace & Co. This is one of the most successful history textbooks for high schools.

I would like to quote a recent statement by Dr. Colegrove. It reads:

Anyone who undertakes to write a textbook on democracy and communism should approach his task with humility and a deep sense of responsibility. He should always bear in mind that no one person has a monopoly on wisdom. He should seek advice and consultation at every stage of the project.

American young men and women must be taught the truth. Accuracy is paramount. At the same time, indoctrination must be avoided. Our American democratic process should extend into public-school education. The essential characteristic of a representative republic is the fact that the citizens actively participate in government. By the same token, in our educational system, our boys and girls should participate in the learning process. In other words, they should be led to draw their own independent conclusions from data presented in a textbook or by the teacher in the classroom. Instead of confronting pupils with iron-bound maxims they should be induced to weigh the evidence and to form their own judgments.

At the same time, teachers and textbooks should not neglect the spiritual values. This precept is more easily uttered than carried out, particularly in case young students are to be induced to form their own value judgments. Perhaps the most approved method is to emphasize American history and tradi-

tions as a basis for comparison with other systems. In any event, the character and personality of the teacher is far more important than the content of the textbook.

In comparing national systems, every effort must be made by both teacher and textbook writer to avoid engendering hatred of other peoples. Textbooks that inculcate hate of potential enemies have been one of the causes of war. While maintaining loyalty to truth and freedom, textbooks should inspire sympathy for and understanding of all peoples.

It is sometimes said that teachers in the public schools refrain from making comparisons between democracy and communism because of fear of entering into a controversial subject. The existence of any such fear is probably exaggerated. Many able teachers are already giving instruction in a comparison of democracies and totalitarian regimes. America has a million loyal, courageous, and devoted teachers. Any hesitancy on their part to teach a comparison of democracy and communism has been largely due to the fact that school boards and school administrators have not been in general agreement as to the necessity for including this subject in the curricula.

The issue is clear. Shall such an important educational project be carried out by a privately supported, tax-exempt organization which is known for its historical and objective approach or shall it be done by the Federal Government, which then will be making further inroads into the field of education instead of leaving it to the State, county, and municipality where it rightfully belongs.

I do not believe, and I am sure you will agree, that the Federal Government should go into the textbook business.

The outline of the complete textbook which is serving as the basis for discussion of the proper content of the textbook is as follows:

DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM—A HIGH SCHOOL TEXTBOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Why study democracy and communism:
(1) Citizens of a republic should be well informed.

(2) Dangers of ignorance.
(3) World conflict between communism and democracy.

(4) Suppression of liberty.
(5) Dictatorships and war.
Chart: Map of the democratic and Communist worlds.

2. What is democracy?
(1) Our form of government.
(2) Participation by the people.
(3) Respect for human beings.
(4) Respect for law.

Chart: Four aspects of democracy.
3. What is communism?
(1) The promise of the good life: Theory and practice.

(2) The deception of citizens.
(3) The people in a dictatorship.
(4) Destruction of constitutional government.

Chart: Four aspects of communism.
4. What is liberty?
(1) Protection of human rights.
(2) Promotion of justice.
(3) Justice through law.
(4) Freedom of opportunity.

Chart: Four fundamentals of liberty.
5. Is American liberty worth fighting for?
(1) Experience of the Pilgrims and Puritans.

(2) Views of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Lincoln.
(3) Declaration of Independence.

- (4) Constitution of the United States.
- (5) Price of liberty: Eternal vigilance.
- Chart: History of liberty in the United States.
6. Communism and liberty.
- (1) The police state in Soviet Russia.
- (2) Loss of liberty in Poland.
- (3) Destruction of freedom in Czechoslovakia.
- (4) Slavery of the Baltic Republics.
- (5) The Red Terror in China.
- Chart: Loss of liberty in Communist countries.
7. How America encourages independent thought.
- (1) How Americans won freedom of speech.
- (2) Guaranties of free speech and press.
- (3) Education for all.
- (4) The American people control the public schools.
- (5) What the public schools teach.
- Chart: The American public schools teach freedom.
8. How communism controls thought.
- (1) Obedience to the "party line."
- (2) Teaching hate in Communist schools.
- (3) Discipline of young Communists.
- (4) Censorship of newspapers, books, and art.
- (5) Education of the "Soviet man."
- Chart: Communist control of thought: Behavior of the "Soviet man."
9. Why some men and women become Communists.
- (1) Communist promises to slum dwellers.
- (2) Promises to unemployed.
- (3) Appeals to minority races.
- (4) False idealism.
- (5) The urge for power.
- Chart: Communist inducements for recruits.
10. How a Communist cell works.
- (1) Daily life of a Communist member.
- (2) Study of Communist doctrine.
- (3) Teaching the party line to novices.
- (4) Obedience to the party leader.
- (5) Sabotage and espionage.
- (6) What is the compensation for this hard work?
- Chart: Workday of a Communist.
11. Democracy in action.
- (1) Practice conforms to theory.
- (2) Representative government.
- (3) Free elections.
- (4) The right to oppose.
- (5) The two-party system.
- (6) The making of law.
- Chart: The democratic process.
12. How Soviet Russia deceives the Russian people.
- (1) The U. S. S. R. constitution is a delusion.
- (2) Faked elections.
- (3) The people have no voice in government.
- (4) False propaganda.
- Chart: Methods of deception in the U. S. S. R.
13. How Red China deceives the Chinese people.
- (1) Imitation of Russian communism.
- (2) No free elections.
- (3) False propaganda.
- (4) Brainwashing in Red China.
- (5) Deception of the peasants.
- Chart: Methods of deception in Red China.
14. The Communist Party in Soviet Russia.
- (1) Limited membership in the Communist Party.
- (2) The grades of leadership.
- (3) The Politburo or Presidium.
- (4) Party discipline.
- (5) The purges.
- Chart: Organization chart of Communist Party.
15. How the Communist Party runs the Russian Government.
- (1) The Council of Ministers.
- (2) The Supreme Soviet.
- (3) Dictatorial control by the Politburo or Presidium.
- (4) A false federal system.
- (5) Secret government.
- Chart: Organization chart of the U. S. S. R. Government showing the party controls.
16. The Communist Party in all countries.
- (1) The World Revolution.
- (2) Local Communist Parties.
- (3) Direction by the Politburo or Presidium in Moscow.
- (4) The former Communist International.
- (5) The Cominform.
- (6) Enforcement of the "party line."
- Chart: World control of the Communist conspiracy.
17. The Bolshevik Revolution.
- (1) The Communist manifesto of Marx and Engels (1848).
- (2) Lenin as world strategist.
- (3) Seizure of military power in Russia.
- (4) The dictatorship of the proletariat.
- (5) The Red terror.
- Chart: The life of Lenin.
18. How the Red terror operates.
- (1) Purpose of terrorism.
- (2) Destruction of classes.
- (3) The police state.
- (4) Use of famine to conquer independent peoples.
- Chart: Types of terrorism.
19. Preparation for revolution in other countries.
- (1) Infiltration and propaganda.
- (2) Communist training schools.
- (3) Preparation for seizure of power.
- (4) Strategy in Western Europe and America.
- (5) Strategy in Asia.
- Chart: The Communist prepares for revolution.
20. Moscow-directed revolutions.
- (1) Communist-inspired revolution in Poland.
- (2) Capture of the Government of Czechoslovakia.
- (3) The Balkan States.
- (4) The Red conquest of China.
- (5) Guerrilla war in Indochina.
- (6) Latin America.
- Chart: Maps of revolution.
21. How the Communists treat political opponents.
- (1) The one-party system.
- (2) Membership in Communist Party is strictly limited.
- (3) Death or slavery for political opponents.
- (4) Purges of members for "deviation."
- (5) New forms of assassination.
- Chart: Political executions.
22. What America has accomplished for the workingman.
- (1) What is the collective bargain?
- (2) Freedom of occupation.
- (3) Social security.
- (4) Old-age benefits.
- (5) High standard of living.
- (6) Investment of savings.
- Chart: Negotiating wage contracts; high standard of living.
23. How communism treats labor unions.
- (1) Abolition of free labor unions.
- (2) Regimentation of labor.
- (3) Labor discipline.
- (4) Slave labor.
- (5) Delusions of the Soviet workingman.
- Chart: Slave-labor camps.
24. How communism treats the peasants.
- (1) Deception of land-hungry peasants.
- (2) Destruction of independent peasants.
- (3) Creation of collective farms.
- (4) Plight of collectivized farmers.
- Chart: Methods of Sovietizing peasants.
25. Why millions submit to communism.
- (1) Hard life of the workingman in overpopulated countries.
- (2) Case study of the railway worker in East Germany.
- (3) Case study of the peasant in Red China.
- (4) The kind of security afforded by communism.
- Chart: Dilemma of the workingman in Communist countries.
26. The democratic and the Communist treatment of racial minorities.
- (1) Civil liberties in the United States.
- (2) Removal of racial restrictions.
- (3) Communist propaganda to attract racial minorities.
- (4) Soviet enslavement of Baltic peoples.
- (5) Soviet extermination of Jews.
- (6) Soviet suppression of Moslems.
- (7) Racial murder.
- Chart: Deportation and enslavement of minorities.
27. The democratic and the Communist treatment of religion.
- (1) Freedom of Religion in democracies.
- (2) Emphasis on spiritual values.
- (3) Materialism versus religion.
- (4) Communism condemns religion as a capitalist trick.
- (5) Soviet persecution of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.
- (6) Soviet control of the Orthodox Church.
- (7) Religious persecution in Red China.
- Chart: Soviet antireligious strategy.
28. How the U. S. S. R. rules satellite countries.
- (1) Political control by the Moscow Politburo or Presidium.
- (2) Economic profit from subject countries.
- (3) Soviet Imperialism.
- (4) Revolt of Yugoslavia.
- (5) Abuse of East Germany.
- Chart: Map of Soviet Imperialism.
29. How communism promotes war.
- (1) The Communist doctrine of violence.
- (2) The Red Army.
- (3) The false peace crusade.
- (4) Wrecking peace conferences.
- (5) Use of Asiatic peoples to fight free states.
- (6) The effects of Soviet Imperialism.
- Chart: Soviet promotion of war.
30. The Korean war.
- (1) Soviet Russia blocks unity of the Korean people.
- (2) Inciting Korean Communists to attack South Korea.
- (3) American leadership in resisting Red aggression.
- (4) Soviet support of Red China for invasion of Korea.
- (5) Obstructing peace efforts.
- Chart: Korea, the battlefield of Soviet aggression.
31. Achievements of the capitalist system.
- (1) The American competitive enterprise system.
- (2) Value of independent initiative.
- (3) American invention.
- (4) American mass production.
- (5) The small-business man in the United States.
- (6) The rising standard of life.
- Chart: American industry.
32. Economic planning in the U. S. S. R.
- (1) State ownership of all means of production.
- (2) The Gosplan.
- (3) Drafting the 5-year plans.
- (4) Results of the 5-year plans.
- (5) Producer's goods at the expense of consumer's goods.
- (6) Depression of standard of living.
- (7) Real wages in Communist Russia.
- Chart: The 5-year plans; comparison of worker's real wages in Soviet Russia and in the United States.
33. How economic planning destroys liberty.
- (1) Control of all economic life.
- (2) Police control of officials and workers.
- (3) No choice of occupation.
- (4) No freedom for workers in the factories.
- (5) No freedom for peasants on collective farms.

(6) Use of false propaganda.

Chart: Economic planning and the Soviet workingman.

34. The Soviet claim of a classless society.

(1) Communist doctrine of a worker's dictatorship.

(2) Trotsky's charge that Stalin betrayed the revolution.

(3) New classes in the Soviet state.

(4) Inequality of income among workers, factory managers, bureaucrats and army officers.

Chart: Bureaucrats and Red Army officers constitute the new economic class in Soviet Russia.

35. Communist fallacies.

(1) That communism has a monopoly of the scientific method.

(2) That Marxian dialectics is infallible.

(3) That communism is inevitable.

(4) That collapse of democratic governments is inevitable.

(5) That the workingman is becoming poorer.

Chart: A graph of fallacies.

36. Relation of socialism to communism.

(1) Definitions.

(2) Split between the Social Democrats and the Marxian Socialists.

(3) Views on private property.

(4) Trend of socialism toward communism.

(5) Where is the dividing line?

Chart: Trends toward communism.

37. Communist attack on constitutional government.

(1) The general strike.

(2) Obstruction in European parliaments.

(3) Infiltration of American organs of public opinion.

(4) Infiltration of American Government.

(5) Subversive activities.

Chart: Illustrations of infiltration.

38. The Communist Party in the United States.

(1) History of the Communist Party.

(2) Communist-front organizations.

(3) Function of the Daily Worker.

(4) The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1952.

(5) The party goes underground.

Chart: Organization and operation of the Communist Party of the United States.

39. The American Republic as a bulwark against communism.

(1) Ideals of the American Republic.

(2) Love of liberty.

(3) Sound traditions.

(4) American contributions to human progress.

(5) American leadership by example.

Chart: American institutions.

APPENDIX

1. Definitions of terms.

2. Problems of democracy and communism.

Reading lists.

Politicking at Its Worst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 16, 1955, issue of the Washington Evening Star:

POLITICKING AT ITS WORST

The Democratic members of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee are playing the

shabbiest kind of politics with the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. Although they have attacked the project with all sorts of holier-than-thou arguments, they have not produced the slightest bit of convincing evidence to support their lurid talk about it—particularly their ridiculous charge that it is an economically wasteful and morally wicked undertaking cooked up in a sinister plot to enrich the private-power interests at the expense of the American people and the sacrosanct Tennessee Valley Authority.

This charge, of course, is about as unjustified and as fantastic as any charge could be. Actually, although the Dixon-Yates contract has certain administrative features that are open to legitimate criticism, it seems in many ways to be sounder—from a dollars-and-cents viewpoint—than similar agreements involving private power and the Atomic Energy Commission. And certainly, considering how the contract's terms have been subjected to exhaustive public debate and congressional scrutiny, few things could be more absurd than the effort to depict the project as an evil brewed in the dark by men conspiring against the public interest. Yet, despite this, and even though the venture has been resoundingly approved by both the AEC and the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Democrats on the joint committee continue to kick the issue around with unabated intensity.

Thus, having a vested interest in their own muddling of the facts, and apparently convinced that they can gain some partisan advantage from attacking without letup, these Democrats demand that the AEC and the SEC reverse themselves with a vote to kill the contract. Further, with crocodile tears in their eyes, they warn (1) that unless this is done the Dixon-Yates controversy—which they alone are keeping alive—will continue "for years to come," with injury to the AEC's military work; and (2) that the administration, not they, will be responsible for that fact. Here, surely, is an example of politicking at its worst, and the President, needless to say, has every reason to feel more determined than ever not to yield to it.

Pay As You Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a good deal of vision and commonsense is presented in an editorial from Newsday, a large daily paper on Long Island. While this editorial was written last month, I have refrained from inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until this time. However, within the next few weeks the House will have the opportunity to make some important decision in regard to the Post Office Department.

Two philosophies will be present. They are diametrically opposed to each other. The first is that the Post Office Department is a service organization similar to the State Department or the Department of Commerce and is therefore entitled to create a financial deficit.

The other philosophy is that the Post Office Department should be run on a paying, business-like basis for the service it performs for individuals, corporations,

publishing houses—in fact, for everybody.

The following editorial summarizes and ably presents the latter contention:

PAY AS YOU MAIL

The postal rate increase proposed by Postmaster General Summerfield are no more than necessary and logical to meet the needs of the Department. The rate increases, which apply to first-, second-, and third-class mail, are expected to bring in an additional \$332 million a year.

This is still not enough to get the Post Office on a pay-as-you-go basis. For the current fiscal year, the deficit is running between \$300 and \$400 million. But with the increased efficiency Summerfield has also promised, the deficit can be cut down to manageable size.

Part of the extra money will go for pay raises for postal workers. These are badly overdue. The workers have not had a raise in more than 4 years, while the cost of living has gone up considerably.

The rate increases are designed to make each division in the Department come closer to paying its own way, and at 4 cents, letters will continue to be one of the biggest bargains available. They have stayed at 3 cents for more than 20 years, while postal costs have nearly doubled.

Newspapers and magazines, too, will bear a greater share of their mailing costs. Summerfield has asked that second-class rates go up 15 percent for two successive years to yield an additional \$8 million plus annually. This is as it should be.

When roughly the same proposals were made to Congress last session, they were turned down. Congress passed a pay raise measure but failed to approve the rate increase. The reason was that 1954 was an election year.

We hope, for the good of the postal department, its workers, and the Federal budget, that Congress can screw up its courage in a nonelection year and approve both measures.

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to provide for a 10-percent pay increase for postal workers, and I have spoken to individual members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to urge that they act promptly on this or similar legislation. On Tuesday, February 15, 1955, I submitted a statement to the committee in support of my bill, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, during the last Congress legislation was passed providing for an increase in the salaries of postal employees. There is no doubt but that this legislation merited more consideration than it received. The increase it provided was totally inadequate, but because the bill was vetoed by the President, the postal workers did not receive even this small measure of relief. I believe we owe it to these employees to take prompt action at this Congress to increase their salaries and make the effective date retroactive. If the bill is vetoed then we should vote to override.

I have introduced a bill which would provide a 10 percent increase in the pay sched-

ules of postal employees. I am very much aware of the need for such increases since in my district and in the New York area generally there are a number of postal workers and other Federal employees, and I know from conversations with them that they have all they can do to make ends meet. Many have suffered income losses from the various reorganization and reclassification programs and from reductions in grade brought about by post-audit actions of the Civil Service Commission. There is reason to believe that very often employees are forced to take reductions in grade because of reduced appropriations.

The Government worker today is called upon to carry an extra workload due to the policy of the administration to reduce Federal payrolls through attrition, which means that vacancies occurring through retirement, death, and resignation, are not filled. These are conditions over which employees have no control. If after 2 or 3 years a man in private industry had his pay reduced because some supervisor had made a mistake in allocating his job to the proper pay scale, the unions would call a strike of all employees. Yet this can happen to a Government employee and there is little or nothing he can do about it. If the Budget Bureau imposes a ceiling on an appropriation for a Government agency and employees have to be laid off through reductions in force or transferred to another post or reduced in grade as a result of it, there is nothing the Federal worker can do but accept it. He may have to readjust his standard of living, he may have to run his old car for another year or two, and cut out some of the little things in life he and his family have learned to enjoy, but there isn't anything he can do except appeal to Congress for an increase in pay.

The postal worker is underpaid. This is truth, not fiction. I marvel at the fact that postmasters are able to recruit qualified men at the extremely low rate of pay at which new employees must start.

I urge you gentlemen to approve an increase in pay which will be equitable and proper. Let me also urge you to proceed with haste since this matter has been pending for a long time and we must keep faith with those who have been waiting so patiently for us to act. I hope this committee will report a bill and send it to the floor before the end of this month. It is the only way in which we can demonstrate that we mean what we have said, that we do intend to keep our promises, that we will make this one of the first legislative enactments of the 84th Congress.

Scientist's Stand Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of February 16, 1955, there was printed a letter written and signed by that distinguished American journalist and editor, Herbert Bayard Swope.

I urge my colleagues in the House to read Mr. Swope's letter in which he discusses the outrageous speech delivered in Chicago by Prof. Harold C. Urey.

It was in this speech that Professor Urey presumed to tell the American people that a grave injustice had been

done in the conviction of the Rosenberg atomic spies.

Mr. Swope has written the best answer to Professor Urey that I have seen. The letter follows:

SCIENTIST'S STAND OPPOSED—DISSERVICE TO OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM IS SEEN IN DR. UREY'S STATEMENT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Once more the question of government by law or government by scientists has come to the fore. Prof. Harold C. Urey, at a dinner in Chicago, February 12, reported by the Times on February 13, is quoted as being convinced that a grave injustice has been done the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell, who were convicted in connection with treason to the United States in revealing secrets of the atomic bomb to Russia.

It is every man's right to adjourn to the nearest tavern and revile the court which may have rendered an adverse decision, but when it comes to a question of standardizing justice how can one better the process of assuming that truth has been served by the hands of the United States district court (in which Judge Irving R. Kaufman did a palpably honest job), the circuit court of appeals, and the United States Supreme Court, which had the Rosenberg case before it three times?

How is our thinking to be formulated? Is it to be based upon the convictions of an individual or the concerted efforts of the courts, acting on a verdict of our fellow citizens sitting as a jury—a method that represents the highest form of public opinion?

DEFENSE METHODS

Professor Urey is undoubtedly a scientist of high order, but does that fact equip him to hold an opinion better than the rest of us who may not know how to make heavy water, but who know and feel the claims of justice? The explanation does not lie in the superiority of his opinion nor that of his fellows. It lies in the curious belief that certain types of scientists are laws unto themselves. They have not yet become certain that, for better or for worse, nationalism is still prevalent. Accordingly, self-protection of a country requires an immediate and an adequate defense against any form of security violations.

Perhaps in the future we will have outgrown nationalism. Personally, I doubt it. But until that time comes I do not see that the attitude of men like Urey or J. Robert Oppenheimer, for whom I hold in other matters a good opinion, should be permitted to destroy the methods of defense through our courts that have been so laboriously built up since Magna Carta.

I think that Dr. Urey's utterance was incendiary. He has a right to an opinion, but I submit that, airing it in the manner in which he did, supported by a galaxy of names, it is not inclined to strengthen our judicial system.

Mind this: I am not one of those who demand conformity; Hitler made "Gleichformigkeit" and abhorrence. To me, democracy is defined best as dissent. But dissent can be expressed in a less arrogant and provocative manner than Professor Urey employed. I would not stop him from a free expression of opinion, but I ask that the forces of those who do not agree with his views become articulate so that their silence will not be taken to mean their assent.

SCIENCE OF LAW

Let them believe that the science of law, even though it be occasionally in error, is as important to us—even more important—than the nuclear sciences. We live under the first every day, but the second, praise be, is one that touches us only occasionally and up to now it has done us no good except in the increase of knowledge.

And knowledge, too, is restricted. Not long ago a distinguished scholar, Dr. Grayson Kirk, who is doing so well at Columbia University, used a slogan for the university's bicentennial celebration, "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof." The first part of the statement, "Man's Right to Knowledge," is sound; but the second part—"and the Free Use Thereof"—is not true. There is much knowledge that we dare not employ freely; for example, the use of knowledge that has to do with our defense.

Much that I have said about Professor Urey applies to other scientists; and I would not exclude Professor Einstein from that group.

The Times, always seeking to be scrupulously fair, printed Urey's statement at length. It owes at least one dissent to the opposition. This, then, is an effort to express that right.

HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE.

New York, February 14, 1955.

Address by Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.,
at Dallas, Tex., February 14, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to call the attention of my colleagues to an occasion of great importance to my district of Dallas County. Our most admired and respected colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOSEPH MARTIN, addressed a large gathering in Dallas February 14 as a part of our Lincoln weekend celebrations.

The response of those present left no doubt as to the affection and high esteem of the people for Mr. MARTIN. We Texans were most appreciative and proud to have him with us to benefit from his vast experience in the Federal Government and to hear his underlying concepts of the function of government.

So that others may also enjoy his remarks of that evening, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following speech which he delivered at that time:

Texas friends and neighbors, this is a visit I have anticipated for many weeks. We hear a great deal about Texas in Washington—some of it even from Texans themselves—and almost everyone winds up by saying that you have to be in Texas to see what is going on in order to believe it.

Any doubts about your growth and progress have vanished as a result of this visit. In fact, I am somewhat surprised that your fine committee could persuade this many Texans to sit still long enough to hear a speech—because only people who are very busy could have brought about what you have accomplished in recent years.

No man, I am sure, could in one evening talk about all of the wonderful things I have seen in this great State since my journey to Dallas. I have managed to absorb some of the highlights of your progress, however. In taking note of some of them, I cannot refrain from thinking that if all of our people could come to Texas for a visit, there would be no fear for the future of the Nation.

The Dallas story is one of which all of you can be justly proud.

I note that your annual payroll is over \$1 billion for the third year in a row.

That the income for all of your people in 1954 set a new record of \$12½ billion.

The census people tell us that the population of Dallas is expected to increase by 30,000 people in 1955; that the State population is growing at a rate that exceeds the national average.

Your employment is increasing steadily; your wage earners are sharing an ever-increasing amount of your prosperity; your markets and farms are prospering; and your construction records for homes and factories reach new peaks with the dawning of each new day.

Texas banks are bulging with the savings and investments of her people; Texas farm marketings are at a new high; Texas agriculture is now the most diversified in the history of the State.

Yes, even the baby business in Texas is booming. In fact, 1 out of every 16 babies born in the United States is now born a native Texan—a notable contribution on the part of Texas mothers, among their many other amazing accomplishments in the building of a bigger and better Texas.

Yes; I am now convinced; Texas is an amazing place; Her people top go-getters; her future bright with the promise that peace, progress, and prosperity are here to stay.

I want to congratulate you on electing BAUCE ALGER as the Representative in Congress from Dallas.

He is a credit to your judgment and a welcome addition to the National Legislature. Already he has established many warm friendships for the benefit of his home State and district, and we respect the intelligence and integrity he has displayed since joining us.

He has demonstrated an energy and alertness that, combined with experience, will make him an outstanding Member of the House. He will be a credit to his State and to his district.

I hope that Mr. ALGER is the first of many Republicans that Texas will send to Congress. I hope that Texas—first in so many things—will also be the first in this part of our great country to really and truly develop into a two-party State.

Had I been borne a Texan, I would be one of your best salesmen.

The fact that I was not, however, does not prevent me from sharing in the pride that is rightfully yours because of your accomplishments.

Texas and the rest of the Nation, I am firmly convinced, have prospered and grown in part because of many things that have been done in Washington during the past 2 years under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower—a native Texan.

The Eisenhower administration and the 83d Congress have set many records of progress.

First, we wiped out the economic controls which had kept our people in a state of constant irritation for more than a decade. These controls handicapped the growth of our country. Business has gone ahead faster because these controls were eliminated.

We settled for good the question of whether Texas and other States were to enjoy the constitutional privileges of managing and exploring their own lands or whether the Federal Government would be allowed limitless encroachment of the rights of our people, and, incidentally, the Federal Government prospered through the legislation.

We ended the Korean war—not completely on our terms, but in a manner at least befitting the dignity of a government determined to build a defense and a security for the long haul to peace.

We abolished certain agencies competing with private business and we sold or are

selling the competitive Federal operations which thrived on tax dollars to the detriment of free enterprise.

The administration also created a new department of Government—Health, Education and Welfare. And the President selected the best-looking Cabinet officer in history to run the Department—Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, a Texan—and she is doing a splendid job.

Many useless Government jobs were abolished, but there was no wholesale patronage firing of employees. On the contrary, the complaint was because some were not removed.

We cut taxes a total of \$7,400,000,000—the biggest reduction in history; and we reduced appropriations in 1954 and 1955 a total of \$64 billion below the 1952-53 level.

This reduction helped us in our efforts to bring about a prosperity based on peace rather than war.

Recognizing the need for a rapid expansion of the Nation's road system, the 83d Congress provided funds of almost \$2 billion for highway and farm-to-market road improvements for 1956 and 1957. In addition, the President has presented to Congress a long-range, multibillion, pay-as-you-go highway program. This is the first modern appraisal and plan for our highway needs in many years, and one that is long overdue.

The St. Lawrence seaway was voted a go-ahead in the past year, so that our eastern and midwestern waterways can expand to meet the needs of a growing population and an expanding economy in that area.

We extended social-security coverage to 10 million additional people and unemployment compensation to 4 million more Americans, recognizing as we did the need for a long-range approach to the problems and needs of a vastly increased number of older citizens.

The men and women who built up our country must not be neglected in their old age.

At the same time, we moved speedily into the field of health and hospitalization for our older people. We redesigned the construction program from a theory of building hospitals for the sake of building hospitals to a program of construction tailored to the need for rest homes and clinics. In this way, so long as the Federal Government can serve a purpose in the area of health and hospitals, we are meeting the needs of those least able to pay for proper care.

This, I might emphasize, is not a New Deal program, a Fair Deal program or a socialist program. It is a human program, as the President so consistently reiterates. It is designed to lift the burden from deserving citizens who face the misfortunes of age or illness without adequate funds. It is but a small measure of the debt we owe those who have worked as good Americans toward the better life we enjoy today.

On the defense front, we made ourselves much stronger militarily, with the full utilization of atomic weapons.

We are living in critical days. We must not minimize the threat to our way of life. Both inside and outside the country there are people who seek to undermine and destroy the freedoms we hold precious. These people must not be allowed to succeed. They cannot succeed if we are alert and vigilant.

Asia is the scene of an unfolding explosive drama. Soviet Russia and its pawn, the Chinese Reds, seek to dominate all Asia. If this could come to pass, it would eventually mean the Red domination of Africa, Asia, Europe, and perhaps eventually the United States.

This threat makes it essential for us to build our defenses so strong that we are invincible. Over \$30 billion is planned to be expended this year on defense alone, and each succeeding year will require equally large sums until the danger is over.

Wisely we are specializing in atomic weapons and atomic defense, for these instruments of warfare present the only way our shores can be attacked. Supremacy in the air and in atomic weapons as planned by President Eisenhower means security. This we must have.

President Eisenhower knows thoroughly our defense needs. When he says we can save \$2 billion for the taxpayers without impairing our defense, I say to you I am for his proposal. This cold war we are in could go on for many years, and we must have economy in our spending for armaments. We must not forget a demoralized financial condition and wild inflation could destroy our country.

The Soviet leaders are no longer a mysterious group. Their aims are as clear as the noonday sun. They seek world domination, and they steadily push to accomplish their objective.

The Red plotters will resort to arms only if they are sure they can win. They know they cannot win now, and therefore they are stalling until they think the time is ripe.

We must keep our defenses strong so that this day will never come.

Let us think about the forces that threaten us. Red China is the immediate foe, but back of her is Red Russia supplying the hardware of war.

When we hear the threatening talk of the Soviet and the Red Chinese let us not be led astray.

We all want peace. We will go a long way to secure peace. But let it be understood we are not going to be bluffed into permitting the Soviets to dominate the world. We will not be coerced into abandoning the free world to servitude and poverty.

We also have the problem of communism and subversion at home. Much has been accomplished by the Eisenhower administration to arrest subversion and bring the Red rats to light. We silenced with harsh facts those who denied the menace existed. We did this by the swift enactment of legislation designed to plug the loopholes in our security.

We stripped the Communist Party of all legal rights.

We denied Government comfort to Red-infiltrated labor unions.

We sent 50 Communist leaders to jail.

We deported more than 100 lingering subversives, who piled the Communist intrigue for years without bothering to apply for citizenship while they planned the destruction of this Nation.

Why the alien subversives were accorded the freedom of this Nation—some for more than a decade—we have yet to learn. We still seek the answer to the question of who built the barrier of illegal protection around them.

When you hear the rattling disputes over the administration's security program, keep these questions in mind. Many have not been answered as yet, many may never be. But so long as I remain in the House of Representatives, an answer to all the questions will be sought.

As a nation, we cherish individual rights. Each of us is entitled to a complete and fair appraisal of our lives at the bar of public opinion as well as in our courts.

Let us retain that freedom without the tarnish of personal restrictions—but let us retain also the commonsense that recognizes the ability of some to use it as a shield while subverting the very heart-beat of personal liberty.

Never forget that once we relax our vigilance, the Communists will seize again upon the same pattern of manipulation, infiltration and spying that worked against us before.

We do not seek revenge against those who blundered in the past. Nor are we seeking silence from those who deny the blunders

or are blind to the dangers we face. Let them speak. But let us weigh their words against the facts as we know them. And I believe when we do, responsible Americans will support with vigor continued efforts to stamp out the Red evil in our time.

Now, what of the future on other fronts?

As I said, last year we gave the largest tax reduction in the history of the country. It is on that solid foundation we will make 1955 a year of prosperity. You may recall how some political partisans were saying last year that we were in a depression. Well, they were just as wrong as men can be. That depression was averted by wise leadership—1953 and 1954 were the 2 most prosperous years in our history, and 1955 will also be a great year for America.

Official Government statistics show that for automobiles, furniture, appliances, food, clothing, personal services, and traveling, our people will spend more—by many, many millions—than they did in 1953 and 1954. In addition, industry alone will spend a record-breaking \$27 billion for construction this year.

The President envisions, and I heartily concur, that a long period of great expansion, stretching to new horizons of peace and plenty, is ahead for us all.

The President's concept of the future is based on the conviction that private citizens must have the widest latitude to contribute to the development of the economy—an opportunity consistent with the needs of all our people, one in concept with the enterprise and ingenuity that built the great Nation we serve today.

This means for the future more good homes, more good schools, better health facilities, and lessening of the impact of disaster upon our citizens in all walks of life.

Our people are self-reliant. They always have been. Thus we build to strengthen that self-reliance instead of weakening it with paternalistic governmental interference in our daily lives.

With this in mind, the President has presented to Congress a program of progress. Designed to supplement the accomplishments of the 83d Congress, this program consists of:

An adjustment of trade regulations to promote the flow of trade and capital between friendly nations and to protect American industry.

A continuation of policies to ferret out and neutralize subversion.

A further cut of \$4½ billion below Government spending in the fiscal year which ended last June 30.

Improvements in the partnership development between Government and private enterprise in the utilization, conservation, and development of our natural resources.

Extended development of a modern highway system in keeping with the growth of our population and the expansion of our towns and cities.

More than \$12 billion for the development of flood control, navigation, harbor improvements, construction of roads, schools, and other utilities.

Improvements in programs to provide better care for our mentally ill, our crippled children, and voluntary health insurance coverage by private concerns.

And, finally, but not the least in importance, the continuation of policies which meet the broad requirements of a growing nation, dedicated to the needs of our steadily increasing standard of living.

Our chances of success on the legislative front are great if our legislators meet the challenge before us. Politically we have a divided house, but the problems this presents should not blind us to the human needs of our people in the days ahead.

I cannot help but be enthusiastic about the future. Just recently—if you will grant me a personal remark—I completed 40 years

of public service. At no time in those 40 years has America ever looked more strong, more abundant, or in better shape to grasp the opportunity for progress that lies ahead.

We have a way of life that is the envy of the world. We have never faltered in sharing our bounty, nor will we now blight our future by selfish motives.

Two global wars have thundered across the vistas of our dreams for peace and plenty. These wars have claimed too many of our courageous young.

More than ever today the world is aware that wars settle nothing, that man's search for peace must be fruitful or we perish.

Let us resolve that in the days ahead we will be strong and steadfast, yet patient and prayerful, and as dedicated Americans work toward the goals we all seek.

Abundance is bulging on the horizons of our lives. The sum of man's knowledge in science, art, and religion mounts steadily toward the rising star of permanent peace and freedom.

The decades of desolation of spirit and wealth lie behind us if we move with confidence and inspiration in the days ahead.

We must work together as Americans; we must unite to help those who lead us.

Our great President, Dwight Eisenhower, has dedicated much of his life to public service.

If we falter in our support of his hopes and ideals, we add to the burden he carries for us all.

Let us as free men take up our share of the task ahead. Let us walk together with buoyant confidence that in God's will the pathways of peace and plenty will climb to the pinnacle of man's faith and spirit that rests in the hearts of men of good will everywhere. By striving thus we will reach the goals of peace, progress, and prosperity for all mankind.

Compensation of Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the attached assembly joint resolution of the California Legislature relative to the compensation of postal employees:

Assembly Joint Resolution 4

Joint resolution relative to the compensation of postal employees

Whereas employees of the United States Post Office Department have received but one wage increase since 1949, which increase failed to compensate them for the great increase in the cost of living that has occurred since 1949; and

Whereas most other public and private employees have received wage increases which more nearly enables them to meet the increased living costs; and

Whereas any increase in the cost of living particularly affects postal employees because of their relatively low wages; and

Whereas postal employees should receive an increase in wages not only because such an increase would be equitable but also because the efficiency of the postal system would be enhanced thereby: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully

memorialized to enact legislation for an increase in the compensation of postal employees commensurate with existing costs of living; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States.

A Little Wider Publicity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by William Chapman White which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 16, 1955. This well illustrates how a persistent and intelligent editor of a weekly paper on the Pacific coast can make his influence felt in the metropolitan paper of New York.

The article follows:

A LITTLE WIDER PUBLICITY

(By William Chapman White)

It is doubtful if many people in these parts read a weekly newspaper published in San Mateo County, in California. It has the somewhat impressive title of "The Half Moon Bay Review and Pescadero Pebble." It usually devotes its news columns to the doings of local organizations, including the Sons of Italy, the PTA, and the 4-H Clubs, to water-supply problems, and to the troubles of the local artichoke growers.

The paper carries on its front page a column written by George E. Dunn, a small-town newspaperman. For some years Mr. Dunn has hammered away at one thing in his column: the need for stiffer sentences, even up to death, for anyone caught selling narcotics to children. Time and again he has written: "There must be more severe penalties placed on those who deal in selling narcotics."

That would seem to be almost obvious, yet too often newspapers all over the land carry stories on the inside pages about dope sellers sentenced to 3 months, 6 months, perhaps even a year. A man can get more than that for stealing a broken, second-hand car or even a scrawny rooster. One after the other, various magazines and papers have published exposés of the use and sale of drugs in small groups in big-city schools. The readers are appropriately shocked. The police bestir themselves for a while. Eventually the problem of the dope traffic to children comes to the courts and the courts can only do what the law allows.

It allows death or life imprisonment for murder, but murder is usually a one-time act. Narcotics selling is chain murder, passing something worse than death on to children yet unborn. The death penalty or life imprisonment may not break up the narcotics trade any more than hanging stopped all horse stealing in the West; but as was said at one horse thief's execution: "The chances are this'll stop him from further horse thieving."

A few weeks ago Congressman J. ARTHUR YOUNGER introduced a bill into this session of Congress. In part it reads: "Any person

who sells or in any manner facilitates the sale to a minor of any narcotic drug . . . shall (in addition to any other applicable penalties prescribed by law) suffer death or imprisonment for life." In addition to this bill now before Congress, two similar bills have been introduced into this session of the California Legislature. One calls for 20 years imprisonment for the first conviction for selling dope to children and death for a second conviction on the same charge. The other bill asks a mandatory 15-year sentence for first conviction and life, without parole, for a second.

It is no accident that Congressman YOUNGER not only comes from California but right from San Mateo County, where Mr. Dunn's columns have their widest circulation. It must be deeply satisfying to Mr. Dunn not only to know that his columns are read but that something he has whammed away at in his column year in and out finally emerges as a bill in Congress.

In his most recent column Mr. Dunn wrote: "To get wider publicity on this subject I would appreciate it if other newspapers give some notice of what endeavors are being made by our legislators in behalf of our youth." That modest request is worth answering. The whole story is typical of the force and the influence that small-town newspapers often possess even though not all that they strive for winds up as a bill in Congress.

It is also heartening to find that Mr. Dunn has never once said, "Look what I did."

The Federal Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, has gotten that subcommittee off to a good start by presenting at its organizational meeting a concise yet comprehensive history of irrigation and reclamation in the West and development of present reclamation policy. I commend this document, prepared by Mr. ASPINALL with the able assistance of the engineering consultant of our committee, Mr. Sid McFarland, to all my colleagues. Copies may be obtained by calling the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD following these remarks, a recent news story and an editorial from the Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo.:

ASPINALL BRIEFS SUBCOMMITTEE ON RECLAMATION, IRRIGATION

(By George S. Holmes)

WASHINGTON.—Something new happened in Congress today. The chairman of a subcommittee prepared the members of the group for their labors by presenting a brief but comprehensive history of the subject with which they will deal.

The chairman was WAYNE N. ASPINALL, the subcommittee, the irrigation and reclamation group of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the history, the origin and development of irrigation and reclamation in the West.

Representative ASPINALL included in the review of the Government's activities in

reclamation from their inception until the present, for the benefit of the new Members not only of the full House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee but of his own Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Many of the new Democratic Members are freshmen, while others have previously served on other committees. ASPINALL's treatise tells them what it is all about and will moreover contribute a basic understanding of the objectives and problems of reclamation which should be extremely helpful to oldtimers on the committee as well as newcomers.

Tracing the origin of irrigation in the United States from the use of the waters of City Creek, in Salt Lake City, by Brigham Young and his followers, in 1847, to the colossal hydroelectric multiple-purpose Federal projects of today, ASPINALL produced figures of astronomical proportions to illustrate the economic wealth irrigation and reclamation have brought to the Nation in general and the West in particular. Here are some of the developments and statistics he cited:

Since 1902, when President Theodore Roosevelt signed the first reclamation act, 79 Federal reclamation projects or major divisions of projects have been constructed by the Government, from many of which private irrigation groups also receive water.

In the 52 years elapsing since creation of reclamation operations, 116 dams have been built, including Hoover, Grand Coulee, Shasta, Hungry Horse, and others, as well as over 5,000 miles of canals, some big enough to carry the waters of rivers of major size. Included in these structures is the world's longest irrigation tunnel, on the Colorado-Big Thompson project in Colorado.

As the result of the availability of water, irrigable lands have increased from 39,300 in 1906 to 7,147,528 acres by June 30, 1953. On these redeemed lands are located 125,000 family-sized farms and 417 towns with a combined population of 1,653,000.

In 1953 the value of crops from federally irrigated land was \$785,940,000. The cumulative value of such crops since 1906 through June 30, 1953, was \$9.7 billion.

During 1954 more than 24.5 billion kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric energy were provided for the power system of the Western States, bringing a return of \$33,900,000 to the United States Treasury.

The total of all net power revenues returned to the Federal Treasury through June 30, 1953, was \$225.9 million.

Net power revenues during the next 50 years from 1953, at the level of fiscal year 1954, should return an additional \$1,692.5 million to the Treasury.

Irrigation and municipal water repayment contracts should return \$691 million, of which \$108.9 million had been paid to June 30, 1953.

Representative ASPINALL described the stimulating effects of this crop and power production on the natural economy as "almost incalculable," as shown by the steady flow of commerce between Eastern and Western States in carload shipments.

The total cost of project plant properly for the Federal reclamation program, as of June 30, 1953, he told his listeners, amounted to approximately \$2.4 billion. This, he emphasized, is only one-fourth the cumulative value of the crops produced on Federal projects, and is also less than the Federal tax revenues received from reclamation areas which may be attributed to Federal reclamation development.

In a brief section on the development of reclamation policy, ASPINALL stressed the fact that repayment of construction costs by the beneficiaries has remained a basic cornerstone through the entire 52 years. Thus, the revenues from water users, and from power developments, help to pay for the

projects, whereas costs allocated to flood control and navigation are nonreimbursable, in accordance with policies established by Congress. Local communities and States, he pointed out, are always consulted in the planning of projects, and operations are turned over to local irrigation districts as soon as practicable.

ASPINALL spells out nine specific major policies on reclamation, since its origin and devotes attention also to special problems, including economic justification and financial feasibility, the 160-acre limitation on water deliveries, the repayment features of the program, the application of power revenues in the reduction of irrigation costs, and the lack of Federal water policy, which has permitted flood control and other Federal activity to go forward on a nonreimbursable basis, while at the same time requiring reimbursement for irrigation construction.

"There is need to re-assess all water conservation programs," he states, "in terms of their contribution to the Nation's economy and the direct recognition of the place water conservation has in the development of the total resource whether it be for flood control, power, or irrigation or other purposes."

In the opinion of this writer, "ASPINALL's Primer on Federal Reclamation" should be required reading by all Members of the Congress.

ASPINALL PRIMER—AID TO CONGRESS AND WEST

Typifying the thoroughness and energy with which the Congressman from the Fourth District of Colorado goes about his job is the compilation and distribution of the ASPINALL Primer on Reclamation, described in Wednesday's paper by the Sentinel's Washington correspondent, George S. Holmes.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the irrigation and reclamation group of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Congressman ASPINALL has compiled a concise yet comprehensive history of irrigation and reclamation in the West, and has made it available to every member of his committee and to other new Members of Congress. In making such information available in concise form to these legislators, WAYNE ASPINALL has served both his fellow Congressmen and the West. For there is no doubt that ignorance of the reclamation system, how it operates, and how it is financed, and of what it has contributed and can contribute to the general welfare of the Nation, is one of the chief reasons that western reclamation projects have been traditionally opposed by many, many Members of Congress.

ASPINALL's primer, we trust, will come to the attention of every Representative and Senator and receive their consideration. It comes at a time when reclamation legislation that is of vital importance to the advancement and prosperity of the whole intermountain area—and therefore to the whole Nation—is soon to be up for consideration.

Defense Against Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following edi-

torial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 17, 1955:

DEFENSE AGAINST FALLOUT

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Administration have acted wisely in making public a summary of the radioactive after-effects of nuclear explosions. Hard facts are the basis for intelligent planning; and Chairman Strauss' measured statement about the fallout seeks to give the facts in perspective. We suspect that the apprehensions about public panic as a result of this sort of disclosure will prove wholly unjustified. Most of the present information about the fallout, although never before released officially, has been known for some time through various printed stories. Such stories may have caused some alarm, but they also have been greeted with a considerable degree of apathy—perhaps because people simply do not want to think about a cataclysm they feel they can do nothing about. This feeling of futility is, if anything, more deadly than fear.

Full understanding of the great dangers about which Mr. Strauss spoke remains essential. Radioactive fallout from a hydrogen explosion could contaminate an area the size of New Jersey and make it uninhabitable for weeks if not months, even if the bulk of the population managed to survive the blast effects and the immediate lethal dosage of radioactivity. The use of the H-bomb to deny territory could be as significant strategically as the destructive effect itself. Nevertheless, there are many relatively simple precautions that can be taken by way of shelter and discipline, as the Atomic Energy Commission points out, that would greatly reduce the loss of life from radioactivity.

Why is there apathy to even the most gruesomely realistic accounts of the H-bomb danger? Because, in this newspaper's opinion, the people have not been presented with a convincing alternative to the paralyzing prospect of being roasted or garmmarayed to ashes if hydrogen war should start. Surely it is time for a radical New Look at the status of civil defense.

The sad fact is that in its net impact civil defense still is in an appalling state of disorganization—not for lack of effort on the part of persons working in it, but because of insufficient attention at the top levels of Government. Congress has treated civil defense more or less as a joke, in part, no doubt, as the result of a can't happen here complex, but also in part because legislators have not been satisfied that the planning is practical. Despite the hard work of many persons, the program is rife with contradictory assumptions and outmoded instructions. For example, in the District of Columbia, which presumably would be one of the major targets, the air-raid warning system so far is of little value; it is impossible to distinguish between the feeble siren tests and an ordinary two-alarm fire. There is little point in recruiting air-raid wardens and ground observers unless they can be instructed realistically in what will be expected of them.

Apathy and futility are luxuries the country cannot afford. Even in the event of an all-out hydrogen attack, estimates are that 65 percent of the population would survive; with adequate civil defense as much as 95 percent would survive. But an adequate program will not come about accidentally. It can only be obtained if men of stature will attach serious importance to the program and if the makeshift expedients are replaced with consistent, hard-headed planning at the top level. Such planning ought to envisage specific instructions to cities as to the kind of blast and fallout they could expect and the practicable evacuation and shelter measures they ought to prepare. It ought to be related to the amount of early warning that may be provided—the present stage, when the margin of warning would

be small and immediate shelter ought to be sought; the period in which 1 to 4 hours of warning would be possible and large-scale evacuation would be feasible; and, finally, the era of the awesome intercontinental ballistic missile if it should be developed.

None of this is in any way a substitute for enforceable disarmament. The only sure defense against the H-bomb is to control it (and this newspaper reiterates its proposal of last Friday for an internationally monitored moratorium on H-bomb tests as a starter). But even in the absence of international control Americans can do a great deal to protect themselves, given some more vigorous planning and leadership. It is absurd for the country to be spending hundreds of millions of dollars on continental defense and an early warning system and then to permit the necessary followthrough at the civil defense level to be dissipated in lethargy and confusion. Americans have a history of responding sensibly if they are told frankly and realistically what is necessary. The administration and Congress bear a joint responsibility to provide this leadership and the money that will be required to make it effective.

Postal Salary Increase Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement submitted by me to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of an adequate and realistic salary increase for postal workers:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to state my views in support of legislation providing an adequate and realistic wage increase for postal workers. Such an increase is long overdue and I respectfully request your favorable consideration of H. R. 1592 and H. R. 2183 introduced by Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON and GEORGE M. RHODES, respectively.

There is general agreement that there should be an increase in the salaries of postal employees. H. R. 1592 and H. R. 2183, providing an increase of 10 percent, represent, I submit, an absolute minimum for those workers who have been underpaid for so long despite a constant rise in our standard of living. The last salary increase was in 1951 and the rise in the cost of living since then makes it imperative that the pending adjustment not only be adequate but that it be made as soon as possible.

As I stated to this committee during the postal pay legislation hearings last year it is a grave reflection on our Government that many employees of our Post Office Department, one of the largest businesses in the world, are forced to supplement their inadequate salaries with outside work in order to meet the increasing cost of living today.

I know what it is to be a housewife. I can understand the frustration of the wives of postal workers in attempting to make ends meet on salaries which are far removed from the real needs of the family.

The postal system is a vital part of our Government and the Government has an obligation to see that it is operated as efficiently as possible. One sure way of undermining this efficiency is by continuing to pay salaries which are grossly inadequate. Postal

employees are entitled to a decent wage that will enable them to care for their families.

The bill proposed by the Postmaster General embodying his reclassification plan is completely unrealistic and delegates power to the Postmaster General that is both unwarranted and unnecessary, and does not provide a fair and reasonable salary increase to postal workers.

I sincerely urge this committee to report out H. R. 1592 or H. R. 2183 and give the Congress an opportunity to pass this long needed legislation as early as possible.

Arizona and the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, our national policy concerning reclamation and power programs is being hotly debated these days. It is likely that many Members of Congress are rethinking their position on these questions. I think some light is thrown on this area of dispute by a penetrating editorial entitled "Arizona and the TVA," which appeared in the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., last Sunday. This piece deserves a wide audience, for its author is no political partisan, but the vigorously independent and widely respected William R. Mathews.

The editorial follows:

ARIZONA AND THE TVA

When Senator BARRY GOLDWATER recently glorified the controversial Dixon-Yates contract, and at the same time denounced the TVA as "socialistic," he must have forgotten the environment of his own city of Phoenix, and the activities of some of his staunch friends.

Phoenix, for instance, is the center of the Salt River Valley reclamation project. This project is run by the Salt River Valley Water Users Association. As the first major irrigation project it was originated by a Republican Congress back in the days of President Taft. It was financed federally by Congress with the assumption that all or part of the cost would be repaid.

The Roosevelt Dam, built in 1912, stands as evidence of how the waters of a river can be stored and as they are released for irrigation, generate electricity. Since the initiation of this project, what had been a semidesert has been transformed into one of the greatest wealth-producing valleys in the world.

Although it was made possible by the Federal Government and the use of Federal funds, the final repayments are just being made over a period of 40 years. It has at all times been tax exempt. As it developed, its management has not hesitated to use commonsense, and as the water flowed through the powerhouse of the Roosevelt Dam to generate electricity, other dams and other generating stations were built at lower levels. The result is that the same water generates electricity several times.

The managers of the project have sold the electricity to reduce the cost per acre-foot of water to the farmers. As dry years came on and the water dried up behind the dams, the managers correctly saw that until they could deliver firm electrical power, they would operate at a disadvantage.

Again they did the common sense thing. They built a steam plant, and have added to it. They borrowed the money to do it, and to this day it is tax exempt.

The magic that this enterprise of electricity and water can work opened up new vistas of what our land here in Arizona can produce once it receives water and electricity. The development of irrigation has spread to such an extent that now the use of the water from the Colorado River becomes a reasonable matter. The organization of the central Arizona project to promote diversion of Colorado River waters to central Arizona has come as a natural reaction.

Behind this newest project are some of the best brains and ability in the State. There is not a Socialist among these men. Some of them, most of them, are beneficiaries of the Salt River project. They know what can be done, and they do not call their project socialistic. What is more, they expect Senator GOLDWATER to get an appropriation from Congress to build it.

Between this achievement here in Arizona and the TVA there is a direct connection. If the waters of the rivers of Tennessee can be used to generate electricity, and by that means attract industries and by manufacturing fertilizer restore wornout lands, why should that be called socialistic? If so, the Salt River project and the proposed central Arizona project are socialistic.

Why is one sponsored by a Democratic administration called socialistic, while the other sponsored by a Republican administration—the first administration incidentally to have the vision of the wonders of rivers, electricity, and irrigation—accepted as private enterprise?

The Dixon-Yates contract fits in, too. If it was good business for the Salt River project to build its own tax exempt steam plant rather than buy electricity from a local utility company, why should it not be good business for TVA to do the same thing?

The issue of free enterprise is not at stake, because the Dixon-Yates contract is a cinch. There is no risk in it. Its profits are guaranteed by the United States Government. Free enterprise implies taking risks with one's own resources. It is a system of profit and loss. It did not take creative ability to put over the Dixon-Yates contract. All it took was the right kind of political influence.

The value of all this discussion, and the thing that Senator GOLDWATER has overlooked, is that here in Arizona we have proved how the harnessing of rivers, and putting their waters to productive use, can create other Valleys of the Sun, and that just as it took Federal financing and authority to do it here, so will it with other projects of which the TVA is another good example.

Air Force's Military Air Transport Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an editorial which appeared in my hometown paper the Coshocton Tribune. To say I am in complete accord with this editorial would be putting it in mild terms.

It has been my privilege to be the recipient of MATS efficiency and cour-

tesy. This department and their personnel go way beyond the line of duty as it is often referred to. They have accepted many challenges and hazards and have always responded with honor and distinction. They are entitled to the thanks of us all.

CONGRATULATIONS

When a war is on, we hear a good deal about the Air Force's Military Air Transport Service. We are extremely conscious then of the huge bulk of men and materials which it lifts swiftly and safely to distant battlefield areas. But we seem to forget that this effort goes on with or without a war.

In 1954, its planes averaged a flight over the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean once every 54 minutes. Every hour of the year, MATS airlifted an average of 56 military passengers, 5 medical patients, and more than 20,000 pounds of high-priority cargo and mail.

Congratulations to MATS are clearly merited for a distinguished showing under every sort of hazard and challenge.

Rapid Growth of the San Fernando Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the rapid growth of the San Fernando Valley. The growth is phenomenal and merits the attention of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States:

VALLEY LEADS LOS ANGELES GROWTH WITH 613,188—COUNTY COMMISSION REPORTS INCREASE TO FIRST OF YEAR

The San Fernando Valley now has 613,188 residents.

This figure, which includes the cities of Burbank and San Fernando, was released today by the county regional planning commission and reports the valley's growth to January 1, 1955.

Meanwhile, the county's total population jumped to a record figure of 4,982,529, according to the report. This represents an increase of 175,896 for the calendar year 1954.

Los Angeles city's population including Torrance, was estimated to 2,228,050, according to the same report.

VALLEY LEADS

The figures for the valley indicate that this is the fastest growing area in the entire county, said Dr. Jackson Mayers, of Valley Junior College sociology department who completed three surveys of the valley.

While central Los Angeles City areas were losing population, the valley section of the city, excluding the cities of Burbank and San Fernando, increased population from 310,964 as of the 1950 census to the present 505,338, Dr. Mayers states.

This represents a 62.5 percent increase in less than 5 years.

HIGHER PERCENTAGE

The totals reveal that the valley is growing at the rate of 3,420 persons a month or 41,000 a year.

The valley growth, Dr. Mayers reported, is the main reason for the 200,586 increase of population in Los Angeles City since 1950. It is responsible for 98 percent of the growth.

Further estimates show that, where the valley was 15.7 percent of the city in 1950, today it has 23 percent of city population.

Burbank, which had 78,577 residents in 1950, now has 92,501. San Fernando City jumped from 12,992 to 15,349 in the same period.

VALLEY POPULATION GAINS 212,077 IN 5 YEARS (By Dr. Jackson Mayers, sociologist at Valley Junior College)

The all-Valley population gain of 212,077 in less than 5 years since the 1950 census exceeds the population increases of any other major city area in the entire United States, a national comparison revealed today.

With a combined population of 618,343 for Los Angeles city parts of the valley, Burbank, San Fernando, and Calabasas, the San Fernando Valley is accredited with being the fastest growing area of its size in the country. Its population is moving up faster than that of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, the nonvalley parts of Los Angeles city, Detroit, and Baltimore. The valley is also exceeding the growth pace of Cleveland, St. Louis, Washington, D. C., Boston, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Milwaukee, and Houston.

Only these cities have larger populations than the San Fernando Valley.

The valley has within it the county's sixth largest town, Van Nuys, which with 94,200 population is exceeded only by Los Angeles city, Long Beach, Hollywood, Pasadena, and Glendale. For the first time Van Nuys has become larger than Burbank which has a population of 92,501.

In 1950 Van Nuys had 57,053 people. The gain in less than 5 years is 65 percent. At its present rate of growth, Van Nuys will become the first city in the San Fernando Valley to pass the 100,000 mark. This record total can be reached some time this year.

Burbank, the second largest valley community, has risen 18 percent over the 78,577 total reported in the 1950 census.

Third place in population goes to North Hollywood with 85,000 people reported as of 1955. This compares to a 1950 total of 69,398, for a rise of 22.5 percent.

The fastest growing town of the whole valley is Reseda with a reported population of 55,000. This represents a 234 percent rise over the 16,456 figure of 1950.

Right behind is Pacoima which registered a 1955 population of 48,000. The total is almost exactly double the 24,301 reported in 1950.

SUN VALLEY UP 39 PERCENT

Sun Valley is up 39 percent to 32,500 people. In 1950 it had 23,359 people.

Studio City with 29,000 is up 37 percent over the 1950 total of 21,046.

With 20,500 people Sherman Oaks showed a rise of 33 percent over the 1950 figure of 15,425.

These increases give the valley 8 cities with populations of 20,000 or more.

Calabasas, which is outside Los Angeles city, has a reported 4,155 people. The city of San Fernando reached 15,349.

Significance of the figures is that city areas of this size are well beyond any known suburb size. These areas are now in the city class. They are meeting most of the basic needs of their populations in essential respects. The Los Angeles area is now changed from a major city and many suburbs to a series of cities, one beside the other. A series of multiple nuclei have come into existence.

In 1959, Los Angeles was the only major city to have less population than the surrounding towns in the county. Los Angeles was outnumbered by 51 percent against 49 percent. It is not dominant in a population sense as is, say, the city of Chicago, where the main city represents 75 percent of Cook County population.

VALLEY HIGH IN NATIONAL CONSTRUCTION

San Fernando Valley (exclusive of Burbank and San Fernando cities) finished

fourth in the Nation in new construction valuation for 1954, according to figures of 40 leading cities, compiled by Dun & Bradstreet, Inc.

Building total here exceeded that of St. Louis, Washington, D. C., Miami, and Minneapolis combined. Following is the table of construction valuations for 1954:

New York.....	\$546,570,149
Los Angeles.....	408,671,889
Chicago.....	229,881,300
San Fernando Valley.....	208,912,098
Houston.....	165,338,198
Dallas.....	142,690,046
Philadelphia.....	137,508,800
Detroit.....	126,511,219
Milwaukee.....	102,241,364
Denver.....	100,569,348
Baltimore.....	89,122,612
Atlanta.....	87,541,690
Seattle.....	77,188,350
San Diego.....	72,379,291
Cleveland.....	62,255,000
St. Louis.....	60,683,304
Kansas City, Mo.....	58,674,000
San Antonio.....	58,307,589
San Francisco.....	57,745,732
Washington, D. C.....	55,687,881
New Orleans.....	54,948,128
Cincinnati.....	53,772,510
Portland, Ore.....	50,525,755
Memphis.....	49,178,068
Miami, Fla.....	49,019,186
Oklahoma City.....	48,515,918
Fort Worth.....	47,081,476
Austin, Tex.....	45,538,709
Long Beach, Calif.....	45,258,150
Columbus, Ohio.....	44,813,590
Wichita.....	41,416,975
Jacksonville.....	41,208,690
Tampa.....	40,944,437
Spokane.....	40,713,804

Mr. Sam Makes History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared January 4, 1955, in the issue of the Daily Times published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., titled: "Mr. Sam Makes History."

It pleased me and I think it will please you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SAM MAKES HISTORY

When SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, is elected Speaker of the House of Representatives tomorrow, he will be establishing historic records.

For one thing, he will be only the second man in all our history—and the first since the Civil War—to be elected Speaker after he had lost the post twice before. Mr. RAYBURN held that office in 1940-1947 and again in 1949-1953. Now he makes it for the third time.

For another point, this is the first time that a Speaker has been chosen for a seventh term.

And, too, Mr. RAYBURN has already served as Speaker for 10 years, 3½ months, which is the all-time record for that job. His new tenure will add years to that record and establish it as even harder for successors to surpass.

Lastly, Mr. RAYBURN heads the list of all our Congressmen in seniority. He now be-

gins his 22d consecutive term since he first took his seat in the House on March 4, 1913.

This has been the record, mind you, of a man who on Thursday celebrates his 73d birthday. Like "Veep" BARKLEY, of Kentucky, who at 77 returns to the Senate over which he once presided, "Mr. SAM" of the Fourth Texas Congressional District, doesn't allow age to slow him down.

And it is comforting that we have in the important post of Speaker, one with his experience and wisdom. For he is second in line of Presidential succession.

Great Lakes Connecting Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which will bring ocean-going vessels to the docks of Milwaukee and other Great Lakes harbors beyond Lake Erie.

The Common Council of the City of Milwaukee has recently adopted a resolution which supports the attempts to deepen the connecting channels of the Great Lakes.

We have heard many eloquent speeches recently on the necessity for expanded foreign trade, in which I strongly concur. The people of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Michigan are inclined to support the reciprocal trade bill, because they see the day approaching when all the Great Lakes will become an artery for foreign trade.

It is inconsistent, Mr. Speaker, for the House of Representatives to support expanded foreign trade, if we do not at the same time support legislation which will enable deep draft ocean navigation to enter the great commercial heart of America, the Middle West.

I therefore commend the following resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee, February 8, 1955:

Resolution regarding Federal legislation and appropriations to deepen connecting channels of the Great Lakes

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Canada are now engaged in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project, which, when completed in 1959, will open the port of Milwaukee and other cities of the Great Lakes to deep draft ocean navigation, with great benefits to the economy of the entire midcontinent area and to national defense; and

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway project will provide 27-foot navigation only to Lake Erie, and the connecting channels of the Great Lakes in the Detroit River, St. Clair River, Straits of Mackinac, and St. Marys River will require deepening in order to bring the full benefits of the St. Lawrence seaway project and deep-draft navigation to the ports of Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior; and

Whereas, entirely aside from the requirements of the St. Lawrence seaway project, the deepening of Great Lakes shipping channels is timely and necessary to utilize to full capacity the many large vessels which have entered service on the Great Lakes recently, representing an investment of hundreds of

millions of dollars, and which are now unable to operate at full capacity due to channel depth limitations; and

Whereas the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels will add to the efficiency of lake and ocean shipping and will confer great economic benefits on the commerce of the Great Lakes and of the entire Middle West, and is consistent with the trend toward deep-draft shipping and the substantial deepening of seaboard harbors at many localities; and

Whereas congressional legislation for this purpose should be given high priority so that the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels may be completed in time to coincide with the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., That this body hereby declares its vigorous support for legislation to authorize the deepening of Great Lakes connecting channels and the appropriation of funds for that purpose by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin be requested to exert their best efforts to secure the passage of such authorizing and appropriating legislation by the 84th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Harbor Commissioners and other interested city officials and departments be authorized by this Common Council to take all steps necessary to further the progress of connecting channels deepening legislation, and to collaborate with all other ports, associations, and interests working toward this end; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to the President of the United States; to the Senators and Members in Congress from the State of Wisconsin; to the Public Works Committee, House of Representatives; to the Commerce Committee, United States Senate; and to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Security Risks and the Risks To Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Harlan Cleveland, executive editor of the Reporter, given at the Rockdale Avenue Temple, in Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 23, 1955, is most appropriate. I direct it to the attention of our colleagues:

SECURITY RISKS AND THE RISKS TO FREEDOM
(By Harlan Cleveland)

Your celebration tonight, 300 years after the first Jewish settlement in America, is bound to remind us of what the Jews have done to build our country. In the spirit of the occasion, perhaps I should take a text from one Jew who laid a calming hand on the Nation's brow in a moment of stress and unreason.

He was Jacob Henry, one of our first security risks. You'll remember that he represented Carteret County in the North Carolina House of Commons in 1808, and was reelected in 1809. Two weeks after the session of 1809 opened, a colleague from Rockingham County moved that Jacob Henry's seat be vacated because, contrary to the constitutional requirement, he "denies the divine authority of the New Testa-

ment, and refused to take the oath prescribed by law for his qualification."

Debate started the next day, and Jacob Henry made a speech justly famous for its rhetoric—and famous also because he was right and his opponents were wrong. "The day, I trust, is long past," said Jacob Henry, "when principles merely speculative were propagated by force. . . . The proud monuments of liberty knew that . . . governments were only concerned about the actions and conduct of man, and not his speculative notions. . . . Will you bind the conscience in chains, and fasten conviction upon the mind, in spite of the conclusions of reason, and of those ties and habitudes which are blended with every pulsation of the heart?"

Jacob Henry won his fight, but he couldn't win ours. We have to do that ourselves. A few years ago, the phrase "security risk" was just another piece of Washington jargon. Now the phrase and all it connotes, sits like a heavy rock on the Nation's conscience, and we have to ask once more, "Will you bind the conscience in chains, and fasten conviction upon the mind?"

A few weeks ago, Albert Einstein wrote our magazine a letter commenting on a series of articles about American science. "Instead of trying to analyze the problem," he said, "I may express my feeling in a short remark: If I would be a young man again and had to decide how to make my living, I would not try to become a scientist or scholar or teacher. I would rather choose to be a plumber or a peddler in the hope to find that degree of independence still available under present circumstances."

At about the same time, these other things were happening:

The chief of a special mission to Brazil was trying to explain to his Brazilian host why the American Government had assigned a detective to accompany him. How could he explain it? The security officer was along to check up, not on the Brazilians but on the members of the American mission.

A friend of mine, back from Germany, showed me a dossier 3 inches thick. "I collected all these papers," he said proudly, "to prove beyond question that I resigned from the Government. Otherwise, everybody will think I was fired."

A Foreign Service officer named John Paton Davies was released from the State Department. Secretary of State Dulles had found that his reporting on China showed a definite lack of judgment, discretion, and reliability. During the next few days, Mr. Dulles showed how much these security questions tug at a man's conscience. The very next day, the Secretary of State called Davies' lawyer to say he would be glad for Davies to use his name as a reference with any future employer. A few days later, the Secretary was quoted by a visitor as still worried. The interview had nothing to do with Davies; but referring to the subject of discussion, the Secretary reportedly said, in effect: "This is very much like the Davies case. We know what is the right thing to do, but we can't of course afford to do it."

Over at the Department of Agriculture, a veteran farm attaché was thrown out. The State Department's security office had cleared him, but Secretary Benson had read part of the file to the President, and the President had said the file scared him. Harold Stassen rehired the man for a sensitive job in a sensitive country, but the President declined to tell his press conference he thought Secretary Benson had been wrong.

At about the same time these more or less tragic events were transpiring, the security program also had its lighthearted side. In one Government agency, a man was called on the carpet by the security office. He had been observed the previous evening with a blonde in a downtown cocktail lounge. How come? The employee, who liked his work, swallowed the obvious retort that it was

none of the Government's business, and produced evidence that the blonde was his cousin, in town for a short visit.

In a municipal court, somewhere in the United States, a drunk refused to answer a question, and said he would "stand on the fifth commandment." The magistrate was equal to the occasion. "You mean you honor your father and your mother?" he retorted. "O. K. Now answer the question."

I understand a Hebrew proverb has it that if God were living on earth, people would break his windows. The tropic growth of the Government's security program tempts me to bring this saying up to date. Nowadays, if God were living on earth, he would be a security risk.

What's got into us, anyway?

It's hard to remember now how recent it all is. In 1939, 15 years ago, when the Russians had been in power already for 22 years, we had no general security program, not even in the Federal Government. That was the year I entered the public service. I was hired under a civil-service code that started out with rule 1, published by the Civil Service Commission in 1884. Listen a moment to rule 1:

"No question in any form or application in any examination shall be so framed as to elicit information concerning the political or religious opinions or affiliations of any applicant, nor shall any inquiry be made concerning such opinions or affiliations, and all disclosures thereof shall be discounted."

I didn't realize it at the time, but in the same year I joined the Government, rule 1 was consigned to the ashcan by the first Hatch Act. For that law, signed in 1939, made it illegal for any Federal employee "to have membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States."

Who's to say what organizations are advocating the overthrow of the United States Government? As the Communist techniques became better known, during and after the war, it was clear that they didn't operate as a direct party of revolution, but as a kind of central gland for secreting into the national bloodstream a constant flow of loyal Communists. They worked through what they called front organizations—which were any organizations they could infiltrate and control—unions, peace societies, research groups, fraternal, and even religious organizations.

The best way to infiltrate any American organization is no mystery. Try it yourself: Just speak up often, take on more than your share of the disagreeable routine work any club has to get done, and arrange for someone to nominate you for the executive committee. The Communists, often concealing their party ties, tried this tested formula in thousands of organizations. Sometimes they succeeded; much, much more often, they failed. But they always tried.

That is why the Department of Justice, which had to decide what organizations the Hatch Act was talking about, developed a list of organizations the Communists tried to infiltrate. From that point on, each step was like dry martinis to a sousé: easy to take, hard to retract.

We're used to blaming Congress for our latter-day intoxication with security, but it's the executive branch that mixed the headiest drinks. It was a Cabinet member, Tom Clark, who published the Attorney General's list of organizations classed as subversive. It was the overloaded security officers in the executive departments who started dispensing with real detective work and relying on a mechanical cross-referencing of names on letterheads and mailing lists of the proscribed organizations. President Truman, not Congress, issued the first loyalty order—

and tightened it later by shifting to the accused the burden of proving there was no reasonable doubt of his loyalty. President Eisenhower, not Congress, replaced the loyalty criterion with the broader concepts of security risks, lumping into a single category Communists, drunks, perverts, over-talkative folk and Americans with relatives stuck behind the Iron Curtain.

Last year, the administration carried the whole process one step further. To prove its patriotism and win elections, it started publishing statistics about how many Federal workers had been fired or resigned with derogatory material in their files.

I have seen some of these security files, while I was working in Washington, and the term "derogatory material" can mean anything or nothing. Everybody these days has known at least one man who, like a friend of mine, has to spend months or years overcoming some casual informant's memory that he was considered a "pink" in the middle thirties. My own favorite case is the one made public by Anthony Lewis, a reporter for the Washington Daily News. In this case, "the employee was accused of associating with a writer who will go here by the name of John Brigby Jones. The charge continued: 'Information indicates that John Brigby Jones was author of a book which was advertised in a Louis Adamic publication. Louis Adamic had been listed as an official of the Progressive Party in Philadelphia in 1948, which has been cited as a Communist-front organization by the California Tenney Legislative Committee.' This might best be called wandering gull—from the Progressive Party to the late Mr. Adamic, to his publication, to a book advertised in it, to the author (who may not have placed the ad), and finally to his acquaintance, the accused Government worker."

To support this kind of reasoning, a whole system of scholarship is now established and expanding with extraordinary speed. It is said the FBI alone has dossiers of disloyalty on 5 to 10 million Americans—no inconsiderable fact by itself, when you consider that at least 1 man, cleared after a long security hearing, was reportedly fired because the agency head was uncomfortable about having in his employ "a man with such a thick security file." These 5 or 10 million names, and many more who could be added to the list on the same criteria, are people who belonged or were on mailing lists of organizations which the Communists tried—and in many cases failed—to capture. The dossiers include lots of "Unevaluated Intelligence," raw data, casual, spiteful, or inaccurately transcribed remarks by informants whose names are not given and who often have not been investigated for reliability themselves.

This system of scholarship is duplicated in some measure by several congressional and State committees, and a growing number of businesses, schools, foundations, and private detective agencies. For the sickness we call security is contagious. It spreads like an ink stain on a blotter—in all directions.

It spreads, first, in extent. Quite apart from the Government's 2½ million servants, and the employees of all the States, and all the members of the Army, the Navy, Air Force, and the Marines, the fear of security risks now pervades every organization that deals with the Government, gets money from the Government, gets tax exemption from the Government, is regulated by the Government, or hopes for future business from the Government. The budding scholarship of security is called on to judge whether literally millions of people will be employed at all—scientists in private firms; workers and executives in defense plants—and their subcontractors; students and researchers on grants from the Government or tax-exempt foundations; actors and writers working in

movies or TV; faculty members in any college or university that may want to get Government contracts to fatten its budget; all merchant seamen; anyone who wants a United States passport; and many, many other categories. The unworried American who today has no occasion to search his memory and put his files and scrapbooks in order is a member of a rapidly dwindling minority.

The search for the riskless society spreads in other ways, too. Once every Government agency has a police department, it's natural for the police to be given added functions, like checking up on the morals and ensuring decorous use by every employee of his leisure time. I'm not joking; a recent Budget Bureau order tells every Washington agency to do just that. Hence the questions about the blond cousin in the cocktail lounge.

The search for risks is also pursued with modernized techniques. A man's private life is now subject to invasion by a widening variety of electronic devices, used by Government and private gumshoes alike: we are already in the era of wrist-watch radios, observation by concealed television, and unbelievably efficient microphones for use in recording your lightest and most private word.

The security system spreads finally through vaguer and vaguer criteria for judgment. A whole tradition of dangling definitions and open-ended categories is in the making. The famous State Department order in 1953, ordering its information outlets not to use "material by any Communists, fellow travelers, etc.," was not so far ahead of its time, after all. The main grist of the security system today is not the Communists, but the "et ceteras."

We have nearly reached the point where the burden of proof is on every American to demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that he is not an "et cetera."

Let us not fail to remember that this didn't all start with the late McCARTHY or any of his political ancestors like Gerald L. K. Smith.

It started with the Communists. The security system began as a natural and healthy reaction to their stealthy duplicity, their secret double lives, their use of the lie as an instrument of power. The Communists tried to take over the centers of power and thought in this country—and failed. But they also tried to break up that sense of community in which our high morale as a nation has always been rooted.

Let's constantly remember this: that to dissolve this sense of community, this "stickum" of mutual trust, is the main concern of our enemies. Even more important than sending spies into our midst is to plant the idea that there are spies in our midst, that no man can be trusted, that even good friends may be secretly vile. As Learned Hand said, "A community is already in the process of dissolution where every man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy."

Twelve years ago, the Chinese Communist leader Mao Tse-tung explained how men could be persuaded to an appreciation of communism:

"If the reasoning is good, if it is to the point, it can be effective. The first method in reasoning," Mao went on to say, "is to give the patients a powerful stimulus, yell at them, 'you're sick,' so the patients will have a fright and break out in an overall sweat; then they can be carefully treated."

We refused to listen to the Communists, but we didn't have an equal resistance when American patriots also yelled at us, "you're sick." In opposing Communist infiltration, we somehow fell into the other trap the Communists had laid for us. Faced by men who found a career in anticommunism, we started helping them to dissolve the "stickum" of mutual trust that holds our society together.

We hear a lot these days about a broad religious revival in this country. Certainly

there are more members of most churches than there have ever been before—a higher proportion of the people professing religion than was present in the Thirteen Original Colonies, which were supposedly peopled with men and women who left Europe so they could practice their religion in peace. If there is such a revival, it is probably not due to a greater acceptance of the antique rituals of your church or mine. More likely, it is because all of us are seeking to rediscover a sense of community we feel we have lost, a sense of community on which our free political institutions themselves are based. We Americans hold shares in a great tradition, a long and noble experience in which a revulsion against torture racks and star chambers produced the great political guarantees that are built into our Constitution.

We all feel, a little desperately, that if the "glue" of community is loosened, the tradition of political freedom can also disappear. That is why so many people feel as Albert Schweitzer wrote in one of his gloomier moments, that "we are not far from shipwreck on the rock of wanting to have even truth organized." Schweitzer overcame his gloom with action. To the question, "Whether I am a pessimist or an optimist," he said, "I answer that my knowledge is pessimistic, but my willing and hoping are optimistic." We can, will, and hope to change our course. But how?

There is much talk these days of a national commission to study the whole security system. Let's see if we can foresee, in outline, the kind of reasoning that a suitable commission might apply to its problem.

First, the commission will have to pin down just why it is that the security system so offends the national sense of what's right, why it cuts so abrasively across the American feeling of community. Surely the answer here is that it introduces an absolute into a political system that has always thrived on moderation, tolerance, the Aristotelian mean. It tries to eliminate risk utterly. It assumes there are absolute secrets which can be absolutely guarded from disclosure to our enemies. It tries to cover everybody.

It flies in the face of the American tradition that men can know something besides the official truth and say something besides the accepted norm. What Milton called the right to say "No" to the authorities is still our most precious social asset.

Our commission will, therefore, have to start by declaring the validity, for our time and Nation, of those same ancient truths and great principles which Jacob Henry used to defend himself in 1809.

It probably won't be able to improve, in this department, on what great American jurists have already said. Listen to Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, in the unanimous DeJonge decision: "The greater the importance of safeguarding the community from incitements to the overthrow of our Constitution by force and violence, the more imperative is the need to preserve inviolate the constitutional rights of free speech, free press, and free assembly in order to maintain the opportunity for free political discussion, to the end that Government may be responsible to the will of the people and that changes, if desired, may be obtained by peaceful means. Therein lies the security of the Republic, the very foundation of constitutional government."

The commission can borrow, too, from the recent statement by the board of directors of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which made clear that there is no such thing as a permanent scientific secret, and introduced the arresting thought that every person is to some extent, however small, a security risk.

With this perspective on its problem, the commission should be able to decide against trying to create a riskless society. But what kind of a security system should it set up in place of the Gargantua that now, as Mao

Tse-tung would wish, causes us to break out in an overall sweat?

The key elements of a rebuilt system, I think, would be these:

1. The new system would cover only a limited number of people, in positions that are really of first importance to the national security.

2. It would encourage Government administrators to weigh the balance of risks, in using or not using a man in the Government's employ. It would thus place the stress on looking at the whole man, not at some isolated incidents or writings or impressions he has made on others.

3. It would abandon the lumping of disloyalty with other reasons for denying to a man the opportunity for public service. It may be impossible to avoid a procedure whereby a disloyal employee is fired with public knowledge of the reason for firing him. But no conceivable case can be made for a system which implies that everybody leaving the Government was a potential traitor.

4. Finally, and most important, there must be some regular judicial review of the whole process—complete with the presumption of innocence, the elimination of hearsay evidence, confrontation of witnesses, and the rest of the safeguards that have been developed in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence over the centuries. Nothing short of a central review by men qualified to make considered judgments after listening to the whole story, will satisfy that underrated critic of every public policy, the American sense of fair play. John Lord O'Brien put it this way in a 1952 lecture: "The right to a hearing—the right to a fair hearing—involves a moral principle and one recognized as an element of public morality long before the adoption of the Constitution. It has become a legal right because it was a moral right, and the age-old test remains unchanged—the test of what is fair between man and man. This phase of the American tradition is the most precious heritage that has come down to us. It must not be sacrificed now."

The sickness which afflicts us, being partly psychosomatic, will not be cured just by taking pills marked "fair procedures." But in revising the procedures and restating our principles, we can perhaps begin to glue back together the sense of community, the lack of which has been so important a part of our national nervous breakdown. And if we recover our balance in the Government's security system, the privately sponsored erosion of our sense of community can more readily be checked.

Community, not conformity. On this point, Jacob Henry gave us a way to remember the difference: "When Charles the Fifth, Emperor of Germany, tired of the cares of government, resigned his crown to this son, he retired to a monastery, where he amused the evening of his life, in regulating the movements of watches, endeavoring to make a number keep the same time, but not being able to make any two exactly alike, it led him to reflect upon the folly and crimes he had committed, in attempting the impossibility of making men think alike."

Lithuanian Independence

SPEECH
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this privilege to pay tribute to the Lithuanians on

the 37th anniversary of their Independence Day.

There are certain things we value so highly that we carefully preserve them from the erosion and forgetfulness of time. There are certain events which we consider of such great significance that we take care always to preserve their memory. Time and time again we advert to these events for inspiration. Time and again we find ourselves drawn to them with a solemn sense of awe and reverence, because we realize that they are milestones of vital significance in man's struggle toward a higher and better life.

Such an event is the proclamation of Lithuanian independence. And such are our feelings when we celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day, the national holiday of all Lithuanians.

After February 16 of 1918, the day on which Lithuania was proclaimed an independent Republic, the history of that land was first a happy one, but then, when the Nazis and Soviet Communists decided to destroy its freedom it entered into a time of serious troubles. Thus, since the proclamation of independence in 1918 Lithuania has experienced both happiness and misery, prosperity and poverty, progressive democracy and totalitarian dictatorship.

The first two decades of Lithuania's independence were a blessing to its peace-loving, hard-working, and patriotic inhabitants. In the course of that short time, from 1919 to 1939, the country was definitely on the road to prosperity and progress, and the people were happy in rebuilding the economic and political life of their reconstituted country. They were not only learning the hard but useful lessons of democracy, but they were also practicing it in their daily communal and national life.

In those relatively calm days when the cold war was unheard of and World War II was not even thought of, Lithuania seemed to be safe and secure. However, as it turned out, the Lithuanians were not masters of their country's fate, nor could they assure its peaceful destiny. There came a turn of international events that has proved disastrous and quite tragic to Lithuania since 1939.

Lithuania's independence was one of the first casualties of World War II, and now, for almost 16 years, the unfortunate Lithuanians have been suffering under the worst of tyrannies. In 1940 their country was annexed to the Soviet Union; in 1941 it was overrun by Nazi forces; in 1944 the Nazis were evicted by the Red army, which came and took over Lithuania in the name of the Soviet Union.

Since those dark days Moscow's agents have turned the country into a prison. Just what the exact situation is in Lithuania we in the West have no way of knowing in detail, because for more than a decade the country has been sealed off from the West. We often get reports or rumors to the effect that there is considerable underground resistance to the Communist regime. Unfortunately, however, a totalitarian dictatorship, once imposed, is difficult to dislodge.

We who understand the plight of the Lithuanians and sympathize with them

think of that historic day when they proclaimed their independence and ardently hope that soon they will be able to celebrate in freedom this national holiday in their homeland.

Statement by Ben A. Droski, President of Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in compliance with a request, I wish to include the following statement by Mr. Ben A. Droski, president of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks:

MICHIGAN FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS
FAVOR BILLS H. R. 2117, H. R. 2118, H. R. 1572, AND REJECT H. R. 2987 IN POSTAL EMPLOYEES PAY INCREASE STRUGGLE

(Statement by Ben A. Droski, president, Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks)

At present, before the House Post Office Committee, numerous pay bills for postal employees are being considered. The employee organizations of the rank-and-file postal employees, which by far exceed all other organizations, are chiefly interested in supporting H. R. 2117, H. R. 2118, and H. R. 1572. These bills include a 10-percent increase with a retroactive clause, an across-the-board raise in all grades. At this point however, this organization would like to stipulate that, only due to the decision of the Government Employees Council, which our national office is affiliated, does it support the 10 percent, the original sum of \$800 is the right figure and amount needed to substantially attain an American standard of living.

REJECTION OF H. R. 298 RECLASSIFICATION BILL AND 5-PERCENT INCREASE

This organization definitely opposes H. R. 2987, the bill submitted by Congressman Tom Murray in behalf of the Post Office Department. This latter bill contains a 5-percent raise plus a reclassification of the entire postal-pay structure. Here are the reasons of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks for this action:

First, the waste of time to consider a proposal of reclassification that would be of no value to the rank and file, should not be borne by the Congress.

Second, the 5 percent offered is not a raise. In full agreement with the Judiciary Committee and the many testimonials given in behalf of a raise for Congressmen and Federal judges, that a raise has been long overdue, the postal employees are seeking a substantial raise of more than 5 percent, and those who believe they can only afford 5 percent, are not sincere in wanting to give the postal people a raise at all.

CONGRESSMEN FORTUNATE IN QUEST FOR PAY INCREASE HAVE NO PERCENTAGE OF RECLASSIFICATION TO CONTENT WITH

The Congressmen are fortunate in their pay quest. They have no percentage to worry about, neither do they have a proposal to be reclassified. However, let us suppose they did have the latter issue to guard against, and suppose it featured the proposals such as the Post Office Department wishes to impose on their employees, here is how it could happen: Congressmen's pay could be judged in accordance with the number of constituents in his or her district.

Such as the number of positions that some of the first-class post offices provide, some large offices and some small, which reclassification would be unfair to. The Congressmen's district could be judged on its importance, classification being rural, residential, or industrial, this in the post office would be, first-, second-, and third-class offices.

A Congressman beginning his first term would probably have to start at a smaller entrance salary. His first term being new to him, he would have to attain his experience before he can become qualified, such as a substitute in the post office. However, if called upon, he could fill in a responsible position, if he were reclassified.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

If a Congressman were appointed to a committee of lesser importance, under reclassification his duties would be enumerated as such, thus his pay would be governed accordingly. Under the Post Office Department reclassification principle—equal pay for equal work.

Unassigned Congressmen, or unfixed key positions as the Reclassification Act calls for in the Post Office, would have the Speaker of the House provide their category, and would determine the applicable salary level. This is what could happen to a Congressman under a mythical reclassification act, and what would happen to a postal employee if he were restricted to such a proposal.

RESPONSIBILITY WITH SAME PAY

It is an established fact that a Congressman can do whatever job he is assigned to. He receives the same pay as his colleague. They will receive a straight across-the-board increase, not in accordance with their importance or responsibility. They are all important in all phases of duties the same as a postal employee.

In reference to the postal employees, the whole situation would be different if they themselves were griping about the responsibilities they all share, but they are not. Why then start a revolution such as reclassification; it wouldn't affect any rank and file employee to receive any benefits; in fact it would cause so much friction that Congress would have to include another addition to the legislation; this would be the provision for another key position known as POP's (post-office patrolmen) in the post offices to keep law and order.

SUBSTANTIAL RAISE FOR ALL

The postal employees are only asking for a substantial raise, straight across the line, not of this 5-percent stuff; this wouldn't pay the income tax on our part-time jobs we have at present; let's decide on a real, sincere raise, justifiable to the difference of a Congressman's cost of living today and in 1939.

To make a more rapid motion, let's make this an emergency issue; it has been since 1951; that's long enough; hurry it out for a vote on the floor of the Congress. We trust in your judgment; you have our facts, and very small wage figures to consult, how can you go astray? Thank you for this opportunity to enlarge upon the feelings of the employees who are members of this great organization.

Navy Supercarriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the

following editorial from the February 9 issue of the Bremerton Sun. Recently I pointed out what seemed to me a weakness in our legislative procedure whereby, unless Congress is alert, our military policy could be dictated by appropriations rather than after the careful study and consideration of the Committee on Armed Services. The analysis of the Bremerton Sun covers this point:

Kitsap's Congressman, TOM PELLY, made a solid case when, in bucking Congressman CANNON on the Missouriian's opposition to construction of another Navy supercarrier, he pointed up a dangerous situation which exists in the Congress.

PELLY said he is fearful the time may come when the Appropriations Committee, such as the one headed by CANNON, actually could dictate this Nation's defense and military policy merely through the device of controlling appropriations.

Our Congressman concedes the likelihood of this at the moment is remote and emphasizes the strong support being given the second supercarrier idea by Chairman VINSON of the Armed Services Committee. PELLY believes any quarrel now between the armed services and Appropriations Committees would be decided by the House in favor of a strong military policy. But he points to historic congressional respect for committee decision and warns: "In other words, unwittingly, we might scuttle our aircraft-carrier program and our national-defense policy. I'm sure we won't, but we might."

From what we understand of the battle swirling around CANNON's head, we feel sure PELLY is right. At the moment CANNON—once a highly respected champion of the taxpayer through his advocacy of economy and a balanced budget—is embroiled in a purely political battle apparently of his own doing. Reinstated as chairman in the Democrat control of the House, he is acting like a minor tyrant in attempting to give out subcommittee leadership posts on a basis of personal favor. He thus is earning the disfavor of many who once supported him.

As a matter of fact, CLARENCE CANNON very well may be spiking his own guns. This should make it all the easier for PELLY and VINSON and other advocates of the supercarrier to push that project along.

Nevertheless, PELLY's initial point still remains a dangerous warning. The overlapping jurisdiction of House committees does present an ever-present situation which, theoretically, could result in a dollar-conscious Appropriations Committee actually writing the Nation's defense policy.

Exchange of Letters With General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had an exchange of correspondence with Gen. Douglas MacArthur which, I am certain, will be of utmost interest to all Members of Congress and to the Nation as a whole.

On January 26, General MacArthur delivered an address in Los Angeles which aroused deep national interest. In it he urged the United States to proclaim its readiness to abolish war, in con-

cert with the other powers of the world. After reading his address in the newspapers, I wrote to him on February 3 and offered to introduce a resolution in Congress declaring that "it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes."

On February 7, General MacArthur replied to my letter saying it would require more than congressional expression "to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war." Instead of a resolution, he suggested that I present the matter on the floor of the House and from here "build up gradually to more aggressive action to implement the basic concept."

Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to take up General MacArthur's suggestion and I hope to bring this matter to the attention of the House in the near future at which time I will be ready to discuss it in greater detail and to present my views on the subject.

I am extremely interested in the idea of developing a people-to-people approach to the problem of international peace, and I shall utilize all efforts in that direction. I welcome the views and suggestions of anyone who can contribute constructively toward the furtherance of this idea.

In the meantime, I desire to place into the RECORD the exchange of correspondence between General MacArthur and myself:

FEBRUARY 3, 1955.

Gen. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR GENERAL MACARTHUR: I was very much interested in your statement which I read in the New York Times, urging the abolition of war. This is very commendable on your part and certainly you, as the greatest living soldier, are qualified to speak on this subject.

What do you think of my introducing a resolution in Congress declaring that it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international disputes? The approved resolution of the Congress, signed by the President of the United States, should also call upon all other nations to adopt similar resolutions.

I am not sufficiently convinced that the United Nations is doing the job intended for it. I favor more of a people-to-people approach to the problem.

Before doing this I would be most appreciative of your views and any further suggestions.

In high esteem, I remain

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 7, 1955.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANFUSO: I am grateful indeed for the support of my views on the futility of war as reflected in your thoughtful note of February 3.

It has always been my opinion that war's abolition can only come about through the emergence of a leadership in world affairs with the strength and vision and moral courage to proclaim a readiness in concert with other major powers, to enforce it as a matter of constitutional doctrine by specific constitutional proscription. There is no doubt in my mind but that the great masses of every nation in the world, whether on this side of the Iron Curtain or on the other,

would, as a matter of self-interest and protection, fully support such a constitutional limitation upon political power and zealously guard it against any despot's violation or abuse. For even in totalitarian regimes the leaders show at least token respect for the constitutional rights of the citizenry. This because all people, even those partially enslaved under oligarchic rule, have grown to look to their constitutions as the final repository and safeguard of their remaining liberties. Thus today, even the Soviet leaders do not so defy the will of the masses as to openly nullify their constitution. They may fool them. They may ignore rights to individual protection. They may sugar-coat many of the constitutional provisions to make them appear to give to the people rights and liberties which they do not in fact give, but they do give them a body of constitutional laws as something they have grown to expect and to demand, just as they constantly prate about peace being the ultimate objective of all public policy because they fear the masses will revolt against any course openly leading to war.

So in my opinion, it would take more than the congressional expression which you suggest to trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war. It would take a ringing affirmation of a dedicated leader commanding universal respect, capable of arousing the conscience of mankind into a crusade against lagging leaders who in the mad lust for ever increased political power willfully ignore the realism that war as an instrument of political power has been outmoded by the advance of science. I do not know when this Nation will be blessed by such a leadership but I pray that it will be before it has been drawn through the tragedy of another and infinitely worse cataclysmic conflict.

I would therefore suggest that instead of submitting a resolution, that you limit yourself initially to presenting your basic views on the floor of the House. From such a beginning you could build up gradually to more aggressive action to implement the basic concept.

With every good wish,

Most cordially,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR.

History's Little Joke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article, written by Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the February 13, 1955, issue of the New York Herald Tribune:

HISTORY'S LITTLE JOKE

(By Joseph Alsop)

TACHEN ISLANDS.—If you want the real measure of what has happened to the Eisenhower administration and American foreign policy in the last 2 years, consider the story of those barren, controversial rocks, the Tachen Islands. If it were not so serious, it would be a cosmic joke. The background of the drama of the evacuation of the Tachens has been simple enough. It is no secret that for 10 days or so Chiang Kai-shek balked bitterly at making a present of the Tachens to the Communists. The Eisenhower administration had to press Chiang very hard, indeed, to take his troops off the Tachens before the Chinese Communists attacked them.

The joke lies in the fact that just 2 years ago the shoe was on exactly the other foot.

Those were the brave early days of Eisenhower policymaking. There was no talk then of cease-fires and peaceful coexistence, and the like. Instead the watchwords were liberation, dynamic new foreign policy, recaptured initiative, and the "unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek."

President Eisenhower's dramatic announcement that after being wickedly held in check by the Truman administration, the Generalissimo had now been boldly unleashed by the Republicans, caused a wave of reaction that reached all the way to the rocky Tachens.

At that time the islands were held by light guerrilla forces, hardly more important than those which fought for Yikiang-shan through close to 3 bloody days. The Formosa Government considered the Tachens too distant from the main island to be covered by air or supplied by sea. The Generalissimo and his military advisers did not wish, therefore, to commit either their prestige or large components of their regular forces to the defense of the Tachens. In short, the islands were then being treated as expendable.

But President Eisenhower had given the watchword. Chiang Kai-shek was unleashed. The Tachens were doubly valuable, as a base for irregular guerrilla operations on the mainland and as a forward radar warning point for both Formosa and Okinawa. So the American military advisory group on Formosa began pressing Chiang Kai-shek very hard to put regulars on the Tachens. This was one of the measures devised in Washington to give a little reality to the famous unleashing. The Americans did not win their point with ease. The Generalissimo was extremely reluctant to put regulars on the Tachens. Certain key Chinese military leaders, particularly the chief of staff of that period, Gen. Chou Chi-jo, resisted the American project to the end. None the less, as usually happens on Formosa, the American advisers triumphed in the end.

The 46th Division was specially chosen to be sent to the islands. Even after the 46th had been installed and the defense positions had been organized, however, the American advisers of the Chinese Government were still dissatisfied.

The commander on the Tachens, Gen. Hu Tsung-nan, was one of the old boys of the Chinese Nationalist Army, with a record that did not inspire confidence.

Once again heavy American pressure was put on the Generalissimo to replace the Tachen commander. When this reporter was in Formosa last year, the Americans had just won their second victory for the defense of the Tachens. Gen. Hu Tsung-nan had been recalled and the able Gen. Liu Nien-li had just been given the Tachen command, which he still holds.

In those days, too, one of the real wonders of Formosa was the world's most uncovered covert operation, the American financed Western Enterprises. Western Enterprises combined the claim to invisibility with a private housing development, special PX's, social clubs, and God knows what other rather conspicuous amenities. The whole town of Taipei knew that the spooks, as they were locally called, were helping the guerrilla operations based on the Tachens.

But now the spooks are folding their bed-sheets and packing to go home. Western Enterprises, as any pedicab driver will tell you, is soon to be no more, and its assets, whatever they may be, are to be transferred to the Navy. This is in fact a significant move in the direction of the cease-fire down the middle of the Formosa Strait and the general acceptance of "two Chinas," which are now the real aims of the Eisenhower administration Asian policymakers.

All of which is important for two reasons. In the first place, what are the unfortunate

Chinese Nationalists to think, when they are first powerfully pressured to defend the "essential" Tachens at all costs, and then told that the Tachens are not essential after all, and please to evacuate at once? This reporter has never shared the Knowland-Robertson-Radford view of the unvarying rightness of Formosa, but in view of the past record, the Generalissimo and his advisers certainly seem to deserve some sympathy at this time.

In the second place, might we not be better off in Asia today if there had not been so much loud, empty talk at the beginning, and if there were a bit more boldness, spirit, and determination in our policymaking today? Maybe it is impolite to ask the question, but the facts demand that it should be asked.

Lincoln and Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, last evening one of my fine Maryland colleagues in the other body, Senator J. GLENN BEALL, spoke before the Republican Club of Prince Georges County, Inc., at the Prince Georges Golf and Country Club. Senator BEALL's remarks were characteristically to the point and of particular interest at this time. Under leave granted, I here include his address:

What would Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, say today of this land of 162 million Americans. Perhaps he would not today express himself any differently than he did in 1856 when he said:

"We are a great empire. We stand at once the wonder and the admiration of the whole world, and we must inquire what it is that has given us so much prosperity, and we shall understand that to give up that one thing—free government—would be to give up all future prosperity.

"This cause is that every man can make himself. It has been said that such a race of prosperity has been run nowhere else."

Lincoln started life as a laborer and never ceased to love those who worked by hand to better themselves and their nation. His implicit faith in the ability of those who were willing to work for their own good and for the good of their neighbor has been an abiding principle of the Republican Party ever since.

On the other hand, he did not fear property and wealth as some have feared and even tried to destroy it in the recent past. He recognized the need for capital so that the means for building a better nation would be available to the bold planners who shared his faith.

Lincoln warned that the heavy hand of government could stifle economic growth as well as the growth of equality and personal liberty. He wanted more than anything else for the individual man to have his fair chance to improve his lot—to build a home, a business, to be free to fulfill his individual destiny.

As a party, we Republicans have held to those beliefs. We have fought to retain the meaning they have for the Nation.

Although our world is vastly different from what it was in Lincoln's day, the essence of our problems is little changed. We face the same issues of freedom, of the relation between levels of government and individ-

uals, of subversion and loyalty, and of the future course of our Nation.

Storm clouds were gathering when Lincoln entered the White House nearly 100 years ago. But he did not flinch. Through the terrible years that followed his leadership held the Nation together.

When President Eisenhower took office, the sky once more was overcast. And he has not flinched.

He has acted as Lincoln did before him. He has cut beneath the party battle to eternal truths. He has stated principles, defined differences, and clarified issues.

And, as was demonstrated by the overwhelming vote of confidence of both Houses on his Formosa resolution, the country is united behind him.

Now, let us see what the administration has done—and what it proposes to do.

The record for 1953 and 1954 shows that—

1. The Korean fighting and bloodshed was ended.

2. Honesty, integrity, and efficiency were restored to the Government.

3. Peacetime prosperity was achieved with 1953 the best and 1954 the next best in history.

4. Truman's spending plans were cut by \$10 billion and taxes reduced nearly 7½ billion dollars a year.

5. Inflation was halted—the dollar stabilized.

6. The 20-year trend toward centralization of power in Washington was reversed.

7. Highest security standards for Government jobs were set and 2,400 risks removed.

8. Social-security and railroad-retirement benefits were extended and improved.

9. Equality of treatment was promoted and racial segregation ended in many areas.

10. United States and free world defenses against Communist aggression were strengthened.

11. Wage and rent controls ended.

12. A start made on the peacetime use of atomic energy.

13. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established and hospital building and vocational rehabilitation expanded.

14. Record Federal aid for highways was voted.

15. Housing aids to help more families own better homes were enlarged.

16. Tidelands restored to the States.

17. Flexible farm-price-support and surplus-disposal programs provided.

18. Postal service was improved.

19. Veterans and civil-service employees benefits have been increased.

An impressive record indeed. But what is past is prologue. Now let us look at our party's program for 1955 as proposed by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message on January 6.

Highlights of the program include:

Tireless labor to make the peace more just and durable, sufficient military strength to discourage resort to war, encouragement of United Nations efforts to limit armaments, mutual and gradual reductions of foreign trade tariff barriers, extension of the Selective Service Act.

Strengthened Reserves and increased benefits for career servicemen, continuation of present tax rates, looking to a reduction in 1956, a nationwide water-resources policy firmly based in law, a new program to meet pressing national highway needs, establishment of a Federal coordinator of public works.

Alleviation of problems of low-income farm families, strengthened Federal disaster-insurance programs, extension of the Small Business Act of 1953, continuance of the 83d Congress' housing program, challenging private industry to meet housing problems fully after 1958.

A program to improve existing health services, including Government reinsurance.

Federal Government coordination in school expansion, assistance to States to cope with juvenile delinquency, a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts in Health, Education, and Welfare, establishment of a 90-cents-an-hour minimum wage, extension of coverage, and Taft-Hartley Act amendments.

The modification of immigration laws, Hawaiian statehood, reduction of the voting age in Federal elections, District of Columbia self-government and suffrage, protection of voting rights of overseas servicemen, and extension of the Reorganization Act and Intergovernmental Relations Commission.

I think the first President of our party would agree that this is indeed a comprehensive, forward-looking program in the best Republican tradition.

Now, although our history has spanned nearly a century between Lincoln and Eisenhower, we still have today the same standards of republicanism held aloft by the party and the American people—the same standards of fair play.

These standards of fair play, I'm afraid, do not always apply to the Democratic Party. I have here a column by Mr. Gould Lincoln of the Washington Evening Star with which I am heartily in accord. I quote:

"The concentrated Democratic attack on Vice President Nixon which began immediately after the 1954 campaign and is now continuing with almost daily sniping, apparently has two basic and impelling reasons," the reporter says. "The first is to rid the Democratic Party of the Communist issue—the Red issue—which has plagued the Democrats for years and has hurt them in a number of States. Not having the courage to attack the President himself, their second aim is to strike at the man closest to him—the Vice President of the United States."

"So beginning with former Democratic National Chairman Stephen A. Mitchell and continued by Adlai Stevenson, Speaker Sam Rayburn, Senator Richard L. Neuberger, and by other freshmen Democrats in Congress, the drive is on to picture the Vice President as merely a smear artist and as such, entirely unworthy, a man who hits below the belt. Their theme song is that he made the Democrats out to be a parcel of traitors over the last score of years, and disloyal at the very least."

"The facts in the case, as revealed by a perusal of the Vice President's campaign speeches, are that the Vice President did no such thing. What he did was to accuse the Democrats of stupidity because they did not recognize the Communist menace; that they did not take the steps necessary to check infiltration of the Reds, and that when cases were called to their attention they did nothing about them. For example, the cases of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White."

"The Vice President said repeatedly that communism should not be a political issue, and that there was no difference between the loyalty of Democrats and Republicans. But, he added, some misguided officials of the Truman administration were blind or indifferent to the danger from the Communists."

"That is the kind of criticism which hurt—and which was effective against the Democrats in the 1950, 1952 and 1954 campaigns."

"The Democrats don't want any more of it."

"They have, they think, disposed of Senator Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin in such a way that he will not be effective in his attacks on them. He took no real part in the last campaign. Now they have turned on Mr. Nixon, who made effective use of the Red issue and is capable of doing so again."

"Senator NEUBERGER, without mentioning the Vice President by name, but plainly indicating Mr. Nixon was his target, recently criticized the latter's campaign against him, Senator NEUBERGER."

"As a matter of fact, Senator NEUBERGER was 1 of the 5 leftwing Democratic candi-

dates singled out by Mr. Nixon in his Pocatello address on October 25, 1954, when the Vice President asserted that the gains that the Democrats would make, if they took over the 84th Congress, inevitably would come from the ADA wing of the party."

"The other four were Glen Taylor, of Idaho, who ran for Vice President on the Henry Wallace ticket in 1948; former Representative John Carroll, of Colorado; Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, and former Representative Yorty, of California."

"Whether it was Mr. Nixon's campaigning or not, 3 out of these 5 Democrats were defeated in their races for the Senate."

"Mr. Nixon is for the present, at least, holding his own fire. His defense is being made by other Republicans, among them Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall. Mr. Hall said it should be clear to every one who reads the papers and hears the TV and radio that there is now underway a 'highly-organized campaign to besmirch the Vice President. The technique is to smear him by falsely accusing him of smearing others. This is one of the lowest tricks in politics and in this instance destructive only to its perpetrators. Dick Nixon is one of the most effective campaigners in history. It is because he tells the truth and is effective that he is under attack."

"But should Mr. Nixon find it necessary to reply, he is quite capable. Further, he knows a lot more about the Communist activities in this country than do his detractors. He was mainly responsible for the conviction of Alger Hiss. No one is going to say to him, 'You never get a Communist.'"

"Nor can the Democrats get away from the fact that they were blind to what was going on when Hiss and White were active in the Government."

Now without exception, Mr. Nixon approached his discussion of the security question by establishing the loyalty of the vast majority of Democrats. In my opinion he never questioned the loyalty of any Democrat. He did repeatedly question ignorance, blindness, or carelessness on the part of some of the leaders of the previous administration.

Then he demonstrated that it was these people who were most interested in the election and an anti-Eisenhower Congress. Here are a few more of his actual quotes:

In Houston on October 4, 1954, "I have found that the great majority of Republicans and Democrats approve of the way the Eisenhower program is restoring standards of loyalty, honesty, and integrity in government."

"The issue in 1952 was not the issue of the relative loyalty of Democrats and Republicans. That was never the issue then—it is not the issue now," he stated in Philadelphia.

In Norwalk, Conn., the Vice President said, "The great majority of all of our people regardless of the party to which they belong are loyal Americans. And I have found that Democrats are just as interested as Republicans in developing an effective program for dealing with disloyal elements."

Then, in a Fresno speech, he said, "The ADA leftwing which is calling for the election of an anti-Eisenhower Congress is not truly representative of the principles of the Democratic Party. Its spokesmen and its policies are unworthy of the traditions of that great political party. There is no question but that millions of Democrats completely disagree with this group in its attacks on the President's loyalty program."

Those do not sound like the words of a smear artist.

They do not sound like the words of a man who would make out the opposition party to be a parcel of traitors.

No, they have more the tone and strength of a man who was a great force in cementing to our future the constitutional freedoms and personal liberties which emerged from the dreams of our Founding Fathers.

They sound more like the words of Abraham Lincoln, a man who worked with the commonsense of Christian humility and the political wisdom to perpetuate the principles of the Republican Party—even as we are working here tonight in Prince Georges County.

Postal Pay Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my statement before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service urging postal pay increases:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, believing as I do that our postal employees are entitled to at least a 10-percent wage increase across the board, I have introduced such legislation and am again appearing before your committee to urge favorable consideration of such an increase in the hope the committee in its wisdom will concur.

I also believe that consideration of a postal salary increase should be completely dissociated from the postage-rate increase. In my opinion, there is no basis for controversy on the wage increase whereas there will be serious controversy on the postage-rate proposal.

During the greater part of the last 2 decades, postal and other Federal employees have been unable to compete with increased prices. Wages of a worker, including Federal employees, must be considered in the light of cost of living. In a period during which our nation as a whole enjoyed unprecedented national prosperity, Federal workers have been stepchildren of our American economy.

Inadequate wages for Government workers can lead only to an inferior caliber of personnel, expensive recruiting and training experience, decreased efficiency, and, in the final analysis, poor Government operation. The combination of these undesirable conditions inevitably results in more costly Government to every taxpayer.

The cost of Government is properly the concern of each of us. No one advocates useless spending or the waste of our Public Treasury. However, in the matter of wages for Federal employees, there is involved a very human question as well as a moral obligation on the part of those responsible for determining salaries. The human question can be satisfied only if the worker is given a wage that will enable him to provide proper and adequate care for his family. A moral responsibility exists as long as Federal employees do not have collective-bargaining rights and in the absence of economic privileges accorded workers in private industry in a given wage dispute.

These two responsibilities should weigh heavily on those charged with establishing Federal salary schedules. They were completely ignored last year in the veto of the wage legislation approved by the 83d Congress. The current attitude of some persons in the executive branch of Government seems to be a take-it-or-leave-it offer, without reference to the needs of the employees or the justice of their case for better wages. This amounts to a callous disregard of more than 2 million Federal workers and their families and a complete evasion of the moral

responsibility on the part of our Federal Government to pay fair and adequate wages.

In my judgment, a pay raise is long overdue for our deserving postal employees and I trust the committee will promptly and favorably report a substantial increase in their compensation.

The Brooklyn Law School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that everyone attaches a certain amount of sentiment to the educational institutions which they have attended. Both sentiment and pride cause me to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following address given by Dean Jerome Prince at the 1954 alumni luncheon of my alma mater, the Brooklyn Law School:

DEAN ADDRESSES ALUMNI ON HISTORY OF LAW SCHOOL

The executive committee of the alumni association has assigned to me the very pleasant task of sketching briefly to you this afternoon the history of Brooklyn Law School. The story of the origin and growth of the law school is a story well worth telling. For its recital, I am confident, will fill you with a sense of justifiable pride in your own institution.

The story begins shortly before the turn of the century, when, at a convention of teachers of commercial law, the late Dean William Payson Richardson met the late Norman P. Heffley, who at that time directed a business school in Brooklyn bearing his name. Mr. Heffley was of the opinion that the community of Brooklyn was in need of a law school, and you may recall that there was then none in existence in Brooklyn. Early in 1901, after many discussions between them, Dean Richardson and Mr. Heffley cooperated to organize Brooklyn Law School and its first class was held on September 30, 1901, in the Heffley School Building, at 243 Ryerson Street, Brooklyn. There were only 5 students in that first class, one of whom was the late Francis X. Carmody. A year later the law school moved from Ryerson Street to a brownstone building at 187 Montague Street, Brooklyn. It seems that the possessions of the law school were then so meager that they were all piled on one cart, and as the cart moved through the streets from the Heffley School Building to Montague Street, one spectator was moved to say: "There goes Brooklyn Law School." This, as many of you know, was Dean Richardson's favorite anecdote.

Mr. Heffley withdrew from the school soon thereafter and the task of supporting the infant institution fell upon Dean Richardson. In 1903, Brooklyn Law School became associated with St. Lawrence University and later became the department of law of that University.

From 1903 until the outbreak of World War II, the law school story is one of almost constant growth and development, in prestige as well as in physical resources. In 1904, to accommodate larger classes, the school moved to the Eagle Building, where it remained until the fall of 1928, when the school entered its own specially constructed building at 375 Pearl Street, Brooklyn.

When World War II broke out in December of 1941, the effect upon the law school was

almost calamitous. Within a short time, the law school attendance so dwindled that we had less students in the entire law school than we were accustomed to have in a single class. Some statistics may be enlightening. In one of the war years, we had only 30 students in the entire day division. This included all 3 years of law study.

I remember having one of the large classes during that period, a class of 15 students. We also had some small classes. Bob Sugarman had a class of two students in partnership. I recall this quite well because 1 of the 2 students was unprepared at the first session and the remaining member of the class was required to do all of the class work that day. I may add that this student resigned a week later, and we decided to cancel the course, thinking a class of one student to be too much of a luxury. During most of this period, there were only three full-time men on the law-school faculty. I was one of them. Professor Sealy and Professor Weyrauch were the other two. In one of the war years, Professor Weyrauch went to Albany to assist Hiram Todd on one of his investigations; that left Don Sealy and me as the entire full-time staff. I must confess that we taught a great many subjects, and if the war had continued a few years longer, each of us would probably have taught the entire curriculum. I recall one afternoon during the war when Don Sealy and I were walking to Joe's Restaurant for lunch, Don said to me: "You remember the story told by Dean Richardson about the spectator who said: 'There goes Brooklyn Law School' when he saw the cart moving the law-school equipment from Ryerson Street to Montague Street? Well, some spectator may now, looking at us, say: 'There goes the Brooklyn Law School faculty.'"

St. Lawrence University, of which we were the law department, had considerable financial difficulties of its own. Each of its departments was operating at a substantial loss. So, St. Lawrence University, to reduce its obligations, decided to liquidate the law school. I have no doubt that the law school would have disappeared at that time were it not for the efforts of Justice William B. Carswell, the only graduate of the law school who was then a member of the board of trustees. Largely as a result of his efforts, an agreement was entered into in December of 1943 by the terms of which Brooklyn Law School separated from St. Lawrence University and became a separate and independent nonprofit institution. A new board of trustees was selected and Justice Carswell became its president.

You might be interested to know that Dick Maloney, our new alumni president, was our attorney at the closing of title in 1943. We did not pay him for his services then and, although he continues to serve as the law school counsel, we have consistently adhered to the precedent thus established.

To effect the separation from St. Lawrence University, it was necessary to place a mortgage upon the building, and some of you may recall that we had an alumni campaign at that time to raise funds.

We held on, at times somewhat grimly, until the close of World War II, when Brooklyn Law School once more became one of the major law schools in the United States.

We suffered a loss in August of 1945, when Dean William Payson Richardson, who had been dean for 44 years, died after a brief illness. He was succeeded by Justice William B. Carswell. I was named vice dean, and later associate dean. We suffered another loss in September of 1953, when Dean Carswell unexpectedly died in Canada. Three months later, I was appointed dean of the law school.

Now what progress have we made in the 54 years of our existence?

Our graduates have achieved prominence in almost every field of endeavor; in the practice of the law, on the bench, in Govern-

ment service, in public life, in the Armed Forces, in commerce, and industry. It may surprise you to know that we have several very distinguished clergymen who are graduates of the law school. I do not intend to burden you with statistics, but it may be of interest to you to know that in the city of New York alone there are well over 50 judges, from magistrate to appellate division justices, who are graduates of Brooklyn Law School.

Whenever our students or graduates have come in open competition with the students or graduates of other schools, we have much more than held our own. Our bar examination results are good, as I think you know. In 1948, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York sponsored for the first time an interlaw school moot court competition. In that first competition, the Brooklyn Law School Moot Court Team won the national title by defeating the Yale University Moot Court Team in the final round. In the 6 annual competitions held thus far, the Brooklyn Law School Moot Court team has won 3 metropolitan championship and this in competition with all the other approved law schools in the city of New York. A prize is given by the association to the student who is adjudged the outstanding student speaker in the city of New York. The selection is made from among the members of the moot court teams representing all of the law schools in the city. This is an annual prize. In the last 6 years, on 3 occasions, a Brooklyn Law School student was selected as the outstanding speaker.

Turning to the law school itself, I might say that not too many of you know that Brooklyn Law School is today, and since 1937 has been, a school approved by the American Bar Association. This means that we are one of the one-hundred-and-twenty odd approved law schools in the United States. Our requirements have been strengthened and increased. An applicant today is required to have completed a minimum of 3 years of acceptable college work with a satisfactory scholastic average, and it might interest you to know that well over 90 percent of our entering class is composed of college graduates.

The normal law school course today is 3 years in the day, or full-time session, and 4 years in the evening, or part-time session. We do, however, permit a student to shorten his course to the extent of one semester by attending summer sessions. We have increased the number of credits required for the degree from 60, which was required about 20 years ago, to 76, the requirement at present. We have attempted to grapple with the vexing but important problem of the extent to which we may profitably help the student to bridge the gap between theory and practice. This we have done by introducing into the curriculum required courses in legal research, in brief writing, in the preparation of pleadings, and in laboratory sessions in trial practice. We also offer elective courses in criminal procedure, in the preparation of corporate forms, and in the preparation of the commonly employed commercial instruments. The most recent addition to our elective courses is a course in military justice.

Brooklyn Law School is today in every sense a nonprofit educational institution. It is governed by a board of trustees, headed by former Supreme Court Justice Charles C. Lockwood, no member of which receives any compensation. The two vice presidents of the board are graduates of the law school and may be known to many of you presently. One of them is Supreme Court Justice Charles N. Cohen, the other is former Corporation Counsel Paul Windels.

I think I have said enough although considerations of time have required me to sketch developments in broad outlines, to justify my conclusion that we have a thor-

oughly sound and progressive institution, with standards and with a record of achievement that will bear comparison with any law school in the United States. What we lack is a well-informed and active alumni body. I regard it as self-evident that the reputation which a school enjoys among the members of the public is but a reflex of the reputation it enjoys among his own graduates. And no school can enjoy among its own graduates the prestige to which it may justly be entitled unless its graduates know and are interested in the progress which the school has made. For these frankly selfish reasons, I hope that this luncheon today will mark the rebirth of a strong, healthy, and active Brooklyn Law School alumni association.

The Eternal Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity of a private preview of the motion picture, *The Eternal Sea*, at the invitation of a friend and acquaintance of mine for many years, the producer and director, Mr. John H. Auer.

The Eternal Sea is a present-day historical episode of the actual experiences of a living Navy admiral, and it is not only an inspiring patriotic story but also an impelling story which would increase the admiration of any American for the United States Navy and the courageous spirit that overcomes all obstacles including physical handicaps to obtain its objectives.

The Eternal Sea will also assure the American people of the security and protection for which the great and powerful United States Navy has been built and organized to provide.

Mr. John Auer, the director and producer, is a devoted and patriotic naturalized American citizen. He came to the United States in 1929 and in that same year took his first oath of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, as he says in very broken English. He resolved to serve his new country to the best of his ability, and in 1951 he produced and directed the picture *Thunderbirds*, which was dedicated to the National Guard. This picture was highly received by all, and Mr. Auer received a citation from the Department of Defense and the National Guard for his patriotic contribution.

The Eternal Sea, which Mr. Auer directed and produced for Republic Pictures, pays homage to the United States Navy, naval aviation, and above all to a courageous American who, despite the great handicap of losing his leg in battle, carried on to express undying devotion to his family, the service, and all mankind. This great American is Rear Adm. John Madison Hoskins, who is still on active duty with the United States Navy.

Private showings of *The Eternal Sea* have been given to many high officials in the Department of Defense, and a few of

the comments received as a result of these showings follow:

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,

President, Republic Pictures Corp.

Congratulations on a truly great American epic of courage. *The Eternal Sea* is excellent theater and gripping entertainment. It will make all who see it prouder than ever before of their American heritage. In behalf of all those who have borne wounds for their country and for those other Americans who have triumphed over disability, our heartfelt thanks for this fine film.

Maj. Gen. MELVIN J. MAAS,
USMCR, Retired; Chairman, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,

Republic Productions, Inc.

The Eternal Sea was reviewed by the Department of Navy and the Office of the Secretary of Defense and hereby is approved for public release. We believe it is a picture you should be proud of. It captures a fine spirit and will be of great value to the service. Its inspirational qualities should be of great value to every American. We consider it an excellent motion picture which justifies our cooperation. Sincere thanks for a job well done.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. HERBERT J. YATES,

President, Republic Studios.

Congratulations to you, Mr. John Auer and Republic studios on *The Eternal Sea*. It is a great picture which will reflect much credit to Republic and Navy. Feel that it will have strong dramatic and human-interest appeal to general public.

Adm. W. G. BEECHER,
Chief of Information, Navy Department.

I urge all patriotic Americans to see this picture not only because of its dramatic appeal, but especially because of its patriotic and inspirational qualities.

Acreage Allotments in Drought-Stricken Counties of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the Senate concurring), That the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America is hereby memorialized and requested to cut the allotment of no individual engaged in farming in counties classified as drought-stricken counties in this State by the Department during the year 1954 below the allotment which was made to such individual for the year 1954 upon any crop, allotment of acreage of which is made by said Department; be it further

Resolved, That upon the passage of this resolution and its signature by the chief executive, a copy thereof by duly certified and forwarded to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from Tennessee, and that

this resolution be spread on the journal of the house of representatives and senate.
Adopted January 25, 1955.

JAMES L. BOMAR,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JARED L. MADDOX,

Speaker of the Senate.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,

Governor.

Ike's Team Is Showing Lack of Skull Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1955, there appeared in the Detroit Free Press a signed editorial by John S. Knight, its president and publisher. In itself the editorial is significant on the score that this lack of teamwork of the Eisenhower administration is being finally recognized, but it is more especially so because a staunch friend of the President points up sharply the weaknesses and by their exposure seeks the means of correction. Mr. Knight bears out the contentions of so many people who have already recognized the confusion of the minds and the tongues of administration spokesmen. These antics might be likened to those of a well-coached clown band with each instrumentalist playing a tune of his own choosing, and drowning out the discord by blowing the harder his own horn. It is high time someone pointed the way for the President and his discordant Cabinet.

Under unanimous consent, heretofore granted, I include in the RECORD the editorial to which I refer:

IKE'S TEAM IS SHOWING LACK OF SKULL PRACTICE

NEW YORK.—The Scripps-Howard newspapers, which have frequently spanked President Eisenhower for not exerting more leadership, have now come to the following conclusion as Ike begins his third year in the White House:

"On the whole, the President has shown a steady growth in confidence, in understanding, in patience and in effectiveness."

In general, that seems to us to be a fair statement of Eisenhower's position today. A year ago, Ike had difficulty in reconciling his role as President of all the people with that of being the actual leader of his party as well.

Now, however, he understands that the two can be compatible so long as he insists that party policy at all times keeps the public interest in mind.

At Wednesday's press conference, the President was confident and relaxed. He now takes loaded questions in stride with the aplomb of a professional.

Ike is getting the "feel" of public life.

Having said this, might I suggest that the administration is wide open to criticism on another count.

I refer to the lack of skull practice between Ike and his Cabinet members on matters of vitally important public policy.

The President likes to think of his official family as a team, presumably with every member playing an important and vital role.

The goal is a successful administration, not headlines for individuals.

Of late, the signals are getting crossed. Agriculture Secretary Benson fires Wolf Ladejinsky, who headed General MacArthur's land-reform program in Japan, as a security risk. Mr. Ladejinsky is promptly rehired by Harold Stassen, boss of the Foreign Operations Administration, with the comment that Ladejinsky has 19 years of Government service without a blemish on his record.

Who is right, Benson or Stassen?

Then we have Defense Secretary Wilson advocating more trade with the Iron Curtain countries in nonstrategic materials. Two years ago Mr. Wilson took an opposite view and wrote Senator McCARTHY that "contributions to the economic potential alone often directly, and almost always indirectly, contribute to any country's military potential."

With reference to Wilson's latest statement, the President says it does not represent the administration's position.

Why, then, did Wilson say it?

Some weeks ago Labor Secretary Mitchell made a speech before the CIO in Los Angeles in which he criticized the right-to-work laws adopted by 17 States.

When asked to comment on this phase of Mitchell's address, the President said Mr. Mitchell was not speaking for the administration.

Why, then, didn't Mitchell clear his speech with the President?

Other notable contradictions within the administration have occurred with respect to Indochina, the "Marshall plan" for Asia, and what we intend to do about Formosa.

There is also a wide-open split between Eisenhower and Senator KNOWLAND, the minority leader, on how to gain freedom for the American airmen held by the Chinese Communists.

The President cannot muzzle Senator KNOWLAND but he does have a right to expect that members of his Cabinet refrain from popping off in opposition to his own views.

He has finally taken steps to avoid future public controversies such as the Ladejinsky case by asking a special unit of the Justice Department to act as a mediator between Government agencies that differ on an individual case.

The President said further that if agreements were not possible, future cases of this kind would be brought to him.

He should now take the further step of requiring public officials speaking on sensitive questions of policy to obtain prior clearance from the White House.

This procedure would clarify administration policy in the public mind and strengthen it immeasurably.

You can't have a winning team with everybody calling signals.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article by C. Wilson Harder titled "Washington and Small Business":

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS
(By C. Wilson Harder)

While he went along with the gag when the Federal Trade Commission found over

a thousand paper wholesalers guilty of conspiracy, Commissioner Lowell Mason, master of brilliant brittle prose, wrote a separate concurring opinion which may well be used as evidence by those wishing to eliminate FTC as a useless appendage on government, and substitute for it a more efficient and aggressive defender of the Nation's antitrust laws.

This decision was against what is called the fine- and wrapping-paper wholesalers. Fine paper is defined as printing papers. Since 1948 FTC has been as busy as bees on this case.

The FTC cited some 22 regional trade-paper associations, and blanketed in as unnamed defendants about 900 paper wholesalers who were called class respondents.

As Mason points out in his opinion, these "class respondents" are mostly small-business men scattered all over the Nation serving small-order customers with specialty-paper products. But FTC held that if they belonged to a trade association, they were guilty per se of conspiracy. Entire evidence entered against many individual wholesalers was that at the time of complaint they were members of some regional trade association.

And yet, while Mason's long opinion pithily emphasizes many points, it does skirt around big issue of FTC operation.

Big issue is this. The production of all kinds of paper is dominated by a few companies who sell direct to larger users, leaving small pickings to wholesalers. These large mills also offer bigger customers fantastic discounts on quantity purchases.

Thus a very small printer usually must buy from a wholesaler. If he becomes larger, he may be able to buy direct from a mill, but if he is a large user of paper, he can buy carload lots from the mill at price reductions which make it impossible for small and medium sized printers to compete for printing work of major jobs. And of course no wholesaler can meet the price competition of his own suppliers.

In paper case, as in so many other cases, FTC decided something was rotten in Denmark but went to Greenland to investigate. In fact, their actions are often akin to that which would prevail if police jailed victims of robbers while not touching bandits.

A few months ago, in tire discount decision, FTC laid down a rule which would have solved not only many problems of tire industry, but also paper industry and many others. But so far FTC has not invoked their own rulings but held compliance in abeyance while ruling goes through slow, laborious trial of court tests. In meantime, small business suffers from continuation of practices which FTC found damaging and illegal.

That is why there is substantial misgivings in Washington about FTC which has shown itself so high and mighty in cracking down on the little man, so blind to the transgressions of the great. And that is why a group of Senators, including Senator ESTES KEFAUVER of crime investigation fame, are talking loudly about an appropriation of a million dollars to finance full-scale investigation of why Nation's antitrust laws are not being enforced, and what measures are needed to insure their enforcement.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Lincoln's Philosophy Lives On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Lincoln Day luncheon in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN'S PHILOSOPHY LIVES ON

(Speech by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, at Lincoln Day luncheon in Los Angeles, February 10, 1955)

Across our country this week, people are meeting to commemorate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, martyred American president who saved our Nation and emancipated a race. His era in history was one of trouble and tribulation. But it was also one which beckoned to him to provide an unselfish and devoted leadership to a high cause, and he provided it to the benefit of his country in full measure. His was a martyrdom of sacrifice to the cause of freedom.

Abraham Lincoln's words come hurtling down the years: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in . . . to do all which may achieve and cherish a lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Mr. Chairman, our work remains unfinished, and our goal remains the same: peace among ourselves and peace with all nations. The burden of those labors is being borne today by a patient, devoted Christian leader, dedicated, as Mr. Lincoln was, to peace at home and throughout the world. With deep religious conviction, with humility, and with native commonsense, President Dwight Eisenhower is presently engaged in arming America morally, strengthening her economically and militarily, conducting her foreign policy skillfully and firmly, all in the forward march toward the attainment of the selfsame goal which our Civil War President set for our Nation.

Many significant changes have been wrought in the past 2 years by our Government in the conduct and direction of our national affairs.

I believe, and I have often said, that the people of our country want clean, strong, honest, American Government. Republicans want it. Democrats want it. So do our independent citizens. I can give you the assurance, though I know you do not need it, that that is exactly what President Eisenhower and his administration are giving to all of us.

The record of these last 2 years is studded with examples of bipartisan approval of presidential recommendations. This is true both in the domestic field and in foreign policy. It is a record which, I believe, will continue in the future.

On some legislation of singular interest to California, I am always proud to remember

that when the roll of Senators was called on passage, Democrats joined Republicans in approving our State's request, and we triumphed over scattering but vigorous partisan opposition.

As a Senator from California, as well as a Senator of the United States, I am grateful for this chance to summarize and highlight a variety of actions that will further our progress and brighten our promising future.

In the past year alone, Congress enacted laws that protected the interests of our cotton farmers, whose crop now is California's leading agricultural commodity; it cushioned the impact on seriously congested schools in scores of our communities where thousands of additional families were drawn by reason of Federal activities and programs. It has contributed toward the solution of our continually pressing water problem, undeniably a matter of greatest concern to our expanding economy and development; and it has facilitated our commerce through improvement of ports along the whole stretch of our coastline.

As a sample of what has been done to safeguard our lands and help us utilize our resources, let me cite part of the record of the 83d Congress:

Increased funds were appropriated to speed the pace of flood prevention projects in Los Angeles, the northern section of the bay region, and in the lower Sacramento Valley.

Dams were authorized to bring about greater use of waters in several widespread areas of our State, for the benefit of farmers and city dwellers alike.

Construction of additional distribution systems was made possible, to carry benefits of the central valley project to more farm areas in the central valleys of our State.

The outlook for the future is encouraging. Recognition of the continuing problem of our schools will be made in the present Congress and hearings on the matter are now in progress in Washington. Progress will be made in our water and power problems. With the recommendation of our Governor, I have again introduced the multiple-purpose Trinity-San Luis project in northern California, together with the so-called Tri-Dam project in San Joaquin, and new legislation to assist the people of Ventura County in their own acute water question.

As a member of the Public Works Committee I look forward to playing an active part in shaping legislation to carry out a comprehensive long-range highway program. This measure will enable the Federal, State, and local governments to tackle the neglected problem of expanding and modernizing roads of all types so our highway network may better meet demands of our highly mobile population.

The Federal Government, at long last, has become an ally in the fight against a menace which endangers an increasing number of communities, air pollution. Just this month President Eisenhower again acknowledged that the complex problem of checking and, we hope, ultimately eliminating smog, requires positive participation by national agencies. They will make a tremendous contribution chiefly in the field of scientific research and should speed the efforts already under way in various metropolitan areas. I shall endeavor to broaden the program of Federal assistance in this field, and I feel hopeful that aid will be forthcoming to clean up the atmosphere in the cities and towns of California and across the Nation.

Production and employment are increasing on a broad front. President Eisenhower has prophesied that, within a decade, our current annual production level of three hundred and sixty billion dollars will increase to five hundred billion or more, expressed in dollars of the same purchasing power.

In the first 2 years of the present administration, Federal appropriations have been reduced, Federal, personal income taxes and excise taxes were cut, the excess-profits tax was repealed, governmental controls on business were abolished, and 1954 was one of the best years, economically, in our history.

We've made magnificent strides in the field of human rights and equal dignity among our people in a fashion that would make Abe Lincoln proud of us. In this free republic of ours, the brotherhood of man becomes an increasingly accepted standard of decency, and the leadership of our Chief Executive has supplied the idealism and the intelligence to bring to more of our people a rising standard of living in this country of free men and free government.

With the most painful and heartfelt regret, the American people are aware that there are those in the world who oppose freedom and who have been measurably successful in stamping it out in great areas. Human slavery, in its most cruel form, is practiced today as a Government policy by those countries chained down by Red communism. Their current activities, placed in the background of their self-proclaimed desires, are cause for sober concern by free America and by the free world. And it is to this question that I desire now to direct your attention.

Basically, the American people today and their Government concern themselves with the security of our Nation and an honorable peace in our world. Perhaps never before have they turned as soberly to the contemplation of our Nation's needs to preserve freedom, as they have today.

We live our lives in a whole new era. Solving the problems of freedom in that era depends upon our acceptance and understanding of the new energies which men of science have brought forth in our time. The needs of the American people in securing their freedom must be, and have been, set in this background.

Several months ago I listened to Admiral Carney in Vallejo, suggest that the American Navy is on its way to complete atomic power for its propulsion. Thus, since 1789, we have passed successively through periods of sailing ships, and steam ships, and diesel ships, to atomically-propelled vessels. Our gallant air force is expanding almost daily, and piston planes give way to jet-powered aircraft. Whereas at the outbreak of the Korean war the United States Air Force had but 42 effective wings out of a projected 70, it has today 121 effective wings out of a projected 137, a goal which will be attained before too many months have passed, with the approval by the Congress to recommendations of the administration. Our airmen have long since penetrated the sonic barrier, and one of their experimental planes has flown 1650 miles per hour, and how much faster is the Defense Department's secret. An American airplane has flown to an altitude in excess of 85,000 feet, and again it is a secret how much further up he may have gone. The United States Army and the Marine Corps likewise have entered upon

a modern atomic posture of readiness and mobility, testifying, without equivocation, of our determination to safeguard American security.

Every citizen of this country and his family may give eternal thanks that the Commander in Chief of our defense forces is an unselfish and enlightened leader devotedly dedicated to peace in the world, partly by reason of his own experiences over an almost entire lifetime as a skilled professional soldier.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress early in January, the President of the United States again stated that our national goals continue to be a just and enduring peace, and a realistic worldwide limitation of the implements of war. "We maintain powerful military forces," he said, "Because there is no present alternative—they are forces designed for deterrent and defensive purposes, able to strike back with destructive power in response to any attack." The defense plans of the United States have been under the personal direction of the President after his own long and contemplative study. His recommendations for our country's defense will, I prophesy, be given the same bipartisan congressional approval in 1956 as they were those last 2 years. There are a few professional disagreements on emphasis, but here again we can be thankful for the experienced counsel which the Chief Executive can give as a military man. His recommendations include, among others, an emphasis on modern airpower and new weapons, the elimination of duplication and overstaffing, the acceleration of a program for our own continental defense, and the buildup of a military reserve. Incidentally, they include increases in compensation for service personnel. When I tell you that only 15 percent of the Regular Air Force personnel are expected to reenlist when their present terms expire, I underline the importance of increasing the attractiveness of peacetime military service.

Meanwhile, in existence or on the drawing boards are weapons so appallingly destructive as to chill one's imagination. International ballistic missiles—euphemistically termed IBM—will, we are told, travel across oceans at unthinkable speed, addressed to targets thousands of miles away, with considerable precision and accuracy. And while the science of destruction continues its deadly progress among the free countries of the world, there is no question that international communism, with the brains it has from varying sources at its disposal, likewise makes progress in this same field.

Recently, the former Chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee said:

"Today, atomic and hydrogen bombs exist in growing numbers on both sides of the Iron curtain. Today—not next year, or the year after, but today—the Soviets have both the bombs and the planes needed to launch a devastating nuclear attack against the cities of North America."

Listen to Winston Churchill as he comments on current history:

"Mankind has never been in this position before. Without having improved appreciably in virtue or enjoying wiser guidance, it has got into its hands for the first time the tools by which it can unfailingly accomplish its own extermination. That is the point in human destinies to which all the glories and toils of men have at last led them. They would do well to pause and ponder upon their new responsibilities. Death stands at attention, obedient, expectant, ready to serve, ready to shear away the people en masse; ready, if called on, to pulverize, without hope of repair, what is left of civilization. He awaits only the word of command. He awaits it from a frail, bewildered being, long his victim, now—for one occasion only—his master."

There you have a glimpse of the background in which nations of the world may decide upon the course to follow in dealing with one another. And it is against that background that the American people must determine the course of their own policy as respects our neighbors. Our Government is seriously concerned with such a question, and the Senate, and the House of Representatives as well, have sat in judgment upon phases of it these past several weeks.

On January 24, President Eisenhower sent to the Senate and the House a message in which he reiterated that this country's basic goal is safeguarding the security of the United States by establishing and preserving a just and honorable peace. He then described, in considerable detail, the serious and darkening situation in the Strait of Formosa. Suffice to say here, since 1945 the islands of Formosa and the Pescadores have been occupied by the Republic of China, a loyal ally of the American people. Communist China, which incidentally still incarcerates innocent American citizens, announced its determination to invade and conquer these islands and bring them under the aegis of Red Chinese communism. The President emphasized the importance to the American people that these islands remain in friendly hands. He requested the Congress to adopt a resolution authorizing him to employ our Armed Forces as he might deem necessary to secure and protect these islands against armed attack.

What, my fellow citizens, is the importance to the American people of Formosa and the Pescadores? In the words of the President of the United States, those islands, in unfriendly hands "would seriously dislocate the existing, even if unstable, balance, of moral, economic, and military forces upon upon which the peace of the Pacific depends. It would create a breach in the island chain of the western Pacific that constitutes, for the United States and other free nations, the geographic backbone of their security structure in that ocean. With that, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States agree."

I want to recall the words of another great American citizen who was a guest of the people of Los Angeles a very few days ago. Speaking to the 82d Congress on his triumphant return to our country, Gen. Douglas MacArthur described the Pacific Ocean as a vast moat to protect the United States as long as we held it. He spoke of a chain of islands in the Pacific which constituted for Americans a protective shield. It was his powerfully-stated conviction that a breach in that littoral defense line by an unfriendly power would make vulnerable each remaining segment of it. And then he said, "Under no circumstances must Formosa fall under Communist control. Such an eventuality would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan and might well force our western frontier back to the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington."

In the considered judgment of such American patriots who are qualified to speak, Communist occupation of Formosa and the Pescadores would seriously endanger the security of the people of the United States and would undermine the cause of peace.

The resolution was debated in the House of Representatives and it passed almost unanimously with only three Members opposing it. It was debated at considerable length in the Senate. All manner of amendments were offered to delimit or restrict the President's responsibility. I listened to those Senators who advocated restrictive amendments or who advocated, indeed, no resolution at all. I listened also to the distinguished Democratic Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who urged the adoption of the

resolution exactly as the President had recommended it. On the basis of all the background and of the Senate debate, I say to the people of my State of California, there was only one course in my judgment to pursue in the cause of American security and peace in the world. That was to uphold the recommendation of the President of the United States. And the Senate did uphold the President's recommendation, and did so overwhelmingly.

Thus, for all the world to see, the President of the United States and the Congress, representing the American people, have taken an unequivocal position. It is a position in line with our basic foreign policy and completely in consonance with our American goal.

That action was followed a few days later by overwhelming ratification in the Senate of the Southeast Asia collective defense treaty. By that commitment the United States, together with Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, France, the Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand, combined to create a protective network of mutual defense, to promote security and to strengthen the fabric of peace in Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific. This treaty is designed to deter aggression, which means Communist aggression, in that area of the world by warning potential aggressors that an open armed attack upon the territory of any of the parties will be regarded by each signatory nation as dangerous to its own peace and safety. In such contingency the parties agree to meet the common danger in accordance with their constitutional processes. They also agree to consult on measures for their common defense whenever the territory of integrity or political independence of any of them is threatened other than by armed attack, which might endanger the peace of the area. Thus it is indicated to communism that its techniques of internal subversion would be dealt with effectively. If communism fails to understand anything but force and might, then communism is forewarned that retribution lies in store for it for breaching the peace in the future.

This is the foreign policy of the Government of the United States. We have now added a mutual defense treaty with Nationalist China. The SEATO treaty in Southeast Asia balances our NATO treaty of mutual security in Europe. It is a policy based upon coming into firm agreement of those who, like ourselves, love freedom. It is designed to deter Communist aggression and the onslaught of Communist slavery. It is an enlightened policy of our own self-interest consistent with our goal of freedom and of peace. There are some in California and some in the Nation who, for varying purposes, oppose this policy. They are a vociferous minority and they are wrong. For my part, my friends, I shall continue to support that policy as it is carried out by the President of the United States.

When Abraham Lincoln was about to become President of the United States in 1861, and as he was traveling en route to Washington, he made a statement to the American people which I repeat as I conclude:

"If the people shall be lost, it is little to any one man . . . but a great deal to the . . . millions of people who inhabit these United States, and their posterity in all coming time. It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind, that not with politicians, not with presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you is the question: Shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations?"

Mr. Lincoln answered history in the affirmative. So will we.

The Challenge to Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 16, 1955, it was my privilege to address the annual meeting of one of the most useful groups in our Nation—the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. This is the organization which has done so much to bring the blessings of electricity, with an attendant higher standard of living, to hundreds of thousands of farm families in rural America.

Other Members of Congress, of both great political parties, who spoke to this highly successful meeting were the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and Representative H. R. Gross, of Iowa.

I addressed the convention, assembled in Convention Hall at Atlantic City, N. J., on the subject of The Challenge to Public Power, reviewing the efforts undertaken during the past 2 years by the present administration to eliminate or destroy the public power program in the United States. I had the honor of being introduced by my old friend, Lee Wooden, of Jewell, in Clatsop County, Oreg., the president of the Rural Electric Cooperative Association in our own State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address to the delegates attending the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE TO PUBLIC POWER

(Address by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

One of the great moments of my career was to stand with George William Norris, the father of public power in America, when he saw Bonneville Dam for the first time. He watched the Columbia River surging inexorably through the Cascade Mountain Range, before it thundered over the spillway of the long, low dam.

"I don't think you people in the Northwest realize what a marvelous resource you have in this wonderful river," said Uncle George. "Is there any other bounty which produces so much good for mankind and yet never diminishes in quantity?"

George Norris is gone now, and the public power program which he helped to build confronts a major crisis. Yet many times I have thought of what he said. What other resource can light farms, turn factory wheels and operate businesses and, at the same time, continue in as great an abundance as ever before?

The lighting up of rural America was born of the same forces that started major multipurpose projects. The first real electric co-op came into being under TVA. Today about 300 of the 1,000 REA's receive all or part of their power supply from Federal power projects. Truly, rural families have a tremendous stake in future resource policies, not only because of potential power supply but because of the great impact of TVA and Bonneville on the rates of private power companies.

When Bonneville and TVA were started, it was like dropping a pebble into a pond of high-power-company rates. The effect of an abundant, low-cost power supply was immediate and far-reaching. The public-power yardstick was felt in ever-widening circles, forcing down the padded rates in adjacent areas.

For 20 years, the United States Government promoted a program to make the rivers of America the servants of the people. I use the term advisedly. I live in a State where only 27 percent of our farms had electricity in 1933. By 1952, this figure had soared to 98 percent. It is practically impossible to measure this gain other than in terms of increased creature comforts, greater purchasing power, a higher standard of living. These are the only proper measurements.

Mrs. Neuberger's mother, Ethel Keltly Brown, is one of the farm women who had no electricity until the programs were begun which symbolize the work of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. Mother Brown has told me what it was like to live on a farm without power. It meant no refrigeration for the food which was cooked. It meant doing that cooking on a wood stove, with the women splitting kindling while the men were at their chores. It meant hand-washing farm clothes—which get excruciatingly dirty—on a corrugated washboard. It meant carrying a Coleman lantern from room to room at night when children were sick.

POWER CHANGES FARM LIFE

Electricity on the farm has changed all this. The vast majority of the farms of our country have power today because of the Federal power program, because of the Rural Electric Administration, because of the watchful vigilance and persistent crusading of groups like the National Electric Cooperative Association. And all this benefit has occurred without diminishing the natural resources of America. The late J. D. Ross, first administrator of Bonneville, used to call that dam "an oil well which will never run dry, a coal mine that will never thin out. . . ."

Although I am only (sic) 42 years old, I come before you today as a man who has seen the public power program revolve in a full cycle in my region, the Pacific Northwest.

I witnessed the program begin a little more than 20 years ago. It was a bipartisan program—a program advanced by far-sighted men in both major political parties. By every possible standard, it was a success. As you know, electricity was brought to the farms, and at rates which the farmer could afford. Industrial payrolls came next, and this meant a steady market in town for the farmer's crops. Although the Pacific Northwest has historically lagged behind the rest of the Nation in manufacturing, its expansion led the land during the first decade that Bonneville power was available. Between 1939 and 1948, the national increase in manufacturing employment was 284 percent but in the States of Oregon and Washington it was 329 percent. Furthermore, this program has been generously paying for itself. Indeed, the annual reports of the Interior Department actually admit that the Columbia River power program is far ahead of the amortization schedule in repayments to the Government.

And auxiliary benefits of incalculable value were occurring simultaneously. In 1933, the year Bonneville Dam was started, a mere 85,000 tons of cargo moved upstream into the reaches of the upper Columbia River. In 1953, the tonnage was 1,375,000. This was merely a bonus from the power program. And what are we to say of the thousands of irrigated homesteads now being wrested from the arid upland desert near Grand Coulee, homesteads where ex-GI's and

their families are making a new start in life?

I stress these benefits that have taken place in my own part of the country because I can be a little more poignant, a little more dramatic, a little more specific about it. These things I have seen with my own eyes. I was at Grand Coulee when the world's biggest dam was started. I saw the first water gurgling through canals amidst the sagebrush and tumbleweed. I saw the first transmission lines stretching out across the wasteland like a steel-legged centipede.

CALCULATED SCHEME STOPS PROGRAM

This was a program dedicated to the welfare of the United States, yet you of the NRECA know what has happened to that program. In 1953, the present national administration stopped it—deliberately, calculatingly, grimly.

The onslaught has occurred on many fronts:

1. Appropriations have been reduced for agencies devoted to the wider use of low-cost power.

2. Key waterpower sites, like Hells Canyon, have been pledged by the administration to private power companies for piecemeal, high-cost development.

3. New Federal starts have been choked off.

4. So-called wheeling agreements with utility corporations have given them control of the power supply in many areas.

5. Attacks upon the public-power preference clause have imperiled the electric supply of rural electric co-ops and other non-profit systems.

6. A nationwide barrage of propaganda, some of it stemming from the White House and executive departments, has sought to indict such undertakings as the Tennessee Valley Authority and Bonneville as "creeping socialism."

7. A so-called partnership with private utilities has been proposed, whereby these companies would monopolize the revenue and energy at Federal power projects.

I emphasize the partnership because it represents today the spearhead of the current attack upon public power. The word "partnership" peppers the President's budget message. It is an appealing word. Yet what kind of a partnership is it? It is a partnership in which the Government relinquishes to private monopolies the powerhouses at Federal dams, while the Government continues to finance the nonreimbursable features, such as fish ladders, floodgates, and navigation locks.

THE MONOPOLY PARTNERSHIP

We had a partnership in operation. It wasn't this kind of partnership. It was a legitimate partnership between the Government and its citizens. Clyde T. Ellis, your executive manager, described this partnership in a masterful address which he delivered a year ago last month at your 1954 convention in Miami. Mr. Ellis referred numerous times to the Federal-local partnership, under which kilowatts were being sold at low cost to whatever distributing agency the residents of a particular area preferred.

It might be a municipal system as in Seattle. It might be a private power company as in Portland. It might be a public utility district as in Clark County, Wash. It might be a rural electric co-op as in Benton and Lincoln Counties, Oreg. These various methods of distribution represented the democratically chosen preference of the men and women living in that part of our Nation. They made the choice without interference by politicians in either the State capital or the National Capital, and then the Federal power system made available energy from the dams constructed on key river networks.

This was a bona fide partnership, as Clyde Ellis made clear. But what is proposed today as partnership is no partnership at all. It is monopoly and special privilege. For at least 50 years, a private stranglehold will be

given legal sanctity at a great power site, and there will be nothing that the men and women in that area can do about it, through half a century of time.

We are told the abandonment of public power is necessary in the name of Americanism. Yet the preference clause, which safeguards the power supply of our rural electric co-ops, goes all the way back to the administration of Theodore Roosevelt and the Reclamation Act of 1906. I refuse to believe that the man who led the Rough Riders up San Juan Hill was a creeping Socialist. The inclusion of the preference clause in the Bonneville Act was principally the work of Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon. Does the present administration want to accuse of socialism the man who was Republican minority floor leader in the United States Senate for well over a decade?

In the barrage of propaganda being fired at the people over the Hells Canyon question, these overtones of patriotism again appear. Is it patriotic to abandon the greatest hydroelectric site left on our continent to the absentee-dominated corporation, which will tap only a segment of the available kilowatts?

PLAYBACK OF HISTORY

Historians tell us that no issues are really new. They all have arisen before—perhaps in different guise and other settings. Yet almost half a century ago, Theodore Roosevelt and his illustrious Chief Forester, Gifford Pinchot, confronted a Hells Canyon problem of their own.

Utility companies were grabbing off power sites on the mountain rivers of the West. Although the Nation had recently set aside the forest reserves, no legislation existed for the specific protection of these hydroelectric power sites. Let Pinchot describe what happened, in his autobiography *Breaking New Ground*:

"A certain number of forest-ranger stations were applied for which were needed less for rangers than to give the Government a temporary hold on some power site and prevent the power octopus from sucking it in. . . . Some of these ranger stations were deliberately located on water power sites, in order to insure some form of government control. . . ."

Contrast this action by Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot with the shameful relinquishment of Hells Canyon by the present masters of the American Government. Roosevelt and Pinchot contrived extra-legal machinery to save these power resources for future generations. They relied upon a subterfuge. This national administration refuses to use the machinery long ago created for the purpose—it seeks to hasten the abandonment of Hells Canyon, John Day, Green Peter, and other sites.

Nor can this be called in any sense of the word a partisan issue. Theodore Roosevelt and Pinchot were lifelong Republicans. The program which this administration has jettisoned was, in many of its concepts, a program originated by Republicans of the past—Roosevelt, Pinchot, Hiram Johnson, Norris, Borah, McNary, and many others. In my own State, I am a Democrat, but thousands of Republicans, on farms and in the cities, assured me that they were loyal to a publicly motivated program of resource development that had its roots within their own party.

Under this administration, engineering and scientific knowledge have been bent to political whims. The 308 report of the United States Army Corps of Engineers is the master plan for development of the Columbia River Basin. Surely if the Army ever errs, it is on the conservative and cautious side. But the 308 report recommends without reservation the erection of a high multipurpose Federal dam in Hells Canyon.

Yet this national administration assures us that the 308 report is wrong at Hells Canyon. Of course, the 308 report, according to the administration, is right at Libby Dam up along the Canadian border, where the prospects for construction are so clouded by international disputes that no private power company covets the site. So, here, the administration is willing to promote a Federal dam. How can the same engineers, with the same transits and the same diamond drills, be wrong on the Snake River and right on the Kootenai River? It is as if a patient told his doctor that the doctor was right about one lung, but wrong about the other.

INTERIOR POLICIES THREATEN REA'S

One of the serious blows suffered by REA's under the new policies was abrogation of 40-year contracts between the Interior Department and cooperatives in the southwest. As a result, the REA's were threatened with the bankruptcy or high rates, or loss of their independence. As you know, the original destruction of the continuing fund vital to these contracts was put through by a former Senator from Oregon. I assure you the new Senator from Oregon will do everything in his power to undo the damage.

Other corrective measures are also necessary, especially against the conspiracy to rewrite the formula for allocating power costs to make the price of Federal power as high as private power.

I cite these things to indicate how politics and greed are intruding into programs which, until the last year or so, were decided by the needs of the American people and not by the selfish desires of 1 or 2 utility corporations.

ATTACK BY STEALTH

As you are well aware, REA funds have been cut but not abolished by Congress. You have been successful in maintaining reasonably adequate loan funds and services during the past 2 years. But this was to be expected. It was forecast at your first annual convention by the late George W. Norris. He said: "The attack upon REA will not be an open assault. The attack will be by stealth and treachery because REA is too popular to be attacked openly."

I don't own a crystal ball, but occult powers are not needed to predict that the Hoover Commission will probably recommend that REA—as you now know it—be abolished. Out of respect for your political potency, they will try to put forth some plausible substitute like a Federal REA corporation forced to borrow money from bankers at high-interest rates, and run by a board of directors and not by the Congress, which is now REA's board of directors.

THAT FEDERAL POWER MONOPOLY

For nearly 2 years, the administration has defended its abandonment of the Federal power program by contending that the Nation was in dire peril of being suffocated by a Federal power monopoly.

Secretary McKay has uttered this warning on many occasions. At McNary Dam on September 23, 1954, the President himself warned against Federal operation of "a gigantic, overwhelming nationwide power monopoly."

On November 4, 1954, Budget Director Rowland H. Hughes warned against committing the country to "a policy of establishing a nationwide power monopoly."

Yet this entire argument was refuted by the President in his State of the Union message of January 6, 1955, when he flatly declared to the Congress that "Federal hydroelectric developments supply but a small fraction of the Nation's power needs."

On this occasion, the President definitely asserted the true facts. Only about 13 percent of the energy used in the Nation is gen-

erated by the Federal Government. Approximately 6 percent spins off the turbines of municipal systems, and the remaining 81 percent from private utility corporations.

What is monopoly—13 percent, or 81 percent?

Yet for months the American people were told solemnly by their highest government officials that they couldn't have any more dams like Grand Coulee, Shasta, and Bonneville because of the imminent dangers of a Federal power monopoly.

Wasn't it Bernard M. Baruch who said that every man had a right to be wrong as to his opinions but that no man had a right to be wrong as to his facts?

SUBSIDIZED POWER: ANOTHER MYTH

Ever since the present national administration went into office, a conscious and deliberate effort has taken place to convince the people of America that the energy generated at Federal hydroelectric projects does not pay for itself. These projects are portrayed as vast drains on our national Treasury.

For example, Secretary of the Interior McKay appeared on the CBS Capitol Cloak Room TV program October 23, 1953. This colloquy took place between him and Mr. Bill Costello, one of the CBS panel:

MR. COSTELLO. "Well, it's your philosophy, then, that the citizen generally should not pay the cost of keeping power rates low but that the individual consumer should pay the actual cost of producing that power."

SECRETARY MCKAY. "That's right. I don't think it's right to subsidize power out in my country—for instance in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and that country. We shouldn't ask for power to be subsidized by the people in New England."

Now if anyone should realize that this is a plain and outright misrepresentation, it should be Secretary McKay. In the first place, his own annual report for 1953 declares (at p. 326) that "the repayment (on Bonneville) is substantially in excess of scheduled requirements." As a former Governor of Oregon and as a resident of the Northwest, the Secretary ought to know that the great Government power projects on the Columbia River are returning to the Treasury not only the original investment in hydroelectric facilities, but also interest and operating costs.

Consider the repayment record on the Bonneville Dam project alone. The Government has invested \$128,549,822 in construction costs and operating expenses for Bonneville Dam. Although its full span of generators have been in operation only 11 years, the project has put \$48,825,959 into Federal coffers from sale of power. In fact, the whole Bonneville system—marketing the output of all Federal dams on the Columbia—has collected gross income of \$340,565,589 through the sale of kilowatts.

Yet these fiscal facts are not known today throughout the Nation. The other day I engaged in a brief and friendly debate on the floor of the Senate with Senator NORRIS CORRON, a fine Republican Senator from New Hampshire. He was of the opinion that our dams in the Northwest are a drain on the taxpayers of his State. In other words, the propaganda put out by Mr. McKay and others has taken root. Senator CORRON does not realize that the Columbia River projects actually, in the long run, will be an ultimate source of financial profit to the Federal Government. And I know he is not aware of the innumerable products manufactured in New England—products like alarm clocks, ice boxes, stoves, washing machines, and shoes—which have been purchased because thousands of rural folks in the Northwest have a higher standard of living and increased purchasing power through the abundant and

low-cost electricity made available to them on their farms.

THE BETRAYAL AT HELLS CANYON

The adage that history repeats itself was never more dramatically brought home to me than when I was asked a year ago to review a book detailing the fight to build Grand Coulee Dam, called *Hell Columbia*. This book, written by George Sundborg, a former Northwest newspaperman, impressed me with the deadly parallel between the fight for Grand Coulee and our present day struggle for Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. Sundborg could not have had the Hells Canyon case in mind when he wrote the book because he started the work before the Hells Canyon struggle commenced.

But the situations are such close parallels they might have been poured from the same mold—like the Gold Dust twins that used to adorn the soap flake boxes.

Kettle Falls was a place on the Columbia River about 117 miles upstream from the proposed Grand Coulee damsite. In March of 1921—just after the appropriation had been secured to core-drill the Coulee site—the Washington Water Power Company began to show interest in Kettle Falls as a site for development. On June 20, 1921, a contract for exploratory drilling on the Grand Coulee site was awarded. Ten days later, Washington Water Power filed an application with the Federal Power Commission to construct a dam at Kettle Falls. The Kettle Falls dam, located in the proposed Coulee reservoir pool, would have lopped off a hundred feet from the height of Grand Coulee—horsepower in the big dam's power output, with consequent reduction of a million.

A long public debate ensued in which spokesmen for a number of Federal and State agencies were enlisted to support the power company. The pattern included such official statements as that of the then secretary of the Federal Power Commission. This gentleman said a dam at Grand Coulee—and I quote—"would involve an excessive initial investment", which, he said, it was "extremely doubtful could be secured for the purpose from any resource." This official went on to say of Grand Coulee that the PPC license to the power company would be granted only for a period of 50 years. "If at the end of that time or even before, it should become evident that the high dam would be a desirable step, the net investment of the Kettle Falls development could readily be absorbed by the Grand Coulee development." And, he added, "further investigation of this plan does not seem to be necessary."

It was not until June 23, 1936, that the FPC issued an order formally denying the Kettle Falls dam permit—nearly 14 years after Washington Water Power made its first move to block Grand Coulee construction.

I detail this background only for purposes of comparing some of the developments in the Grand Coulee and Hells Canyon fights. On June 9, 1947, the Army Corps of Engineers announced a public hearing would be held on plans for development of the Middle Snake River. These plans included Hells Canyon Dam, which was a key part of its famous 308 Report on Columbia River development. Thirteen days later, the Idaho Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for a preliminary permit for a new run-of-the-river dam at Oxbow site, some 35 miles upstream from the Hells Canyon site. Granting of the Oxbow license would forever bar construction of Hells Canyon Dam, but would preserve the barony which the Idaho Power Co. holds in Idaho.

Since the Oxbow application was filed, the battle has raged on. We have seen spokesmen for Government agencies and company-front groups pressured to back the company scheme, just as in the days of Grand Coulee. Hells Canyon Dam and the whole plan for full development of the Columbia Basin was hit hardest by action of Secretary

of the Interior Douglas McKay in withdrawing his Department's opposition to the Oxbow license.

As recently as last spring we, in Oregon, heard the Secretary repeat that the Federal budget was too precarious to start new dams. He was especially insistent about expenditures for Hells Canyon Dam, although when campaigning in the Colorado River Basin he never mentioned this fiscal situation. In Oregon, it was like listening to a hollow echo from the corridors of history—shades of that former FPC secretary who said Grand Coulee involved "excessive initial investment."

McKay never mentioned that, although Grand Coulee has had its full quota of generators in operation only since 1951, it has paid into the Federal Treasury over \$51 million toward retiring an eventual power debt of \$221 million.

POWER-COMPANY SLOGANS REVIVED

The parallel between Hells Canyon and Grand Coulee is significant. It shows that the situations and the arguments are not new. The ideas espoused by the Interior Secretary on Hells Canyon were merely revived from the Grand Coulee fight. It would appear that the public-opinion formers thumbed back through their book of tricks and slogans to pick out the present-day arguments.

But what if the arguments used by McKay and other administration spokesmen had prevailed in the embryo days of Grand Coulee? What would have happened to the energy which activated the Hanford works and made plutonium available for our knock-out punch in World War II? Where would the power have come from for the aluminum to make 50,000 planes a year for our Nation's defense? How would we have started to wrest from the desert 15,000 farmsteads for ex-GI's and others in the Coulee region?

Fortunately, the views of those who ridiculed Grand Coulee as a "white elephant" did not prevail. As a result, America has been a better and more secure place in which to live. There were men of vision, integrity, and courage—men like George Norris, of Nebraska, and Tim O'Sullivan, from the plateau of eastern Washington—who were willing to carry on in the face of ridicule, deception, and pressure. To prevent the warmed-over arguments of the 1920's from being used against the public-power program today, we must keep alive their traditions of battle. They knew not the meaning of surrender, nor did they compromise when faced with discouragement.

Many of you may feel that the picture of the moment is bleak. But you should feel optimistic and proud. You have been in the front lines, blunting the attack. You have been hurt in some areas but not beyond recovery.

It is a far road from a damsite on a tributary to the Columbia where Norris stood that day long ago, with the fine spray drifting into his face. The prophecy and admonition which Norris gave applies today, as it did then. He said: "We will come some day, perhaps within our lifetime, to the great electric age. . . . Since Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden of Eden, there has never been discovered an element in nature with so many possibilities of usefulness and pleasure as electricity. We ought to guard with jealous care the concentration of water-power in the hands of any combination of men."

This is Norris' challenge to us. He is gone. We are here. Can we fail this man—and the hosts like him—who fought for public power when it was considered a lost cause, when the movement was in infancy? The illustrious Jefferson said, "Each generation must make its own fight for liberty." Because Norris and his contemporaries won their battle, we cannot rest content. Our own Armageddon lies ahead.

The outcome is in our own hands.

Lincoln, Eisenhower, and a Republican Philosophy for Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day address which I delivered last Saturday night at Glastonbury, Conn.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN, EISENHOWER, AND A REPUBLICAN PHILOSOPHY FOR OUR TIMES

(By United States Senator Prescott Bush)

In every public speaker's life there come two reactions after he receives an invitation to address a meeting such as this. First, there is the warm, happy glow when the invitation arrives, and he feels that after all this time someone is still interested in what he has to say. Later, unhappily, comes the descent to the depths, as the time by which he must prepare his remarks inexorably approaches, and he wonders what new message he can bring his audience.

In this latter mood, back in Washington a few days ago, and thinking of Abraham Lincoln, whom we honor tonight, 90 years after his death, my eyes fell on a newspaper clipping I keep below the glass on my desk. It's a prayer which James Reston of the New York Times reprinted in his column some months ago. Let me read it to you:

"God give us men! A time like this demands Strong minds, great heart, true faith, and ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog

In public duty and in private thinking.
God, give us men. Amen."

As I read those lines again one night last week, they gave me one part of the message I want to bring to you tonight:

The Republican Party can be eternally proud that in two times of crisis in the history of our Nation it gave America two Presidents of the stature of Abraham Lincoln and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Both men, in truth, of "strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands." Both above the fog in public duty and in private thinking.

There have been other great Republican Presidents. The name of Teddy Roosevelt, to mention only one, comes automatically to mind. But between Lincoln and none of our other great Presidents, including the Oyster Bay Roosevelt, have there been such similarities as exist between the Great Emancipator and Dwight Eisenhower.

Many parallels between Lincoln and Eisenhower could be pointed out. I will mention but a few.

First, most obviously, are the times of national crises in which each bore the burdens of office. Lincoln, in his day, was confronted with a nation half slave and half free; Eisenhower, today, struggles with the many grave problems created by a world half slave and half free.

Outstanding, next, are their similar great qualities as spiritual leaders of the American people, leaders with a reverent faith in God

and in the Divine inspiration which gives life to the great documents of our history, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Both men came at times in our history when there was need for the flame of that faith to burn brighter.

And then there is their leadership in stating the philosophy of the Republican Party to which we give our allegiance.

Political conditions in our times, as in Lincoln's day, envelop the political battle in a thick smog. Differences between our major parties are blurred. Factions mark splits within each party. Slogans and labels today are used much as they were in Lincoln's time to create differences where none exist, or to cover up the real differences which honest reason and discussion would expose.

Facing similar conditions in his time, Lincoln did something about them which we are only now beginning to understand. He cut beneath the party battle to eternal truths. He stated principles, defined differences, and clarified issues. No one can read the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates or the Lincoln campaign speeches without being impressed with his patient determination to draw the line between the emerging Republican Party and his Democratic opponents.

The same thing is being done today by President Eisenhower. A careful reader of his state papers and public utterances will find within them a growing body of political philosophy, a philosophy suited for our times and the Nation's manifold problems of the day.

As modern Republicans, we believe with Lincoln that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. And, as our case is new, so must we think and act anew."

And President Eisenhower, while holding fast to the fundamentals of our American system of government which our opponents sometimes forget and still forget, is thinking and acting anew as we come to grips with the sometimes bewilderingly complex problems we face.

It is significant that our President has so often quoted Lincoln's famous statement on the nature of government:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

And Dwight Eisenhower has added to that statement his own—one which I venture to suggest will one day become as famous:

"In all those things which deal with people, be liberal, be human. In all those things which deal with the people's money or their economy or their form of government, be conservative—and don't be afraid to use the word."

Together, those statements form the central core of the philosophy of our modern Republican Party—a party which is alive and sympathetic to the human needs of the people, and a party which, unlike our opponents at times, is aware of the dangers to the people's freedom which lie in overly paternalistic, centralized government.

It is a philosophy of progressive moderation, as the President has called it, or of moderate progressiveness as others name it. Whatever it be named, it is a philosophy which strikes a responsive chord in the minds and aspirations of the American people, who find a steady advance along the middle of the road to our future more sensible and more attractive than frenetic zigzagging from left to right and vice versa.

The Republican Party has come a long way in improving its political philosophy since I first voted for Charles Evans Hughes in New Haven in 1918. It has profited by its own mistakes. It has profited by the mis-

takes of its political opponents. And, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, it reflects the best understanding of the real obligations and duties of government that we have yet seen in the history of the United States.

Our philosophy recognizes that in this complex industrial civilization of modern times, the problems of government are more complicated and more comprehensive than they have ever been before.

We recognize that there has grown to be a greater degree of interdependence among our people than ever before.

We recognize that the security and happiness of the American home is the most important basic asset in American economic, political, and social life.

We recognize that the happiness and security of those homes depends upon jobs. It depends upon opportunities and incentives to work.

We recognize that there can be no prosperity in the truest sense unless there are jobs available for all who are willing and able to work.

So, with these basic facts in mind, the Eisenhower administration has undertaken, in the past 2 years, to unleash the forces which will create this indispensable situation. It has adopted a policy of incentives, rather than a punitive attitude, toward labor, capital, and management. It has passed legislation designed to loosen up the savings of the people and put them into constructive job-creating enterprises. It has been unashamed to state the doctrine that just as labor is worthy of its hire, so are the savings of the people.

In matters of taxation, it has adopted an incentive rather than a punitive attitude. And in dealing with private business, it has adopted a helpful and understanding attitude rather than one of punitive vindictiveness. And taken all in all, these attitudes and policies have resulted in more jobs—more jobs than we have ever had before in any peacetime period in American history.

But that is not all. Our policies have created a situation and an environment which gives tremendous confidence for the future. No one could read the President's Economic Report of January 19, 1955, without being inspired with confidence for the future. We recognize our Government's obligation to serve the basic human needs of our people, to encourage and promote personal and family security, and we point the way to accomplishment of those ends by encouragement and stimulation of jobmaking private enterprise.

I have referred to factional splits within the 2 major parties today. I sometimes think that we Republicans worry so much about our own differences of opinion that we blind ourselves to the very serious cleavages which drive apart the Democrats. From observation in the Senate, I can assure you that those cleavages exist, although I must reluctantly confess that the Democrats, perhaps smarter politicians than we, gloss them over as much as possible. And when the chips are down, their party discipline takes command.

Nevertheless, we can't blink the fact that there are divisions in our Republican Party, differences which are particularly apparent in the Senate. There has been encouraging progress in the early days of the 84th Congress towards increasing the unity among Republican Senators. I hope that progress will continue.

And to my Republican friends in Connecticut, I say that we are in need of greater unity—greater unity and a spirit of confidence. The shock and disappointment of losing the Governorship in the most recent election has caused some to doubt and despair. There are some, I regret to say, who fail to realize that in Dwight D. Eisenhower and the record we are making under

his leadership the Republican Party has its greatest asset since the days of Lincoln.

Let us look to the future instead of the past. And our future as a party is bright. I see an overwhelming victory ahead for us in 1956. I see that victory because the record we are making will be unbeatable—the record both in national affairs and in the zealous attention to the interests of Connecticut which is being given by your entire Republican delegation in the Congress.

The President has the trust of the American people. I confidently expect that he will run again. In his messages to the 84th Congress, he has outlined a program and expressed a philosophy which we, as modern Republicans, embrace and in which we can take pride. It is a program and a philosophy for our times, reflecting the hopes and aspirations of a great majority of the American people.

The enactment of the program for the 84th Congress—and I believe most of it will be adopted, although not without heel-dragging and querulous quibbling by our opponents—will add luster to the record made by the 83d.

So look ahead.

Cast off the chains of fear and doubt. Be proud of our party and its great leader who will surely restore it to the hearts and affections of the American people.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY MCGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the Record the results of a questionnaire I sent to the citizens in the 17th Ohio District. I am proud to represent this district in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with major national and international problems facing Congress today.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to each of my constituents in the district, but I believe the replies I have received are the opinions of a cross section of those I represent.

Question sheets were sent to almost every occupational group: Republican and Democratic committeemen and women, laborers, attorneys, housewives, public office holders and government employees, salesmen, retired men and women, ministers, college and high-school students, and their instructors. Also included are those working in business and industry, newspaper, radio and professional positions.

Blanks were mailed to individuals and reproductions of the questionnaire were published in nearly all of the 20 daily and weekly newspapers in my district.

A large percent of the completed forms contained comments on the questions which proves to me that the average citizen is interested in the vital issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them. I am very pleased so many took the time to write and attach letters and notes to

the questionnaire enlarging upon their answers.

The population in my district is composed of about half rural and half urban residents. Nearly all of the labor and farm organizations are represented as well as large and small business. There are also 2 colleges and 2 universities.

It is not often that a Congressman can obtain a true picture of such an evenly divided district, but through the questionnaire method, I feel I have gained the majority opinion of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE IN AN ENDEAVOR TO LEARN THE VIEWS OF THE FOLKS BACK HOME

	Yes	No
1. Which is your choice on the farm program relative to price support and crop control?		
(a) 100-percent price support and rigid crop control.....	8	92
(b) Flexible price support and medium crop control.....	64	36
(c) No price support and no crop control.....	30	70
2. Should women qualified for social security be eligible for benefits at age 60?	68	32
3. Realizing the need for a strong national defense, which do you prefer?		
(a) Extension of the present draft law.....	57	43
(b) Universal military training.....	42	58
4. Do you believe that our present foreign policy program is proving effective and promoting world peace?	55	45
(If your answer is negative write your own suggestions on the back of this questionnaire.)		
5. Do you favor continuation of:		
(a) Technical assistance to Europe?	75	25
(b) Economic assistance to Europe?	38	62
(c) Military assistance to Europe?	53	47
6. Do you favor continuation of:		
(a) Technical assistance to Asia?	76	24
(b) Economic assistance to Asia?	46	54
(c) Military assistance to Asia?	49	51

Signature _____
 Street _____
 City and State _____
 Occupation _____

Please fill out and return this questionnaire to J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 1434 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire

	Yes	No
Question 1. Which is your choice on the farm program relative to price support and crop control?		
(a) 100 percent price support and rigid crop control:		
Total replies.....	8	92
Attorneys.....	18	82
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	7	93
Farmers.....	11	89
Housewives.....	2	98
Labor.....	5	95
Ministers.....	0	100
Newspaper and radio.....	0	100
Occupation not given and organizations.....	15	85
Professionals.....	5	95
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	7	93
Retired.....	15	85
Teachers.....	6	94
Students.....	9	91

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
Question 1.—Continued		
(b) Flexible price support and medium crop control:		
Total replies.....	64	3
Attorneys.....	58	42
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	52	48
Farmers.....	41	59
Housewives.....	60	40
Labor.....	56	44
Ministers.....	75	25
Newspaper and radio.....	67	43
Occupation not given and organizations.....	60	40
Professionals.....	73	27
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	56	44
Retired.....	33	67
Teachers.....	72	28
Students.....	83	17
(c) No price support and no crop control:		
Total replies.....	30	70
Attorneys.....	38	62
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	47	53
Farmers.....	50	50
Housewives.....	35	65
Labor.....	40	60
Ministers.....	25	75
Newspaper and radio.....	38	62
Occupation not given and organizations.....	29	71
Professionals.....	23	77
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	44	56
Retired.....	37	63
Teachers.....	25	75
Students.....	12	88
Question 2. Should women qualified for social security be eligible for benefits at age 60?		
Total replies.....	68	32
Attorneys.....	49	51
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	60	40
Farmers.....	52	48
Housewives.....	63	37
Labor.....	78	22
Ministers.....	50	50
Newspaper and radio.....	100	0
Occupation not given and organizations.....	67	33
Professionals.....	53	47
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	66	34
Retired.....	62	38
Teachers.....	75	25
Students.....	79	21
Question 3. Realizing the need for a strong national defense, which do you prefer?		
(a) Extension of the present draft law:		
Total replies.....	57	43
Attorneys.....	46	54
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	49	51
Farmers.....	50	50
Housewives.....	56	44
Labor.....	57	43
Ministers.....	85	15
Newspaper and radio.....	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations.....	45	55
Professionals.....	56	44
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	50	50
Retired.....	54	46
Teachers.....	60	40
Students.....	55	45
(b) Universal military training:		
Total replies.....	42	58
Attorneys.....	42	58
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	47	53
Farmers.....	32	68
Housewives.....	38	62
Labor.....	60	40
Ministers.....	11	89
Newspaper and radio.....	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations.....	44	56
Professionals.....	43	57
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	47	53
Retired.....	54	46
Teachers.....	41	59
Students.....	45	55
Question 4. Do you believe that our present foreign policy program is proving effective and promoting world peace?		
Total replies.....	55	45
Attorneys.....	52	48
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	55	45
Farmers.....	39	61
Housewives.....	51	49
Labor.....	51	49

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
Question 4.—Continued		
Ministers.....	72	28
Newspaper and radio.....	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations.....	51	49
Professionals.....	56	44
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	50	50
Retired.....	40	60
Teachers.....	68	32
Students.....	60	40
Question 5. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) Technical assistance to Europe?		
Total replies.....	75	25
Attorneys.....	74	26
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	72	28
Farmers.....	70	30
Housewives.....	68	32
Labor.....	65	35
Ministers.....	83	17
Newspaper and radio.....	57	43
Occupation not given and organizations.....	67	33
Professionals.....	85	15
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	69	31
Retired.....	59	41
Teachers.....	86	14
Students.....	81	19
(b) Economic assistance to Europe?		
Total replies.....	38	62
Attorneys.....	38	62
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	31	69
Farmers.....	33	67
Housewives.....	44	56
Labor.....	35	65
Ministers.....	54	46
Newspaper and radio.....	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations.....	39	61
Professionals.....	35	65
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	41	59
Retired.....	32	68
Teachers.....	52	48
Students.....	38	62
(c) Military assistance to Europe?		
Total replies.....	53	47
Attorneys.....	54	46
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	48	52
Farmers.....	42	58
Housewives.....	30	70
Labor.....	42	58
Ministers.....	61	39
Newspaper and radio.....	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations.....	41	59
Professionals.....	57	43
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	48	52
Retired.....	43	57
Teachers.....	60	40
Students.....	65	35
Question 6. Do you favor continuation of—		
(a) Technical assistance to Asia?		
Total replies.....	76	24
Attorneys.....	76	24
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	75	25
Farmers.....	69	31
Housewives.....	70	30
Labor.....	65	35
Ministers.....	85	15
Newspaper and radio.....	75	25
Occupation not given and organizations.....	63	37
Professionals.....	80	20
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	69	31
Retired.....	54	46
Teachers.....	85	15
Students.....	82	18
(b) Economic assistance to Asia?		
Total replies.....	46	54
Attorneys.....	40	60
Business, industry, and salesmen.....	42	58
Farmers.....	41	59
Housewives.....	44	56
Labor.....	44	56
Ministers.....	61	39
Newspaper and radio.....	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations.....	44	56
Professionals.....	44	56
Public office holders and Federal employees.....	59	41
Retired.....	40	60
Teachers.....	66	34
Students.....	40	60

Percentage distribution of replies to
questionnaire—Continued

	Yes	No
Question 6.—Continued		
(c) Military assistance to Asia?		
Total replies.....	49	51
Attorneys.....	54	46
Business, industry, and sales-		
men.....	45	55
Farmers.....	38	62
Housewives.....	36	64
Labor.....	35	65
Ministers.....	60	40
Newspaper and radio.....	43	57
Occupation not given and		
organizations.....	32	68
Professionals.....	57	43
Public office holders and		
Federal employees.....	53	47
Retired.....	47	53
Teachers.....	54	46
Students.....	58	42

Rinaldo Burrus Page, a Man Devoted to
North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have prepared a brief statement regarding the late Mr. Rinaldo Burrus Page, of Wilmington, N. C., and his valuable contribution to his adopted State. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RINALDO BURRUS PAGE, A MAN DEVOTED TO
NORTH CAROLINA

On February 2, 1955, death marched into the ranks of North Carolina's most useful citizenry and claimed a distinguished business and civic leader, Mr. Rinaldo Burrus Page, publisher of the Star-News newspapers of Wilmington.

He was the first chairman of the North Carolina State Ports Authority and a Wilmington civic leader for 25 years.

A native of Columbus, Ga., Mr. Page began his newspaper experience on his father's paper, the Columbus Ledger. He attended Emory University and the University of Georgia. After service in France in World War I, he returned to the newspaper business, coming to Wilmington in 1927 as president and publisher of the Wilmington Morning Star, later acquiring the Wilmington News.

Following years of undivided interest in the development of his city and the Cape Fear region, Gov. R. Gregg Cherry named Mr. Page to the chairmanship of the newly created ports commission in 1945. Mr. Page had long been a leading spokesman for the development of better ports in North Carolina, and with the passing of time, my State will realize even more the wisdom and courage that he possessed.

His contribution to his fellowman was not limited to the newspaper and ports fields. He devoted himself to progressive civic duty in many areas.

Once convinced that a cause was just, Mr. Page was never satisfied with anything less than complete success—a clear-cut challenge and priceless heritage for his lineage and associates.

He wrought well and left a lasting impress upon the annals of our generation.

Danger From Mass Asphyxiations From
Smog in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, we are now told that there is a continuing and expanding hazard to the people of the city of Los Angeles from mass asphyxiation from smog. "Smog" is a California word which describes air pollution. We are told of the hazard by one qualified to know, Mr. A. F. Merewether, of New York City, president of the American Meteorological Society, and a citizen of the State and city of New York.

Because of the increasing hazard to the health of those who reside not alone in the cities of America, but also in rural towns across the country, the two distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], my senior colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and I were prompted to introduce proposed legislation which would create a Federal Air Pollution Control Act, and which would enlist the scientific resources of the Federal Government in what must be a united effort against the menace of air pollution.

The statement to which I have referred was made in a letter which was written by Mr. Merewether, and which is commented upon in the Los Angeles Times of Wednesday, February 2, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMOG DANGER REAL, SAYS NEW YORKER—
METEOROLOGIST CALLS ATTENTION TO PAST
MASS ASPHYXIATIONS

The president of the American Meteorological Society in a letter turned over yesterday to the board of supervisors remarked that mass asphyxiations from smog in Los Angeles would not surprise him.

The writer was A. F. Merewether, of New York City, who in addition to heading the society is meteorology director for American Airlines at LaGuardia Field.

He wrote the letter to Dr. M. Nelberger, senior meteorologist for the Air Pollution Foundation. The letter was given to the supervisors by Dr. Lauren B. Hitchcock, managing director of the foundation.

DISAGREES WITH THEORY

Merewether disagreed with the Elwell theory that smog is created freakishly by nature. He said smog is man-made and that Los Angeles is more conducive to its concentration than most places.

"The Americans have been pouring sewage and refuse into our streams for years and we are not surprised that neither we nor fish can swim safely in such waters any longer," he wrote.

"Why then try to make it such a mystery when we do the same thing to our atmosphere?"

SMOG NOT NEW

Merewether reminded that smog is not new and mentioned the smog disasters in London, Donora, and the Meuse Valley in France. "I, for one, will not be at all surprised to pick up the paper some morning and read of the same sort of mass asphyxiations (in Los

Angeles) that have struck before in other parts of the world.

"It has been said," he continued, "that 'those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.' From the viewpoint of an outsider, looking on from a safe and comfortable distance, that seems to be the choice of you folks out in 'sunny California.'"

Ground-Breaking Ceremonies for the Hendersonville, N. C., Plant of the General Electric Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the General Electric Co. is locating several of its new plants in North Carolina. My coworker, Representative GEORGE A. SHUFORD, and I were privileged to attend the ground-breaking ceremonies of one of these new plants near Hendersonville, N. C., on February 4, 1955, and to hear a magnificent address made by Mr. Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board of directors of General Electric Co., who is one of the industrial statesmen of our day. His address abounds in prophetic insights in respect to the future uses of power, and for this reason merits dissemination and preservation. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been aptly said that if your impressions of the Southeast are more than 5 years old, you had better make a recheck.

About 5 years ago the General Electric board of directors made an official visit to Georgia. I remember particularly how we admired the climate, the dogwood, the violets, and spring, which at that moment was bustlin' out all over.

But there was another kind of "spring" in the air too. New plans, new plants, new industries were springing up wherever we went. Strongest of all the impressions I received was the continuing expansion of electric power requirements, and this was not just because the Georgia Power Co. was our more than adequate host.

It is because I know of no better index of a nation's or a region's progress and potential economic growth than a rapidly rising curve of electric power generation. Electricity touches so many other things, and like an economist's fairy tale, whatever it touches becomes transformed.

A Southern writer, James Street, has expressed this in another way: "My Southern emblem," he said, "is the washing machine on the front porch of the little house where the cabin in the cotton used to be. Drive along back roads and you'll see scads of them. Why on the front porch? I don't know. But I know this: a washing machine means electricity, and unless you have lived by lamplight or fired a washpot in the backyards you'll never know what electricity really means."

It has been too long since I visited North Carolina and I am very glad to be back for a recheck. I have received a great many impressions today—of your broad streets lined with oaks and maples and your fine

homes. And if it is a little early for even a southern spring, it is obvious that you are still bustin' out in an epidemic of industrial activity.

The South has changed more in the last 15 years than in the previous 50, and more in the last 5 than the previous 15. Miles and miles of brandnew factories, as modern as day-after-tomorrow, line your countryside. Where all of this may eventually lead I don't think any of us can adequately assess at this moment, but when I remind you that we now have planned or in operation four plants in North Carolina it is obvious that we at General Electric believe that "nothing could be finer than to be in Carolina" for the rest of our corporate life which, because corporations need never die, could be forever.

This belief is based upon a double prognostication: (1) The future of this area, and (2) the future of the electrical industry. That these futures are inextricably interwoven does not diminish either but augments them.

The future of North Carolina is based upon figures that I do not need to cite to this audience: the growth in population at faster than the national average; markets that are growing faster than population; leadership in tobacco, textile, and furniture manufacture, and new diversification in electronics, chemicals, specialties; increased value of farm property and value added by manufacture; rising industrial payroll and farm income; multiplying demand for electric energy.

The future of the electrical industry is based upon the fact that we expect to produce and sell as much electrical equipment in the next 10 years as we have in the entire 75 years of our existence.

I am glad to see a number of friends and colleagues in the business of producing electricity, or of making equipment to generate or use it, here in the audience. It would be interesting to know how each of you happened to get into this business, because, whatever the reasons or motivations, we find ourselves today in the most exciting, challenging and, in my judgment, the most essential undertaking in the length and breadth of America. Energy, electric energy, is literally the cornerstone of our phenomenal national growth and economic preeminence. It is also one of the key requirements for America's continued progress and leadership.

It is even more interesting to note how some of the pioneers of this great industry got into the business. James Buchanan Duke got into it, I have been told, because of a sore toe and a physician who practiced electrical development of his native State along with his medicine. But long before the hydroelectric plants of Duke, there was power in the Piedmont. Hard-working, hard-headed men, with no foreknowledge of the inevitable change in relationship from money and land to money and machinery, mechanically harnessed the water falling in the streams for a variety of tasks and thus attached themselves and their region to change. Doing so long ago, they took the Carolinas into the main stream of modern industrial America.

Then, in 1894, there occurred an event of great historic significance to the South and to the electrical industry: the first application, at Columbia, S. C., of alternating current motors to turn the spindles in a textile mill. This was followed, just 10 years later, by the first hydroelectric plant of what is now the Duke power system.

But I doubt that even Duke envisioned the power of the South of today. During the last 5 years the electric utilities of this State have increased their generating facilities by a million kilowatts. That's growth with a capital G. Carolina Power & Light Co. is

now in the midst of a \$200 million construction program. Duke power is now creating near Belmont a single station with a continuous capability of 1 million kilowatts.

These are some of the fantastic figures of the fantastic growth of electric energy in this country. We can be truly thankful that our job in the years ahead will not be one of protecting the status quo or battling for just a little more business. Rather it will be the difficult but much more satisfying task of keeping abreast, or more accurately, of keeping ahead of the broad sweep of expanding demand for electric energy everywhere in this country.

Seventy-five years ago or less, the only significant use of electricity besides heating a lamp filament to incandescence or consuming the carbon rod in an arc lamp was to operate traction motors in a street railway car. Today, it is hard indeed to think of any human activity that is not associated with the use of electricity.

In 1954, for example, just to do such things as beat up eggs and wash dishes, to mow lawns and freeze foods and heat homes, we manufactured our 100 millionth fractional horsepower motor. Today lamps are used not merely to give light, but to soothe our aches and sprains, decorate our holidays, sterilize and deodorize the atmosphere, take pictures, and give us the epidemic equivalent of a winter vacation. And the fastest growing part of the electrical industry, electronics, is not so much concerned with increasing the amount of energy at man's disposal, as the amount of knowledge.

You, here in Hendersonville, are very close to the center of the new industrial South. I feel we are very fortunate, in the electrical industry, producing electricity or manufacturing the devices to make it or use it, in being so close to the absolute center of things, industrially speaking, and as measured by the potential and leverage for good.

Sir Anthony Eden, when he was here a couple of years ago, was talking one evening about the difference between the totalitarian state, in which one party has absolute political authority and no opposition is brooked; the two-party system, as here and in Britain; and the multiparty system, as in France—with any number of splinter parties and the great difficulty of getting a majority in any party. It seems that a Frenchman and a few associates had decided to get together and form a new party. The difficulty was what to call it. They were sitting around a cafe trying to solve this problem. At last one of the group had an inspiration. "I know what," he said, "we will call it the party of the extreme center."

Perhaps I am prejudiced, but as I have traveled the world and noted the needs and hopes and accomplishments of people everywhere I could not escape the conclusion that the extreme center of the civilization in which we live—social, economic, and political—is power—electric power. Radiating in all directions from that center, its proven worth to mankind is prodigious, and its potential for further good is literally infinite.

I like to think of the electrical industry as constituting a kind of benign circle. We make, as you know, products which generate electric power; other products which transmit and distribute it to the points where it is needed; and still other products, millions of them, which use and are operated by electric power. Now whatever we do well and effectively in one of these three great segments—generation, distribution, or utilization—is reflected favorably in the other two. A new product like television, for example, has added substantially to the electric power load of the country. With growing loads the utility companies use ever larger, ever more efficient generating equipment which accounts, in large part, for electric energy being available today at a lower price

than it was 15 years ago, whereas other prices, on the average, have risen 90 percent in the same period.

The benign circle is completed by very virtue of the fact that the extremely low cost of electric power in turn makes possible the sale, not only of new things like television, but more and more of a numberless variety of power driven products for the homes, factories, schools, hospitals—indeed for every use known to mankind. And as more and more of these products are installed the power load continues to climb and we start again around that benign circle which lightens our burdens and brightens our lives with every turn.

This new plant for which we have broken ground today will make Hendersonville an even more important part of that benign circle. It will mean new citizens for your community, for many of our top managers and specialists will come to make their homes here, and visitors will be drawn from all parts of the world. It will mean new business during construction and new employment and new payrolls when the plant is completed.

But that is not all. The product of this factory will mean more time for many outdoor activities all over the country. It will mean the saving of thousands of lives and millions of dollars from after-dark traffic accidents; it will mean reduced crime. These are some of the contributions that Hendersonville, as the "outdoor lighting center of the world," will make to America.

Just about a hundred miles from here is one of the most modern street-lighting installations in America today. Fluorescent street lights are comparatively new. Yet Statesville has 104 of them—one of the largest single installations in the United States. The outlook down the years is bright and challenging.

I have emphasized the growth of the Southeast in the last 5 or 10 years and with good reason. It is encouraging also to know that each sector of the country has grown during the same period—some a little and some a lot.

With natural and justifiable pride in yourself and in your State, it may be observed that you have done better than the average. You are to be congratulated. At the same time I know you are conscious of the importance of national balance in the midst of dynamic growth and change.

Each sector of our country depends upon the other; the contribution of each is essential to our overall economic well-being. Although there have been substantial changes in the relative contributions of some of the sectors to our national income, the record shows that each grows with the assistance of the other and creates still further opportunities for the growth of the others.

It is just good business to put some of our payrolls into areas where our major markets are, as our competitors are doing. To do so does not give preference to one area over another; it ultimately helps every community in which General Electric has a plant. We cannot continue to grow except with and as a part of the economic development of the Nation as a whole.

I mentioned a moment ago that we now have, or are planning, 4 plants in North Carolina. In addition to plants to Asheboro, Goldsboro, Hendersonville, and Hickory planned or in being, since the war plants have been added at Rome, Ga.; Anniston, Ala.; Memphis, Tenn.; Lexington, Owensboro, and Louisville, Ky.; Jackson, Miss.; and Jonesboro, Ark. These plants, producing a wide variety of products including electronic tubes, transformers, automatic blankets, automatic washers and dryers, dishwashers, ranges, lamps, outdoor lighting equipment, and small motors, are contributing importantly to the diversified economy of the

South. Our investment in new factories, laboratories, and equipment has exceeded \$1,100,000,000 since the war. Of this, \$155 million was for new and improved research and advanced development facilities for improved products and services.

All of this has taken place under a planned program of decentralization. Neither the "new South" nor New England has cause to fear this program. On the contrary. If we plan well, the new plants, like the old ones, will be competitive and continue to grow with new and expanding markets. Some of these new plants, like the one to be erected here, are headquarters for the business in which they are engaged.

We are not leaving one locality in favor of another; rather we are expanding with the Nation's expanding and changing population—into new markets and new areas of development. Before there was a plan for Hendersonville, there was a Lynn plan, which contemplates full and effective use of improved and modernized facilities in that fine city. Our expansion at new locations is expected to be only a small part of our total business.

The Hendersonville plant will manufacture street and flood-lighting equipment, traffic control systems, and military and airport lighting products. Like so many other fields of this various and diverse electrical industry, we expect the demand for these products to double in the next 10 years. To help insure that it does, we have included a research laboratory for continuous research and development of new lighting techniques.

In other words, we are satisfied that tremendous business opportunities lie ahead for all parts and sectors of this country, and most certainly for those engaged in the generation, transmission and distribution of electric energy, and in the manufacture of devices to produce or utilize it.

Ours is still a young, vigorous, and growing country. Its rate of growth will be, in part, a function of the efficiency of our operations, reflected in wide availability and low cost of electric power, and also in part on the ingenuity of ourselves and of others in finding ever new and ever more uses for that power. And if, as I believe, new uses for electric energy will continue to emerge in direct proportion to the manpower and dollars devoted to research, there can be no question that demand for power will broaden and deepen with each passing decade.

I believe that statement to be true in the absolute sense, barring only world war III. That is to say, I am satisfied that the years 1960, 1970, 1980, and so on will witness, each for its own decade, a broader, more extensive use of electricity on the one hand and a deeper, more intensive consumption of it on the other. If anything besides death and taxes is certain in this ever-changing world, that prognostication in my judgment heads the list.

The uncertainty, ladies and gentlemen—and there is uncertainty—lies in the magnitude of the growth of demand during the balance of this century. It is the rate of growth, the slope of the curve, that can vary between wide limits. Assuming, as one must in this gathering, that our industries will have vigorous, intelligent and far-sighted management, the actual course of the curve will depend, for one thing, on developments in the great struggle between the free and Communist countries of the world. It will depend also on the wisdom, or lack of it, of America's foreign policy, economic as well as political. And finally, it will depend heavily on the economic climate or environment which America selects—or, more accurately, elects—for itself in the years ahead.

It is not my purpose to discuss the international scene this evening, except to repeat a prediction I have made before and continue to endorse. Paradoxical as it may

seem, I am prepared to venture the prediction that the pressures, tensions, fears, and sufferings imposed on the world by the Russian and, more recently, Chinese imperialist drive for domination will turn out in the end to have been a blessing in disguise. I say this because I believe, first, that the drive will fail, and second, that in taking the necessary steps to defeat it the free world will have organized itself economically and politically in ways enormously beneficial to the cause of world peace. I visualize that Europe, Latin America, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia will all be benefited by economic and political arrangements made, or to be made, as countermeasures to the Soviet drive for power; arrangements which, in the absence of the deadly Communist threat, would have been quite impossible of accomplishment.

These things will not happen in a hurry, nor will the ultimate victory of the free world derive from any single coup or conference. Rather they will result at long last from the cumulative effect of a very great many separate acts and undertakings embracing the military, economic, and propaganda fields.

The next 10 years will certainly not be dull ones. If we can, in the course of them, cultivate and strengthen this truly wonderful economic system of ours; if we can be wise, patient, and firm, but not inflexible, in our international relations; and if, with God's guidance, we can thus discharge with distinction our recently acquired role of leadership in world affairs, we shall have earned the right to enjoy the full fruits of an age boundless in opportunity both for material and spiritual satisfaction. I am in favor of that—and I suspect you are also.

United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on February 11 I had the honor of addressing the Executives Club of Chicago. This is an exceptionally fine group, and I was more than pleased to have the opportunity to speak to them. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks I made plus the full documentation of the speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last month a new United Nations Commission, known as the Commission on International Commodity Trade convened in New York. Our Government took a momentous step in December of 1954 when the Honorable Nat King, Acting United States Representative in the United Nations Economic and Social Council released the following statement:

"At the last session of the Council I stated that my delegation hoped to be able to announce at this session whether my Government would participate in the Commission on International Commodity Trade. In this connection I am now authorized to make the following statement:

"The United States Government is not now prepared to participate in the work of the Commission on International Commod-

ity Trade. It wishes for the present to keep in close contact with the Commission's work as it develops in the hope that it might be able to be of possible assistance. The United States Government will be prepared to re-examine the question of its eventual participation after the Commission's terms of reference and its scope of activities have been defined."

I wish to commend the Secretary of State and his associates for this action. I regard it as the first step in reversing some of the unfortunate economic trends within the United Nations which were originally promoted by our own Government.

Our present able delegation to the Economic and Social Council, headed by the Honorable Preston Hotchkiss, has had to devote a great deal of its efforts to combat proposals which originated in our own State Department many years ago. This is unfortunate as the Iron Curtain countries are presented with an opportunity to sow dissension among the free nations when it becomes necessary for us to cast votes in opposition to proposals sponsored by friendly countries in the United Nations. Yet, if we are to remain true to our own economic philosophy, we can take no other course. Our sins of the past have now returned to haunt us.

This Commission on International Commodity Trade is 1 of 2 groups established by the Economic and Social Council whose activities can have a very profound effect upon our economy. The other is the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices. I now intend to trace the establishment of these groups to concepts originally formulated by our own Government.

Our State Department published a document entitled "Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment" in November of 1945. The forword to this publication read as follows:

"Developed by a technical staff within the Government of the United States in preparation for an International Conference on Trade and Employment and presented for consideration by the peoples of the world."

The thesis of this document was that international trade was kept small by four factors:

- (1) Restrictions imposed by Governments, i. e., tariffs and quotas.
- (2) Excessive price fluctuations in the markets for primary commodities.
- (3) Restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels.
- (4) Irregularity and the fear of irregularity in production and employment.

This State Department document proposed the formation of an International Trade Organization to make recommendations for the removal of the impediments to expanding world trade enumerated previously and to implement such recommendations.

The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, at its first session early in 1946, adopted a resolution to call an International Conference on Trade and Employment as suggested in the United States proposals. The council also established a preparatory committee to prepare an agenda and a draft charter for consideration by the conference. This preparatory committee held its first meeting in London in the fall of 1946. Subsequent meetings were held in New York and Geneva.

The international conference, to consider the charter, convened at Habana, Cuba, on November 21, 1947, and remained in session until March 24, 1948. The document which emerged from these deliberations is now familiarly known as the Habana Charter. It was submitted to the Congress in April 1949, and was strongly supported by President Truman and the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted extensive hearings on this agree-

ment in April and May 1950. No report was ever made by the committee. The State Department announced in December of 1950 that it would not ask the 82d Congress, which convened in 1951, to again consider agreeing to United States membership in the proposed International Trade Organization.

Although the basic concepts for the charter had originated in our own Government, it is quite clear that the Congress never accepted the document which emerged from this series of meetings under United Nations auspices. In fact, the State Department, by its announcement in December of 1950, clearly showed that it realized the futility of asking the Congress to consider this subject again.

I shall now show how the four restrictive factors enumerated in the United States proposals were incorporated into the charter.

The first obstacle to the expansion of world trade outlined in the State Department's proposals was the restriction on trade imposed by governments, including tariffs, quotas, and exchange controls. Chapter IV of the Habana Charter entitled "Commercial Policy" dealt with procedures to reduce tariffs and to extend the most-favored-nation treatment in trade agreements. It also covered quantitative restrictions and currency controls.

Chapter VI of the Habana Charter was entitled "Intergovernmental Commodity Agreements." This chapter recommended the use of such agreements to eliminate excessive price fluctuations in the markets for primary commodities and implemented the State Department proposal dealing with this subject. The preamble to this chapter stated, and I quote:

"The members recognize that the conditions under which some primary commodities are produced, exchanged and consumed are such that international trade in these commodities may be affected by special difficulties such as the tendency toward persistent disequilibrium between production and consumption, the accumulation of burdensome stocks and pronounced fluctuations in prices. These special difficulties may have serious adverse effects on the interests of producers and consumers, as well as widespread repercussions jeopardizing the general policy of economic expansion. The members recognize that such difficulties may, at times, necessitate special treatment of the international trade in such commodities through intergovernmental agreement."

Chapter V of the Habana Charter was entitled "Restrictive Business Practices." It provided for procedures to eliminate the restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels in the original United States proposals. In effect it proposed an international antitrust law.

Chapter II of the Habana Charter was entitled "Employment and Economic Activities." This chapter dealt with the irregularity and the fear of irregularity in production and employment and, again implemented the State Department's proposals dealing with this subject.

The proponents of these proposals did not wait for the nations of the world to ratify the charter for the International Trade Organization. Steps were taken during the third session of the Preparatory Committee for the Habana Conference which met in Geneva in the spring of 1947 to implement some of these proposals.

This Preparatory Committee sponsored negotiations for the reduction of tariffs and conducted discussions which led to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade familiarly known as GATT. Although these tariff negotiations were sponsored by the Preparatory Committee for the Habana Conference to implement one chapter of the

proposed charter and were finally incorporated in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the countries concerned established a separate organization, which is not an operating unit of the United Nations, to carry on this work. Other succeeding sessions were conducted at Annecy, France, and Torquay, England.

The GATT organization differs from the other groups which trace their origin to the original State Department proposals. In the first place, of the Iron Curtain countries, only Czechoslovakia which became a signatory to the GATT before she went behind the Iron Curtain is a member. The activities of GATT, by its very nature, are directed at the removal of trade barriers and not to the imposition of new controls and restrictions.

There was much criticism in the Congress of the GATT because many of us felt that no authority had been granted by the Congress through the Trade Agreements Act to enter into any such negotiations. The Eisenhower administration has scrupulously followed the practice of submitting agreements to the Congress so that the Congress and the executive can work together as independent and coordinate branches of our Government.

The provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade currently are being renegotiated at Geneva. The President has assured us that they will be submitted to the Congress for our consideration. For the first time an opportunity will be afforded for this agreement to receive consideration on its merits by the Senate of the United States.

I am confident that the Congress and the President working together in this way can come up with a workable solution to expanding our foreign trade which is the objective that we are all seeking.

The Economic and Social Council proceeded to implement another of the United States proposals without even waiting for the convening of the Habana Conference. This was the proposal which dealt with excessive price fluctuations in the markets for primary commodities.

This United Nations group, at its fourth session, recommended, and I quote from the resolution:

"That, pending the establishment of the International Trade Organization, members of the United Nations adopt as a general guide in intergovernmental consultation or action with respect to commodity problems the principles laid down in chapter VI as a whole, i. e., the chapter on intergovernmental commodity arrangements * * * ; and

"Requests the Secretary-General to appoint an Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements to keep informed of and to facilitate by appropriate means such intergovernmental consultation or action with respect to commodity problems."

The Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements was not sanctioned by the Congress. The interim referred to in the title for this organization was presumably the time interval between the formation of this group and the ratification of the charter for the International Trade Organization. The interim has continued through 1954, although the United States decision not to join the ITO was made known in 1950. This organization which was established at Geneva, has now been supplanted by this permanent new Commission on International Commodity Trade, which met in New York last month. While some may feel that this action is unimportant, as we were not bound by any decisions made by this interim committee, in the opinion of the President's Materials Policy Commission, popularly known as the Paley Commission, this is not the case. Page 87, volume I, of its report, which was issued in 1952, contained the following statement:

"The United States has not ratified the treaty, but under a resolution the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a general guide."

This clearly indicates that, even though Congress refused to give its assent to United States participation in the International Trade Organization, the Paley Commission believed we were bound to accept these concepts. I shall now read from page 90 of the Paley report:

"By resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, a review of chapter VI of the Habana Charter is called for some time in 1952. This code serves as a general guide for efforts of the free nations to stabilize materials markets."

Now let us review together the developments which took place starting in the General Assembly late in 1952 which culminated in our decision not to participate in this new Commission on International Commodity Trade.

In November of 1952 the Argentine Government presented a resolution of far-reaching significance to the seventh session of the General Assembly, which was then meeting in New York. This resolution was a new implementation of the original proposals of our State Department which had been embodied in chapter VI of the rejected Habana Charter. I shall now read the operative part of this draft resolution. It provided that the General Assembly should recommend to member states—and I quote—that—

"(a) Whenever governments adopt measures affecting the prices of primary commodities entering international trade, they should duly consider the effect of such measures on the terms of trade of countries in the process of development, in order to ensure that the prices of primary commodities remain in an adequate, just and equitable relation to the prices of capital goods and other manufactured articles so as to permit the more satisfactory formation of domestic savings in the countries in the process of development and to facilitate the establishment of just wage levels for the working population of these countries with a view to reducing the existing disparity between their standards of living and those in the highly industrialized countries;

"(b) Their governments should refrain, unless unavoidably required by national security in times of war and without prejudice to technological research and progress, from encouraging the production of any synthetic or substitute materials that unnecessarily affect the international demand for natural primary commodities;

"(c) Their governments should intensify their efforts to reduce restrictions on imports of primary commodities."

It is quite obvious, from what I have just read that the purpose of this resolution was to establish fixed, rigid international parity prices for all of the world's materials which could only be supported by heavy outlays on the part of the United States. It is also apparent that this resolution was aimed at discouraging the development of synthetic products, particularly synthetic rubber and synthetic fibers within the United States. This provision directly affects our national security. I know that none of us wish to again struggle with the problem of providing rubber from distant sources which confronted us in World War II.

Representatives from Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, France, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom opposed this resolution as too general in scope and open to dangerous interpretations. The 1952 yearbook of the United Nations summarized the objections voiced by these countries. Among them were:

"(1) That a system of international parity prices such as that implied in the draft could not be instituted unless foreign trade

were controlled by the state; (2) that such a system would make the economic structure more rigid and would not be conducive to increased productivity; (3) that there were no objective criteria for determining an adequate, just, and equitable relationship between prices of primary commodities and those of capital and other manufactured goods; and (4) that it would be better to deal with the problem through individual commodity agreements as the need arose.

"They also objected to the recommendation that governments should not encourage the manufacture of synthetic or substitute materials. Such action, they held, would harm the interests of both underdeveloped and industrialized countries; it would also stand in the way of progress, from which all, in the long run, would benefit. The latter point was also made by the representatives of Cuba, Ecuador, and Peru."

After considerable debate within the General Assembly and the adoption of several amendments, the Argentine resolution was put to a vote. It was approved on November 29, 1952, with 29 countries voting in favor of it, 16 opposing it, and 9 abstaining. I am happy to say that our Government was among the 16 countries opposed to the adoption of this resolution. The amended resolution contained the following provision which was not a part of the original Argentine draft resolution:

"Recommends that governments should cooperate in establishing multilateral international arrangements relating to primary commodities for the purpose of—

"(a) Insuring the stability of the prices of the said commodities in keeping with a reasonable, fair, and equitable relationship between these prices and those of capital goods and other manufactured articles; and

"(b) Safeguarding the continuity of the economic and social progress of all countries, those producing as well as those consuming such raw materials."

You will note that this provision again urges the member governments to establish multilateral commodity agreements.

The amended resolution further provided that the Secretary General was to appoint a group of experts to study the entire problem and make recommendations for further action to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Pursuant to this resolution, the Secretary General appointed five economists whose recommendations were transmitted to the Economic and Social Council in a report released in November of 1953. This report is entitled "Commodity Trade and Economic Development."

The report suggested the establishment of world buffer stocks and a new international currency which would be based upon the monetization of these stocks. It also proposed the negotiation of multilateral commodity agreements to cover a group of commodities rather than a single commodity. There were many other strange proposals which were totally incompatible with American free-enterprise economic concepts. The most important recommendation of the committee of experts was that a new trade Stabilization Commission be established. Now I shall read exactly what the experts proposed in this connection. They said:

"It seems to us that there is at present no effective international procedure for discussing and proposing action on the general problem of stabilization—a matter which transcends the problems of particular commodities. The present organization is directed toward piecemeal action, commodity by commodity. We do not think that this is sufficient; a general and simultaneous approach to the problem of stability in its many aspects is required. It is possible that a gap in international organization has here arisen unintentionally, through the absence of an

international trade organization as envisaged in the Habana charter."

This so-called gap in international organization to which the experts refer, had not arisen unintentionally insofar as the Congress of the United States was concerned. I shall continue reading from the recommendations of the experts:

"We therefore propose that the Economic and Social Council should establish an inter-governmental commission, which we will refer to as the Trade Stabilization Commission. In order to provide permanent representation for the most important trading countries and an adequate rotation of representation for others, it would probably be necessary to have eight or nine member governments."

"The work of the Commission would involve exchanges of views between governments on possible types of action to which they may not wish to appear publicly committed; and there is a very real risk that premature knowledge of the Commission's deliberations would produce harmful effects in the commodity markets. We therefore recommend that, contrary to usual United Nations practice, the Commission should meet in closed session except when it decides otherwise. We would expect that, in addition to the formal meetings, occasions would be required for informal exchanges of view among the representatives of the member governments, meeting in private."

Our Government should not establish an international organization in which governments would make proposals to which they may not wish to appear publicly committed. I subscribe to President Woodrow Wilson's doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at. I am opposed to private meetings to "rig" commodity markets. This is essentially what the experts propose. We must all realize, in discussing these proposals that representatives of the Iron Curtain countries would be eligible to participate in this Commission.

The report of the experts and its recommendation for this new commission was placed on the agenda of the meeting of the Economic and Social Council which convened in New York in April 1954, and a resolution was introduced by the Argentine Government to establish this new commission. The comments of our representative to the Economic and Social Council, Mr. Preston Hotchkiss, are most illuminating. I shall now read his statement regarding these proposals:

"The problem of marked price instability in primary commodity markets is, therefore, one with which my Government and all governments of the free world must be greatly concerned. As to the desirability of reducing this instability, there can be no disagreement. The problem to be faced is how this can be safely accomplished. Devices that serve temporarily to reduce price fluctuations must be judged by their potentialities for contributing to healthy economic growth. They may retard rather than promote such growth if they interfere with long-term price trends and introduce rigidities and restraints that impair the elasticity of economic adjustment which is fundamental to economic progress."

"This is a danger which must be faced in the consideration of proposals for governmental commodity arrangements. This danger and the great practical difficulties involved in reaching accord on the details of any contemplated arrangement largely explain why so few international agreements involving consuming as well as producing countries have hitherto been reached. The experts recognize this situation and see little prospect of any substantial increase in the number of agreements. My delegation shares this view."

"The experts also believe, however, that commodity agreements, if properly drawn

and operated, may be an effective means for preventing excessive price fluctuation. This they hope might be obtained if the attempt were made to cover several commodities in a single agreement instead of relying on the inevitably slow and uncertain increase in single-commodity agreements."

"I must confess, Mr. President, that I find no ground to justify this hope. The difficulties experienced in negotiations relating to a single commodity would in my judgment be greatly multiplied if we attempted to deal with many commodities at the same time. Moreover, any agreement covering many commodities would involve widespread interference with the workings of a free-world economy. It would magnify the danger of diverting production, consumption and trade patterns from the channels they would be likely to assume under a more healthy, competitive and free-enterprise system. The net result of such arrangements, even if it were practicable to conclude them, would, I firmly believe, be detrimental and not beneficial to economic development."

"The experts extend their proposals for comprehensive commodity stabilization arrangements by recommending for further study a 'commodity reserve currency scheme.' If this were an academic seminar we might, Mr. President, find some interest in discussing the complexities of this by no means novel proposal. This, however, is not an exercise in which I would care to engage in this forum. I see no likelihood whatever that my Government would be disposed to give this scheme any serious consideration in the foreseeable future. I feel sure that other delegations will share my view that the scheme is impractical. I hope therefore that the Council will not devote time and energy which might well be spent in more useful activities to detailed examination of a proposal that would seem to have no chance whatever of acceptance by governments."

"The experts recommend—and this is their most specific proposal—the establishment by the Council of a Trade Stabilization Commission. This commission would be concerned with proposals for dealing with the problem of stabilization generally. It would leave undisturbed the existing international machinery, such as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and its associated study groups, which provide mainly for action, on commodity by commodity."

"My delegation is unable to support this recommendation. The proposed commission would inevitably exercise the same general responsibilities as the old Economic and Employment Commission of the Council and might be expected to suffer from the same defects. The establishment of a commission charged with responsibility for considering broad questions of economic policy would simply invite duplication of discussion, since these are questions which the Council itself must necessarily debate."

The resolution introduced by the Argentine Government established the terms of reference for this proposed new Commission. I shall now quote from the resolution:

"The main task of the Commission shall be to examine measures designed to avoid excessive fluctuations in the prices of and the volume of trade in primary commodities, including measures aiming at the maintenance of a just and equitable relationship between the prices of primary commodities and the prices of manufactured goods in international trade. * * *

This resolution is designed to establish a system of international parity prices which is totally incompatible with our approach to foreign economic relations."

This resolution was adopted on April 30, on a rollcall vote of the 18 nations comprising the Economic and Social Council. The United States was joined in opposing the

establishment of this new Commission by Belgium, Norway, France, and the United Kingdom. The Australian delegation abstained from voting. The resolution was supported by 12 countries, the Argentine, Free China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Turkey, U. S. S. R., Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The formation of the Commission had the support of Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia whose concepts of stabilizing commodity markets would certainly be quite different from our own. The resolution as adopted deferred the actual organization of the Commission until the 18th session of the Economic and Social Council which convened at Geneva in June of 1954. Our delegation at Geneva continued its opposition to the formation of this Commission and indicated that even if we were elected, we might not be willing to participate. In spite of United States opposition, the Council voted to proceed with the organization of the Commission with the first session scheduled for January 1955.

The United Kingdom and France voted with the United States to delay the organization of the Commission. However, following the vote in the Economic and Social Council both these countries announced that they would participate in spite of their opposition. The resolution adopted at Geneva transferred most of the functions of the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements to the new Commission on International Commodity Trade. The Interim Committee, which was only to be in existence until the Habana Charter was ratified, thus has now become a permanent United Nations organ under a new name.

The announcement of our Government in which we declined to participate at the first session of this new Commission included this statement: "The United States Government will be prepared to reexamine the question of its eventual participation after the Commission's terms of reference and its scope of activities have been defined." I am glad that this is the case as we have no desire to minimize the seriousness of the problems of price instability. Our Government is opposed to the present terms of reference which imply Government action to stabilize prices through international agreements and international parity prices. I can see many possibilities for useful work by this Commission in compiling statistics and studying market problems, thus making it possible for the free markets of the world to operate more effectively. My interpretation of the statement by our representative is that we will always be prepared to assist in such activities that do not compromise free enterprise economic principles.

The history I have related follows the progress of this concept from 1945 to 1955, a 10-year period. Our State Department deserves great credit for having successfully extricated the United States from a creature of its own creation which has untold potentialities of causing economic chaos. The New York Times of January 11, in reporting the forthcoming meeting of this new Commission made the following significant comment:

"The United States will pass up a delegate's seat, but will send an observer to the first session of the newly established Commission on International Commodity Trade. The Commission will open its meetings here next Monday.

"Although United States opposition to the Commission is nothing new, this is the first time that Washington has given a diplomatic cold shoulder to a United Nations organ."

It has always seemed to be a paradox that those who advocate free trade and the removal of Government restrictions on our economy should, at the same time, have been

fostering commodity agreements. There is probably no more restrictive device than such an agreement as it interjects Government controls throughout the production and marketing process.

During previous administrations, our State Department was apparently most sympathetic to the commodity agreement concept. I am happy to see that this is no longer so.

The Randall Commission, in both its majority and minority reports condemned such agreements as restrictive devices. Following the release of the report by the Randall Commission, our Government declined to participate in the International Tin Agreement. We have also resisted efforts to establish commodity stabilization groups within the Western Hemisphere at the Rio Conference. Let me again compliment the Secretary of State and his colleagues who have credibly performed a very difficult task in reversing this trend toward Government controls over the world's economy.

Unfortunately, all our problems are not behind us. The original State Department proposals of 1945, included measures to deal with restrictions imposed by private combines and cartels. As I have already indicated, chapter V of the Habana Charter was drafted to implement these particular proposals.

This chapter, dealing with restrictive practices by private business, was in sharp conflict with the philosophy of chapter VI which fostered Government price-fixing and cartel operations. Many apparently believe that actions taken by governments in concert with other governments or in cooperation with certain industries should escape the condemnation imposed by chapter V of the charter. In a sense chapter VI was really a modification or loophole in chapter V.

Professors Stocking and Watkins in their book *Cartels or Competition* define a cartel as " . . . an arrangement among, or on behalf of, producers engaged in the same line of business, with the design or effect of limiting or eliminating competition among them. . . ."

They also say "rival business enterprises may set up cartels by direct negotiation and mutual commitments, or governments may establish them by treaty."

The commodity agreements provided in chapter VI are, of course, cartels established through government negotiation and commitment. The evils of cartels were dramatically shown during the Hitler and Mussolini regimes in Germany and Italy where private cartels were taken over by these governments to strengthen their economies for war. The entire Habana Charter concept, as embodied in chapter V, was to curb private international cartels but to tolerate the government cartels provided in chapter VI. In retrospect, let me remind you of the extraordinary economic power developed by the Nazi Government through intergovernmental commodity agreements after it came to power in Germany.

Prof. Edward S. Mason, of Harvard University, was deputy to the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Economic Affairs in 1945. Presumably, he was quite familiar with the proposals issued by our State Department at that time.

He published a book under the sponsorship of the Committee for Economic Development entitled "Controlling World Trade" in June of 1946. I shall now read two paragraphs from the introduction of this book:

"This divergence between American and other experience with cartels and commodity agreements must be borne in mind in the ensuing discussion. There is a school of thought in the United States that abhors cartels as private treaties restrictive of trade but embraces commodity agreements as intergovernmental arrangements inevitably serving the public interest. Cartels may, and

usually do, restrict trade but so do commodity agreements—and much more effectively. Nor is the range of interests served necessarily very different.

"The general line of policy defended in this report is that, when international controls relating to a commodity or industry are demonstrably necessary, they should be intergovernmental in character. It does not follow that intergovernmental commodity agreements should be numerous or easily justifiable on grounds of public interest. If the agreement, moreover, lies outside the field of agriculture, it is likely to involve a type of governmental relation to industry with which the United States has as yet had little experience."

Mr. Mason concluded his 265-page treatise with this statement:

"To enable the machinery to function, it will be necessary to reshape not only commercial policy but policies hitherto considered as belonging to the field of domestic regulation, and such action as is proposed can only be taken with the cooperation of other governments and with due regard for their interests."

We are now confronted with exactly the situation portrayed by Professor Mason if the report of the so-called Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices is adopted by the Economic and Social Council.

The United States delegation at Havana was opposed to restrictive business practices per se. This is consistent with all of our economic concepts. In reviewing the Havana Conference I find that there were three points of view which were compromised in the final draft of chapter V. As I have already indicated, our point of view was that cartels were bad per se. Some believed that cartels were useful devices and that action was required only to cope with flagrant abuses. The Luxembourg delegation took this position. Others took a middle ground. The United Kingdom delegation took such a point of view. There was actually very little support for the stringent action recommended by the United States.

Chapter V of the Habana Charter dealt only with restrictive business practices when, and I quote: "Such practices have harmful effects." The definition of harmful effects was to be left to the new international agency to determine. No sanctions for failure to comply with the Charter were imposed. This philosophy is also incorporated in the new United Nations proposals.

I shall now trace the steps since the rejection of the Habana Charter by the Congress of the United States which have resulted in this report of the United Nations ad hoc committee on Restrictive Business Practices presently on the agenda of the Economic and Social Council.

Our antitrust laws are of the utmost importance in promoting a free-enterprise economy. The Sherman Act was adopted in 1890 during the administration of President Harrison, a Republican President. The Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Acts were adopted during the administration of President Wilson, a Democratic President. The spirit of our antitrust laws is truly bipartisan and they have a vital role in maintaining a competitive economy in this country. I believe in them and I am in favor of strengthening these laws if such action is shown to be necessary and in a vigorous enforcement of the laws now on the statute books. I am opposed to all cartels. There are no good cartels as far as I am concerned.

Unfortunately, our antitrust laws have sometimes been used to harass legitimate business by those whose paramount interest has not been the preservation of free enterprise. I am afraid they may have been deliberately used to bring it into disrepute and to lay the groundwork for a socialist economy within the United States. Those who con-

ceived such improper uses of the antitrust laws are, I am sure, no longer on our Government payroll.

It seems strange that almost immediately after the rejection of the Havana Charter by the 81st Congress, and the decision by the State Department not to resubmit it to the 82d Congress, the United States Government took the lead in attempting to implement chapter V through the United Nations.

In 1951, the United States delegation submitted a resolution to the Economic and Social Council asking that the question of restrictive business practices should be placed on the agenda of the 13th session of the Council. The United States draft resolution recommended the establishment of an ad hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices charged with formulating and submitting to the Council, proposals on appropriate methods to be adopted by international agreement to deal with harmful restrictive business practices.

Perhaps, the purpose of establishing this international machinery was to be able to proceed against American companies doing business abroad because of our inability to apply United States statutes in the jurisdiction of other sovereign nations. We must remember that these same companies were bound to conduct their activities so as to comply with the laws of the country in which they were operating. Since our antitrust laws are free-enterprise laws, I see no way that an international body, including Communist and Socialist states, could establish appropriate methods to deal with antitrust violations on a universal basis. It would seem to me that treaties by the United States and other countries with the same type of economy and with similar judicial procedures might be more fruitful. The United Nations approach can only lead to chaos.

The United States proposal was debated at length during the 13th session of the Economic and Social Council held in the summer of 1951 at Geneva. The Yearbook of the United Nations for 1951, reports this debate and I am particularly interested in the comments which appear in this official document on the attitude of other countries who have no concept of our antitrust laws. I shall now quote from the United Nations Yearbook:

"The representatives of Belgium, France, Peru, Sweden, and Uruguay, while agreeing as to the harmful effects of many restrictive business practices and believing that far-reaching private agreements constituted a political danger, felt nevertheless that international producers' agreements were not always to be condemned and that in certain cases they met urgent needs connected with economic progress.

"The representative of Peru stated that, in South America, public commercial enterprises were operated in the interests of the State and of the community, many of them being accompanied by measures to protect the individual's social rights. These enterprises, he said, should not be confused with private monopolies.

"The representatives of Chile, Mexico, and Uruguay also emphasized the important part played by public commercial enterprises in their national development. The Chilean and Mexican representatives stated that they would abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution. Representatives supporting the resolution believed, however, that studies and investigations were necessary to distinguish between good and bad restrictive practices.

"The representative of the International Cooperative Alliance referred to a recent survey by his organization which had revealed the widespread use and the harmful effect of restrictive business practices. He described the manner in which his organization had been fighting such practices and

urged the Council to undertake an authoritative investigation in this field.

"In the view of the representatives of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the U. S. S. R., the United States proposal was designed to camouflage the real objective of United States monopolies. Figures were cited in order to show that these monopolies controlled the United States foreign trade and investments. These monopolies, those representatives said, in their struggle to gain domination of world markets, engaged in extensive restrictive business practices to remove any competition; they earned immense profits in underdeveloped countries, and were powerful enough to obtain a stranglehold on European trusts, secure markets for their excess production in Europe, and influence the political life of other countries through economic control. United States exports were being used as instruments of discriminatory policies applied against the peoples' democracies. American big business, those representatives maintained, fostered the creation of monopolies which it could dominate, but opposed the creation of those over which it had no control."

After extensive debate and the adoption of amendments the United States resolution was approved and the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices was appointed. It consisted of Belgium, Canada, France, India, Mexico, Pakistan, Sweden, the United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay.

The terms of reference of the ad hoc committee provided that, and I quote: "The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations recommend that the measures adopted in the cases and the purposes stated in the preceding paragraphs shall be based on the principles set forth in chapter V of the Havana Charter concerning restrictive business practices."

Thus, entirely at the initiative of the United States Government this ad hoc committee was established under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to implement chapter V of the rejected Havana Charter.

The United States representative on this committee was Corwin Edwards, the former chief economist of the Federal Trade Commission. The secretary of the ad hoc committee itself was Sigmund Timberg, formerly with the Antitrust Division in the United States Department of Justice. The committee assembled in January of 1952 and presented its report in March of 1953. During this period, the committee held 77 meetings, a great majority of which were closed to the public. The report of the committee was filed with the United Nations Secretary-General in March of 1953.

It was considered briefly at two sessions of the Economic and Social Council who requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to refer this report and the analysis by the Secretariat to the member states and to specialized agencies for examination and comment. The Council also decided that consideration of the report would be resumed not later than at its 19th session which will convene at United Nations headquarters in New York at the end of March of this year.

It is important that the people of the United States be familiar with this report and the pitfalls into which we can be led should it be adopted. An article by Samuel K. C. Kopper which appeared in the Virginia Law Review of December 1954 gives a complete analysis of this report. This article is a revision and expansion of a paper originally presented by Mr. Kopper to the Fourth International Congress of Comparative Law at the Faculte de Droit, University of Paris, on August 6, 1954.

Mr. Kopper has an unusual background which uniquely qualifies him to review the

report of this Committee. After graduating from Princeton University in 1937, he obtained his law degree at the University of Virginia in 1940. Subsequently, he studied at the Academie de Droit, International de la Haye. From 1946 to 1949 he was an adviser to the United States delegations to the United Nations Security Council and to its General Assembly. He was a special consultant to the Assistant Secretary of State during 1952-53. He has also been the officer in charge of North African Affairs, the Deputy and Acting Director of the Office of Near East Affairs, and is presently counsel for the Arabian-American Oil Co. in New York City. He is also the chairman of the Near East Committee, Section of International and Comparative Law of the American Bar Association.

I shall now read the relevant sections of Mr. Kopper's article.

"EXCERPTS FROM THE INTERNATIONAL REGULATION OF CARTELS—CURRENT PROPOSALS

"(By Samuel K. C. Kopper)

"A. The draft articles

"The report of the ad hoc committee contained draft articles of agreement,¹ which were based largely on chapter V of the Havana Charter. The draft articles of agreement call for the establishment of a United Nations organization composed of all United Nations members, the basic objective of which is to coordinate national and international action to prevent and eliminate restrictive business practices whenever such practices have harmful effects on the expansion of production or trade.² It is provided that there will be a 'representative body' composed of all members of the United Nations, and an 'executive board' which is to carry out the functions and duties of the representative body and exercise its powers. Membership on the executive board will be determined by the extent to which a nation participates in international trade, and by a geographical balance.

"The draft articles of agreement contain a preamble, 20 articles, and an appendix which describes the share in world trade of individual countries. The preamble states that national and international action is required to attain: (1) A reduction of governmental and private trade barriers and the promotion on equitable terms of access to markets, products, and productive facilities; (2) encouragement of industrial and agricultural development, particularly in underdeveloped areas; (3) balance and expansion of the world economy through greater and more efficient production, increased income and greater consumption, and the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international trade; and (4) the promotion of mutual understanding and cooperation to solve problems arising in all aspects of international trade. The preamble concludes with a recognition that national and international action in the field of restrictive business practices can contribute substantially to the attainment of such overall objectives.

"Article 1 sets forth the general policy toward restrictive business practices. Each member of the Organization shall take measures and cooperate with other members to prevent restrictive business practices that have harmful effects on the expansion of production or trade. The Organization is empowered to determine whether a particular practice is restrictive and has harmful effects whenever: (1) It receives a complaint; (2) the practice is engaged in or made effective by one or more private or public commercial enterprises; and (3) such enterprises possess effective trade control among a number of countries in one or more products.

"Restrictive business practices are defined as (1) Fixing of prices, or of terms or condi-

¹Footnotes at end of speech.

tions to be observed in the purchase, sale, or lease of any product; (2) exclusion of enterprises from, or allocation or division of, any territorial market or field of business activity, or allocation of customers, or fixing of sale or purchase quotas; (3) discrimination against particular enterprises; (4) production limitations or quotas; (5) prevention of development or application of technology or invention, whether patented or not, or withholding of same with the result of monopolizing an industrial or commercial field; (6) illegal extension of rights under patents, trade-marks, or copyrights; and (7) any similar practices which the Organization may declare, by a majority of two-thirds of the members present and voting, to be restrictive business practices.

"The breadth of this article can be fully appreciated only by a careful study of its precise language. It clearly appears at a glance, however, that the article is not only broad but vague. Furthermore, it is questionable whether the criteria set forth are adequate for an international organization to determine whether specific practices are restrictive or not. Perhaps the most fundamental question raised by this article is whether its basic philosophy is generally accepted in the family of nations. It presumably represents the philosophy of the United States, but in the United States there is no clear agreement as to just what this philosophy really is.

"The confusion about the application of American antitrust laws in foreign commerce could hardly be greater.² Not only is there confusion about the application of these laws but there is also little agreement about the meaning of some of the terms used in article 1. The Attorney General of the United States has established a committee to re-examine our antitrust laws.³ Particular attention is to be paid to their extraterritorial application. Pending the completion of this study, it is doubtful whether other nations will be eager to accept the terminology and philosophy of this article. Certainly an international organization composed of nations having widely differing concepts of law would have an exceedingly difficult time implementing or interpreting it.

"Article 2 provides that any member may consult directly, or ask the Organization to arrange a consultation, with other members in any instance in which the member thinks it has been affected within the meaning of article 1. If the Organization considers action justified, it will arrange for and assist in such consultation. This article gives the Organization very broad authority without any checks. It could open the door to frivolous cases which might very well be considered by the Organization for political reasons.

"Article 3 concerns investigative procedure. It provides for the presentation of written complaints to the Organization which must contain minimal information (prescribed by the Organization) as to the nature of the practice complained of. The Organization determines whether the complaint is justified. If, however, the Organization is satisfied that the practice in question was specifically required by governmental measures in existence prior to the complaint, no further investigation shall be undertaken, provided that any practice found to exist in more than one country may be further investigated in the Organization's discretion, if such practice is not specifically required in all countries in which it is found to exist.

"Reasonable opportunities for being heard shall be afforded the complainant and the commercial enterprise alleged to have engaged in the practice complained of. All members are to be informed of the complaint. Any member can be asked for information on the complaint. The Organiza-

tion shall decide whether there has been a violation, and shall inform all members of its decision and reasons therefor. If there is a violation, the Organization has the power to request the members concerned to take remedial action in accordance with their respective laws and procedures.⁴ The remainder of the article deals with reports which the Organization shall make on the matter.

"This article clearly indicates that there is discrimination in favor of public enterprises and against private enterprises. The ad hoc committee frankly admitted that 'special difficulties arose, however, in connection with restrictive business practices which were sanctioned by governmental statutes or regulations.'⁵

"This is a fundamental defect in the whole plan. A further defect which appears in this article is the provision that members will be requested⁶ to take remedial measures in accordance with their respective laws and procedures. Nations like the United States, which has rigid and enforced laws, will be placed at an obvious disadvantage vis-a-vis countries with less rigid and frequently unenforced laws. If this disadvantage were temporary it might be tolerated. It is perfectly clear, however, that it might last for years, or decades, and hence would be unacceptable. It is obvious that laws and procedures vary widely in the various countries of the United Nations.⁷ When, if ever, they will come to resemble those of the United States is uncertain.

"A final observation about article 3 should be made. The investigation, trial, and adjudication of cases involving restrictive business practices are extremely intricate and complicated tasks. The patient and painstaking efforts of trained people are always required to bring about a fair and just settlement of such cases. The proposed United Nations plan does not spell out how these difficult tasks will be performed. Will there be an investigatory staff, or is the advisory staff provided for in articles 13 and 15 to conduct investigations? What information will be used? Can judicial proceedings and committee investigations in this country be used? What power and authority will an investigatory staff have? Or if the investigations are left entirely to the individual member nations, what assurance can there be that investigative procedures will be reasonably similar? The answer to the last question clearly seems to be that there can be no assurance because of the wide differences in approach to this whole subject among the member nations of the United Nations. It should be noted in conclusion that it would be possible under article 3 for the Organization to publish reports on charges even though the latter had been proved false.

"Article 4 authorizes the Organization to make studies of all aspects of restrictive business practices. It may request members to supply information in connection with these studies. Thus, the burden may fall on nations with a great deal of commerce to receive recommendations from countries whose basic motives are political.

"Article 5 provides that each member shall take all possible measures to insure that within its jurisdiction private and public commercial enterprises do not engage in restrictive practices as previously defined. Members are to comply promptly with requests from the Organization for information regarding complaints. They are to take action in accordance with their constitutions or systems of law and economic organization. Nothing in the agreement shall be construed, however, as requiring a member to give information contrary to its essential security interests.

"The obligations imposed on the members contain no safeguards against frivolous complaints. The criteria upon which the Organization will base its decision as to whether a complaint is justified are unclear. The burden may frequently be on the defending country to prove that it is innocent under its own laws. Furthermore, the paragraph requiring members to take action under the constitution or system of law and economic organization is meaningless in view of the wide diversity of such systems. There is no equitable basis for international conduct or action.

"In article 8 it is recognized that certain services, e. g., transportation and telecommunications, are substantial elements of international trade, and that any restrictive business practices by them may have harmful effects. If any member thinks that such harmful restrictive business practices exist, it may submit a written statement on the situation to those whose private or public enterprises are involved, and sympathetic consideration shall be given to effecting a satisfactory adjustment. If no adjustment is made and the matter is referred to the Organization, it shall be transferred to the intergovernmental body concerned if one exists. If there is no such body, the Organization may make recommendations.

"Article 9 contains four paragraphs which empower the Organization to bring to the attention of members measures taken by other members or intergovernmental bodies or agencies regarding business practices; to make arrangements with other intergovernmental bodies or agencies which will provide for effective cooperation with respect to restrictive business practices; and to make suitable arrangements for consultation and cooperation with nongovernmental organizations.

"If it is anticipated that the Organization will do these things, as well as all of the other things provided for in preceding articles, on a worldwide basis, it will have to maintain an astonishingly large staff of highly trained personnel.

"Article 10 provides that the representative body is to consist of all members of the agency. Each is to have one vote. Decisions are to be made by the majority of the members unless otherwise provided in the agreement. The representative body is to meet regularly and can be convoked by the executive board or by one-third of the members of the representative body. It is to establish its own rules of procedure, and final authority to determine the policies of the agency shall be vested in it.

"This article underscores what has been pointed out in comments on previous articles—the policies with regard to restrictive business practices might very well be determined by a group of nations having only a small percentage of world commerce, and whose motivations might stem from political, ideological, or other reasons to the detriment of more highly commercial nations. The proposed program is, to say the least, a novel one. The procedure for adjudication is nonjudicial, and might easily become political or partisan. Yet various articles of the proposal refer to what the Organization may decide, or to decisions of the Organization.⁸ Are these decisions to take on the aura of judicial decisions? With no applicable law and no agreement about basic principles, confusion unbounded might easily reign.

"Article 11 concerns the executive board. The executive board is to carry on the functions of the representative body. Its size and composition are to be determined by the body. The selection of members is to be made with due regard to 'the objectives of including members from the differ-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ent types of economies and degrees of economic development to be found among members of the agency, from the broad geographical areas to which the members belong, and from countries of chief economic importance, for which last criterion particular regard shall be paid to members' shares in international trade."

"On the basis of previous experience in the United Nations, one could anticipate a Board composed roughly of 25 percent from Latin America, 25 percent from Europe, 25 percent from Asia, and the remainder from the United States, the Iron Curtain countries (if they should join the Organization), and the British Commonwealth. In the absence of a clearer definition of the powers and limitations of the Organization, the countries having rigid laws on restrictive business practices would be placed in a disadvantageous position in dealing with nations having looser or unenforced laws.

"Article 13 provides that the chief advisory officer of the agency, who is appointed by the representative body, shall be the director of the advisory staff. He is to select the staff. The advisory staff shall exercise its functions with complete independence in the general interest of all members, and shall neither solicit nor accept instructions from any government. Article 15 assigns to the advisory staff almost entire responsibility for evaluating the substance of each complaint. The staff is to arrange for the analysis of the information, and to prepare the report. It can call for additional information, and do whatever is necessary to obtain information to prepare the report of the representative body.

"Articles 13 and 15 make it obvious that the position of the director of the advisory staff is important. Likewise, the staff will have considerable latitude in light of its 'complete independence.' The director has a substantial amount of power. His position should not be underestimated. He is in effect both prosecutor and judge. This, coupled with the fact that there are no rules of law to guide him or within which he should operate, produces a unsatisfactory and unacceptable system.

"Article 16 provides that the representative body 'shall take full account of reports of the advisory staff.' This emphasizes the importance of the work of the advisory staff.

"Articles 17, 18, 19, and 20 make provisions for the content of reports; entry into force of the agreement; and amendment, withdrawal, termination, interpretation, and definition of the agreement. The agreement is to come into force on the 60th day after—

"(a) The number of governments which have deposited instruments of acceptance shall reach 20 or more and shall cover 65 percent or more of the total value of world imports and exports, as set forth in appendix A; [or]

"(b) The number of governments which have deposited instruments of acceptance shall have reached 20 or more and shall cover 65 percent or more of the total value of world imports and exports as set forth in appendix A, and shall include six countries which individually have 3 percent or more of such total value."

"Amendment of the agreement can be effected by a two-thirds majority of the members of the Organization. Any member may withdraw at any time. Withdrawal is to become effective 6 months after receipt of the written notice by the executive secretary. The agreement can be terminated by a three-fourths vote of the members.

"The provisions for the coming into force of the agreement are sound. They do prevent it from becoming effective without the concurrence of most of the important commercial countries.

"The appendix of the agreement points up the fact that only seven countries in the world have trade over 3 percent of the world total. These are:

	Percent
"(1) United Kingdom and dependencies.....	17.57
"(2) United States and dependencies.....	17.22
"(3) France and dependencies.....	8.04
"(4) Canada.....	5.15
"(5) Germany (Federal Republic).....	4.47
"(6) Netherlands and dependencies.....	3.91
"(7) Belgium-Luxembourg and dependencies.....	3.77

"The total of these 7 countries is 60.13 percent. There are 57 countries each with trade under 3 percent of the world total.

"B. International Reaction to the Draft Articles

"In light of the foregoing objections to the ad hoc committee's report, it seems remarkable that none of the delegations or the nongovernmental organizations pointed out the defects of the plan." Furthermore there has been no indication yet that these difficulties will be taken into account. One is forced to conclude that the fear of being branded a 'procartelist' has muted the voices of organizations and individuals. This is a regrettable situation, since we are not concerned with the merits or demerits of cartels and restrictive business practices, but only with the wisdom and validity of plans to handle them.

"The Belgian representative to ECOSOC did observe that cartels were not necessarily evils in themselves. Their evil springs from the general economic situation that calls them into being. Turkey questioned whether there was any point in the Council's discussing only one part of the ITO Charter. The French representative felt that the proposals might well be expanded so that there would be a comprehensive coverage of all restrictive practices. The United States and the United Kingdom were non-committal."

"The other members of ECOSOC and the nongovernmental representatives seemed for the most part to be favorably disposed toward the committee's report. The Soviet Union, which is the largest and most ominous cartel in history, abstained after making some snide remarks about the same American industry which had contributed so much to Russian success against nazism. The Russian representative and Mr. Boson, the representative of the International Cooperative Alliance, referred to the antitrust suit of 1952 against a number of American oil companies. Boson hardly paid a tribute to the American system of law when he stated:

"In the United States of America, the grand jury investigating the international petroleum cartel had failed to establish a prima facie case. There was no doubt that an investigation by an international body would have been more successful."

"This conclusion is as unjustified as it is revealing of exactly what the International Cooperative Alliance really wants.

"C. General Considerations

"Aside from the specific objections to the Ad Hoc Committee plan outlined in earlier paragraphs, there are a number of general observations which ought to be taken into account:

"(1) Chapter V of the Habana Chapter, upon which the ad hoc committee plan is based, was only one part of an overall proposal to deal with barriers to the free flow of trade. To attempt to implement only a part of the plan would be a mistake;

"(2) The committee's plan does not rest on a sound basis of agreement as to what is or is not an objectionable business practice;

"(3) The language employed in the plan is not sufficiently precise, but is vague and ambiguous;

"(4) The plan purports to deal with matters normally handled by the courts in the various countries covered by it, yet there are no provisions which would insure the use of judicial processes by the Organization. On the contrary, it would appear that there is no guaranty of due process of law, and that enforcement would be obtained by indictment;

"(5) Members of the Organization would be such on different bases inasmuch as the laws of the participating nations all differ in some respects;

"(6) There is no reference to the important question of the right of each sovereign nation to handle restrictive business practices in its own territory in accordance with its own laws and ideologies." The committee recognized the difficulty, but stated that 'the issue [of overlapping jurisdictions and conflicts of laws] has, however, far-reaching implications which raise serious difficulties of substance; moreover, the question arose whether the matter came properly within the committee's competence. For these reasons, and having regard to the limited time available to the committee, most members felt it would not be profitable to pursue the matter."

"III. Domestic laws and conditions in the nations concerned

"Any consideration of proposals for the international regulation of cartels must take into account national legislation on the subject. With world trade and business activity expanding, the private-law aspects of international industrial combinations become of increasing interest to the student of conflict of laws. The ad hoc committee made an analysis of the constitutional provisions and laws of a number of countries on the subject of restrictive business practices. The conclusions of the committee are of interest.

"The documents have confirmed in the minds of the committee three broad propositions which underlie Resolution 375. These are:

"1. That opinions differ from country to country about restrictive business practices and about governmental policies towards them;

"2. That restrictive business practices affecting international trade may in some circumstances have harmful effects on the fulfillment of widely acceptable objectives of international economic policy;

"3. That it may be difficult in such cases for appropriate action to be undertaken solely by governments acting individually."

"Paragraph 1 of the preceding quotation is, if anything, an understatement of the present situation. In a number of European countries cartels have been quite acceptable to governments." In the United States, Congress passed the Webb-Pomerene Act,¹ authorizing exporters to combine to form export corporations so they could match their foreign competitors. The question has been raised whether the European Coal and Steel Community might end in a superinternational cartel. Whether it does or not, the plan proposed to the United Nations simply does not cover arrangements like these.

"The ad hoc committee plan takes no appreciable account of the problems which confront private enterprise seeking to do business abroad under laws which are all too frequently different from those at home. The risks involved in such ventures are often enormous. At the present time, the petroleum industry is in the forefront of American investors abroad. The industry is concerned about the implications of the extension of American antitrust laws to operations being conducted within the sovereign territory of another State." There must be a clarification of the national laws before any international action based on national law can be undertaken.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

"In the United States there is a confusing lack of clarity as to where the Attorney General's jurisdiction should logically end, and where that of the Secretary of State should begin. While it is very true that the Sherman and Clayton Acts have been strong links in the chain of the free enterprise system,¹⁸ efforts to extend their application extraterritorially to foreign operations of American concerns may in certain instances work a positive disservice to national security interests of the United States. In nations unaccustomed to American antitrust law, reactions to antitrust proceedings against American companies frequently range from surprise and incredulity to suspicion and hostility—particularly where criminal proceedings are instituted.

"Space does not permit a detailed analysis of all governmental measures which have been taken relating to restrictive business practices. The recent reports of the United Nations ad hoc committee and of the United States Department of State to a Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly¹⁹ contain a review of constitutional provisions and legislation in a number of countries. There are certain significant deductions which can be drawn from these reports when a comparison of the various laws is made.

"We have noted that the ad hoc committee found that opinions differ from country to country about restrictive business practices.²⁰ The Department of State report comes to the same conclusion:

"As might be expected, the type of statutes as well as the degree of effectiveness of their provisions and of their administration has varied greatly from country to country. These factors are a function of a number of complex considerations, such as the type of government in the particular country at the period in which legislation was adopted; its economic, social, and political aims; and the fundamental philosophy of the government and the people of a country toward the part the business community should play in the economic and political structure of the country. It is accordingly difficult to reach any generalizations as to the trend of development in the group of countries as a whole."²¹

"Comments from the State Department report on selected countries are also of interest:

"The Austrian economy is characterized by an absence of free competition, caused in large part by the concentration of economic power. This concentration results from such factors as (a) the dominant influence of a few firms in the principal areas of private industry; (b) the dominant position of the larger banks; (c) a complex network of interlocking directorates by means of which a few leading groups control a large part of the private industrial economy; and (d) the nationalization of a major sector of industry.²²

"Industrial federations form the principal basis of the strong ties that exist among individual Belgian firms. . . .

"Existing Belgian legislation is favorable to the formation of cartels and imposes but few limits on their operation.²³

"There are in France few large industrial firms in a monopoly or nonmonopoly position. There has, however, been a trend to the uniting of business firms in cooperative agreements or associations. The comptoir system of doing business often involves restrictions on the right of the individual firm to take independent action as to prices, quantity and type of production, and areas of sale.

"At the present time, there is no legislation in existence in France directly relating to restrictive business practices which can be effectively employed to control or eliminate such practices.²⁴

"Germany's industrial development has been characterized by a high degree of economic concentration during the entire period of the existence of the country as a modern industrial state.

"In general, the economic structure of Germany has been characterized by industrial combinations based on financial and legal interrelationships such as trusts and combines, and by cartels.²⁵

"The political and business climate in Western Germany is generally unfavorable to a program for the elimination of restrictive business practices.²⁶

"Swiss industry is highly organized into trade associations which regulate the terms of sale and prices in practically all sectors of the economy.²⁷

"There are no laws in Denmark which actually prohibit business enterprises from organizing cartels or engaging in other arrangements designed to restrain competition.²⁸

"The selected comments quoted above clearly indicate the wide variety of ideas and concepts on how to deal with restrictive business practices. It should be noted that both the Department of State Report and the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee's Report discuss only a relatively small number of countries. Important though these countries may be, there is still a large group of countries which have virtually no interest in the whole subject.²⁹

"Conclusion

"It is true that there has been much interest manifested in some countries, particularly in Western Europe, about the problem of restrictive business practices. However, it would seem abundantly clear that even the proponents of United Nations action in the field recognize the great variations in national approaches to the problem.³⁰ Furthermore, while constitutional and statutory provisions may exist in many countries, whether they are really enforced is quite another matter.³¹

"This brings us to the conclusion that no matter how strongly one may feel about restrictive business agreements, action in the international sphere which is predicated on national law is questionable policy. There can be little doubt that the Ad Hoc Committee was confronted with a most difficult task.³² Valiant though its efforts were, the great differences of opinion were an exceedingly difficult problem to overcome.

"It can only be concluded, therefore, that the answer to the question raised by Prof. Corwin Edwards as to whether the United Nations proposals "afford a useful basis for a beginning of multilateral action"³³ is that they regrettably do not appear to be satisfactory in their present form. Whether any plan can be developed in the absence of uniformity in national laws is extremely doubtful. In the meantime, based on his experience attending United Nations sessions in official and semiofficial capacities, the writer believes that it would be a positive disservice to the United Nations organization to attempt to give it a somewhat nebulous responsibility based on an ambiguous plan to attain a hazy objective in the field of restrictive business practices. On the other hand, a heavy responsibility rests on governments and business to see that business practices are not harmful or disruptive of the free flow of international trade, and to make any constructive suggestions toward this end which the United Nations and its members might consider."

The principal conclusion I derive from what I have just read is that it is impossible for an administrative body established within the United Nations to act as a court and determine violations of restrictive business practices. The laws of the sovereign nations

differ so widely concerning this subject that it is impossible to frame an agreement predicated on national law which would be meaningful. Without a uniformity in national laws which, in turn, presupposes some common agreement on the type of economy under which the different countries shall operate, it is impossible to conceive of any useful purpose resulting from the implementation of chapter V through a new United Nations organ.

The resolution establishing this ad hoc committee, which was adopted in September of 1951, also provided—and I am quoting from the resolution:

"Determines further that the committee shall:

"(a) Obtain information from governments, specialized agencies and other sources, on restrictive business practices, whether based on cartel agreements or not, that affect international trade and international economic cooperation generally, and on legislation adopted and measures taken by individual member States in connection with restrictive business practices and with the object of restoring the freedom of competition; and

"(b) Present to the council analyses of this information together with the proposals mentioned in paragraph 4. . . ."

Pursuant to this resolution, two United Nations documents were issued, known as supplements 11A and 11B to the official records of the 16th session of the Economic and Social Council. These documents analyze governmental measures relating to restrictive business practices. While these documents clearly show that there is no uniformity in the approach to restrictive business practices by the nations of the world, they also raise another problem which has disturbed me. They review our antitrust laws and refer to criminal proceedings which are meaningful to those familiar with American jurisprudence, but place American free enterprise in an unfavorable light in a forum such as the United Nations with its Iron Curtain members who do not adhere to our judicial concepts.

Our Government has just recently furnished another report to the United Nations pursuant to this resolution. This report assumes a complete understanding of the philosophy underlying our antitrust laws by the reader of a United Nations document. Unfortunately, few foreign readers possess such understanding. It proceeds to describe various antitrust cases which have been initiated in the United States and cites the complaints in detail. Many of these cases have not been brought to trial, and I am sure that those who wish to impugn the motives and philosophy of American business enterprise will have a field day with this document. I wish to read just one page from this report, which clearly shows the unfavorable light in which American enterprise is placed. I shall now read from page 3 of the document:

"3. ADMINISTRATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

"During the course of the period since January 1, 1953, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice had brought through July 1954, a total of 55 new cases, of which 29 have been criminal proceedings, and the remaining 26, civil cases. These cases cover a broad variety of industries as well as of types of restraints. A majority of them have been directed at traditional violations of the antitrust statutes such as price-fixing, allocation of customers or territories, and boycotts. As an example, a criminal case and a separate civil action were filed against four pencil manufacturers charging a price-fixing conspiracy, including collusive bidding on Government contracts.³⁴ In another instance, four distributors of toilet

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

goods, perfumes, and cosmetics were charged, in a separate action filed against each company, with attempting to restrain trade, through misuse of the United States trademark laws, by preventing goods produced by their foreign affiliates from being imported and sold in this country through competitors.²⁸

"Several important cases having international as well as domestic significance have been brought against monopoly or monopolistic practices of dominant companies in their respective fields. One of these, filed on October 9, 1953, charges the American Smelting & Refining Co. and St. Joseph Lead Co., with a conspiracy to monopolize and restrain trade in primary lead.²⁹ The case charges the companies with collaborating to preempt supply sources of raw material, to limit the marketing opportunities of competitors and to restrict overall domestic production of lead ore. On April 21, 1953, a complaint was filed against five leading United States oil companies charging unlawful agreement to secure and exercise control over foreign production and supplies of petroleum and its products, to regulate imports into the United States in order to maintain an agreed level of domestic world prices, and to divide foreign producing and marketing territories.³⁰ The complaint charged further that some thirty jointly owned companies were created to give effect to these arrangements."

You will note the reference to a price-fixing conspiracy, collusion, and the statement that a criminal case was instituted. I am sure that the representatives from the Soviet Union will be happy to have this official report of our Government to use for propaganda purposes.

This report also recites actions recently instituted under the 1950 amendments of section 7 of the Clayton Act. This statement is meaningful to those of us who are familiar with this legislation, but in the form in which the report is presented, it has no meaning whatsoever to other countries who will receive it through the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Our present able delegation to the Council has sufficient difficulty in presenting the merits of the American free-enterprise system without having to be confronted with a report placing American business enterprise in a most unfavorable light in such a forum.

On October 21, 1953, I testified before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada was the chairman, and reviewed the steps which led to the convening of the conference at Habana. After outlining the State Department's 1945 proposals, I said that they represented a bold move in the direction of world government and threatened the measures of security in which I have been particularly interested throughout my entire adult lifetime.

The report of this ad hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices, which will be before the Economic and Social Council this spring, included this statement which confirms the fears I expressed at that time:

"Governments have long since come realistically to accept the concept that different types of trade barriers must be dealt with at a different pace and through different organizational arrangements. For example, the International Monetary Fund, which is charged with the problem of dealing with exchange restrictions, was established several years before any organization had been set up to deal with the problem of import restrictions, the close companion of exchange restrictions; and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs was established

without any parallel organization with respect to restrictive business practices. Both the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement, in turn, were created at a time when no formal arrangements had been developed for continuous consideration of commodity agreements and commodity allocations, problems which are intimately related to trade-barrier problems. In each of these fields, notwithstanding their interrelationships, machinery for international action was developed at its own pace and in its own form. The problems of liaison and consistency of pace have proved far less difficult in actuality than in the abstract. A common core of membership in these groups, supplemented by the enterprise of the secretariats, by arrangements similar to those provided in article 9 of the draft agreement, and by a few formal ties, have created a reasonably workable system."

I am confident that the steps which have already been taken by the Eisenhower administration to repudiate chapter VI of the Habana Charter through our nonparticipation in the Trade Stabilization Commission will be repeated at the forthcoming session of the Economic and Social Council when, I sincerely hope, we will withdraw from any further participation in this group designed to implement chapter V of the rejected Habana Charter.

¹ Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices E/2380, E/AC.37/3 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 16th Sess., Supp. 11) 12 et seq. (March 30, 1953).

² The ad hoc committee was not specifically instructed to prepare the draft articles. It appears clear, however, that the Committee considered this the most satisfactory way to implement ECOSOC's recommendation. The Secretary-General of the United Nations had been instructed to obtain information on the type of organization which could implement the Committee proposals. See note 26, supra.

However, he explained in a note to ECOSOC that this could not be done by July 1953, because one of the most important of the inter-governmental bodies, the Contracting Parties to GATT, had had no regular meeting. Note by the Secretary-General concerning the report requested under Council resolution 375 (XIII) E/2443 (1953).

³ See Searls, Trade and Commerce Among the Several States or With Foreign Nations, proceedings at annual meeting, section of antitrust law, American Bar Association 58 (Aug. 26, 27, 1953). See also Hale and Hale, Monopoly Abroad: The Antitrust Laws and Commerce in Foreign Areas, 31 Texas L. Rev. 493 (1953); see note, Foreign Subsidiaries in Antitrust Law, 4 Stan. L. Rev. 559 (1952).

⁴ See 21 U. S. L. Week 2651 (June 30, 1953). ⁵ Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices E/2380, E/AC.37/3 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 16th Sess., Supp. 11) 4, par. 22 (March 30, 1953).

⁶ The Organization's power is limited to "requesting" members to take remedial action and "recommending" possible remedial measures.

⁷ This conclusion is based on the findings in Analysis of Government Measures Relating to Restrictive Business Practices E/2379 and E/2379/Add.1, E/AC.37/2 and E/AC.37/2/Add.1 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Official Records, 16th Sess., Supp. 11A), (April 29, 1953), and Foreign Legislation Concerning Monopoly and Cartel Practices (report of Department of State to Subcommittee on Monopoly, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, subcommittee print No. 5, 82d Cong., 2d Sess.) (1952).

⁸ E. g., art. 2, pars. 3, 5, 8; art. 5, par. 4.

⁹ The International Chamber of Commerce has subsequently indicated its opposition to the plan. Resolution adopted by council of

International Chamber of Commerce, Doc. 225/23, Rome, Italy, April 13, 1954. Likewise, the National Association of Manufacturers has indicated its lack of agreement. See Restrictive Business Practices, Comments * * * E/2612 (U. N. Economic and Social Council Document) (May 28, 1954). But there has not been any analytical survey of the implications of the plan.

¹⁰ The summary of attitudes is taken from Official Records (U. N. Econ. & Social Council, 16th Sess.) 742d meeting E/SR.742, p. 239 et seq. (July 30, 1953), 744th meeting E/SR.744, p. 257 et seq. (July 31, 1953).

¹¹ Id. at 244. The views of other nongovernmental organizations like the ICFTU seemed to spring from a genuine apprehension of restrictive business arrangements. Unfortunately, they do not seem to have recognized the dangers of an unworkable plan. Possibly time will permit a more thorough examination of the proposals.

¹² See Haight, International Law and Extraterritorial Application of the Antitrust Laws, 63 Yale L. J. 639 (1954); Whitney, Sources of Conflict Between International Law and the Antitrust Laws, 63 Yale L. J. 655 (1954). The conflict of laws could not be more clearly illustrated than in the recent cases of *United States v. Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.* (105 F. Supp. 215 (S. D. N. Y. 1952)), and *British Nylon Spinners, Ltd. v. Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.* ((1953) 1 Ch. 19).

¹³ Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices E/2380, E/AC.37/3 (U. N. Econ. & Social Council Official Records, 16th Sess., Supp. 11) 6, ¶ 36 (March 30, 1953).

¹⁴ Analysis of Governmental Measures Relating to Restrictive Business Practices E/2379 and E/2379/Add.1, E/AC.37/2 and E/AC.37/2/Add.1 (U. N. Econ. & Social Council Official Records, 16th Sess., Supp. 11A) 1 (April 29, 1953).

¹⁵ Examples: Cement Entente of 1935 in Belgium; Zinc Rollers Entente of 1933; syndicate of Belgian Manufacturers of Machine Tools. In Austria virtually all industry is organized through trade associations. See note 49 infra.

¹⁶ 40 Stat. 516 (1918), 15 U. S. C. §§ 61-65 (1952). 49 Stat. 1526 (1936), 15 U. S. C. § 13 et seq. (1952) (Robinson-Patman Discrimination Act) further complicates American antitrust law.

¹⁷ Joint Oil Producing Ventures in the Middle East—Their Status under United States Antitrust Laws (Submitted by Standard Oil Co. of N. J. to Atty. Gen.'s Nat'l. Comm. To Study the Antitrust Laws) (Dec. 13, 1953). See also the defendants' answers in *United States v. Standard Oil Co. of N. J.* (Civil No. 86-27, S. D. N. Y.); defendants' answers filed Sept. 1, 1953; amended answer filed by Texas Co., Sept. 21, 1953.

¹⁸ The importance of the antitrust laws to United States foreign trade was clearly stated by the Honorable Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, in an address before the Washington Board of Trade, entitled "World Trade and the Antitrust Laws" (Sept. 27, 1954).

¹⁹ See notes 10, 25 supra.

²⁰ See note 40 supra.

²¹ Foreign Legislation Concerning Monopoly and Cartel Practices (report of Department of State to Subcommittee on Monopoly, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee Print No. 5, 82d Cong., 2d Sess.), 1 (1952).

²² Id. at 6.

²³ Id. at 15.

²⁴ Id. at 20. A bill for the surveillance of economic agreements to ensure freedom of production and trade was submitted to the Assemblée Nationale at the second term, 1953, No. 5704. See texts of National Legislation and Other Governmental Measures Relating to Restrictive Business Practices E/2379/Add.2, E/AC.37/2/Add.2 (U. N. Eco-

conomic and Social Council Official Records, 16th sess., supp. 11B) 76 n.9 (March 13, 1953).

²⁰ Id. at 31.

²¹ Id. at 43. Despite the stringent allied decartelization program, there are numerous signs that German industry much prefers to do business by the old methods.

²² Id. at 58.

²³ Id. at 62.

²⁴ Recent comments from member nations, specialized agencies, intergovernmental organizations, and nongovernmental organizations regrettably reflect little additional analysis of the problem, particularly as it involves the efficacy of the ad hoc committee's proposals. Restrictive Business Practices, Comments * * * E/2612 (U. N. Economic and Social Council document) (May 28, 1954).

²⁵ This is the writer's conclusion with respect to such informative articles as Timberg, Restrictive Business Practices, 2 Am. J. Comp. L. 445 (1953). Mr. Timberg was secretary of the ad hoc committee on restrictive business practices.

²⁶ Id. at 465.

While the constitutional texts and statutory provisions of many other countries show on their face a similar hostility against monopolies, these have no history of practical enforcement.

²⁷ Having participated in a number of international conferences, the writer is deeply aware of the painstaking effort and negotiation necessary to achieve workable agreements.

²⁸ Edwards, Regulation of Monopolistic Cartelization, 14 Ohio St. L. J. 252, 278 (1953).

²⁹ U. S. v. American Lead Pencil Co., et al. (Civ. 73-54), civil complaint and final judgment, 2 copies enclosed; criminal action, copy enclosed.

³⁰ U. S. v. Parfums Corday, Inc. (civ. 93-268), complaint, copy enclosed. *Lanvin Parfums, Inc.* (civ. 93-269), complaint, copy enclosed. *Guerlain, Inc.* (civ. 93-267), complaint, copy enclosed. *Empiro Corp.* (civ. 93-270), complaint, final judgment, copy enclosed.

³¹ U. S. v. American Smelting and Refining Co. and St. Joseph Lead Co. (civ. 88-249), complaint, 2 copies enclosed.

³² U. S. v. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) et al. (civ. 88-27) complaint, copy enclosed.

A Model for United States Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the battle for men's minds is often as crucial as the struggle for geographic territory. Very few ideas ever have been crushed by bombs, swords, wild beasts, or even atomic bombs. We could win or lose the cold war against communism in the hearts and souls of the men and women of Asia.

One avenue by which the United States can win the allegiance of these people is through our magazines, our books, our newspapers, and our other literary and journalistic products.

I ask to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative and illuminating article, entitled "A Model for United States Propaganda," written by Peggy Durdin and published in the New York Times magazine of February 6, 1955,

describing the strikingly effective job done in Burma by the Library of the United States Information Service in the city of Rangoon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MODEL FOR UNITED STATES PROPAGANDA

(By Peggy Durdin)

RANGOON.—Aside from her gold-domed pagodas and Buddhist temples, the most popular place in all Burma is a simple American library which might have been whisked overnight on a magic carpet to Asia from any town or city between Maine and California. A huge, light-filled, book-lined room on the ground floor of a British bank in Rangoon, it radiates friendliness, informality and cheerful service in the best American tradition. Without fuss or fanfare, it has made thousands of friends for the United States in a part of the world where people automatically suspect and distrust the motives of the West and where the Communists' chief propaganda line is anti-Americanism.

Regarded by Washington as the most successful library the United States Information Agency has established anywhere abroad, it exemplifies the kind of aid which Asian countries really welcome. It benefits the community and is a part of it—and so is not an obvious device to sell a bill of goods.

Every American who pays taxes for foreign aid can be proud of the way this United States institution has helped the young Government of Burma—Independent only since 1948—cope with Communist insurrection and build a stable country, probably the most hopeful one in Southeast Asia today. Since Burma's own Communists are in armed rebellion, since it shares a long border with a resurgent China which has historically been aggressive westward and since a Peking-directed embassy in Rangoon actively conspires among the local Chinese community, Burmese leaders have not needed forced feeding of propaganda from Americans to understand and fight communism. What they have desperately needed—and what the American library has consistently supplied—is information and help in setting up an administration and service so effective that the people would not become discontented and readily swallow the lies and promises of the Communists.

The library reaches not only officials but private citizens of all ages in every part of Burma. More than 1,300 Burmese come every day to this busy establishment. Men and women in gay sarongs pore over the racks of magazines, take notes from technical volumes, browse through the biography and fiction or, if they cannot read English, look at the brightly illustrated books in the children's annex. Pretty Burmese attendants decked with bits of glittering jewelry break with Asian custom by giving rich and poor, ragged and elegant, the same courteous attention. The patrons range from dirty little barefoot urchins, who sleep on the sidewalk at night, to dignified Buddhist monks and the highest officials of the Burmese Government.

The library's books travel by river boat, by plane, and on the backs of human porters through and into Communist-held territory, across thousands of miles of jungle and mountains. Burmese read them eagerly in an umbrella cooperative in Bassein, a school in Mandalay, a prisoner's reading room in Myitkyina, an army officers' club in Akyab and a youth league in Moulmein. A doctor who has to perform a complicated new operation, a merchant who wants to make "sparklers" and a landowner who plans to set up a model village on his property turn for help to the American library.

The father of a Communist university student borrowed a standard economics text-

book, studied it and passed it on to his son. They discussed it together. When he returned the book the man said, "This book gave my son the true facts. He is no longer a Communist."

A teacher in a remote Burmese village wrote the librarian, "We owe you thousands of thanks. Long live America and democracy." Another reader offered to teach Burmese to the library's American staff members free of charge in token of his gratitude.

The Burmese, official and civilian, appreciate the library because they so desperately needed it. Before the war, when Burma was a British colony, libraries were regarded as special preserves for scholars—small, gloomy places where books were hidden in a back closet or, at best, locked behind glass panes where no one could finger them.

During the 4-year period of Japanese occupation and the Pacific war, fighting and Allied bombing destroyed most of the libraries and very few books were printed or imported. At the war's end, bookstores were virtually empty and many schools had not a single textbook. Cut off from contact with the rest of the world for so long, lacking the magazines, newspapers, radio, television, and newsreels that Americans take for granted, Burmese of every age in thousands of little villages were book-hungry.

Then, before the country was rehabilitated, Burma got her independence. Almost immediately the country's future was jeopardized by large-scale armed rebellion, both Communist and non-Communist (and not yet wiped out completely though no longer strong enough to wreck the state). At the same time, the Burmese were faced with the tremendous tasks of rebuilding their badly damaged cities, roads and railways and setting up the entire machinery of government: central and local administrations, tax and education systems, public health, public works, police and defense forces. In the capital city of Rangoon and all over the rest of Burma, patriotic young people, full of enthusiasm and hope, started new jobs without much technical know-how or administrative experience to guide them.

It was at this critical stage of Burma's development, when many of its friends wondered whether it would disintegrate into chaos, that the United States Information Agency appointed Zelma Graham to transform the little American reading room in Rangoon into a real library. A friendly, level-headed Pennsylvanian in her early forties, unmistakably and even typically American, the widow of a Baptist missionary in Burma, she had joined Dr. Seagrave's famous medical unit after Pearl Harbor and was evacuated to India just ahead of the Japanese.

Then she worked for the American Army and Government in India, North Burma, West China, and Thailand. When she got the Rangoon job, she took a quick librarian's course at Columbia University and arrived in Burma when the country, like all newly independent, ex-colonial Asian nations, was full of suspicions and resentments of the West.

Mrs. Graham immediately inaugurated a lending service and began to harass Washington for books. She got them; she always gets them. She set up a few simple lines of policy as American as pumpkin pie. First of all, she produced the first physically attractive library in all Burmese history; it has gay curtain, spacious tables, comfortable chairs, and lots of space and light. The next great innovation was that books were placed on open shelves and everyone was encouraged to enjoy the hitherto unheard-of luxury of browsing through them.

Then she trained her staff of Americans, Burmese, Indians, Chinese, and Pakistanis to disregard the demands of "face" and treat a shy, threadbare little clerk and the Chief Justice of Burma with exactly the same

smiling courtesy. She made a rule, quickly recognized all over Burma, that the library would never refuse a single reasonable request for help. Her own little office is open to everyone; if the book or information wanted is not available, she gets it from Washington, by cable if the need is urgent.

Perhaps most important of all, the library was and is designed, in solid American tradition, to be of service to the community and country, not as a propaganda device. When the sensitive and suspicious Burmese realized that propaganda was not going to be rammed down their throats, they began to throng to the American library.

Over and over again Burmese officials, faced with new and knotty problems, have come to the library for guidance. Frequently they ask for "everything the United States is doing in this field."

They want help on public water supply, low-cost housing, the architectural design of schools and gymnasiums for hot climates, census-taking, improved farming techniques, character education for children, 4-H clubs, traffic control in civil aviation, tax systems and the training of naval cadets. The police use American books on prison reform, the FBI juvenile delinquency, police training and methods. (One officer asked for "the American way to catch a spy.")

When a young government official from Burma's far northeast wrote in: "I am a public relations officer for this state but I don't know what it is. Can you tell me?" Mrs. Graham sent him the appropriate book.

The importance of adequate transportation and communications in good administration—and in fighting rebellion—is obvious. Officials of the Government-owned Burma railways say they could not have operated without the library. Their own technical collection destroyed during the war, rebuilt and destroyed a second time by insurgents, they draft their training material from American texts. The chief engineer circulates a history of American railroads among his staff "to give my men a vision of what we can accomplish."

Material from the American library helped the Burmese Parliament decide to support the U. N. action on Korea in 1950. The Government constantly asks for information on the United Nations, American foreign policy, and democracy. The commission entrusted with the vital task of writing school texts for Burma has been using American schoolbooks for reference.

Thousands of individuals write or come in for specific information unavailable anywhere else in the country. "What is the Pentagon?" "Where can I locate world freight rates?" "Where can one get artificial limbs for children?"

Special loan collections of books go all over Burma to schools, to reading rooms of the Armed Forces and Government, to youth hostels and all kinds of student organizations, to a Buddhist training school for monks and to the influential Buddhist monasteries.

The books are read in little family clubs of 20 or 30 members and in community reading centers. Sometimes all the members of one of these village reading rooms pile into buses to visit the Rangoon library; several hundred Burmese—including babies slung across their mothers' hips and white-haired old grandfathers—will then spend a fascinated hour touring the library much as Americans tour the Louvre in Paris.

A member of parliament from the far Chin Hills in western Burma always takes books back with him by air when he returns to his constituency. Porters meet his plane and carry the boxes of reading material on their backs for 5 days to the various little schools in his area.

One day four stately, saffron-robed Buddhist monks walked into the library to "look

at this place we have been hearing about." They explained that some of the pupils in their monastery school had told the unlikely story that everyone, even children, could come in and sit and read or take out books, and they wanted to know whether this could actually be true. After looking around the main library and the children's annex, one of the monks said to a Burmese attendant, "America must feel really friendly to the Burmese, to give them such a good library anyone can use without paying anything."

Zelma Graham opened the children's section—the first public library for young people in Burma's history—in early 1949, when the only equipment in many Rangoon schools was broken slate and chalk, and the few children's books available in Burma were printed on cheap, flimsy paper without any illustrations or pictures.

After the first few days, not one of the several hundred volumes ever touched the library shelves; at least six children waited for every book returned by a borrower. In those first few months, some books were recovered half a dozen times. Today there are thousands of books for the 14,000 members of the children's annex.

An important virtue of the library is that it helps to break down the barriers of nationality, religion, and economic standing that separate Burmese children in their school and play. Rich or poor, Hindu, Christian, or Buddhist, they all come together in the American library. Gathered around the librarian will be a 12-year-old boy in a faded, threadbare sarong, carrying a fat Burma cheroot; a dainty little Indian belle with black painted eyes and diamonds in her nose; a 10-year-old child with a baby slung over one slender hip; a rich little Burmese with gold earrings and buttons and flowers in her hair and escorted by an "ayah"; a little Chinese Boy Scout in khaki; a Sikh youngster with a magnificent turban.

At the low tables, together with the youngsters, are a scattering of young men in their late 'teens or early 20's who are just learning English. Frequently 1 or 2 big Buddhist monks who can't read English at all sit among the children, their shaven heads bent intently over colored illustrations of great cities, strange animals, foreign countries, farms, trains, and airplanes.

There is always an orderly queue of children waiting to take out books. Burmese boys and girls are not used to standing in line for things, particularly if they have money and social standing. The librarians explained to them that this was the custom in the United States. Now the children themselves tell new members, "You must stand in line. This is the way we do it in the American library."

"My son tells me he has to wait in line to get books in your library," a Government official said with a frown one day to Mrs. Graham.

"Yes," he does. "Everyone does," she said. "He tells me he has to stand in the same line with the servants' children."

"Yes," she answered. "It's the same line for everyone."

"Well," she said finally, with a grin, "my son seems to like it. So I guess it must be all right."

The children greatly enjoy other activities of the library which are seldom included in their school curriculum: a weekly newspaper (the only one for young people in all Burma); exhibits of things they make themselves, like model boats and houses; singing, story-telling, and play with blocks, clay, and crayons.

When Mrs. Graham tried to cut the music period from twice to once a week, a committee of Burmese about 2 feet high presented themselves before her desk and said, politely but firmly, in their best English: "We demand music, please. We demand not stop music class."

Though most of them are Buddhists, the children love to sing carols and start asking for them months before Christmas. Only once did a slight hitch arise in the music hour; the singing of Scotland's Burning—Fire! Fire! Fire! Fire!—had to be discontinued because of the old Burmese superstition that the prophecies of children and fools come true.

One important way in which the whole library contributes to Burmese-American friendship and indirectly counters Communist propaganda is that it gives the ordinary Burmese a chance to get acquainted, on his own initiative, with the real United States. Burmese ideas of America come chiefly from Communist literature and the poorer Hollywood movies.

As a result, they tend to think of the United States as a nation of selfish, wealthy, moneygrubbers who cannot possibly understand or sympathize with the simple people and the problems of an underdeveloped Asian country. From the library's special exhibits, books, and weekly educational films the Burmese build for themselves a much more accurate picture, one they accept because it has not been forced on them.

After watching movies on American life, people ask such questions as, "Why don't Americans 'lose face' when they do their own housework, carry their own packages, and drive their own cars?" "How do communities finance all these things that Americans seem to get free?" and "What causes the high standard of living in your country?"

In addition to helping interpret America, the library itself has become a model for similar Burmese institutions; it gives short training courses to Burmese librarians and has aided the University of Rangoon and other key organizations in building up and organizing their own book collections.

No one will ever be able to measure finally the help this library has given Government and individuals in Burma, the understanding of America it has spread, or the good will it has created by giving good and friendly service in a simple, unassuming fashion. Selling democracy over the world is perhaps, after all, not so different from selling a car to an American. Doubtless the salesman's patter is important. But what matters in the long run—and what this American library gives—is performance.

Address by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin,
of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, before the Rotary Club of New York, on February 17, 1955. This address is most interesting and thought-provoking, and I commend it to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can understand it if some of you felt inclined to raise your eyebrows when you learned that a speaker was to address you on such a subject as *An American Looks Abroad*. You may feel inclined to believe that too many Americans have already done too much

looking abroad, and especially too much talking about it, to the grave embarrassment of the officials charged with the conduct of our foreign relations.

It is unfortunately true, but I assure you that you will not hear from me any suggestion of any specific action that should or should not be taken by any official of the United States. Under our constitutional system the President through the agency of the Secretary of State conducts foreign relations except in cases involving treaties, when he acts by and with the consent and advice of the Senate. That is the supreme law of the land, binding upon every one of us; but if it were not so, still I have enough confidence in the integrity and intelligence of the Secretary, the Senate, and the President to be content to leave the application of our foreign policy in their hands and to offer them nothing but my loyal and unwavering support in their most difficult task.

But the foreign policy itself is not identical with the ways and means of carrying it into effect. The foreign policy is not the creation of the President, the Secretary and the Senate; it is the will of the American people in their relations with other nations, and the success of the 3 agencies is to be measured by their success in understanding that will, and making it effective. Foreign policy, as distinguished from the conduct of foreign relations, is very much the business of every citizen and the man who has not formed some kind of opinion on the subject has not fulfilled his civic duty.

The vast majority of Americans, I feel sure, have formed an opinion, but I am equally sure that they have not made that opinion clear to the rest of the world and I cherish some doubt that they have made it altogether clear to themselves. This is no cause for wonder since the attitude we hold is the outgrowth of our experience, not something we have sat down and studied out as a chess player studies out a problem before making his next move. American foreign policy, as I conceive it, is not the attitude we have chosen to assume, but the attitude that we are bound to assume toward the rest of the world, given our political philosophy plus our historical experience.

Both our philosophy and our experience are unique in important respects, so it inevitably follows that our attitude is, if not unique, at least exceptional; which means that there is a high probability that others will misunderstand and misinterpret it. It is my belief that the greater part of our present strains and stresses are attributable to this misunderstanding and misinterpretation; but I am not prepared to maintain that this is altogether the fault of other nations. The American attitude, which seems simple and inevitable to us, may very well be perplexing, indeed downright incredible to people of different traditions and experience.

For one thing, as among the haves and the have-nots, the United States is very definitely a have Nation; but among the haves, it is the only one that acquired its wealth by a struggle that was directed almost exclusively against the forces of nature, rather than against rival nations. We have fought many wars, but only one, that against Mexico in 1846, was highly profitable; and it is precisely the Mexican war that we have always regarded with least national pride. From the economic standpoint, California was well worth the struggle, but we have never been satisfied that any economic profit justifies a war.

This doubt is now shared by all highly developed nations, but only because economic profit cannot result from full-scale war. There is no region on earth so fabulously rich that its possession would repay the costs of a struggle with Russia; and on the other side, invasion and conquest of the United States would not repay Russia the costs of a struggle with us, simply be-

cause the economic value of this country would be largely obliterated by the process of invasion and conquest.

But this is true only because of the fabulous cost of modern war. For centuries it was possible for the Czar to extend his realm very profitably by conquest. So it was with all the other great empires of history; it is only recently that war has become so costly that it is almost as ruinous to the victor as to the vanquished. For that reason this country alone among the great powers has no tradition of war as a profit-making enterprise. Our Indian wars do not furnish an exception, for at the time they were fought they were regarded as police actions to establish law and order rather than as aggressions against another nation.

But because our experience has been so different from that of the rest of the world, it is hard for the rest of the world to understand our attitude; and we, for our part, find it difficult to understand why others cannot understand us. There has been no meeting of minds, and this, I believe, accounts for more of our difficulties than all the schemes of wicked men.

I do not claim for a moment that the United States is a nation of philosophers. Like other countries we have our quota of greedy men, unscrupulous men, short-sighted men, and a great variety of fanatics; but these constitute what Theodore Roosevelt called the lunatic fringe and may be disregarded. I think the great mass of the American people are committed heart and soul to these four propositions:

First, that we do not covet either the territory or the authority of any other nation;

Second, that we do not regard war as a legitimate means of extending either our power or our prosperity;

Third, that neither Divine Providence nor manifest destiny calls upon us to impose our form of government on any people against their will.

Fourth, that we do have an obligation to lend our support to any movement with a reasonable promise of extending equal justice under law to all nations.

Obviously, if 3 out of 4 Americans believe that these 4 principles should constitute the basis of our foreign policy, we do not, as a Nation, constitute a threat to any other country. On the contrary, our military and economic power, controlled by these principles, should be a reassurance to all men of good will.

Nevertheless, he is an optimist indeed who can persuade himself that the rest of the world does so regard it. There is only too much evidence that we are widely feared and fear, of course, generates hatred. This is open to one explanation only, which is that a large part of the world does not believe that we really adhere to the principles we profess.

It follows that the application of American foreign policy is essentially a process of convincing the world of American good faith. Opposing it are certain powerful outside forces with an interest, a real or fancied, in preventing this outcome. Dealing with these outside forces is the business of the President and the Secretary of State, and intervention in that business by private citizens is both unlawful and highly inexpedient.

But it does not follow that the private citizen has no responsibility at all in the situation. On the contrary, his is the final responsibility in a democracy in which public opinion determines foreign policy. He can discharge it, however, not by positive but only by negative action. His part is not to oppose the forces of evil directly, but to refrain from giving them aid and comfort by any injudicious act or word.

After all, 3 of the 4 principles stated a few minutes ago are negative—we do not covet the possessions of others, we do not

regard war as a lawful instrument of national policy, we do not look upon ourselves as a master race. Our primary duty, then is not to give the lie to our own pretensions by conduct which our enemies can turn to the uses of their manufacturers of propaganda.

Yet the private citizen's duty does include one positive phase. It is his duty to make every reasonable effort to understand the attitude of others, including that of our bitterest opponents. I grant that in theory it is no less their duty to understand us; but we can do nothing about that, and I am speaking from the standpoint of an American.

At this moment our heritage of freedom of speech and freedom of inquiry takes on multiplied value; in fact, under existing circumstances the right becomes a duty. I cannot understand the thinking of those Americans who would blindfold our eyes and stop up our ears lest we become contaminated by learning exactly what it is with which we must contend. The ideology—I refuse to call it a philosophy—of communism seems to be as viciously false as any error that has cursed the human mind in history; but I consider it the duty of an American to learn all that he can about it; just as it is the duty of a surgeon to learn all that he can about cancer. Communism, like cancer, has demonstrated a hideous ability to spread, and until we understand its ways of spreading we shall never know how to control it.

There are Americans, some of them undoubtedly as sincere as I am, who are horrified by the idea of a calm, careful study of communism, or of fascism, or of any other idea repugnant to our American system. But while they are sincere, they are also defeatists. You cannot handle infection, they argue, without becoming infected. But you can. It is precisely because you can that science has made such progress in the battle against infection. It is a matter of antiseptics, and in the realm of ideas the most powerful antiseptic in the world is freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of thought, freedom of inquiry.

It is for this reason that I regard those men who would curb and restrict the freedom of the American mind as no less dangerously misled than men who would remove its disinfectants from a hospital. It is a curious and discouraging fact that our enemies sometimes seem to have a keener appreciation of the real nature of freedom than we have. The masters of Soviet Russia are, from their standpoint, quite right in going to any extreme to stamp out freedom of the mind. They are far more concerned to abolish freedom of speech and thought than they are to abolish freedom of the body, and with good reason. Their system is entirely consistent with considerable freedom of movement among their subjects, but it cannot exist in the presence of even a relatively slight degree of freedom of the mind.

Our system, on the other hand, cannot exist without it; yet some earnest souls among us look with complacency on removal of our one defense against infection by error of the most virulent type. This tendency I regard as the most dangerous threat to our foreign policy; for while the success of that policy depends in the first instance on the skill and energy of our diplomats, in the final analysis it depends upon the preservation, the extension, and the strengthening of American freedom.

This is a task that cannot be performed by any official, elective or appointive. It can be performed only by a great body of private citizens who are freemen and propose to remain free; and it is the most important duty that lies upon any man up to and including the President of the United States.

So when an American looks abroad in the year 1955 he will see, if he looks intelligently, a stern warning against indolence and drowsiness in defending his own liberty at

home. The foreign policy of any free, self-governing people is not a threat to any other free people; but the world must have no doubt whatever that we are in fact free and self-governing before it can feel confident that our prodigious strength exists for the defense and not the destruction of liberty.

A single instance of oppression or flagrant injustice in America shocks the world more than appalling repressions in Russia. We sometimes grow querulous over that. It seems to us unjust that there should be a greater outcry when a single American is sent to jail on perjured testimony, or harried and harassed for expressing unpopular opinions, than there is when thousands are consigned to Siberian labor camps.

Perhaps it is unjust, but it is also a tremendous compliment. It is evidence that the world is half convinced that we really are what we profess to be and is correspondingly disturbed by the smallest evidence that it is not so. Looking abroad we can see the importance of preventing the appearance of such evidence. To some extent we are realizing it; we have managed to get through more than 3 years without a lynching in all the continental expanse of the United States. One reason that we have developed a tender conscience as regards that crime, is, I am persuaded, realization that a mob murder in this country has repercussions in the ends of the earth and is hailed with glee by all the powers of darkness.

So has any other denial of the rights of man. Slaves are not much criticized for acting slavishly, but he who professes to be a freeman must be free, or become the scandal of the world. The American who looks abroad may see his own image reflected in the minds of foreign peoples; and if that image shocks him a bit, so much the better for him if it impels him to straighten up and become something closer to the ideal that his professions have created in the minds of others.

I am enough of an idealist—a romantic, if you choose to call it so—to believe that a great destiny is within the grasp of my country. But when I look abroad I realize that it will never be achieved by military might, or economic power. It will be achieved only by being, rather than by doing, by character rather than by deeds, by a constantly closer approach to the ideal that the founders of the Republic had in mind when they set up a nation that by cherishing and extending human liberty within its own borders would, they believed, become a beacon to mankind.

Report of Foreign Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, there was appointed last year a subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the purpose of making an inspection in many countries of Europe concerning shipping, shipyards, and others matters of concern to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] were appointed on the subcommittee, and accompanying them was the subcommittee counsel, Mr. Webster.

They made a report to me as chairman of the committee at that time,

which I think contains very valuable information for the Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND
FOREIGN COMMERCE,
December 30, 1954.

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER,

Chairman, Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce, United
States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BRICKER: You will recall that by letter dated July 29, 1954, you authorized Senator WILLIAM A. PURTELL, our subcommittee counsel, Mr. Webster, and me to visit various European countries for the purpose of inspecting certain foreign shipyards and investigating other matters of concern to this committee. Accordingly, I am writing you in behalf of our group to report on our European trip.

On August 20, 1954, we sailed from New York aboard the S. S. *United States*.

We arrived in LeHavre on August 25 and proceeded directly to Paris. As you know, Senator PURTELL had a previous commitment to meet various United States Senators and Congressmen in Vienna on August 27 for the purpose of representing our country at the interparliamentary conference held in that city until September 2. As a result, we parted that evening after a final conference in Paris, Senator PURTELL taking the train to Vienna and Mr. Webster and I taking another train to Bremen.

However, before we parted we mapped out our itinerary. Since I had to be back in the States by no later than September 8, 1954, we decided I should spend my entire time in Germany: at Bremen, Hamburg, and Bonn. We also agreed that when I left Germany on or about September 1, 1954, Mr. Webster would go on to Rome in order to meet Senator PURTELL when he arrived from Vienna on or about September 3, 1954. On leaving Rome they planned to visit Genoa, Italy; Rotterdam, Holland; London, England; Clyde, Scotland; and Dublin, Ireland. If all went well—as in fact it did—they intended to return aboard the *United States* when it sailed from Southampton on September 23, 1954.

Of course, I am very sorry that previous commitments would not permit me to revisit the splendid shipyards in Holland and Italy, or to see for the first time the world-famous yards on the Clyde or in Belfast. However, in view of the scope and importance of German shipbuilding, I am not sorry that I refrained from trying to visit yards in other countries. To the contrary, my only regret is that I did not have more time to spend in Germany.

It seems to me that it would be burdensome to weigh down the body of this letter with a multitude of statistical information. Therefore, while now and then I will allude to a statistic or two worth noting, I will include most of that type of material in various accompanying enclosures.

This is not to say that I consider the enclosures routine or meaningless. Indeed, I have reason to believe that some of them, especially those dealing with current costs of building ships in various European yards, may prove to be of value to the Maritime Administration, the General Accounting Office, and the Appropriations Committees. While I am not so naive as to believe that Senator PURTELL and I, in the limited time at our disposal, were able to turn up complete answers to any or all of the intensely complex questions involved in the determination of construction differential subsidies, I am sure that some of the material we gathered

has not been made available to our Government before.

After you have finished examining the enclosures, with your permission I will invite the Maritime Administrator, the Comptroller General, and the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to review and make appropriate use of them. In view of the fact that much of this information was supplied to us with the understanding that it would not be used in any way which might embarrass the supplier, I will request those who are permitted to use it to do so discreetly.

On August 26, Mr. Webster and I arrived in Bremen, where we were met by Consul General Edward D. McLaughlin. That afternoon we conferred at his home with him and the following people: Mr. Hermann Helms, Jr., director of Hansa Line; Mr. Manfred von Ohelmb Hauenschild, director of Norddeutsche Bank A. G.; Dr. Gustav Adolf Theel, head of Bremen Institute for Shipping Research; Mr. Fred Riddle, Lykes Lines representative; Mr. William Amoss, Jr., Lykes Lines representative.

Among the subjects we discussed in addition to Germany's shipping and shipbuilding industries were various experiences which American companies such as Lykes have had in serving Bremen. We also had an opportunity to invite the views of these leading Bremen shipping authorities on the so-called 50-50 or cargo-preference bill (Public Law 604). Dr. Theel, in particular, is a noted authority in such matters and authored the Bremen World Shipping Yearbook 1952-53.

Because Public Law 604 was so new—in fact it was not signed by the President until August 26, 1954—it was to be expected that there would be a certain amount of misunderstanding concerning its provisions. However, I was gratified to note that these gentlemen recognized that the United States as a sovereign Nation cannot afford to rely on foreign shipping to meet its ocean transportation needs; and further, that our country must maintain a healthy, privately owned, and operated merchant marine. It was also gratifying to discover that they recognize that in order for us to maintain an adequate privately owned merchant marine we must to some extent subsidize it directly, or indirectly, in order for us to be somewhere near par with our low-labor-cost foreign competitors. Nor did they take exception to the premise that it is only reasonable for a nation which must subsidize its merchant marine to a substantial extent to require that at least 50 percent of the ocean cargoes owned or financed by the government of that country be carried in merchant vessels flying its flag.

Here, as in certain other places visited by Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster, we found that the main concern which our foreign competitors have about the cargo-preference bill is based on a misunderstanding, i. e., that the bill requires that at least 50 percent of all United States exports and imports be carried on United States-flag ships. Of course it does not, applying as it does only to cargoes in which our Government has an interest as owner, financier, or guarantor. It affects in no way those transactions which are commercial rather than governmental in nature.

As in other countries, we here observed a certain amount of anxiety that we would extend the cargo preference principle to cover commercial, as well as Government-owned or financed cargoes. We did our best to dispel these fears and I feel that in large measure we succeeded.

We also observed a certain amount of concern lest other countries use our cargo-preference bill to justify them in discriminating against the ships of other nations by giving their own vessels a monopoly of all exports and imports. We pointed out that the fact that other nations might selfishly misinterpret our bill was not sufficient reason for

us to repeal it; and on this score we heard no persuasive rebuttal.

That afternoon (August 26) we visited the A. G. Weser yard (Aktiengesellschaft Weser). There we were cordially received by Mr. H. W. Schliephake, vice president, who escorted us on a tour of the yard. Before mentioning a few of our observations I believe it might be helpful if I set forth some general information concerning the A. G. Weser Co. and its yards in Bremen and Bremerhaven:

Prior to 1945, the A. G. Weser Co., with shipyards in Bremen and Bremerhaven, was one of Germany's largest shipbuilding companies. However, it suffered a severe setback as a result of the war. The Bremen yard was almost completely dismantled and delivered to the Soviet Union as reparations. However, buildings and foundations of shipways, which had not been destroyed by bombing, were left intact so that an astonishingly quick reconstruction was possible after the company obtained permission to resume shipbuilding in the Bremen plant in April 1951. The Bremerhaven shipyards were not dismantled and could resume shipbuilding in 1947.

Today the company again is 1 of the 4 largest shipyards in Western Germany. In shipbuilding capacity it probably ranks third or fourth (after Deutsche Werft, Hamburg; Howaldtswerke, Hamburg; and probably also behind Howaldtswerke, Kiel); in number of employees it may rank second or even first. Employment as of June 30, 1954: Bremen yards, total, 6,000, 2,600 thereof in shipbuilding; Bremerhaven yard, total, 3,230, 2,970 thereof in shipbuilding.

The relatively high number of employees as compared with shipbuilding capacity is explained by the fact that a considerable percentage of labor force is engaged in machine construction work (turbines, diesel engines, oil tanks and containers, coupling gear, etc.).

Germany's largest and fastest prewar passenger liner, the *SS Bremen*, was built in A. G. Weser's Bremen shipyards.

The Bremerhaven shipyards, known as A. G. Weser, Werk Seebeck, specialize in fishing and whaling vessels, but they also construct passenger and freight vessels up to 16,000 deadweight tons. There are 2 shipways in Bremerhaven.

Due to the fact that shipyards and machine construction plants in Bremen had to be rebuilt completely after dismantling, the Bremen shipyards today are reportedly equipped with the most up-to-date installations. A large new shipway with travelling cranes has recently been completed. It has a length of 175 meters, width of 35 meters, and a height of 52 meters. The other four shipways in Bremen are equipped with large luffing and slewing cranes. A large hall has been erected for welding sections.

The shipbuilding capacity of the company is reported to be back to the prewar level, although only two-thirds of the former space is occupied due to more efficient production methods and layout. The company owns several floating drydocks for repair work. The largest has a lifting capacity of 16,000 tons; two smaller ones located in the Bremen free-trade zone have lifting capacities of 1,500 to 2,000 tons. The construction of the fourth floating drydock of 12,000 tons lifting capacity is nearing completion. The present equipment enables the company to construct vessels of the largest known size, including tankers, up to 60,000 (d. w. t.). The only limitation will be set by the depth of water at the shipway which is 38 feet in Bremen. The output of the Bremen yard in 1954 was 6 vessels totaling 39,200 (gr. t.), the Bremerhaven yard produced 16 units with a total of 24,800 (gr. t.).

During our visit to the A. G. Weser Bremen yard we found it very busy. In relation to the state of physical condition it must have

been in at the end of the war, the yard seems now to be in excellent shape. Many new buildings already exist and others are under construction. These new structures facilitate the building or prefabrication of many ship components which would otherwise have to be constructed in the open, perhaps on board ship and subject to the impediments of weather.

Large tanker construction, for the account of various American owners and others, seemed to be the cause of much construction activity.

I was pleased to see that in spite of all the war damage, and in spite of the intensity of effort to rebuild and improve their yard, the German workers have not lost their sense of humor. For example, all that remains of one building in the yard is a large smokestack. On it is painted the German equivalent of "no smoking."

We also visited the offices of Captain Daehne, Director of the Bremen Port Authority. He showed us a magnificent mechanized model of the port. From our discussions with him and our personal observations of the port itself it was plainly apparent that Bremen has not only reconstructed many of its facilities which were damaged or destroyed during the war, but it is well on its way to making it a better and busier port than ever before. In fact their facilities for loading and unloading grain are as fine as any I have ever seen.

Of course in speaking or thinking of the port of Bremen, it would be improper to leave the impression that Bremen stands separate and apart from Bremerhaven. Indeed the ports of Bremen are a series of 5 ports, running from Bremerhaven (where the Weser River joins the North Sea) up the Weser, past Bremen-Farge, Bremen-Blumenthal, Bremen-Vegesack to Bremen. The sister towns of Bremen and Bremerhaven make up what some refer to as the "Free Hanseatic Town of Bremen."

On August 27, 1954, Mr. Webster and I left Bremen and traveled to Hamburg where we were met by representatives of the United States consulate in that city. Shortly after arrival we conferred with Dr. Roerhrike, local representative of the Germany Shipowners Association. Thus we had an opportunity to discuss with him and members of the consulate staff the cargo-preference bill. Our impressions were very much the same as those we had received from similar discussions in Bremen.

During our altogether too short weekend stay in Hamburg we made an extensive tour of the harbor in the company of Mr. Widenmann, chief of the Harbor Construction Office. We went into the areas of the port covered by the following shipyards:

1. Deutsche Werft Aktiengesellschaft: This yard has an annual output capacity of about 65,000 (gr. t.). It specializes in the construction of motor and turbine tanker vessels, motor cargo vessels, and refrigerated ships.

2. Howaldtswerke Aktiengesellschaft: This yard has an annual output capacity of approximately 50,000 (gr. t.) and builds all types of vessels. As in Bremen, we noticed a great deal of ocean-going tonnage, mainly of the tanker variety, under construction. Especially memorable was the 47,000 (dw. t.) tanker, *Ibn Saud*, being built by Howaldtswerke Aktiengesellschaft for the Greek shipbuilding magnate, Onassis.

In Hamburg, too, we were shown an excellent model of the port. Dr. Scholvin, of the Federal Ministry of Transportation, shipping section, discussed with us the task of rebuilding the port after the war and how it has progressed.

Here, too, as in Bremen, it seems to me that this port is rapidly becoming better and busier than ever before. In particular, I was impressed with the extensive number of new dockside cargo cranes. Whereas in

Bremen the semiportal type of crane has been used for many years, Hamburg, in reconstructing its port, decided to employ the full-portal type. I was informed that because of the traffic handled through Hamburg, the port organization was compelled to extend the rail-track system on the water side of the sheds which line the wharves; and that this modification entailed an alteration to the crane system. If semiportal cranes had been installed they would have had to have much larger spans than the full-portal variety. I concluded that Hamburg seems to be proceeding on the premise that it can expedite turn-around time of ships by installing more lower-priced cranes rather than fewer of the more expensive type.

Of course the strict competitive rivalry between Bremen and Hamburg is as intense as ever. Indeed it is understandable that the German officials, with whom we discussed maritime matters in both ports, radiated pride in their respective cities.

On Monday morning, August 30, 1954, Mr. Webster and I left Hamburg and arrived in Bonn that afternoon. We were met by Mr. Emerson M. Brown (Chief of the Transportation Section of the Office of Economic Affairs, HICOG) and spent the remainder of that day and evening consulting with Mr. Brown, Mr. John W. Tuthill (Acting Director, OEA, HICOG), Mr. Wier Brown (Chief of the Finance and Program Division, OEA, HICOG, and U. S. Treasury representative), and Mrs. Charles H. Breecher (Acting Chief, Industrial Services Division, OEA, HICOG). That evening we also had the honor of dining and conversing with not only these gentlemen but also with Dr. Westrick, State Secretary of the Federal Ministry of Economics; and Dr. Bergmann, State Secretary of the Federal Ministry for Transportation. I was extremely pleased to have this opportunity to talk with Drs. Westrick and Bergmann for, as you probably know, the positions which they hold are similar to positions held by members of our President's Cabinet. I understand that Dr. Westrick plans to be in the United States in the near future and I am looking forward to the honor of a visit from him.

On August 31, Mr. Webster and I conferred with Drs. Hubner and Schmid of the Shipbuilding Office of the Federal Ministry of Economics. Although we had discussed elsewhere in our trip throughout Germany the cost of vessel construction, I was especially gratified by our conference with these eminent German officials.

That afternoon we had the honor of lunching with Ambassador and Mrs. Conant at their home. Indeed, among the most pleasant and profitable experiences I had abroad was the time I spent that afternoon with the Conants. In view of the fact that EDC had just been defeated in the French Assembly, it is understandable, I believe, that our discussion was not limited to maritime matters. Naturally, I was pessimistic and skeptical about the EDC developments. However, after talking with Ambassador Conant, I felt I had a much better understanding of certain key issues and alternatives. I came away from this meeting with immense confidence in the Ambassador's judgment.

That evening Mr. Webster departed for Genoa, Italy, for the purpose of making arrangements for various conferences and meetings to be held in that city by Senator PURCELL and him when they returned from Rome. The next morning I boarded the Ruhr-Paris express for Paris, and after less than a day in that beautiful city, I left for Cherbourg which I boarded the *SS. Queen Mary*. As you know, there were no American-flag vessels whose schedules would have permitted me to stay in Germany as long as I did and still be back in the United States by September 8, 1954.

In reflecting upon our altogether too short visit to Germany, I believe that certain maritime matters are worthy of additional mention. I have not tried to set them forth in any particular order, but just as they come to mind. They are as follows:

1. In 1953 the German shipyards constructed 66 vessels for foreign account. I was informed that this was 41 percent of their total construction and amounted to 239,500 (gr. t.).

2. The German merchant fleet, as of December 31, 1953, was made up of 2,111 vessels with a total tonnage of 1,930,215 (gr. t.), an increase of 95 vessels of 411,815 (gr. t.) over the level at the close of 1952.

3. The German fleet at the close of 1953 was a little less than one-half of its prewar size of 4 million (gr. t.).

4. The *Gripsholm's* sailing on February 2, 1954, from Bremen to New York under the colors of Norddeutscher Lloyd, and the inclusion of that line in the reorganized Continental North Atlantic Westbound Freight Conference are matters of international interest and significance.

5. The total volume of cargo carried by the German fleet (including cargo carried between foreign ports) in 1953 amounted to 34,200,000 tons as compared to 28,100,000 tons in 1952, an increase of about 22 percent.

6. Passenger traffic carried by the German merchant fleet in 1953 was negligible. German freighter-passenger accommodations were limited to between 6 and 12 passengers. However, German shipowners have started to construct a new type of combined passenger/cargo vessel capable of carrying approximately 86 passengers.

7. German shipbuilding costs increased in 1953, due primarily to higher prices for steel plates and higher wages for German shipyard workers.

8. The main form of national subsidy or aid extended by Germany to encourage merchant vessel construction in that country is found in section 7D of the German income-tax law. This section has enabled German shipowners to accelerate the depreciation of their vessels. More than that, it has authorized German taxpayers receiving excess income to deduct from their taxable income, as operational expenses or business promotion costs, sums of money which they have granted or loaned without interest for the promotion of shipbuilding.

Although this income-tax provision has apparently done much to revive and promote German shipbuilding, I was informed that such tax privileges probably would be abolished effective January 1, 1955. A speech to that effect was delivered to the Bundestag on March 11, 1954, by Dr. Fritz Schaeffer, Federal Finance Minister.

After conferring with Counsel General Cloyce K. Huston, and his assistant, Mr. Alfred Dennis in Genoa, and after making arrangements for Senator PURTELL to confer with local shipping authorities, Mr. Webster joined the Senator as the latter came through Florence bound for Rome. Upon arrival in Rome, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster were met by representatives from the American Embassy. They were disappointed to learn that Ambassador Luce would not be in Rome during their visit. However, they had the benefit of conferring with her immediate assistant, Minister Counselor Elbridge Durbrow.

In Rome they conferred with Mr. John M. Kennedy (the Embassy's commercial attaché), Mr. Thomas A. Lane (the Embassy's labor attaché and chief of the MSA Labor Division), Captain Ralph S. McDowell (Bureau of Ship's representative in charge of offshore procurement) and Mr. Harry H. Phelan (the Embassy's minerals attaché). Their discussions covered matters such as offshore procurement, the labor situation, unemployment, costs, etc., relative to shipbuilding and ship repair.

On September 9, 1954, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster arrived in Genoa. That morning they visited the Ansaldo Shipyards in Genoa, where they conferred with Mr. Federico Lombardi, general manager of the entire Ansaldo Co., and Mr. Giuseppe Carnivale, general manager of Ansaldo's Genoa yard. They learned that this yard has 8 shipways, 2 of which are masonry and 6 of which are movable. The yard's construction capacity was reported to be between 8 and 10 merchant ships of 9,000-10,000 d. w. t. While this yard has employed approximately 6,000 workers, it was employing approximately 4,300 on September 1, 1954. Ansaldo is rightfully proud of the fact that it constructed Italy's newest luxury liner, the *Cristoforo Colombo*, in its Genoa yard.

That afternoon Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster attended a luncheon given by the Genoa Propeller Club. In addition to having an opportunity thus to meet most of the Genoa shipping fraternity—particularly the representatives of American shipping concerns—Senator PURTELL took this occasion to express our committee's most sincere and intense interest in merchant marine matters of all sorts and kinds, wherever they arise or exist. As we had in other places throughout Europe, he invited questions concerning the part our Government plays in merchant marine affairs; and generally held himself open to answer any questions concerning our maritime policies. He emphasized the fact that we as a nation are not interested in having the largest merchant marine in the world. He stressed, however, that we intended to maintain a healthy privately owned merchant fleet of adequate size and strength to prevent a recurrence of the disastrous state of unpreparedness in which we found ourselves at the beginning of World Wars I and II.

After lunch a prearranged meeting was held where he and Mr. Webster conferred at length in the American Consulate with the following people present: Mr. Basil A. McLean, local representative of American Bureau of Shipping; Mr. Harold Vinick, local representative of Stevenson Lines; Mr. Max J. Wolfson, local representative of Lykes Lines; Mr. Alphonse Sasseville, local representative of American Export Lines; Mr. William Sharon, local representative of American President Lines; Vice Consul John H. Barber; Consul General Cloyce K. Huston.

This was a lengthy, rather comprehensive conference during which the representatives of American shipping aired freely many problems which they knew would be of interest to Senator PURTELL. This meeting was revealing and most worthwhile.

The next morning, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster went to the main office of the Ansaldo Co. where they conferred with Dr. Giuseppe Rosini, managing director of the entire Ansaldo Co., and Mr. Federico Lombardi, whom they had met at the shipyard the day before. After their conference, they visited the office of the Industrialists Association of the Province of Genoa. There they conferred with Mr. Alessandro Dufour, prominent Italian industrialist and Mr. Antonio Cerruti, head of OARN, one of Genoa's finest ship repair yards. During these meetings shipbuilding and ship repair problems were discussed.

On Friday, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster went to the home of Prof. Antonio Giordano for the purpose of discussing with him his views on our recent cargo-preference bill. He was recuperating from a recent illness. Members of the United States Consulate staff had brought to their attention the fact that Professor Giordano was in charge of the Genoa office of a well-known and influential economic and financial newspaper published in Milan known as "24 Ore." He had recently written for that paper an article critical of our cargo-preference bill. Since "24 Ore" is highly regarded and carefully read by many

thousands of Italians, it was Senator PURTELL's desire to obtain a better understanding of the professor's point of view and so afford him an opportunity to better appreciate our point of view.

Because Professor Giordano had not received a copy of the Commerce Department's Maritime Subsidy Report, they left with him 1 of the 2 copies which they then had in their possession. In addition, they assured him that should he at any time desire additional information about our maritime program, we would give him what we had available. They observed, as we had in Germany, that the main concern our foreign competitors have about the cargo-preference bill stems from some misunderstanding of its provisions and a lack of information as to the size merchant fleet which our Government believes we must necessarily maintain. Here, too, they found a certain amount of concern that other nations would use the cargo-preference bill as an excuse to enact discriminatory maritime legislation.

To summarize certain of the more important conclusions reached by Senator PURTELL as a result of his various meetings and discussions in Italy, the following:

1. As of September 1, 1954, generally speaking, the Italian shipyards were facing a serious crisis due to lack of work. They were working at approximately 30 percent of full capacity. The major shipbuilder, Ansaldo, is government-owned and controlled.

It is apparently true that material cost in Italy is higher than in any other European country. Some sources estimate that a Liberty ship could be built in Great Britain for approximately 30 to 35 percent less than in Italy. However, other sources estimate that this difference is less, between 10 to 27 percent, leaving aside subsidies in effect and the new Italian law hereinafter discussed. Some sources estimate that at least one-half of this difference is due to Italy's higher material cost, with the remainder attributable to higher labor cost.

2. One of the most disturbing things brought to the attention of Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster was the large number of Communist labor leaders employed in Italian shipyards. The Communists apparently had received little discouragement from management. Evidently it was the thought of some segments of Italian management that this hands-off policy would insure labor peace.

Without elaborating in this report, suffice to say that the domination of labor unions by Communists in shipyards where offshore procurement orders have been placed did not pass unnoticed.

3. On July 17, 1954, an Italian subsidy law, known as the Tambroni law became effective. It is designed to encourage the building of oceangoing tonnage in Italian yards. Its benefits are extended to people of other countries, as well as to Italian nationals. Because of its recent enactment, there is considerable doubt as to the details of how it will operate. Nonetheless, it is expected that the Tambroni law will encourage many people who would have built ships in other countries to place their orders in Italy.

The Italian Government seems to believe that in the next 10 years Italy can modernize her merchant fleet, while at the same time raising her gross tonnage from the present figure of 3.7 million tons to 5 million tons. This would be an increase of 1.5 million tons over that which she possessed before World War II. This would require constructing 2.3 million tons of shipbuilding for Italian account in the next 10 years, or approximately 230,000 tons per year. At present the capacity of all Italian shipyards is rated at 300,000 tons per year.

Mr. Tambroni, the present Minister of Merchant Marine, apparently hopes to attract a substantial amount of foreign contracts in order to keep the Italian yards at the necessary level of business activity. In

considering his approach to the problem, it should be noted that the Italian Government controls 80 percent of Italy's shipbuilding industry and is saddled with 12 billion lire per annum carrying and other charges. With this background, one can better understand why Italy enacted the Tambroni subsidy law (No. 522 of July 17, 1954). The Government seems to have calculated that at 66 percent of capacity Italian yards can revise their cost factors toward a set of lower unit return figures which will not only make the yards competitive with their foreign counterparts but will also absorb the Government's burden.

The Tambroni law is designed to stimulate orders for ship construction and ship-repair work within a specific period of time. Shipowners will be granted exemptions from custom's duties on imported raw materials and finished and semifinished products used in building and repairing ships. Exemption from the Italian general sales tax on internal business transaction will be granted. As a spur to speedy utilization of this program, the subsidy will be decreased 10 percent each year.

Under the Tambroni law the subsidies will be given directly to the shipyards, not to the shipowners. The law states that there is no limit to the amount of repair or building contracts which will be aided by its provisions. Any unused subsidy funds set aside by the Government in any particular year may be carried forward to succeeding years.

4. The effect of the McCarran Act upon seamen and therefore upon the Italian merchant marine was the subject of frequent discussions held by Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster while they were in Italy. Generally speaking, there appears to be a great deal of resentment by the Italians concerning this law. I am attaching as enclosure H copies of 2 articles which appeared in Italian publications in July and August 1954 dealing with the McCarran Act's seamen visa provisions.

Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster left Genoa Friday evening, September 10, for Paris. Sunday morning they boarded the North Star Express and arrived at The Hague late that afternoon. They were met by Mr. Andrea G. Ronhovde (the Embassy's Deputy Chief of Mission), Mr. Howard R. Cottam (the Embassy's Counsel for Economic Affairs), Mr. Thomas McCrairie (maritime attaché for the American Embassy in London), and Mr. Peter Abeille (maritime attaché for the American Embassy in London).

That evening during and after dinner at the Cottam residence, they received a general briefing on the Dutch shipbuilding picture from Mr. Elvin Sibert (United States consul general, Amsterdam), and Mr. Paul J. Reveley (United States consul general, Rotterdam).

On September 13, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster, accompanied by Consul General Reveley, Mr. McCrairie, and Mr. Abeille, visited the Rotterdam Drydock Co. (the Rotterdamsche Droogdok Mij). In 1953, 593 vessels of 2,315,000 gross tons underwent repairs in this yard. The flagship of the Holland-Amerika Lijn, the *Nieuw Amsterdam*, was constructed in this yard, which is hoping to construct a new passenger vessel for the Holland-Amerika Lijn at a cost roughly estimated to be approximately 100 million guilders. This yard is presently operating at close to full employment, 5,000 workers being on the job.

In their tour of the Rotterdam Drydock Co.'s magnificent yard they were accompanied by its director, Mr. Knappe. Senator PURTELL's broad background in American heavy industry and in the allied fields of metallurgy and machine tooling was remarked on several times by Dutch officials. More than once they volunteered their appreciation of his understanding of their production processes and problems.

That afternoon, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster visited the C. Van der Giessen & Sons yard near Rotterdam. This yard has 5 building berths capable of handling up to 32,000 deadweight tons. Its activities are limited to new construction, although occasionally it has done some reconditioning work. Since World War II some 30 vessels have been delivered and another 15 are in the course of construction or on order. The bulk of the yard's output consists of medium-sized cargo and passenger vessels. As with many of the other Dutch yards, it has constructed vessels for owners in other countries, including Argentina, Finland, France, Norway, Switzerland, and the United States.

That evening at the home of Ambassador H. Freeman Matthews, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster met the following people, many of whom hold positions of great influence in Dutch maritime affairs:

Dr. D. G. W. Spitzen (Secretary-General, Ministry of Transport and Waterways).

Dr. J. Q. Bas Backer (Director, Western Hemisphere Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs).

Mr. W. L. de Vries (Director-General of Shipping, Directorate General of Shipping).

Mr. E. A. Plate (Chief, Directorate Industry and Wholesale Ministry of Economic Affairs).

Mr. Th. van der Graaf (Secretary of Directorate for Shipbuilding and Repairs).

Mr. J. W. Hupkes (director of the Kon. Mij "De Schelde" N. V.).

Comdr. J. W. A. Langenberg (Kon. Mij "De Schelde" N. V.).

Dr. P. van der Toorn (director, Holland-America Line).

Mr. S. van West (managing director, Dock & Shipyard Co., "Wilton-Fijenoord").

Mr. E. A. Vreede (secretary to Netherlands Shipowners' Association).

Mr. F. E. Straatemeier (United States Lines).

Mr. Peter van der Giessen (director N. V. C. v. d. Giessen & Zonen's Shipyards).

Mr. A. Knappe (director of the Rotterdam Drydock Co.).

Dr. D. A. Delprat (director Shipping Co. "Nederland").

Mr. J. van Tilburg (deputy to Rotterdam burgomaster).

Mr. Frank C. Grismer (Director FOA Mission).

Mr. Andreas G. Ronhovde (Deputy Chief of Mission).

Mr. Howard R. Cottam (Counselor for Economic Affairs).

Mr. Elvin Sibert (consul general, Amsterdam).

Mr. Paul J. Reveley (consul general, Rotterdam).

Mr. Harold H. Rhodes (first secretary).

Mr. Thomas McCrairie (maritime attaché, American Embassy, London).

Mr. Peter Abeille (maritime attaché, American Embassy, London).

Mr. Robert A. Brand (second secretary).

Mr. Robert Donhauser (Public Affairs Office).

Commander M. B. Davis (assistant naval attaché).

Mr. Oliver M. Marcy (second secretary).

This reception provided Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster an excellent opportunity to discuss with these leaders in Dutch shipping our cargo preference bill, their ship construction costs, their maritime labor situation, and other shipping problems. We understand that this was the first Embassy gathering at which so many major Dutch shipping interests were in attendance.

As a result of their visit to Holland, brief as it was, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster concluded:

1. From a competitive point of view, the shipyards of Holland appear to be ready, willing, and able to compete on at least an equal basis with the yards in any other European country. However, it should

be noted that Holland has lost some business to Germany and appears to consider that country its strongest European shipbuilding rival. In view of the fact that the Tambroni law is so new, it is conceivable that Italy might well establish itself as a strong competitor for the position of shipbuilding supremacy presently held by Holland.

2. The labor situation in Holland, in relation to that in other European countries, is very good. Labor strife is relatively rare; the labor force apparently is receptive to improved productive processes; and Holland's quantity of skilled and experienced shipbuilding labor is large. In this connection, it should be noted that Dutch shipbuilders are somewhat concerned about the difficulty of obtaining apprentices or trainees. Their labor problem appears to be one of shortage rather than surplus.

The stability of the Dutch labor situation is evidenced by the fact that apparently some yards are willing to enter into fixed-price contracts if they can be completed within 18 months.

3. In addition to vessel construction and repair, most of Holland's shipyards are extensively engaged in performing work for other industries. Thus, these yards which are reported to be the best equipped in Europe, are apparently using their ingenuity and initiative in order to obtain maximum utilization of plant and facilities.

On Tuesday, September 14, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster sailed from Holland for England. They arrived in London that evening. The next day they conferred with Rear Adm. A. L. P. Mark-Wardlaw, R. N. (retired), (president of the executive committee, International Cargo Handling Coordination Association), Mr. Rex B. Sheppard, C. B. E. (director, the Shipbuilding Conference), Mr. Winthrop G. Brown (deputy to the Minister for Economic Affairs, American Embassy) and Mr. Thomas McCrairie. Among the matters they discussed were the International Cargo Handling Coordination Association Conference recently held in Naples, Italy; the McCarran Act's seamen visa provisions; the cargo preference bill; and the state of shipbuilding in the United Kingdom. Rear Admiral Mark-Wardlaw gave Senator PURTELL various publications relating to the Naples Conference. * * * I call your attention in particular to the following articles which appear in the attached copy of the Journal of Commerce, International Cargo Handling Conference number, published June 25, 1954:

1. Some Impressions of the Naples Conference, by Charles Birchall.

2. A Stevedore's Point of View, by G. Sirtaine.

3. Some Problems of Administration (of the Ideal Port), by B. Nagorski.

4. New Cargo Cranes at Hamburg, by Dr. Hans Neumann.

That evening, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster left London and arrived in Glasgow the next morning. There they visited two of the United Kingdom's finest and best-known shipyards, the Fairfield Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd., and John Brown & Co., Ltd.

At the Fairfield yard they conferred at some length with the managing director, Vice Adm. A. W. Longley-Cook, C. B., C. B. E., D. S. O., managing director, Fairfield Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd. At the John Brown yard that afternoon they met and conferred with the following gentlemen: Mr. J. W. Begg, financial director; Mr. John Rennie, shipyard director; Mr. J. H. Johnston, general manager, engine works; Mr. A. N. Benson, secretary; Mr. J. B. Bucher, head of gas turbine department.

Unfortunately, Sir James M. McNeill, K. C. V. O., managing director of the John Brown yard whom they had hoped to meet, was absent.

The Fairfield Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Ltd., has six berths. It is capable of constructing vessels up to 1,000 feet in length. Over the years, it has excelled in the production of warships, passenger and cargo vessels, tankers and ore carriers. John Brown & Co., Ltd.'s yard has seven berths and is capable of constructing vessels exceeding 1,000 feet in length. Its annual output capacity is approximately 90,000 tons. Some of Britain's finest passenger vessels have been constructed in this yard, as well as high-grade refrigerated cargo vessels, tankers, cross-channel steamers, and train ferries.

On Friday, September 17, Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster left Glasgow for Dublin. They arrived in the latter city Saturday morning. That afternoon during lunch with Ambassador and Mrs. William Taft they not only discussed various maritime matters, but also many others in which the two countries have mutual interests. The seamen visa provisions of the McCarran Act and our cargo-preference bill were, of course, the subject of extensive discussions between Senator PURTELL, Ambassador Taft, and members of the Ambassador's staff.

While Senator PURTELL was in Dublin he met and conferred with various high-ranking members of the Irish Government, some of whom he had worked with at the Interparliamentary Conference in Vienna.

I am attaching as enclosure K certain material gathered by Senator PURTELL concerning shipping and shipbuilding in Ireland. It is, indeed, worthy of note that the Harland & Wolf yard in Belfast, the largest shipyard in Ireland, has recently constructed the *Southern Cross*, a beautiful 20,000-ton liner. You might recall that this fine vessel was built for the Shaw Savill Line and was launched by the Queen last August. This vessel is somewhat unique among passenger vessels in that her boilers and engines are installed aft. She is designed to carry 1,200 passengers in tourist-class accommodations. She will carry no cargo on her four voyages around the world each year. It is planned that she will link Britain with South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster returned to London on September 21. While there they conferred with Ambassador Aldrich. They also held a brief conference with Mr. J. Hancock, London representative for the South Pacific Steamship Lines.

Later that afternoon, accompanied by Mr. Thomas McCrae, they visited the offices of the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom. There they conferred at length with its president, Mr. J. C. Denholm, C. B. E.; its vice president, Mr. A. I. Anderson (chairman, Orient Steam Navigation Co.); its general manager, Mr. H. E. Gorick, C. B. E.; and its assistant manager, Mr. R. G. Malloch Brown. These gentlemen were deeply concerned about our cargo-preference bill. Senator PURTELL and Mr. Webster tried to answer all of the questions raised by these gentlemen. However, they were unable to answer to their own satisfaction one or two of the matters raised by the representatives of the Chamber of Shipping and gave assurances that the Department of Commerce would be asked to supply the information desired. Steps have been taken to secure this information and upon its receipt it will be forwarded to Mr. Denholm.

As Senator PURTELL discovered when he was in Genoa discussing the matter with Professor Giordano, the representatives of the Chamber of Shipping had not been furnished copies of the Commerce Department's Maritime Subsidy Policy Report. Copies of this important document have been forwarded to Mr. Denholm.

Senator PURTELL reports that after visiting the British Isles he reached the following conclusions, among others:

1. Shipbuilding costs are now about 4 times as high in 1939 and approximately twice as high as in 1945-46. There are no signs of a reduction or even of stabilization; and increases in shipyard wages and steel prices further aggravate this problem. Britain's budget in 1954 made some concessions to shipowners as to other industrialists by the introduction of the 20-percent investment allowance.

However, as in this country, the accrued tax-free depreciation goes but a little way toward meeting replacement costs, and the balance must come from borrowing or from profits, if any. British shipowners seem agreed that the solution to their problem is to revise the existing system of taxation, and particularly the system of assessing depreciation allowances on the basis of original cost without referring to higher replacement cost.

2. Britain's merchant fleet, while not as obsolete as this country's, is nonetheless composed of many vessels of 20 years of age.

3. In an article appearing in the September 13 issue of the *Times*, the following statements seem pertinent and authoritative:

"Although British shipowners are having to meet increasing competition from foreign flags, including those of countries with 'artificial fleets' either State-subsidized or financed by foreign nationals, and although British shipbuilders now face severe competition from foreign shipyards—particularly in Germany—some significant comparisons may be made from the figures set forth in Lloyd's Register shipbuilding returns. In respect of the amounts of work under construction in the United Kingdom and abroad at the end of June (the most recent date for which figures are available) it can be seen that the British figure of 2,195,000 tons gross represented 38 per cent of the world total—an increase of 3 per cent over June last year. Germany was still the leading foreign competitor, with 12 percent of the total, followed by the Netherlands, Sweden, France, the United States, Japan, and Italy, in that order.

"Tonnage under construction overseas showed a substantial fall of 260,000 tons from the previous midsummer, compared with a rise of 72,000 in the United Kingdom during the same period. This divergence may be attributed to the fact that the worldwide decline in the placing of new orders has had a more immediate effect on foreign yards, particularly those in Western Europe, since they have a higher productive tempo—largely due to three-shift working—and a smaller backlog of orders than most British yards . . .

"While foreign shipyards are now bidding more keenly for new orders than at any time since the end of the war, some of them are helped substantially by various economic devices. In France and Italy there are direct State subsidies, while in Western Germany there are taxation reliefs and low rates of interest on loans. In some of the Scandinavian countries and in the Netherlands there are long-term credit provisions backed by the State or by municipalities. British shipbuilders enjoy no such artificial aids and their existence elsewhere makes competitive pressure all the stronger. The shipbuilding conference has stated on behalf of the industry as a whole that while it has never sought direct State assistance it looks to the Government of the day to create conditions in which private enterprise can flourish.

"Since the war British shipbuilders have spent heavily on the modernization and re-equipment of their yards. Some of them are now as well-armed for the competitive struggle as their foreign rivals. But on the labor side of the industry the situation is somewhat different. On the continent longer hours, lower real wages and piece-work rates, shift working round the clock,

and an absence of strict demarcation between various jobs are the general rule; and foreign shipbuilding employers can therefore make the fullest possible use of their physical equipment."

In closing, let me express for Senator PURTELL, Mr. Webster, and myself our appreciation of the opportunity afforded us to visit the various countries we did and participate in the many interesting events which I have discussed in this letter. We feel that as a result of our trip we have a much better understanding of the views of our friends in the various European countries we visited. In addition, we believe that those with whom we discussed America's maritime policies have a better and more sympathetic appreciation of the many serious problems we face in this field.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Chairman, Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee.

Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting article by Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers Union of America, which appeared in the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, Thursday, December 30, 1954:

A CRITIQUE OF BIG BUSINESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Trade union economists, claiming we in this country are relaxing vigilance against "economic giants," cautions against toleration of big business. Says trade unions recognize big business as a threat against well-being of the mass of Americans, but denies that "big unions," themselves are monopolies or a hindrance to public welfare. Holds executives of big business not only control our economic life, but exercise extraordinary powers over our political institutions.)

The Government's success in promoting high employment and stimulating national and personal advances should not become a justification for glorifying big business or relaxing our determination to dissolve these aggregations of economic power. Individual well-being and confidence, realized through a 20-year battle against monolithic business bureaucrats, are in danger as a result of their success in regaining public prestige, prominence and political power. Apologetics may temporarily divert men as they appraise the soundness of the defenses. But on analysis, these arguments melt away, as inadequate. Citizens' organizations for united action such as labor unions are no justification for vast concentrations of economic power. The countervailing forces are limited in scope and not equal to the challenge of balancing corporate power.

We are relaxing our vigilance against the economic giants at a time when other countries, such as Great Britain and Canada, are adopting the philosophy and techniques of our antitrust movement. Others, like Japan and Germany, are restraining their monopolies or cartels at our Government's insistence. This Nation was profoundly convinced that big business organizations aided and abetted the totalitarian aggressors. In other countries they had established a tight grip

upon the economy which inhibited expansion. This country has a long history of public suspicion of big business. But we are now urged to tolerate the institution and relax our inadequate restrictions because our national economy has, for a short time, operated at full or high employment levels.

The American trade unionist cannot accept this position. He recognizes in big business a formidable threat to the well-being of the mass of Americans. Despite the temptation for the trade-union movement to retire from this battle, to collect the special fruits of negotiations with big concerns, or to discourage the diversionary, baseless political counteroffensive against big unionism, its national leadership, almost alone among the organized interest groups, has continued steadfastly to support curbs on big business. No real trade unionist can give credence to professions that unions are capable of matching the corporation's power, even in the area of industrial relations.

The recent efforts to popularize big business have set at rest one issue. Its existence is now acknowledged. We are in agreement that it is a major force in our economy. Instead of denying its power and protesting the prevalence of a competitive society, we now hear broad claims of the indispensability of big corporations. They are the cornerstone of America's wealth and progress. The former evils, it is claimed, have either disappeared or been submerged by the constructive results of their operations.

One technical issue still persists. The apologists argue that industrial concentration is not as great as it was at the beginning of the century. It has grown absolutely, but has not kept pace with the growth of our economy. However, statistical measures, better attuned to measure economic domination in our age, can readily establish that its relative position has not dwindled and has possibly grown.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF BIG BUSINESS MUST BE QUESTIONED

The principal new defense of big business is its alleged capacity for developing, financing and installing industrial change. The big corporations are better able to maintain research facilities, finance the experimental and pilot operations, and market the new products. America's industrial progressiveness is equated with big business. Without the experience coming from the operations of the giant corporation, we would not have been able to operate our war economy.

This defense sounds quite contrived, coming at a time when Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, formerly director of reactor development of the Atomic Energy Commission, bluntly informs management that it has neglected the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful uses. Postwar industrial research was largely financed by the Government, although much of the work itself was done by corporations on contract with the Government. The development of consulting research institutions as well as the facilities in universities ready to accept contracts from private industry and Government should help explode the myth of any special research competence on the part of the big corporation. The real complaint is that industry's concentration on practical problems has retarded our progress in the pure sciences.

Big corporations have, in the past, been associated with restrictive practices and cartels. The investigations of the Temporary National Economic Committee had much to reveal of the repressive effect of large aggregates of power on new innovations.

In other countries, where the competitive tradition is less strongly established and the Government is less vigilant, we can ascribe part of the prevailing economic stagnancy to the lack of venturesomeness of the large, established corporations.

Must we not, therefore, look to factors other than large-scale business for the pe-

culiar stimulants to the progressiveness of our economy? May it not be that the very contributions by big corporations were encouraged by special privileges and the competitive advantages granted them by the Government? They were primarily responsible for obtaining for business at the beginning of World War II, the privilege of accelerated depreciation, as the price for conversion to military production. They obtained a disproportionate share of the procurement contracts, certificates of necessity for new construction, Government plants and equipment, and management contracts to operate Government properties and research. These financial privileges permitted them to grow, to become enriched and to master the art of large-scale management of production.

The failure of small business, the special small business agencies within the Government and the congressional committees to get a reasonable share of government work for small business speaks eloquently of the vast economic power of the large corporations and their successful liaison with the procurement and military authorities. Frequently, the latter were recruited from these very large businesses on a dollar-a-year basis.

Our past experience supports the conclusion that the rate of industrial change would be stimulated by the existence of a greater multiplicity of enterprises. The new industrial era makes research indispensable to the life of a business, quite independent of its size. The fact that large corporations contrived, with Government assistance, to get an early start, is no basis for believing that they alone are equipped for this job. The existence of numbers of small concerns marketing new products attests to this conclusion. But they are no competitive match for the corporate giants.

The increasing availability of competent research men permits of their use by a broader range of concerns. The multiplication of research agencies for special fields reaffirms our conviction that business, the Government, and the universities can develop new research organizations to serve an industry or process users, without being dependent upon a specific large corporation. Fundamental research may have to continue even more broadly than at present to be a public function.

The spokesmen for big business are not on strong ground when they contend that big business tends necessarily to be more efficient. The current recession has provided an abundant array of names of large companies in financial and competitive difficulties because managerial ineptness had left them unprepared for current problems. Many mergers and purchases of corporations are inspired for reasons of tax advantage, financial manipulation and personal self-interest, rather than the attainment of the optimum size of enterprise. Evidence is abundant that the desirable size of production units is much smaller than those of the very large corporations. The economies of centralized management can be attained in smaller than current large units, as witnessed by the drive for decentralization of corporate activities.

Top management is unable to direct operations in big business enterprises on the basis of intimate knowledge. No one can argue that the wide diversity of products of the giant corporations are essential for their efficiency. They serve primarily to perpetuate current property owners through use of monies which would otherwise have to be paid as taxes. A study of the history of these large firms shows that their position was gained through earlier mergers rather than any special record of efficiency.

ABUSES AND DANGERS OF BIG BUSINESS

If support for big business cannot be convincingly developed on the basis of its particular capacity for innovation and efficiency, the abundant evidence of dangers and abuses and the problems big business presents to our democratic society are truly

alarming. Big business has eliminated the traditional types of competition. Prices are now set by deliberate choice; production schedules are designed for specific business objectives, including maximum profits; innovations are introduced when older products or processes become a business drawback or when industrial prestige dictates. Whatever the decision, it is deliberately reached on review of benefits, rather than forced through competitive pressures. National efficiency is no necessary byproduct. The major decision-making authorities are highly centralized in corporations, and the costs of ineptness and bad judgment are huge. Many of us would argue, with considerable documentary support, that big business policies on prices, wages, and investments were the critical factors in precipitating our great disaster of 1929.

Their economic influence extends far beyond the reaches of their own corporate confines. The large corporations are governed by men with wide interests and influences in other enterprises. Cases have been paraded of interlocking officers and directors helping decide the course of business relations and the prices and volumes of related enterprises. Understandings and concurrence of policy and action are further promoted by the use of common service agencies, such as banks, tax experts, lawyers, engineers, labor relations men, and other consultants. But beyond these direct influences, we must recognize the vast empires of suppliers, dealers and purchasers dependent upon these business giants and subservient to their interests.

The large corporation is usually administered by a small group, whose voice dictates and dominates policy and action. Their financial interest is usually small, but their rewards are generous through their own controls. Members of boards of directors often find their greatest rewards in guiding business to their own financial affiliates. Stockholders appear to be more like people invited by management to supply money rather than men who hire the management. They are kept satisfied with regular and occasional extra dividends. The voting machine is controlled by the "inside" management. Even in battles between conflicting financial groups, arising at a time of crisis, the stockholder is given the choice of surrendering his judgment to one or the other group, as the appeals are never buttressed by platforms or programs. The charters give the stockholders few powers to initiate or review. Even in this era of advanced stockholder relations, he is treated as an outsider to whom select decisions are referred as they are released to the public.

The large corporation is truly an institution endowed with public interest, usually privately controlled by a small clique, affiliated with others in the "management class." Most of the limits on the managers' powers are vague and not truly restrictive. They have little to answer for as long as the enterprise is profitable and dividends are regularly paid.

The executives not only control our economic life through these corporations, but exercise extraordinary powers on political institutions. True, under the New Deal, they lost out in significant areas of our National Government, and the reaction to the depression swept them out of dominant positions in many State and local governments. But persistent effort and generous financial assistance and gratuities have reestablished their influence at the local and State levels sufficiently to endear the principle of State's rights. After an arduous campaign to recapture the Federal Administration, starting in 1938 with the Liberty League, big business rode in with the Eisenhower administration. Its objectives are to reduce governmental activities and supervision, free big business of restraints, and transfer decisions from Government to its provinces,

Public relations programs, lobbying expenditures, and special efforts to influence legislators and administrators reflect the tremendous resources at their command to secure favors. The results have justified the effort. Government contracts, grants for research, certificates of necessity, financing facilities, plant structures, windfall profits, and accelerated depreciation privileges have more than balanced the costs. Direct appeals to the legislatures have brought special tax gains for the large corporations, with resulting more liberal depreciation allowances and other tax benefits.

Vexed by the prevailing, historic disapproval of bigness in the United States these men have embarked on a campaign to restore their prestige and influence in our cultural and communal life. The law has given them ample resources, since tax exemptions enable the corporate officials to spend public funds for educational or civic purposes so as to build up recognition and power. Their own payrolls carry many skilled persons prepared to sell the public on the big corporation. The multiplicity of recent books, including those providing no personal advantage to the writers, speak of the scope of current efforts at promoting public approval. The crest of this campaign was reached when President Eisenhower pronounced in his annual message that "size alone does not preclude effective competition." Others have served big business with rationalization for their high prices stressing the need for self-financing of expansion, or with polemics for LIFO methods of valuing inventory and price adjustments on assets.

Their efforts to win public approval would not warrant criticism if business enterprises were public relations institutions. They are, however, chartered for production and sales for specific business ventures and not as educational, political, or propaganda agencies, organized to direct our political and social thought. The Corrupt Practices Act prohibits contributions to political campaigns. Are not these other uses of tax-exempt funds and corporation income, most often without stockholder approval, equally unjustified or irrelevant to the functions of the business enterprise?

ARE COMPETITION AND COUNTERVAILING FORCES ENOUGH TO BALANCE BIG BUSINESS IN THE UNITED STATES?

The above developments have raised serious doubts as to the wisdom of the decisions and the use made of the concentrated economic power held by the managers of big business. In our political life, we have the means with which to counterbalance their influence and ambitions for domination. True, the struggle for real political democracy is not an equal one because of their financial resources, influence over the press and channels of communication. In fact, we know only too well the devious techniques used to infiltrate both parties, though predominantly the Republican.

Individual freedom and our traditions of free speech and thought have served to protect us in our cultural and communal affairs. But even in that area, the extensive employment or endowment of professional groups by big business has distorted the perspective of many members of such groups. The battle to preserve individual independence is a continuous one.

What have we to rely upon in our economic society? Competition among producers or sellers has been severely restricted as a restraining and controlling influence. A vast number of our markets, defined according to one's own tests, are dominated by a few producers or sellers. Moreover, the Government has had to restrict the operation of competitive forces in some areas, because they were so destructive of labor standards or terms of trade. Of course, some business-

men, including some most vocal on the need for competition, have obtained governmental protection for price fixing, as in the case of the resale price maintenance laws.

With competition widely recognized by the consumer as no longer dominant, the economist came along to document the conclusion with fact and theory. This onslaught on big business prestige brought few immediate defenses, since the 1929 depression had already reduced its stature. But, at the beginning of the forties, new responses became available, heralded by J. M. Clark's essay on *Workable Competition*. Since then we have heard a number of defenses of bigness.

The superior rate of innovation resulting from large business organization, it is claimed, provides an adequate substitution for older types of competition. The loss in economic efficiency and the temporary high price created by administered price levels are offset by the subsequent lower price level of the successor items. Competition has been broadened from bargaining among producers trying to sell the same item to producers selling competitive and alternative products or services. The battle for the consumer's dollar has become a real economic force with the increase in the volume and importance of discretionary buying, driving down prices and stimulating efficiency. While advertising and other nonprice appeals are the principal leverages, the long-run effects on price are favorable.

The results of economic activity, rather than the form of business organization, must be the test by which to judge business performance. "Workable competition" must substitute for "pure competition." But the theorists have not supplied us with adequate tests of "workable competition" or means of measuring the degree of decentralization of power. Too often in the past, formalistic criteria, such as uniform prices obtained in a competitive market, are employed to justify monopolistic behavior, without looking behind the economic effects of the corporation's and industry's entire behavior.

John Kenneth Galbraith focuses on another force in the economy to assure us that we can live with bigness. Countervailing powers counteract and balance the primary concentration of power. They are nurtured in the same environment, among the actual or potential victims, to curb the abuses and the misuse of power employed against them. In a most optimistic mood, he conceives it as being a self-generating force which can keep our private economy in balance and make government intervention unnecessary.

Neither approach to the vital challenge of big business in a democratic society is reassuring. The first suggestion, that we test our economy not in terms of size of units or structure, but by results, continually fails us. The data for testing the conclusion are inadequate and the apologists have not even enrolled big business into their camp to provide them with the sinews of defense. Pragmatic tests are few. They tend to be satisfied with proof of absence of collusion or complete monopolistic domination. Otherwise, the case rests upon assigning credit to big business for the postwar prosperity and obligingly forgetting the collapse of 1929 and the failures of the '30's.

Big corporations are not pressed to reduce prices to real cost levels. The influences affecting decisions are many, including the desire for maximum or reasonable profits—whichever phrase is most pleasing—both over long and short periods, and other factors of policy, such as substitutes, public reaction, and prevailing industrial codes. These are limiting factors on, and not determinants of, prices. The decision is management's. The selected lever of returns depends completely on the reconciliation it chooses. As for the consumer's freedom to

react, it is limited by the allegiances he has developed, as a result of advertising and social pressures, to particular goods and specific brands.

The overall decisions are not conducive to the best economic efficiency. At times, the efficient will forego business, such as Government contracts for tanks, or will maintain high prices to prevent his small competitors from going out of business, lest he incur the public's wrath and to assuage public resentment against monopoly. Results are not sufficient to test an institution; motives are equally important.

Just as prices are determined by a combination of motives involving profit and industrial position, so are other decisions on innovation, volume of production, and competitive behavior. Many are the abuses of economic power when the latitude is so wide and the limits of discretion so broad.

Limitations on investment are common when the market is producing profits; discouragement of new entrants is strong when the public eye is not focused on an industry. Yet the same corporations are quite ready to encourage favorable opinion when criticism is gathering on the horizon, by leasing their know-how to other firms, as Du Pont has done in the case of both nylon and cellophane production. If suspicions of avarice are becoming too widespread, they are quite prepared to mitigate them with generous contributions to public purposes of tax exempt funds.

The theory that each oligopolist begets his own counterpoise is a reassuring thesis. But the author himself has many misgivings about its reliability. There are vast areas where such countervailing forces do not exist. Unfortunately, in the field from which he gets his clearest inspiration—labor—there are many zones of concentrated power, including chemicals and textiles, in which there are no pervasive union organizations. The big corporations employing white collar persons have not been counterbalanced by corresponding labor organization to assure equality of bargaining in this area.

The new countervailing institutions require a "minimum of opportunity and a capacity for organization." They are often lacking or weak, particularly when the Government is controlled by the oligopolists themselves, intent upon preventing new countervailing groups from arising and destroying those which exist. The present employer-oriented National Labor Relations Board provides little encouragement for the appearance of independent labor organization.

If government is necessary to bring into being and to nurture the countervailing forces, as Galbraith observes, might we not first concern ourselves with the problem of maintaining an administration favorable to such operations?

Furthermore, there are industries where such countervailing organizations are unlikely to appear because of the predominance of the giants. To the automobile industries, thus safe from countervailing forces in the manufacture and selling, we would add tobacco, film producers, liquor, household appliances, and other durable goods manufacturers. Even the retailers, engaged in the new forms of large-scale retailing, who have reduced marketing costs through greater efficiencies, have not really reduced the manufacturer's prices except by intruding in his field.

The faith in this alternative becomes even less firm when we are told that countervailing forces are effective only in periods of recession, deflation, or depression. But our tolerance of big business developed in the postwar years, when inflationary tendencies, if not outright inflation, prevailed. Our suspicions of big business grew strongest and criticisms harshest when countervailing forces are allegedly most operative. It was

in the thirties that the big corporations most ardently pursued restrictive production, investment, and high price policies. This combination of views is hardly tenable.

Galbraith declares that his countervailing forces, where they exist, will not give "an ideal distribution and employment of resources." They will only operate in the "right direction," which is, presumably, countervailing pressure against abuse of private power. We cannot be even assured that where they exist they will offset the primary power in every area of its decision making. The trade union will, at best, only balance in the area of relations with workers, the farmer on his purchases, etc. What is to be done to insure complete coverage where the self-generating forces nurtured by government do not produce the adequate countervailing force for some areas? Can this position relieve us of our anxiety about the power of big business even in the economic area, where we must constantly search out or create new institutions and find substitutes for countervailing forces where they do not arise?

BIG UNIONISM

A major diversionary move, designed to sidetrack attacks on big business and to curb organized labor, takes the form of a demand to bring unions within the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks is the most recent protagonist of this position, carrying it from the point where the National Association of Manufacturers left it during the debates on the Taft-Hartley Act.

The fundamental fact is that trade unions bargain with management on terms of employment and not on the price of goods and services. The law has long recognized that human labor is not a commodity.

The results are not determined by workers, but are agreements of two really opposing parties. If management's decisions are influenced by its monopolistic or dominant position in the market and its confidence in its ability, as price leader, to pass on the cost of improvements to labor, then the issue is no different than any other management decision in our era of big business. We should curb its power and not the workers' organization, a major countervailing force in our society. If any correction is to be made, it should be to increase the protection provided workers organizing in areas where big business is now able to suppress such organization with the aid of the Taft-Hartley Act and the present National Labor Relations Board.

The existence of a national labor organization does not in itself establish national bargaining. Many national unions in localized industries depend completely on autonomous local negotiations. As a matter of fact, little industrywide bargaining exists in the United States. Pattern bargaining predominates. The industry usually waits for the conclusion of labor agreements with its leader or pattern-setter for guidance on its settlements with other companies. This practice of following the leader on labor standards antedates collective bargaining and originates in many industries with the determination to resist labor organization. Union agreements with satellite companies are often on less favorable terms to the workers than those with the leader.

The cry of "big unionism" is a smoke-screen to hide the determination to destroy effective unionism.

The major problem of big, as well as small unions and other membership institutions, is that of assuring a proper voice and safeguard for the individual's freedom therein, without atomizing the organization itself and reducing its bargaining power. Many promising developments have been instituted in this area.

CONCLUSION

Big business is a challenge to the American people. Its power and dominance must

be kept under constant surveillance. The new prestige cultivated in the postwar years has served it well in gathering new privileges and incentives and in extending its authority. Its influence in our political, social, and cultural life has deepened greatly. Under the stimulus of national emergencies and an expanding economy, together with special benefits and incentives, big business grew and subordinated many restrictive practices and inclinations. But this does not mean that they have been eliminated. It requires a strong trade union movement, a high level of taxes, and a Federal administration responsive to many equalitarian and diverse interests, to maintain some economic balance.

Many of these essentials for countervailing pressures have waned, particularly with the new national administration's alliance with big business. We have no systematic procedures nor do we possess adequate countervailing forces to pressure big business to act constantly in the public interest, promote national efficiency, assure adequate utilization of resources, provide the lowest possible prices for services and goods, and help maintain and expand a full employment economy. These forces in our democratic machinery are lacking.

Many doubts have been voiced concerning the adequacy of our enforcement of the antitrust laws. The courts have not been too helpful and the Department of Justice has not always been sufficiently vigilant. Nevertheless, these laws and court decisions have inhibited big business in cartelizing its powers. A simpler procedure for enforcement would be helpful. But above all else, we need more specific legislative definitions of undesirable practice, restrictions on bigness, and more powers for regulation.

Big corporations must be incorporated by the Federal Government and subject to an identical system of limitations. The Federal agency should be furnished with regular reports on policy, performance, and results and should be entitled, on its own motions or on public complaint, to survey individual corporations for behavior in conflict with the public interest. Criteria should be developed to define the types of big corporations and businesses which should be dissolved, as were the public utility holding corporations in the thirties.

The beneficiaries of public privileges and financial incentives should be particularly responsible for meeting tests of constructive business practice, progressive management, reasonable price levels, and constructive collective bargaining. Where the market itself cannot effectively operate to pressure prices and production to efficiency levels, we must substitute public review. The present Corrupt Practices Act prohibits corporations from intruding into our political life. A code is necessary for limiting the use of tax exempt funds and corporate payrolls to influence our social, cultural, and communal institutions.

Big corporations are public institutions dominated and governed by private interests. Those who abuse their power should be dissolved. The others should be subject to constant public scrutiny.

Aircraft Carrier Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to set forth in the Record a most significant

and enlightening article by James H. Smith, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Air), which appeared in the February 1955 issue of United States Naval Institute Proceedings:

MOBILE SEA BASE SYSTEMS IN NUCLEAR WARFARE

It is increasingly evident that nuclear warfare is refocusing attention upon the need for a military force based on the high seas. Rather than diminishing the future value and need of a Navy, the advent of the atom, like that of the airplane, has reemphasized the importance of seapower.

In modern warfare the offense has taken a commanding lead over the defense. This lead is a product of the nuclear weapon and its sharply increased lethal radius. Even so, a reasonable defense against nuclear explosives might be devised, were it not for the tremendous increase in the speed of the vehicle delivering the explosive. The speed of these vehicles—whether they are today's supersonic jet bombers or tomorrow's long-range missiles—reduces the warning period before an attack and, consequently, the time in which we can bring our defense to bear. The destruction of the attacker is therefore up to defenses that are already in place.

A handful of men operating offensive, nuclear weapons today can do more damage than an entire army in the past, and they can do it at a distance of thousands of miles from their home base and within hours (ultimately, minutes) of the decision to attack. Even against a 90 percent effective defense—an almost incredible effectiveness level—they could probably achieve a rate of destruction critical to the defender.

It would be hard to estimate what percent of effectiveness could be achieved by the defense against an enemy jet bomber attack. It is known that against future missiles of the improved V-2 type there is no practicable defense. Against those prospective missiles the only solution—and against today's weapons a more effective solution—is to destroy the bases from which they might be launched.

These facts lead to several conclusions which appear valid for the medium-term future:

First: The offensive can inflict devastating results despite any foreseeable defensive effort.

Second: The best defense is an overwhelming counteroffense, directed primarily at the bases and sources of the enemy striking forces.

Third: National security, unless one can be sure of striking first, lies in convincing an enemy that even if he strikes the first blow, he cannot prevent an overwhelming and possibly fatal counterattack against his airpower and other nuclear weapons potentials.

Since it is the consistent policy of the United States not to initiate preventive war, it is plain that our deterrent of war before it starts (and our survival if it does) depends on our ability to counterattack promptly and with great force and precision no matter how severe the enemy's initial attack. Such a defense requires two things: First, the United States long-range weapons and their delivery systems must remain adequate in numbers and second to none in quality. Second, the bases from which these weapons are launched must neither be nor appear to be vulnerable to an enemy's initial attack. This last requirement cannot be overemphasized. The present contest is not a game in which the aces are hidden. The enemy must know and know well that his best calculations and best efforts cannot earn him immunity from a blow of magnitude equal to, or greater than, that which he has attempted.

Therefore the security of the base system from which our retaliatory attack is launched is a major concern of our military

planners. To compensate for the limited range of our present bombers and missiles, we now have bases well advanced toward the enemy targets. Yet fixed bases on foreign soil in close proximity to the enemy cannot always be used—because of problems of sovereignty. Nor can they be defended adequately. In these advanced locations they offer the most obvious, immovable, exposed targets for surprise attack by relatively short-range enemy nuclear weapons.

The concentration of all the services on increasing the range of our weapons steadily reduces our dependence on bases near the target. However, a corresponding increase in range of enemy weapons would also make even our immovable home bases vulnerable to sudden overwhelming attacks which could prevent our counterattack.

In a recent magazine article Gen. Charles A. Lindbergh pointed to the vulnerability of airbases as a weak spot in our atomic deterrent potential. He emphasized the importance of decentralizing and scattering our bases to prevent their simultaneous destruction. He assumed quite logically that we cannot conceal the location of our land bases from enemy intelligence agents.

On the other hand, sea bases can be readily decentralized and scattered and their location cannot be predicted by the enemy. This is of great importance because long-range pilotless missiles such as those developed from German V-1 and V-2 types (which will be among the major threats to our fixed land bases in the future) cannot be used effectively against moving targets. This is a fundamental weakness inherent in the guidance problem for very long-range missiles. This weakness confers a very great advantage on the nation that invests a goodly share of its deterrent and retaliatory potential in forces operating from mobile bases.

It is therefore submitted that:

1. Our defense in nuclear warfare must be based primarily on a well-advertised ability and intention to counterattack with overwhelming force.

2. For maximum assurance against a surprise attack, at least a part of the United States counterattack potential must be decentralized and dispersed far and wide on moving bases. This might be called an ultimate or an additional deterrent, supplementing our fixed-base striking forces. In any event it is so important that if we did not have mobile sea bases we should be forced to invent them. Fortunately we have them.

The most practical moving base for an offensive weapon today is that which moves on water. There are several such bases. It can be a surface ship such as the carrier or it can be a submarine from which aircraft or missiles are launched, or simply the sea itself from which seaplanes supplied by mobile tenders operate against the target. Moving bases may eventually shift to the air, but such a development requires endurance in aircraft beyond anything presently in sight. For today's use, inventing an American mobile deterrent force for the atomic age is not necessary. Because the Navy has not lost sight of the strategic and tactical value of mobility which the sea provides, naval power stands squarely in the road to meet future national strategic requirements.

On this faith in the enduring virtues of mobility the American carrier striking force was founded. That force is mobile deterrent power today. Furthermore, carrier forces have the additional virtue, uncommon these days, of diverting enemy intentions and weapons away from our populated areas and out to sea. This is extremely important when considering such things as radioactive "fallout."

The mobile deterrent forces the United States will need must have three characteristics. First, they must have the ability to deal devastating blows precisely—a high rate of destruction against the enemy's striking

power. Second, they must be self-sustaining for periods sufficient to render overwhelming injury to the enemy, so that even if our shore bases are destroyed they can still continue from the far seas to hurl destruction at the enemy's military vitals. Third, although invulnerable to long-range pilotless missiles, they must still be defensible against the modern humanly guided weapons.

Those are the three characteristics which must mark the carrier striking forces of today and tomorrow.

Future carrier striking forces can be visualized as a handful of large ships able to maintain high speeds in all sea conditions—say, 3 carriers, 7 guided missile cruisers, and 2 high-speed resupply ships per task force. This small task force may be contrasted with the 100-ship Task Force 58 of World War II and its many dozens of logistic support ships. This handful of a dozen ships will be far more economical, yet more powerful and more mobile. The ratio of punch to overhead will be tremendously improved.

This mobile force will be spread out over an ocean area the size of the State of Maine. It will be so widely dispersed that no single weapon, of any size now visualized, can seriously damage more than 1 ship.

Such a force would pack a very great offensive punch. It would include aircraft able to deliver large yield weapons under all weather conditions against enemy bases 1,500 or more miles distant. It would have other smaller, supersonic aircraft, each able to deliver in the medium ranges a weapon large enough to knock out an opposing air base or missile site. Coordinating with such carrier forces will be advanced forces of nuclear-powered submarines, launching atomic missiles against targets at relatively short ranges.

These forces would be self-sustaining for some 30 days of war operations, a long time in terms of atomic war. Most of the ships would have nuclear propulsion. Aviation fuel and weapons resupply would come from the 2 fast supply ships traveling with each task force.

Because of the dispersion of the force's ships and the range of its weapons, such a carrier force could exert a tight and exclusive control over an area of 60,000 square miles—the 6 New England States rearranged into a circle 275 miles in diameter. An enemy vessel or aircraft would approach that area at its peril and few would live to penetrate even part way to its center.

In the past, fast carrier task forces have been satisfied to have 1 or 2 cracks at the enemy attackers. Antiaircraft and anti-submarine defenses have been tightly concentrated around the carriers for mutual reinforcement. Combat air patrols were dispatched to break up enemy attacks 50 miles out. Against the Japanese this was enough. In 1 day alone—the Marianas turkey shoot—the Japanese threw 545 aircraft against such a formation and had 366 shot down. Against nuclear attacks even this high performance is unacceptable, even though it is not expected that the mobile deterrent force would face such numbers.

Against air attack, the future carrier force would have a defense system unrecognizable when compared to that of our World War II task force. Short range antiaircraft weapons would be absent because they have been made obsolete by the distance from target to release point in modern high-speed bombing. Instead, defense against air attack would in great part depend on medium range guided missiles carried aboard the cruiser missile ships. Nuclear warheads would be available for missiles fired against large bomber formations, should the enemy be unwise enough to concentrate his aircraft.

Against enemy submarines there would be concentric rings of warning and defense, provided primarily by helicopters based on the guided-missile cruisers. The outer ring

would be effective many miles from the carriers. Nuclear antisubmarine weapons would also be available. The use of destroyers will be entirely different from the procedure of World War II and probably none would be employed in a carrier task force.

This exploration of the potential capabilities of future carrier defense has been mentioned in some detail because of the prevailing feeling that carriers are easy to sink. Those who share that feeling fail to distinguish between putting a carrier out of action and stopping the carrier force as a whole. In the defense of the modern carrier task force, the objective will be to stop all attackers before they reach release position. A failure will not sink the entire force, although it may knock out any one ship.

But the unpleasant fact of nuclear war is that today practically everything is vulnerable, particularly airfields. Nuclear tests tell us exactly what size atomic bomb is required to lower the center of any man-made runway in the world to a depth of 100 feet. Any runway so attacked will stay sunk. But it is obvious that of the two bases—fixed and mobile—the latter has a far greater chance of survival.

The sea base, moreover, has other important advantages:

First, it enjoys unobstructed radar vision.

Second, the location of that sea base cannot be predicted. The location of the carrier force will not be a secret, but within its vast dispersed control area the carrier location will be obscure. Moreover, the carrier task force's defense system will be especially designed to limit enemy reconnaissance.

Third, the sea base's offensive punch would be used to stop attacks at their source—the enemy's bases—using the full advantage of our mobile basis against their fixed bases. The ace we do not mind showing is that we will know course and distance to their fixed bases in advance, while they will not know the exact whereabouts of our mobile bases.

Such a carrier task force is the application of atomic capabilities in an exacting blend of air and sea power, of carrier-based fighters relying on warning and control furnished by cruisers, of warning and antisubmarine helicopters operating from cruiser decks, of carriers poised behind cruiser-launched missile umbrellas, and of all ships in turn depending on the effective destruction of enemy forces and bases by carrier-based bombers and submarine-launched missiles. It is the logical development of sea-air power in the atomic age. This would be our primary mobile deterrent force for the age of long-range missiles. It is a force which the Navy must perfect before that age comes, and which, though it would not escape unscathed, would have a most favorable exchange rate in a battle as well as the power of diverting the enemy forces from our homeland.

This future carrier force has been projected to demonstrate that the carrier has not yet reached its ultimate development as a major weapons system. Further, the principle of the mobile air base, which it exemplifies, is, of necessity, experiencing a resurrection among exponents of airpower.

In addition to the carrier, there will be other mobile deterrent forces to strengthen United States strategy in the age of missiles. Very long-range missiles launched from submarines and surface ships constitute one fruitful line of advance. Also promising is the long-range attack seaplane. This has an additional advantage which the carrier force lacks—seaplane forces can be widely dispersed overseas in many small, relatively inexpensive units, in areas where maintenance of other forces would be too costly. The appearance of modern United States seaplanes in an area thousands of miles from American soil could establish a threat to an enemy's flank and require a diversion of his defenses from other fronts.

The seaplane can soon be given the speed and altitude and load-carrying capabilities of land-based jet bombers. It can be given the ability to operate from any sheltered bay, gulf, lagoon, and estuary having water depth of a few feet. It can be given the capability to land in semisheltered sea areas adjacent to the enemy's shore, refuel, rearm, and replenish from a waiting submarine and proceed on its mission. It need not return to the area whence it departed. With these capabilities it could deliver powerful weapons to vital targets, yet operate from a mobile base well removed from threat of heavy attack. The operating base, a seaplane tender far to the rear, can be given missile and helicopter defenses against light air and submarine attack. It can be moved frequently to foil enemy attack; no advance preparation is needed and no expensive facilities are left behind as improvements to someone else's property. Nor are the sabotage and espionage problems as great for a floating base.

With perhaps half a dozen seaplanes, a single tender, and a pair of logistic submarines, an integrated force could be provided that an enemy could not ignore. Once nuclear propulsion can be fitted to the seaplanes—and for this they appear ideally adapted—the submarines could be dispensed with and the tender base moved still farther back out of attack range.

Use of a proper seaplane force is good deployment—an essential to nuclear warfare. It permits tomorrow's Navy to attack from unpredictable directions and to dilute, divert, and divide an enemy's attacking forces.

It is therefore submitted that, first, survival of the United States requires a supplementary reserve of nuclear striking power which can be launched from mobile bases and, second, the Navy's development of weapons systems employing sea and air provides such power in natural course. It is important to note also that such naval forces can be equally effective in both nuclear war and nonnuclear war. This permits us to apply the type and degree of power appropriate to the situation and avoids the predicament of being unable to use force when necessary because the only force available is too great for the circumstances.

Whether or not we become engaged in limited wars in the future, there will be jobs to do which may not involve all-out nuclear assault on the enemy's sources of military strength. Allies must be supported, supplied, and in some cases fed, and our own raw material needs must be met. And so transports, both surface and air, must flow safely across the oceans. Perhaps tactical air support for hard-pressed allies must also be provided, without atomizing a friendly population. It is likewise conceivable that in the later phases of a nuclear war the patterns of a nonnuclear, conventional war may return.

In any event these naval striking forces have the dual capability for both types of war. Most of the existing fleet was designed for the nonnuclear, and successfully so, as the Pacific wars have shown. New construction, modernization, and modifications will continue to be adapted to the atomic. But they will retain their flexibility however the issue may be joined. Mobility makes them irreplaceable as a safety factor today; the same mobility and flexibility spell economy in a world where the exact place and nature of the next threat cannot always be anticipated. They will be replaced only by weapons of greater mobility, speed, and range.

The United States must face up realistically to the problems and requirements of nuclear war. As a first priority, varied types of striking forces must be adequately maintained which alone can deter nuclear warfare, and which alone can be decisive in the first phase of such a war if it comes. A reasonable effort must also be devoted to home defense and to the support of our overseas commitments; even though the defen-

sive is not decisive, the enemy cannot be left an open invitation to move unopposed.

If adequate strength is to be maintained in this critical area while supporting a reasonable civil economy, there must be a constant re-examination of both the kind and the qualities of forces. Those types of weapons which give relatively less security per man or dollar—however useful they may be for specific purposes—must be questioned and reappraised. While the possible requirements of limited war must not be neglected, the maintenance in peacetime of forces which in unlimited war could be useful only in the later stages, and might even be serious burdens in the early stages, must likewise be questioned. It must be appreciated that in nuclear war it takes far fewer men to destroy at unheard of rates, and that it will take more and more men for reconstruction of industry, transport, and essential shelter.

As the nature of war changes many of our present weapons and forces will inevitably become relics of history, including elements of the Navy and of naval aviation as well. All weapons systems must stand the tests of mobility, multi-purpose flexibility, speed and range, lethality, and the other attributes. Our obligation is to discard those which do not measure up and to accelerate the development of those which show promise.

With this approach, the Navy has a future more vital and more demanding than ever before.

Tuna: This Industry's Illness Can Be Fatal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Point Newsweekly, February 3, 1955, published in San Diego, Calif.:

TUNA: THIS INDUSTRY'S ILLNESS CAN BE FATAL

(By Robert K. Lawson)

The closing last week of the Van Camp Sea Food Co., Inc., plant in San Diego only dramatizes an already existing condition—the near fatal illness of the tuna industry.

The Van Camp shutdown was much publicized. Few know, however, that the High Seas plant here, subsidiary of Star Kist, has packed no tuna since the fall of 1954. Thus San Diego, "tuna capital of the world," is left with a single operating cannery—Westgate California Tuna Packing Co.

Essentially the Van Camp closing, while generated by the sad state of the industry, is timed to accomplish specific things. Negotiations with the independent cannery workers union were set to start in a month or two. The closing will pretty well knock the wind from union demands for a wage increase.

The canneries are bucking boat owners' demands for \$330 per ton as a price for tuna. The official price is now \$300 and it is said that only boat owners who will accept \$270 are making sales to the canneries.

Van Camp operates two older and less efficient canneries in the San Pedro-Terminal Island area. The San Diego plant is more modern, better equipped and more efficient. Thus the decision to close the plant here, instead of one of the older plants, would seem to have been dictated by a desire to influence negotiations with the cannery workers on the one hand and the boat owners on the other.

Robert L. Beamon, Van Camp's general manager, says the cannery should be open again by albacore season—around June 1. Maybe sooner. And maybe not.

He blames high inventories which in turn have been created in part by the influx of tuna from Japan. Meantime San Diego has 800 more unemployed, and this week was feeling the loss of the \$50,000 weekly payroll.

San Diego possesses one of the most unique economies in the United States, with a virtual guarantee of at least \$174,697,054 Navy payroll annually, plus \$83,962,736 from agricultural production, and \$39 million tourist-trade income.

Despite this apparent cushion, her financial security is intrinsically geared to the manufacturing facilities that form her largest source of income, where fluctuations in the production of manufactured goods frequently cause devastating effects.

Ranking first, second, and third in this category are aircraft, with \$321 million; tuna, with \$65,822,000; and its allied industry, shipbuilding and repair, with \$14,106,000. Combined the "big three" employ most of the 52,150 people who produce industrial products valued in excess of \$540 million annually.

With the end of World War II the United States instituted a reconstruction and rehabilitation program in Japan.

Very soon the production of fish outstripped the food requirements of the Japanese, who do not eat processed fish in any form. They consume only fresh fish, and something had to be done with the surplus. It turned out to be an admirable export item.

Meanwhile the United States producers (San Diego, San Pedro, Terminal Island) had indoctrinated the palates of the American people for tuna canned in oil to the tune of around 8 million cases annually by 1948. The American tuna fishing fleet (San Diego) was producing most of the market requirements, with a few thousand cases from Peru and other countries making up the balance of imports.

Japanese imports began to arrive in this country, and by 1949 they held about 2½ percent of the American market, which by that time had climbed another half million cases. The rise in imports cost the American fleet proportionately, but the matter was not considered seriously at that time.

It was shortly after this that the Japanese importers got busy (aided by a reduction in tariffs) and they slugged over 3 million cases into this country in 1950. The effect was, to put it mildly, devastating. It tied up one-third of the American tuna fishing fleet hard and fast in San Diego harbor. It cost the owners and operators thousands of dollars that fall.

The Japanese recognized their mistake (and duly noted quota proposals in the U. S. Congress and they voluntarily imposed a quota on tuna exports until the glutted market situation here could recover. They reduced exports about 1 million cases per year for the next 2 years. The American fleet staggered through, although it never fully recovered.

By 1953, however, the importers were back in the saddle. They shipped in another 3 million cases that year, and the American fleet took another staggering blow. It was not as critical this time, though since the American market had now reached a capacity of about 11 million cases.

Another factor aided United States boat owners. Building steadily since the end of the war, the fleet strength had reached 214 vessels when the crisis struck in 1950. By 1953, however, the fleet had shrunk to 183.

Following the 1950 market glut, the tuna industry repeatedly appealed to the Government for a tariff or quota, or some form of control over imports. These pleas ran afoul free trade policies and the need to keep the

Japanese economy going to save that nation from the clutches of Communist domination.

Many vessel owners got out of the business, reinvested their money in other enterprises, or transferred their vessels elsewhere. They are continuing to do so, and the end of 1954 saw the American fleet strength reduced to 163 vessels; exactly where it stood at the end of the war.

Meanwhile the Japanese fleet continued to build and imports of tuna continued to soar. The fall of 1954 saw another 50 vessels of the American fleet tied up in San Diego harbor. Many waited as long as 30 days, and more, after arriving in port following 60 or more days at sea before unloading their catch.

When the Japanese tuna import glut struck last year, the American Tunaboat Association, a boat owners' cooperative corporation in San Diego, representing a membership of about 70 percent of the American tuna fleet, held a contract with the cannery guaranteeing a price of \$330 per ton. The glut reopened negotiations and resulted in a reduction of \$30 per ton in the price.

This contract expired on December 31, 1954. However, vessels which had sailed for the fishing banks were considered to be eligible for the contract price, even though they did not return until after January 1, 1955. There is current a strong rumor that the vessels being unloaded today are those whose owners agree to accept as little as \$270 per ton.

Fishing is like no other business in the world; yet it is also curiously like any small business. Each vessel is a small business. The owner may have an investment ranging from \$250,000 to \$600,000.

Economics of a hypothetical fishing trip could run something like this: Most vessels in the \$500,000 class are equipped to carry 300 tons of frozen tuna. The owner, and there can be as many as 10 or more with equal investments of \$5,000, undertakes to go out to the fishing banks.

He acquires a crew of 15 men on what is called a share basis. This means that all members share out equally on the amount of fish caught. If he returns with a full load, he should receive \$90,000 for his catch if the prevailing price per ton is \$300.

Fifty percent, approximately, of the price received for the load goes to cover operating expenses—insurance, bait licenses, depreciation, owner's share. The balance of \$45,000 to be split among the crew of 15, or about \$3,000 each before taxes. If there were 10 owners they would receive a proportionate share after other deductions.

On the face of it, this appears to be fairly high wages for the fisherman. Considering other aspects of the situation, however, it just about equals the wages paid for comparable jobs ashore. The boats don't always come in with a full load.

And here is where the Japanese import situation cuts more deeply into the fleet's financial welfare. United States boats may be tied up in port for long periods waiting to unload their catch at canneries where the imports take precedence.

The impact of a tie up of 50 tuna clippers in San Diego harbor can be presented graphically in dollars. Fifty tuna clippers could hold 10,000 tons of tuna, with a value of about \$3 million to the fishermen.

Coupled with this fact, the valuation of the tuna clippers would be about \$15 million. The \$15 million, which is not earning dividends, and is actually costing money tied up, plus the \$3 million, not in the fishermen's pockets where it could be spent, takes about \$18 million out of circulation in San Diego.

When the 1950 glut shattered the fleet, owners who couldn't get out of the business found it expedient to place their vessels under foreign registry.

It was relatively simple to operate in other countries, and it presented some very distinct advantages. The boats were required to hire nationals of those countries for a crew and to pay United States type wages only to their own captain, engineer, and navigator. On the crew they saved money.

True, they got \$30 less per ton, but they more than made this up in the cheaper labor, and they were assured of full fishing time. Freezer vessels took their catches promptly. Minor repairs were accomplished in foreign shipyards.

There has been much talk of lack of cooperation within the industry. Both the cannery and the fishermen-producers obviously desired the same thing in the form of excessive Japanese imports. They have never gotten together, however, because each takes a markedly dim view of the problems confronting the other.

The cannery maintain they have spent about \$9 million building a 12-million case tuna market. The money has been shelled out in publicity, public relations, advertising.

The canner is naturally sensitive to his responsibility to maintain this market. He is pretty sure the market will continue to expand.

His stand is that he cannot afford to gamble on the possibility of running short of the raw materials necessary to supply the market. The fishing business, being relatively unpredictable causes him to seek a method of locking his door against the hazard of poor catches by the domestic fleet.

With a view to accomplishing this security the cannery are increasing their interests in South American countries, Puerto Rico, and the Central Americas. The grand play, from where we sit, is that if the United States fishermen get legislation to slow the imports, the cannery will have insured their supplies of raw materials by these overseas investments.

The constant shrinkage of the American fishing fleets cuts into the shipyards and repair business here. Repair of the tuna clippers provides a large share of the shipyard income, and it is entirely illogical to presume the owner of a vessel based abroad would elect to travel several thousand miles for a repair job here.

San Diego, relieved of a good portion of the shipyard repair business, and relieved of many of the fishermen, presents some significant economic aspects to this community. The loss of revenue from personal property taxes on the vessels, together with other taxes, and the sale of several thousand dollars in provisions and fuel and oil each trip is not a small item. In addition there are the taxes and wages of the fishermen.

It is not inconceivable that foreign canneries could can the fish and ship the product into the United States utilizing foreign labor and facilities. This function, because of present tariffs, would leave the American cannery with the job of sealing the can—a mighty thin industry.

There are strong rumors that a huge fish freezing and storage plant is under construction in southern California. Fishermen wonder whether the plant may be utilized to hold their catches, or to freeze and hold the surplus Japanese imports they have every reason to believe will continue to climb.

The answers to these questions may be just around the corner. But if past performance curves are any criterion for these observations the situation could explode momentarily. Right now, based on statistics for the first 9 months of 1954, the American fishing fleet holds about 56 percent of the American market, Japan 38 percent.

Ceremonies Honoring Rev. A. A. Skonieczki, Rt. Rev. Bronislaus Michalski, and Hon. Philip J. Philbin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include therein a news account of impressive ceremonies recently conducted at Saint Stanislaus Hall, Three Rivers, Mass., in honor of my friend, a great and able leader of the Polish cause in this country, the Reverend A. A. Skonieczki, and the Right Reverend Bronislaus Michalski, Prothonotary Apostolic of London, England, an outstanding spiritual leader and chaplain for the Polish Army in exile, and myself.

At the exercises I was invested with the Order of Polonia Restituta and it would be impossible for me to express my appreciation to my very dear friend, Father Skonieczki, for so thoughtfully arranging the occasion and the Polish Government in exile for so generously bestowing upon me its highest civilian award. In a very humble spirit indeed, I express my gratitude.

Father Skonieczki has been a powerful voice and a tower of strength in fostering true Americanism, patriotism and devotion to the principles of liberty. His unflagging efforts for the cause of Polish freedom have endeared him not only to his own people, but to all lovers of freedom. That his work and the work of so many other devoted leaders, who are striving to secure liberation of Poland, may soon have a triumphant result, is the hope and the prayer of all Americans.

It is because of the unselfish, untiring efforts of Father Skonieczki and men like him, who are inspired with noble American principles and dedicated to the achievement of freedom for the oppressed and persecuted, that the people behind the Iron Curtain are able to keep their courage high and their faith for ultimate deliverance unshaken. Father Skonieczki and his associates, who are working for liberation of subject nations, compel the admiration of all other Americans because in the best sense they represent unyielding devotion to the principles of democracy and freedom.

The news excerpts which I insert are part of my remarks.

At Palmer last night speaking at a dinner honoring his appointment to the order of Polonia Restituta, high decoration of the Polish Government in Exile, conferred upon him for "outstanding service and contributions to the cause of freedom," Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN blasted organized world communism and urged peace based on justice for all nations.

PHILBIN declared that despite solemn pledges before, during and after World War II, "the Communist conspiracy is forcing the United States and the free world to live virtually in a huge armed camp."

"There can be no lasting peace based on tyranny exploitation, and in justice," he said. "The liberation of oppressed nations behind the Iron Curtain is not only necessary on moral grounds. Until it is accomplished, there can be no true peace in the world and a peace movement based on oppression, the continuance of insidious Communist infiltration and appeasement of those working for the destruction of freedom can only end in disaster."

"This Nation must stand for its principles, protect its rights, its interests, and its liberties. It must defend the cause of freedom. It can never waver or retreat before the forces of Red aggression. Our Nation must stand fearlessly for security and peace predicated upon principles of justice, confident of our great strength, military, economic, and spiritual, united in our determination, come what may, to protect the cherished way of life."

Honored also by the gathering were the Reverend A. A. Skonieczki and Msgr. Bronislaus Michalski, both of whom were decorated by the Polish Government for distinguished service.

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1955.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: We are taking the liberty of bringing to your attention that February 7, 1955, will be the 10th anniversary of the famous wartime meeting of the Big Three which marked the beginning of a series of retreats of the free world before the forward march of Soviet aggression. We refer, of course, to the meeting of Joseph V. Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston S. Churchill at Yalta in 1945.

Under an agreement reached there—or, rather, extracted by Stalin under the threat not to join in the war with Japan—the Soviet sphere of influence has been carved out in Eastern Europe. The enslavement of several European nations—Poland included—has been sanctioned by the two western leaders, caving in under Stalin's blackmail.

At Yalta, too, the way was paved for the sovietization of China. The Yalta compact remains an executive agreement, never ratified by the United States Senate and therefore not binding. Repeated Soviet violations of the Yalta agreement deprive that document, secretly drafted, of its last vestige of questionable validity.

Millions of Americans believe that the Yalta agreement should be denounced and declared not valid. All unilateral actions undertaken by Stalin under the cloak of that most unfortunate result of personal diplomacy, should be declared illegal. Only a compete and unhesitating renunciation of the Yalta agreement by the Congress and the executive branch of our Government could restore American prestige in Europe and Asia.

Referring to your splendid record in the fight for American security and our moral leadership of the free world, we beg to submit to your attention the necessity of raising your voice on the Floor of the House on Monday, February 7, in defense of the Polish Nation—the prime victim of the Yalta deal—and the other nations, victimized by Soviet imperialism.

You may rest assured that the expression of your views on that occasion will find most appreciative response in the minds and hearts of those who deeply believe that as long as Yalta remains unrepudiated and un denounced, the enslaved nations of the world—our most faithful allies—will be unable to trust our word.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative,
Polish American Congress, Inc.

PALMER, MASS.—Three Rivers and portions of its neighboring villages, where the spark of righteousness, loyalty, and faithfulness to its Polish ancestry still burns brightly in the hearts of the older generation, despite many persecutions now and in past years, where the flower of budding young Polish womanhood and manhood blossoms for one common cause to take sides with brethren in every city and town in the United States and Europe to return of ravaged Poland to the rank it once held and should now hold among the peace and God-fearing peoples on the earth, listened to an inspiring and forceful speech in St. Stanislaus Hall last night delivered by Poland's friend in Congress, Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, representing the Third Congressional District.

His rousing talk was timely, for it came upon the occasion of 3 persons being honored during a testimonial banquet, 1 of them being Mr. PHILBIN himself. A capacity crowd attentively listened in hushed silence, applauding and cheering as the occasion merited, as Representative PHILBIN held his audience spell-bound with a dynamic and well-chosen speech.

There were 700 persons of Polish ancestry, both young and old, who came to heap tribute upon their beloved pastor, Rev. A. A. Skonieczki of SS. Peter and Paul Parish, who now holds the title of honorary commander in Polonia Restituta, and was recently appointed honorary colonel-chaplain in the Polish Armed Forces—to revere and admire the Right Reverend Monsignor Bronislaus Michalski, protonotary apostolic of London, England, who has jurisdiction over displaced soldiers of the Polish Army and displaced civilians now living in England—and to receive into their hearts a dear friend and crusader in the Polish cause, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, who was honored by Monsignor Michalski by having a medal and ribbon pinned about his neck, giving him a similar title as Father Skonieczki's, that of honorary commander in Polonia Restituta. The medal is the highest award bestowed upon an individual by the Polish Government in exile and is comparable only to the Congressional Medal of Honor given someone in the United States.

And, there were many of the older folks present, who inspired and spurred on by Representative PHILBIN's blast upon the tyrannical governments of the world, principally communism, who are trying to stamp out the last flickering hope of a new Poland, were noted to nod their heads in agreement on certain statements and to equally show signs of negation on others as Mr. PHILBIN drilled home his aims to continue the fight to obtain protection for the peoples of oppressed Poland and other similar nations who have felt the scourge and pestilence of an invader and the hand of death and destruction in their lands. Many were the elderly listeners of Polish heritage who brushed aside a tear now and then, no doubt taking back thoughts to dear ones in the fatherland who have either felt the heavy hand of tyranny fall on their heads and to those who have been scattered to the four corners of the earth by war.

Representative PHILBIN branded the Kremlin and its supporters who have infiltrated with their diabolical schemes and policies into every nation of the world as cruel, vicious, unscrupulous conspirators who would crush all peace-loving nations on the face of the earth under the foot of tyranny and urged all to take up the fight against the terroristic Communists with their plague of hatred and death.

Representative PHILBIN was one of three who was honored last night at a testimonial dinner given those who have taken up the torch in the fight to liberate suppressed Poland and other similar nations. He cited the Katyn massacre of the Polish officers

one of the most atrocious crimes in the history of mankind and said no peace will ever be entertained until the last of those who would crush and enslave be exterminated. He said nations with the horror of death and bondage hanging over them, should be protected. He lashed out: "We shall never stop—never remain silent—never cease to fight—to free nations from this communistic scourge and the principles it stands for."

A member of the Armed Forces Committee in Washington, he told of the death-dealing weapons now being held by aggressors and the United States, touching briefly on the hydrogen and atomic bombs. He urged the continued making of these destructive missiles and stocking them so that the United States can be prepared for any nation who should dare to challenge our rights for peace, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

Representative PHILBIN said he took up the fight on Poland's behalf, because he was an American and all real Americans refuse to stand by and see a smaller nation maltreated and annihilated by a tyrannical force. He said he is one of a large group of crusading men who started the march to see Poland and other hard-pressed countries returned to rightful places in the world and would continue with zealousness and determination to fight on until this goal is achieved.

Before Representative PHILBIN took over the rostrum, another inspirational speech was delivered by Chaplain Col. Andrew T. F. Nowak, United States Army, Retired, Chicopee Falls. Father Nowak thanked committees who were instrumental in bringing the Polish people together on this momentous occasion. He heaped tribute on the 3 honored guests and touched upon Generals Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and Krzyzanowski and other Polish soldiers and immigrants who came here during the early years of our country and helped to mold the Government and policies now in the United States. Also extolling the work advanced on Poland's behalf by Father Skonieczki, Monsignor Michalski, and Representative PHILBIN, were speakers, Rev. Marian Stanczyk, of Ludlow, and Rev. Bronislaus S. Rosnik, of Providence, R. I. The latter, always fighting for liberties of oppressed Poles, was instrumental in having a statue of General Pulaski erected in Roger Williams Park, Providence, R. I. Father Skonieczki closed the speaking program by thanking all for their efforts in making a going away affair for Monsignor Michalski such a success. Monsignor Michalski, a seminary associate of Father Skonieczki, has been a guest at the local rectory for many weeks and soon returns to his work in England.

Other guests at the head table were Rev. Joseph Piszczalka, M. S. Westfield, Rev. John P. Kochanowski, Gilbertville, Rev. Walter Rozpad, Woonsocket, R. I., Rev. Josephat Piasta, Chicopee, Rev. Oswald Loretan, of Bondsville, Rev. Michael Bielak, Ware, Rev. Leonard Pakulski, O. F. M. of Holyoke, Rev. Joseph Niedzwiecki of Southbridge, Rev. John Klekotka of Greenfield, and Rev. John E. Abertin, SS. Peter & Paul Parish.

Interspersed with the speechmaking was a program of Polish dances, songs, and duets. Participating were the SS. Peter and Paul mixed choir, Misses Irene and Lillian Frydryk, Benigna Smola, Edwin Olearczyk, Mary Wielkiewicz, Richard Nowak, and Barbara Salamon. Fr. Loretan of St. Adalbert's, Bondsville, gave the invocation and Rev. Leonard Pakulski of Holyoke, conducted the closing prayer. Rev. John Aubertin served as master of ceremonies. As the inspired crowd wended its way through the doors of the hall after singing of the Polish national anthem, many were the happy faces to know that so much has been done for their cause in the fight for freedom and happiness.

Eisenhower Record at Midterm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the March 1955 number of Democratic Digest:

THE EISENHOWER RECORD AT MIDTERM—
BACKDOWN GOVERNMENT

Most of the newsmen who attended the President's press conference of January 12 emerged shaking their heads in bewilderment. This was the conference at which the President discussed the now famous Ladejinsky case.

Previously, the White House had stood squarely behind Agriculture Secretary Benson in his firing of the land reform expert as a security risk. It had then made known the President's full approval of the rehiring of Ladejinsky for what Foreign Aid Director Stassen termed a "sensitive" job in Vietnam. Despite this White House position, Benson was sticking to his view of Ladejinsky as a security risk. Obviously, the President's position needed clarification.

What the reporters got instead was uncertainty and confusion. Mr. Eisenhower gave his full backing to the right of Benson and Stassen to hold contrary views about Ladejinsky and, while, of course, he had to support Mr. Stassen's rehiring of Ladejinsky, any mistake of judgment in the matter would rest on Stassen's shoulders.

The President having reversed his field 3 times in the course of 1 press conference, a reporter remarked as he left the conference, "If this keeps up, Ike is going to be known as 'the man who wouldn't stay put.'"

The Ladejinsky case was just one of many instances in the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration in which the White House had shifted its ground or completely yielded its position. This wavering White House leadership, which left all of the Cabinet officers without any certainty of top-side support of their positions, has resulted in what some call government by backdown.

The most recent and, in the view of many, the most significant example of government by backdown concerns the much-heralded Marshall plan for Asia program.

This program was formulated by Secretary of State Dulles and Foreign Aid Director Stassen to combat communism in Asia through extensive economic aid which, it was hoped, would bring the same remarkable recovery and the same receding of communism that the Marshall plan brought in Europe.

But when Messrs. Dulles and Stassen launched their program within the administration, they did not reckon on the power or persuasiveness of Treasury Secretary Humphrey, whose main concern is balancing the budget at all costs. Humphrey was attending a South American conference when the Dulles-Stassen plan was first broached. Upon his return, he is reported to have berated Stassen for inaugurating such an expensive plan.

The President, who had been thought to support Dulles and Stassen, quietly shifted his position toward Humphrey's, and neither the state of the Union message nor the President's budget contained any direct reference to the Marshall plan for Asia program.

Apparently, remarked the magazine *Commonweal*, this trial balloon has been shot

down not by sources outside the Eisenhower team, but by the administration itself.

Another recent important instance of government by backdown was in the so-called New Look defense policy. In 1953, pressed by what it felt to be the political necessity of making a drastic cut in the Truman budget, the administration slashed the Air Force funds by \$5 billion. The following year, with the Indochina crisis dominating the headlines, the administration reversed its field, and restored the Air Force cuts. This year, defense cuts are again the order of the day—with the Army bearing the brunt.

To those who have watched the President closely and critically over the past 2 years, these major reversals are not surprising. They are part of a consistent pattern of Presidential backdowns. For example, during the public storm over the removal of books from the shelves of United States overseas libraries, which many compared with book burning in Germany, Mr. Eisenhower exhorted a college commencement, "Don't join the book burners." But a few days later, the Washington Post was to comment, sadly, "If the President's words at Dartmouth are to have practical meaning, they must be applied first within his own administration."

In the face of this Presidential wavering, it is no wonder that the State Department issued no less than 11 separate directives on the types of books to be removed from overseas library shelves.

In a similar vein, the President in November 1953, enunciated what he called the Abilene code—the right of every man to face his accuser. Despite the acclamation with which this pronouncement was received, the President did nothing to alter his own Government security system so as to afford that right to Federal employees, many of whom have been fired because of anonymous charges.

Having twice declared that communism would and should not be a 1954 campaign issue, the President later twice commended Vice President Nixon on his campaign role, although Mr. Nixon had himself, in his nationwide stump speeches, spark-plugged the GOP exploitation of that issue. Moreover, having declared his firm intention not "to make of the Presidency an agency to use in partisan elections," Mr. Eisenhower later yielded to the pressures of Republican leaders and established an alltime presidential record for participation in an off year election campaign, even to the extent of endorsing some Republican candidates who had openly opposed his program across the board. It was during the course of his partisan campaign, that the President made his prediction of a "cold war of partisan politics" if a Democratic Congress were elected, a statement from which he felt obliged to back down in his first postelection press conference.

There was another series of presidential backdowns, made in the face of—and often to avoid—a showdown fight with Old Guard Republicans in Congress. Best known of these is his 1954 surrender on his 3-year trade program and his acceptance of a 1-year extension of the trade agreements act. Sometimes forgotten as part of the backdown on trade are the President's appointment of an arch-protectionist to the Tariff Commission, his endorsement of a plan to "pack" the Tariff Commission with a 4-3 GOP protectionist majority, and his raising of the tariff on Swiss watches.

Another celebrated Presidential backdown was on the question of amendments to the Taft-Hartley labor law. On July 31, 1953, a set of Taft-Hartley liberalizing amendments apparently agreed upon by the President and Labor Secretary Martin Durkin were about to be sent to Congress, when the death of Senator Robert H. Taft caused a delay. Meanwhile, the content of the Eisenhower-

Durkin amendment "leaked" to the press, bringing a storm of protest from old guard forces in Congress. The President withdrew his support from the Durkin proposals and Durkin resigned in protest.

In 1953, Mr. Eisenhower came out for 35,000 public housing units, but when 83 percent of the House GOP succeeded in killing his proposal outright, the President backed away from a fight. Later, he called public housing a "moral obligation," yet reversed himself once again and defended congressional cuts in public housing against criticism by New York City construction coordinator, Robert Moses.

But perhaps the most serious Eisenhower backdown in the face of a fight with Congress was over the Bricker amendment, the attempt by old guard isolationists to tie the hands of the President in the making of treaties. Originally represented as "unalterably opposed" to the Bricker amendment, the White House was totally silent when Senate GOP Leader Knowland, who supposedly represents the White House on the Senate floor, pulled a last-minute switch and supported a modified version of the Bricker amendment.

Some of the Eisenhower backdowns have involved the abandonment of GOP campaign myths (some of which candidate Eisenhower had helped to perpetuate), in the light of what Adlai Stevenson has called the stark reality of responsibility.

One was the myth that the famous Yalta agreement had been a "sellout" of Eastern Europe to the Russians, and had to be repudiated. This, Mr. Eisenhower promised to do, not only during the 1952 campaign, but also in his first state of the Union message. Yet when the Yalta agreement was examined, it was found to pledge free elections for the peoples of Eastern Europe, and therefore the President was obliged to reverse his field and ask Congress to reaffirm rather than repudiate the agreement.

In that same state of the union message, the President announced he was unleashing Chiang Kai-shek's forces for attacks on the Chinese mainland from Formosa, implying that President Truman's placement of the 7th Fleet in the Straits of Formosa had been primarily for the protection of the Chinese Reds. Six months later, Marguerite Higgins of the New York Herald Tribune revealed that the administration, through a secret gentleman's agreement with Chiang, had effectively "re-leashed" him. This arrangement has recently been confirmed in public.

Also abandoned has been the GOP campaign line on liberation of the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain and the inadequacy of the containment policy of the Truman administration. Today, the President talks of "no alternative to coexistence," which to most is a far cry from the liberation line, and akin to containment.

Eisenhower campaign talk about the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan has given way to the adoption of a wool-support program which the Omaha World-Herald has called the Brannan plan, lock, stock, and barrel.

The backdowns from other campaign pledges are a story in themselves. Abandoned, among other things, have been the golden promise of 90 percent parity price supports for farmers, a balanced budget, the fostering of REA, the operation of TVA at maximum efficiency, the speeding up of soil conservation, and the fostering of a merit system in Federal civil service, which was torpedoed when the President lent his own name and office to a scheme for Federal recruitment through the Republican National Committee.

One aspect of "government by backdown" that distresses those who have wanted to see this new administration succeed—and especially those who have hoped the administration would stand up to Senator McCarthy—

and his forces—has been the way in which the President has shifted his ground in such a way as to undercut his own Cabinet officers.

The placing of the Ladejinsky decision on the shoulders of Mr. Stassen is reminiscent of another incident, early in the administration, when Mr. Stassen asserted the rights of the executive branch in opposition to Senator McCarthy's private negotiations with Greek shippers, only to have the President slap him down publicly, and, in effect, side with McCarthy.

Soon thereafter, in a background meeting with reporters, Secretary of State Dulles discussed a tentative plan for the settlement of the Korean war. First to knock the props from under the Secretary the next morning was the White House.

More recently, when Labor Secretary Mitchell came out against the State "right to work laws," bitterly opposed by labor, the White House was quick to assert that the Secretary spoke only for himself, and not for the administration.

Instances such as these have given administration officials reason to believe that they can never be certain of topside support from their boss should they be caught in the midst of a hot controversy.

Some believe this to be the basis for the many administration compromises with the McCarthy forces; the retention of Scott McLeod as State Department Security Officer; the failure to clear former WAVE commander Mildred McAfee Horton as a delegate to the U. N. Commission; the firing of a Cohn-Schine target, Theodore Kagan, from his key United States Information post in Germany; the firing of Foreign Service Officer John Paton Davis, cleared on loyalty grounds by Dulles, but dismissed as a security risk merely for poor judgment (surrender to Asia Firsters?); and, of course, the abject surrender of Army Secretary Stevens to McCarthy at the famous chicken lunch—a humiliation which many believe might have been avoided had the Pentagon been able to count on firm White House support.

What is the explanation for "Government by backdown" and for the title, "The Man Who Wouldn't Stay Put"? One observer, in a recent discussion of this question, recalled the greatest Eisenhower backdown of all: Eisenhower's embracing, during the 1952 campaign, of Senators McCarthy and Jenner, the two men who had labeled his greatest friend and benefactor, George Marshall, a traitor and a living lie.

"When General Eisenhower agreed to cut out that praise of General Marshall from his Milwaukee campaign speech, in order to appease McCarthy," said this observer, "the pattern was set. Since then, one backdown has followed another. And more are likely to come."

A Paradox

SPEECH
OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting a few moments ago to hear the gentlemen who represent districts where there is unemployment, state their opposition to the bill H. R. 1, on which we will be called to vote tomorrow.

They want protection for local industries and the employees of those industries.

Yet some of these same gentlemen have been consistent and ardent advocates of aid to other countries, the purpose of which was to train employees, finance industries, whose products are now in direct competition with those of our own industries, and whose protection they now seek.

To me it does not seem logical to tax our people, to send our dollars, our machinery, our technicians abroad to establish an industry and then, when that industry is born and has become efficient, deny it the right to sell its products in this country without restriction.

I shall be paired against the bill, because I believe that we should first consider the interests of our own people.

A Memorable Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in this morning's issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MEMORABLE ANNIVERSARY

In the closing days of the presidential campaign of 1952 General Eisenhower opened a broadside against the Truman administration for its refusal to come to grips with the problem of inflation and rising living costs. Speaking at Troy, N. Y., in late October, the Republican candidate not only charged the administration with failing to halt inflation; he charged that while identifying itself with the meaningless symbol of price controls the administration was actually pursuing inflationary policies on other fronts. In short, he declared, inflation was "no accident." It was deliberate administration policy.

Once installed in the White House Mr. Eisenhower lost little time in showing that what he had said at Troy was not mere campaign oratory. In his first state of the Union message the new President said, in effect, though not in these exact words:

"The American free-price system has already been kept in bed too long. Under the law as it now stands, it has until April 30 to get out of bed and out of the hospital. There is no reason whatsoever why that time limit should be extended. In fact, I plan to see that the patient begins to try out his legs right away, and that he gets a little more exercise each day. He should be back on the job well before April 30."

The President's blunt statement drew criticism not only from political critics but from price-control addicts in both parties. The holdover Price Administrator, Joseph H. Freehill, expressed the opinion that decontrol "would cost the economy of this country \$3 billion annually in higher prices." If these frightening prophecies disturbed Mr. Eisenhower in any way that fact was not visible in the events that ensued. On February 6, 4 days after he had briefed the Nation on his basic strategy with respect to prices, he had launched his offensive against price-wage controls. In an Executive order he ter-

minated wage and salary controls as of that date and struck the ceilings from a long list of consumer items. In the ensuing weeks six more package actions of the same kind followed. With the last of these, which came on March 17, the Nation found itself back on a free price economy for the first time since January 26, 1951.

This action demonstrated to the country that in professing his confidence in the free price system, Mr. Eisenhower was not indulging in empty rhetoric. But it would be a misinterpretation of this episode to assume that in thus staking his leadership on a program which (such was the state of mind into which the Nation had drifted by then) was thought by many to be fraught with serious danger Mr. Eisenhower was indulging in a blind gamble. If it could be said that a calculated risk was involved, then it would have to be added that before making his move against price controls the President had taken every precaution to see that that risk was reduced to a minimum. Mr. Eisenhower was fully aware, as he showed in his Troy speech that rising living costs had nothing to do with price-control legislation, but that they stemmed from inflationary fiscal and monetary policies. Therefore, one of his very first acts after he was elected was to pick for the key post in the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget men who shared his own philosophy on this issue and would could be counted upon to work in harmony with the Federal Reserve Board in getting the Nation's monetary and fiscal policies back on a sound basis. The story of how these appointees have worked together as a team and the success they have achieved needs no retelling at this time. However, since it is now almost exactly 2 years since the President's program for dismantling the apparatus of price-wage controls it might be appropriate to conclude with a short statistical footnote.

In January 1953 the last month before the dismantling process began, the wholesale price index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics stood at 109.9. The corresponding figure for January 1955, which has just been reported, is 110.2. Thus the net change in the wholesale price level has been an increase of 0.3 point, or less than three-tenths of 1 percent. In January 1953 the Consumer Price Index (sometimes referred to as the Cost of Living Index) stood at 113.9. We do not yet have the corresponding figure for January 1955, but in December this index stood at 114.3. Which is to say consumer prices have risen over this 2-year period by exactly 0.4 point, or between three-tenths and four-tenths of 1 percent.

A Two-Party System in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 5 it was my pleasure and honor to address the meeting of the North Carolina Young Republican Convention in Charlotte, N. C. During the course of the program, the winner of their annual declamation contest, Mr. David M. Foley, who is a National Director of the Democratic Youth of America, and who is a senior in the O'Donoghue High School, read the paper that won him this prize. Because Mr. Foley's remarks so thoroughly get at the root of the Republican

problem in all States where a true two-party system does not exist, and because these remarks should be read and understood by Republicans everywhere, I ask unanimous consent that this fine paper be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT CAN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY DO TO ESTABLISH A TWO-PARTY SYSTEM IN NORTH CAROLINA?

(By David M. Foley)

That is a good question. It has been asked by a great many people, mostly Republicans, for a long time. Since it is still being asked, I take it for granted that you are still looking for the answer. Now the people who have been answering this question are, for the most part, Republicans. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that perhaps it is difficult for Republicans to look objectively at their problem. My views are those of one outside the Republican Party looking in somewhat critically. It is, I believe, a new slant, a new perspective. I hope you find something of value.

Walt Whitman once said, "Political democracy as it exists and practically works in America, with all its threatening evils, supplies a training school for making first-class men. It is life's gymnasium, not of good only, but of all."

Our political system is based on the two-party system. Politics cannot be the training school for first-class men without the two-party system, for the single party has become the symbol of dictatorship and anarchy.

At this time, North Carolina is a single-party State. This is not good for North Carolina or her people because competition leads to improvement of the product.

Before you can change this situation, you must look into its causes. Why is North Carolina a one-party State? Whose fault is it? There is only one conclusion we may draw. The Republican Party itself has made North Carolina a one-party State. Therefore it is up to the Republicans alone to rectify this situation. How did the GOP place North Carolina in the one-party class? The Republican State organization did not invite the participation of young people. Once young and enthusiastic party leaders became old, and yet they continued to rule the party. They became discouraged and did not offer Republican candidates on the ballot. What party machinery there was in North Carolina fell into decay. The Republican Party became stagnant.

Within the past 3 or 4 years, it has been evidenced that, at last the Republican Party is again becoming seriously interested in winning elections in North Carolina. The Republican Party is again testing the treacherous water of politics.

We all realize that it is impossible for the Republican Party to become active until North Carolina is a two-party State. Thus your question, How can that be done?

The answer is relatively simple because a standard formula may be followed. If the Republicans really desire a 2-party system in North Carolina they can have it. However, it is up to the Republicans alone. North Carolina will not become a 2-party State from mere wishful thinking. It will take action, direct action, to bring this about.

Of what does this action consist? What is this magic formula that can, and will, convert North Carolina into a 2-party State?

It is the building of an initial nucleus of common interest. Let me quote from a book by Dr. Clarence King. He writes, "If we can mentally recapture a skill which most of us possessed at the age of 12 it will help us to master the initial steps. Imagine that it is a winter morning after a fresh fall of snow. You step out of your door determined to

roll the largest snowball that ever was built. What do you do first? Do you take a shovel and mound the snow together and round it off? Of course, you don't. You begin by rolling a small snowball. All depends on that central, cohesive core. If the snow will not 'pack' you may have to go back in the house and await a better day. But once that small snowball begins to attract other particles and a steep enough slope, you could give it a push and it would go on without you, enlarging itself indefinitely. We can push the analogy of the snowball one step further. Have you ever seen a snowball in March, standing unmelted with green grass about it, when all the surrounding snow is gone? It lasts because of that hard cohesive center which was built so well. Many an aggregation of human beings melts away at the first discouragement because it was built hastily of a large number of members, all having an equally tepid enthusiasm without any firm central cohesive core?"

Logically it follows that without a hard core of loyal and enthusiastic Republicans, the GOP will never get out in the snow, let alone roll that snowball down the slope.

Where is this nucleus to be found? If it is to be found at all, it will be found among the young Republicans of the State. It is this group alone that cannot introduce the new, fresh, ideas that are necessary to rejuvenate an organization.

From this hard core, this inner circle, will come the second circle, members to serve on committees, friends to do the leg work. As members of your team, they will reach out and influence other citizens.

You must learn practical politics. You must leave your easy chairs and get out of your warm houses. In order to have a two-party system in North Carolina, you must toil, you must sweat, you must work. You must build a new organization. Once established, you must hold it.

Canvass your district systematically. Apportion precinct captains. Locate the vote. Get those votes to the polls. Get to know your community. Reach the public. All these are important steps in the establishment of an active Republican Party in North Carolina.

However, they will mean nothing unless and until they are put into practical use. You must decide. Do you desire a two-party system strongly enough to work for it? Make your decision and either go into action or lapse back into ineffectiveness and stagnation.

Whether your program is accepted or rejected by the people will depend on your effectiveness in selling your candidates and your platform. However, always remember that it is harder to fool the people than you think. At times your suave politicians with their booming greetings and hearty handshakes will win a battle. But it is the party of the people that will win the war.

Take your program to the people. Build a hard core of active young Republicans. Launch your snowball down the slope of North Carolina. Perhaps it will expand and grow until North Carolina will be a two-party State, and politics will, once again, be a training school for first class men, a gymnasium of life for all.

On Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians throughout the

world observed the 37th anniversary of their homeland's independence.

Though burdened with grief over the oppression which has overtaken their country, Lithuanian people nevertheless demonstrate each year their undying will to be free.

It is such sustained spirit which 1 day will result in freedom for all peoples whose hearts cry for liberty.

The Lithuanian spirit may well be the beacon light to rally all of the temporarily oppressed, to lead the broken peoples on waves of hope to the self-government they so dearly cherish.

It is a courageous thing they do—celebrating an independence which exists only in their minds and hearts. But it is only by such zealous devotion to freedom that independence is achieved.

In this quest the Lithuanian people have our wholehearted support and admiration.

An Invitation To Participate in Lenten Services at Lutheran Church of the Reformation on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the following letter from Rev. Lawrence D. Folkemer, pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, located on Capitol Hill at 212 East Capitol Street.

Dr. Folkemer, in his letter addressed to me, extends a cordial invitation to the Members of Congress to attend the service on Ash Wednesday, February 23, from 12:10 to 12:30 p. m., and as many of the other noonday Lenten services as will be convenient.

The letter of invitation from Dr. Folkemer reads as follows:

LUTHERAN CHURCH OF THE REFORMATION,

Washington, D. C., February 15, 1955.

The Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOLVERTON: In a time when world events produce so much anxiety and uncertainty in the human heart, and when the human spirit must endure hardships too heavy to bear alone, it is a great source of strength and consolation to be able to turn aside for a few moments to worship God and replenish the spirit.

For many years on Capitol Hill, noonday Community Lenten Services have been conducted at the Church of the Reformation. These services have been a source of inspiration for thousands of men and women who have desired, during Lent, a short period each day for meditation, prayer, and rest. The season of Lent through the long centuries has given to Christians an opportunity to deepen their spiritual life and to face their daily tasks with renewed faith and devotion.

The services are interdenominational in nature. Guest clergymen of all denominations are invited to speak. Lent affords an opportunity for people of all churches to worship their common Lord.

It is our hope that Members of the Congress will be able to attend the first service on Ash Wednesday, February 23 from 12:10 to

12:30. It is the first day of the sacred Lenten season. Special prayers will be offered in behalf of our President and Members of Congress at this service.

Services will be held each day, Monday through Friday at the same hour.

May we respectfully and sincerely invite all the Members of the Congress together with their staff to the Lenten services.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE D. FOLKEMER,
Pastor, Church of the Reformation.

The following is a list of the speakers who will address the Lenten Services and the days on which they will do so:

NOON-DAY LENTEN SPEAKERS

Ash Wednesday, February 23: Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, Church of the Reformation.

February 24: Rev. Donald W. Prigge, Church of the Reformation.

February 25: Rev. Otto Reimherr, Hope Lutheran Church.

February 28: Dr. Carl R. Simon, Keller Memorial Lutheran Church.

March 1, 2, 3, 4: Dr. Charles D. Kean, Church of the Epiphany (Episcopal).

March 7: Rev. Paul E. Horn, Memorial Evangelical United Brethren Church.

March 8, 9, 10, 11: Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, Calvary Baptist Church.

March 14: Rev. Robert E. Lee, St. Luke's Lutheran Church.

March 15, 16: Dr. Paul R. Schearrer, Takoma Park Presbyterian Church.

March 17, 18: Rev. P. Gordon Scott, Westmoreland Congregational Church.

March 21: Dr. Clarence E. Nelson, Augustana Lutheran Church.

March 22, 23—Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, National Presbyterian Church.

March 24: Dr. Robert E. Van Deusen, National Lutheran Council.

March 25: Dr. Edward B. Willingham, National Baptist Church.

March 28: Canon Theodore O. Wedel, Washington Cathedral.

March 29, 30: Dr. Albert P. Shirkey, Mount Vernon Methodist Church.

March 31, April 1: Dr. Carl Heath Kopf, First Congregational Church.

April 4: Dr. Walter B. Freed, Luther Place Memorial Church.

April 5: Dr. George M. Docherty, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church.

April 6: Dr. Hirl A. Kester, Waugh Methodist Church.

April 7: Dr. Lawrence D. Folkemer, Church of the Reformation.

April 8: 3-hour Good Friday service, 12 to 3 o'clock.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of Michigan State College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON HAYWORTH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State College, at Centennial Founders' Day awards dinner, February 12, 1955:

This event has an importance far transcending that normally attached to the celebration of a university's centennial. Despite our pride in our institution, and much significance as we attach to this date, we

recognize that many of you were impelled to come to East Lansing and take part in today's events by emotions besides your respect for Michigan State College. We are trying to make this whole centennial year more than a prolonged celebration of an institutional centenary; we recognize that we are observing, not the 100th birthday of Michigan State alone, but the centennial of putting into practice of a great, a new, a revolutionary idea in higher education. We honor the pioneers of Michigan who conceived the idea of a new kind of education and founded this college in the woods, near the State Capitol, but at that time 27 miles from the nearest railroad as the working embodiment of their hopes and ambitions for a better tomorrow and a better world. We recognize that they were but the intellectual and spiritual heirs of hundreds and thousands of men and women who had been thinking and working over many decades to devise an effective educational instrument with which to accomplish widespread and increasing good for mankind.

We revere men like John C. Holmes, and Bela Hubbard, and Joseph Williams, and Kinsley S. Bingham, and the other stalwarts of early Michigan. An eternal debt of gratitude is owed to them for their courage and foresight in establishing the Michigan Agricultural College as the first of the people's colleges. But on this Founders' Day we honor a much larger company, including both men with names distinguished in English and American history, and men whose names are now forgotten.

Fortune chanced to favor Michigan as the place in which the seeds scattered so widely in the years before 1855 were to germinate and to take root first. Conditions were favorable in many other places as witness the number of basically similar colleges established elsewhere within a few short years. The best evidence is in the fact that only 7 years after the Michigan experiment has been undertaken the Morrill Act creating the national system of land-grant colleges was passed by a Congress preoccupied with the problems of a terrible Civil War, and signed by a President weighed down by burdens such as no other President has ever been called upon to bear.

On this occasion it seems appropriate to cite a few of those from whom our Michigan pioneers must certainly have acquired inspiration and encouragement—men like John Milton, who, writing about education more than three centuries ago, gave a definition of education which remains one of the best ever proposed. His definition, you will recall, was this:

"I call, therefore, a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war."

Modern educators—or some of them—might criticize education as Milton conceived of it because it would not be pupil-centered, but I think we must give credit to Milton as one of the founders because he was interested in preparing men for full participation in the society of which they lived, which certainly is a traditional objective of education at the land-grant colleges and universities.

There are many others deserving of mention: The leaders of the dissident religious sects in colonial days which looked upon widespread literacy as a barrier against retreat into narrow dogmatism; the founders of Harvard and other early universities, with their concern that the colonies have an educated clergy; Jefferson, with his broad liberal ideas of education and his labor of love in establishing the University of Virginia as an institution far advanced for its day; the unrecorded thinkers and doers who brought William E. Channing, an outstanding pulpit orator of his day, to declare in a sermon:

"The grand doctrine, that every human being should have the means of self-culture, of progress in knowledge and virtue, of health, of comfort and happiness, of exercising the powers and affections of a man, this is slowly taking place as the highest social truth."

Men such as these deserve to be honored as founders of the new kind of education which became practically available just a century ago. There are many others, including Justin Morrill, the son of a Vermont blacksmith, who was determined to make available to the children of other poor men the education he had been denied; Abraham Lincoln, the son of a restless backwoods farmer, who knew from his own bitter experience the shortcomings of our educational system from the viewpoint of the common people; these, and many more, deserve their place on the list of founders to whom we pay tribute tonight.

I am sure you agree that it is by the happiest of coincidences that the day of this celebration should fall upon the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the man of the people, who must have taken deep personal satisfaction in setting his pen to the Morrill Act, knowing full well that he was performing a great act of emancipation for the common people from which he had come.

It is one of the strengths, and one of the glories, of the land-grant-college tradition that this new kind of education was developed and made available in response to a persistent public demand. We have in history no comparable example of an educational agency deliberately designed, created, and put into use specifically to do the will of the American people, to serve them as they wanted to be served. We in the land-grant colleges and universities would do well to remember that our institutions are the creatures of the people in the most specific sense, and I believe that history records that they have prospered and retained the affection of the people in direct proportion to their success in interpreting the changing needs of the common people of America and in serving those needs as the people themselves want them to be served.

The temptation on an occasion such as this is to recount the achievements of the century now passed into history, and to revel in the satisfaction which comes from association with a successful enterprise. But a prolonged review would be out of place to this audience which knows as well as, or better than I, the many magnificent accomplishments of higher education in America. But perhaps it would not be out of place to mention briefly some of the accomplishments of our society toward which higher education in general, and the land-grant colleges in particular, have contributed heavily in the century since 1855. We would not all agree in every particular in preparing such a list but I think we could single out at least three achievements upon which we would agree.

I am sure no one would quarrel with the first, which is the achievement of spectacular material gains, a higher standard of living than man has ever known. We would all agree that these spectacular gains came within our grasp as a people only when we decided to make the advantages of education available on the broadest possible scale. Thereby, we multiplied the native skills of the American people and made possible the miracles of invention and mass production with which we constantly astound the rest of the world. We could not have achieved these every-day miracles had we not opened the doors of educational opportunity wide, thereby creating not alone the trained working force required, but also the desire for the goods and services produced. This we have done by broadening perspectives and stimulating the ambitions of millions of people.

The application of science to the art of agriculture has been an underlying factor in

our industrial growth. As long as the great majority of our people had to be employed in the production of food and fiber we could spare few hands for the mills and shops. A century ago, something like 85 out of every 100 workers were necessarily engaged in agriculture, leaving only 15 to do the rest of the Nation's work. Today, thanks to the application of science, only 12 workers out of each 100 are needed on the farms to grow the food and fiber for the rest of our people. The other 88 are free to man the machine and sell the goods and provide the services which spell prosperity, comfort, and even luxury by standards elsewhere, for the people of the United States.

How great has been the contribution of the land-grant colleges, I leave to your own estimation. Certainly they deserve the bulk of the credit in the field of agriculture, and a good share in the field of engineering and the associated industrial arts.

A second achievement to be claimed for the century just ended is the achievement of a high degree of social mobility. In appraising this contribution of education, we must remember that, as President Conant pointed out this afternoon, an outstanding feature of the American system has been its insistence upon equality of opportunity. It was to achieve that equality that the founders established here the revolutionary college which was to grow into this university. They and others of like mind were determined that the sons and daughters of the well-to-do were not to have the advantages of higher education to themselves alone; they established as a major goal the affording of equal opportunities to the children of the industrial worker and the farmer as well.

As a result, for decade after decade, the children of the poor and the well-to-do have attended primary schools, secondary schools, and colleges and universities together; they have studied together, recited together, played together. Day after day, they have participated in repeated demonstrations that good marks and diplomas do not depend on wealth or social position, but depend upon the ability and the ambition of the individual. Generation after generation of young Americans have grown up with the certain knowledge that they need not remain in the economic or social classes to which they were born; they could climb upward as far as their intelligence and initiative could carry them, and by the same token could fall as far as their sloth and irresponsibility allowed. There has been no artificial traditional limit upon opportunity; the transition from rags to riches has long been commonplace in America.

In this healthy climate we Americans have nurtured and developed a unique way of life. Almost unnoticed either here or abroad, we have come closer to achieving the classless society of broad equality among people than have those nations which have sought to build such a society by law and dictatorial decree. For this magnificent achievement, the American system of education deserves much credit.

A companion achievement, closely associated with that of social mobility but deserving of mention as the third to be singled out this evening, is that of political stability. We have demonstrated, by millions of examples, that our political and social system does make it possible for a man or woman to achieve a full and happy life. We have examples by the millions that caste and class and sect are meaningless terms for those with intelligence and ambition, and in the fullness of time, we will be able to say with equal pride that color, too, has ceased to be an unfair handicap for the able man. This has kept us remarkably loyal to our basic political and economic system.

Here in these facts we have our strongest defense against the subversives of either ex-

treme who would pervert our system of living together to suit their twisted minds and unholy desires.

We dare not claim that more and more education is the only cure for the ills of the world. We can, however, say with pride that by our consistent efforts to insure equality through education, we have woven unequalled strength and stability into the fabric of American society.

But enough of looking to the past. It is all too easy to take too seriously the flattering things we say about ourselves, and about the accomplishments of education in general, and the land-grant philosophy in particular. The coins of yesterday will not pay the bills of tomorrow; indeed, we need to find out whether they will still be legal tender. It is in the future that we must do the unfinished work to which our centennial theme dedicates our efforts.

Peering as best we can into the cloudy future, what are likely to be the needs of the society which education is pledged to serve? Does the fundamental philosophy of the past as it has been molded and reshaped by events of a century still qualify as the rule by which to guide our actions?

In assaying the ability of our fundamental philosophy to meet the needs of the future, let us apply the tests suggested by the three major achievements we have claimed for higher education in America.

First, will we continue to need trained people, and an ever-increasing proportion of trained people in our population? The answer is most assuredly "yes." We are in a bitter struggle for survival with a political-economic system which has placed high stakes on education as a major device with which to gain its nefarious ends. We have been warned repeatedly that Communist Russia is training more scientists than we in the hope of eventually reversing our relative positions in the scientific fields, and thus gaining mastery over us through utilization of horrible engines of war. Our very will to survive dictates that we keep the lead in this nightmarish race until such time as mankind's good sense works out a scheme to outlaw aggression, war, and this constant flirting with mass destruction.

Moreover, our society grows steadily more complex and complicated. There have never been too many educated people; now we face the challenge to train enough merely to keep this ponderous and complicated machine moving efficiently. Certain our expanding economy, judging from past experience, will impose a demand for increasing numbers of young people trained in the traditional professions and vocations, and in many of which we do not even dream today.

Yes, we certainly can expect that the future will find use for the young people trained by our colleges and universities to serve in a wide variety of fields; here we are on sure ground.

Next, will we need to continue to strengthen our social structure to give it still more mobility and adaptability to meet changing conditions? Here there is much to be done; not yet have we achieved all that we should achieve, not so long as we have a single person in need of medical care beyond his resources, a single mistreated child, a single family deprived of the heritage of hope. As yet, equality of opportunity is still no more than the goal toward which we have taken tremendous strides. As yet, too many qualified young men and women find educations and the choice of life work beyond the possibility of realization; too many barriers of race and creed remain; intolerance and bigotry have not been banished from the land. Here, there is much for education to do; it is for us to hope that the record of the past will persuade the future to entrust to our institutions the responsibility of completing the work thus far advanced.

It is essential that the movement go forward, for now not our eyes alone are focused on our work; throughout the world, eyes are turned upon America to see if she is qualified for the role of leadership to which she has fallen heir. Alien eyes watch closely to see whether we make steady progress in solving our own social problems. What other nations see will go far in determining whether they finally accept our leadership, or reject the philosophy of freedom and opportunity we offer to them, and turn elsewhere for leadership. Only people with an educated understanding of our strengths and weaknesses, and with a will to make the improvements we need, can guide America through this critical period. I am sure you agree that such people can best be produced in large numbers in our colleges and universities; the question for us is whether we can produce them in the numbers required.

In the area of political stability, we are not as sure of our position. We must honestly face up to the fact that there has been some loss of confidence in colleges and universities in recent years. I feel that this results in part from our colleges and universities losing confidence in themselves, in their fundamental aims and purposes. If this were not true, we would not hear so much talk about the climate of fear in which some faculty members profess to find themselves. From my observation, this condition about which they complain has been grossly exaggerated. True, there have been attempts at political intimidation. But on the other hand, there have been some embarrassing examples of bad judgment and headstrong insistence on academic rights without much thought about academic responsibility, and the two have just about balanced each other, the only net result being that there has been planted in the public mind some suspicion about the essential integrity of colleges and universities.

Actually, this suspicion, if it does exist, might be attributed in part to a misguided attempt to blame someone for the feeling of insecurity which seems to be widely prevalent. The psychologists may not agree, but it appears to me that American people have been caught up in a net of frustration out of which they cannot find their way easily. Perhaps hurt bewilderment would be a more accurate description of their emotional condition. At any rate, they look at the tremendous expenditures in blood and treasure in two world wars and a localized but bitter war in Korea, at the billions they have sent overseas to help friendly and erstwhile enemy countries alike restore their economies, at the experts they have commissioned to help other countries move a little faster along the road to the good society, and what do they have to show for their efforts?

After making all of these expenditures, what do they see in return? The avowed enmity of a large portion of the world, the reluctant friendship of a much smaller portion, the close alliance of a still smaller portion, and the true understanding friendship of only a very few of the world's people. Knowing their own motives to be primarily altruistic, no wonder the American people are frustrated or bewildered. To be hated, pitied, tolerated—this, for Americans, is poor return on a colossal investment.

They have found, in short, that our wonderful shiny machines have not won for us the respect and affection of the world. They have learned that all of our wealth cannot buy us the peace and security we crave. Having devoted so much of our time and energy to the development of our great industrial system and the improvement of our standard of living, it is no wonder that we feel insecure when we find that we cannot depend on material possessions alone to give us our hearts' fondest desires.

Who is to blame if Americans have been led to place too much importance on material possessions, to depend too much upon science to solve all the problems of the world? This is not the time or place to assess blame, except to say that colleges and universities, as the source of many of our scientific miracles, and as pretenders to intellectual leadership, must accept their share. It is axiomatic that he who claims the credit for a particular plan or process is liable for blame if the plan fails or the process goes awry. It should not surprise us when those who sang the praises of the scientists for making all of our industrial and agricultural wonders possible are quick to say that those same scientists are to blame when they find that with all our worldly goods, we are still discontented and insecure.

The national malady of insecurity should be a matter of concern for our colleges and universities. We have as our responsibility the training of the leaders of this country; it is we who have encouraged them to take the materialistic view of life. As an example, it is we who have countenanced the stripping of the cultural subjects from the scientific curricula and graduated engineers who knew engineering and little else, biologists who knew biology and little else, chemists who knew chemistry and little else, and narrow specialists in many fields. The land-grant colleges, with their strong technological traditions, have been as guilty as any in this distortion of education.

If our national feeling of insecurity can be attributed to a slackening of national reliance upon material things, then there is great hope for America, because our churches and our educational system can do something to remedy the situation. In these times when we find that material advantages do not automatically bring peace and security in their wake, perhaps we can bring the American people to agree with Emerson that "a rush of thoughts is the only conceivable prosperity that can come to us."

In view of the conditions of the day and the prospects for the future we are forced to the conclusion that a considerable re-vamping of our educational machinery and a revision of our attitudes are desirable if we are to meet successfully the challenges that press upon us. We must come back to the realization that colleges and universities, public and private alike, are operated and supported, not alone for the benefit of the students, as individuals, but for the good society will reap from having those students trained for lives of greater usefulness.

To accomplish this end, it is essential that the devotees of the liberal arts tradition and the protagonists of the practical compose their differences once and for all, each conceding that the other has something good to offer, and that education cannot be complete without both.

My plea is for a definition of education to fit the times. Let me suggest that an educated man in today's world is one who is trained and conditioned to be an effective citizen. He need not necessarily be a man who has attained wealth, or outstanding professional distinction, or high public office. Indeed, he may not be known beyond the borders of his own community.

But he will have been educated to contribute to the economic well-being to the limit of his creative and productive skills; he will have been educated to contribute to social stability by his understanding of the world around him, and by his tolerance for the rights and opinions of others; he will have been educated to contribute to the moral stability of his Nation by his acceptance and practice of such fundamental principles as personal honor and integrity, belief in a good God, and government by law instead of by men; and he will have been educated to contribute to the political sta-

bility by his reasoned, thinking approach to public issues, his rejection of demagogic appeals, and his ability to lead or to follow with equal intelligence.

If we keep some such definition in mind, we as educators will not think so much in terms of graduating engineers, or accountants, or doctors, or agriculturists, or lawyers, or teachers, as of graduating educated men and women, trained to be effective citizens of our democracy and of the world, men and women ready and willing to assume leadership in a Nation crying for more intelligent direction and guidance in a world full of confusion, insecurity, and doubt.

It is both disconcerting and humbling to realize that the Founders we honor on this occasion saw clearly the need for education of this kind, and spoke plainly to those who would heed. From the numberless pages of reference, I draw but three abbreviated examples of their wisdom in charting the course of American education.

The first is the familiar injunction from the Ordinance of 1787 establishing the Northwest Territory of which Michigan was once a part:

"Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" as a means of preserving the lasting values on which successful popular government are built.

The second is the equally-familiar statement from the Morrill Act providing for the liberal and practical education of the common people in the several pursuits and professions of life.

The third is from a source less familiar to most of you. It comes from the writings of Bela Hubbard, one of the Michigan farmers who worked successfully to establish the first agricultural college here just 100 years ago. After describing the technical courses which should be offered in this new kind of college, that backwoods farmer added this significant word of caution: "Nor should the claims of literature and the fine arts be wholly neglected, as tending to polish the mind and manner, and add greater luster and dignity to life."

How wisely they thought. How plainly they spoke. How well advised we of this sophisticated modern age would be to take their counsel as we move into the second century of service to the American people. We could pay these Founding Fathers no greater honor than to acknowledge the wisdom of their words, the clarity of their vision. Armed with such wisdom, warmed by such understanding, we can march unafraid to meet the challenges of the unknown future, sustained by the faith that as we serve God's children, we perform the will of God.

Proposed Increase in Salaries of Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Pay Hike for Congress," published in the Washington Daily News of February 17, 1955, pointing out the unsoundness of salary increases financed by borrowing by our Government, which is already living off the taxable income of future generations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PAY HIKE FOR CONGRESS

By the overwhelming vote of 283 to 118, the House of Representatives has voted to raise the salaries of its own Members, and those of the Senate and Federal judges.

There are many ways to justify higher salaries for Congressmen. Statistics, such as figures on the rise in the cost of living since the last pay raise, can be found which may even support the 66½ percent raise the House favors.

We have no idea that the House honestly expects such a big raise. The \$10,000 increase was voted for bargaining purposes with the more conservative Senate.

But whatever may be the proper salary boost for Members of Congress, we think the public has a right to expect that they will show the same enthusiasm in finding the money to pay for the raise—either by taxation or spending economies. And definitely not thru more borrowing by a Government already living off the taxable incomes of future generations.

Urey Denounces Atom Spy's Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Urey Denounces Atom Spy's Trial," which was published in the New York Times on Sunday, February 13, 1955. In that connection I also ask to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter in answer to the article, the letter having been written by Herbert Bayard Swope, under date of February 14, 1955, addressed to the New York Times, and published in its issue of February 16; and also an editorial entitled "Where To Employ an Expert," the editorial being in regard to the same matter.

There being no objection, the article, letter, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 13, 1955]

UREY DENOUNCES ATOM SPY'S TRIAL—CHARGES SOBELL WAS NOT JUSTIFIED—HE ALSO DEFENDS ROSENBERGS

CHICAGO, February 12.—Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel Prize winner and professor of chemistry and nuclear studies at the University of Chicago, charged here tonight that:

Morton Sobell, who was convicted with Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the atom spies, "was not properly tried," and that "the verdict and sentence were not justified."

The Rosenbergs were not proved guilty of the crime for which they were executed.

Warning that the integrity of justice as administered in the United States was at stake, Dr. Urey said:

"If proper trials cannot be secured for unpopular people—and it is evident from the publicity of this trial that all those charged with crimes were unpopular—then it will become impossible to secure justice for other somewhat less unpopular people and so on until no justice is possible at all."

Dr. Urey spoke at a testimonial dinner given him by the Chicago Sobell committee. The Chicago group is a unit of the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell.

A spokesman said the group was attempting to secure a new trial for Sobell. It also is seeking to have Sobell removed from Alcatraz, where he is serving a 30-year prison term, to another penitentiary.

Dr. Urey was among prominent Americans who joined in a "friends of the court" brief submitted January 28 to the Chief Clerk of the Supreme Court. The brief asked for a new trial for Sobell. The appeal is based on the ground of new evidence that major prosecution witnesses had committed perjury.

At the dinner, Dr. Urey made his charges after he had been presented with a bound volume of scrolls. They were signed by 5,000 persons throughout the world in tribute to him as a scientist and for his achievements as a citizen.

The volume of scrolls, which was presented by Mrs. Sobell, read in part:

"In your protests in the Rosenberg and Sobell case, even to those who may disagree with your evaluation of the case itself, you have exemplified the vital principle of seeking out firmly and courageously when one deeply feels an injustice has taken place."

Dr. Urey criticized the use of the professional informer by the Department of Justice and congressional committees. He cited recent statements of Harvey Matusow that he had given false testimony in trials of Communists. He also said that Roy M. Cohn, former counsel for the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, then headed by Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin, had been involved by Matusow.

Dr. Urey said that Mr. Cohn was assistant prosecutor against Sobell and the Rosenbergs. The scientist stressed that Sobell had been convicted on the word of an admitted perjurer.

He also asserted that a well-justified concern for our security on a modern, dangerous world has led us to do things which will undermine our life, our form of Government, and our freedoms.

Defending his right to voice his views, Dr. Urey said, "I am exercising certain rights that were mine at birth and I wish to keep them until death."

Following is a list of some who signed the scrolls:

Dr. James Franck and Linus Pauling, Nobel prize-winning scientists; Dr. Henry Steele Commager, Columbia University; Van Wyck Brooks, author; Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, president emerita of Bethune-Cookman College; Roger Baldwin, national chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union; Dr. Percy Julian, of Oak Park, Ill., president of Suburban Chemical Co., Franklin Park, Ill.; Prof. Fowler Harper, Yale Law School; A. Phillip Randolph, president of Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, A. F. of L.; Dr. Robert Strozzi, dean of students, University of Chicago; Rabbi Abraham Cronbach, of Cincinnati.

Also Alexander Meikeljohn, former president of Amherst College; Prof. Kirtley Mather, Harvard; Prof. Ernest W. Burgess, University of Chicago; Prof. Philip Morrison, scientist, Ithaca, N. Y.; Prof. Mark De Wolfe Howe, Harvard Law School; Prof. Robert S. Lynd, Columbia University; Judge George Quillie, Chicago; Dr. George Sarton, Harvard; Justice James A. Wolfe, of Utah, retired.

Also Charles A. Coulson, professor of mathematics, Oxford, England; Lord Chorley, Middlesex, England; Waldo Frank, author; Prof. Dorothy Brewster, retired, Columbia University; John K. Holm, scientist, Pittsburgh; Serge Hovv, composer, New York City; Prof. Anton J. Carlson, University of Chicago; Dr. Alexander S. Langsdorf, dean

emeritus, Washington University; Robert Morris Lovett, former Governor of the Virgin Islands; Dr. Isaac Kolthoff, scientist, University of Minnesota; the Reverend John Howland Lathrop, the Reverend John Paul Jones, and Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois, educator, all of New York.

Also the Reverend John Howard Melish, the Reverend William Howard Melish, and Rabbi Max Felshin, all of New York; Prof. H. H. Wilson, Princeton University, and Royal Wilbur France, attorney, New York.

Also Robert M. Hutchins, former president of the University of Chicago, now head of Fund for the Republic, Inc., an offshoot of the Ford Foundation, and Arnold Toynbee, British historian.

[From the New York Times of February 16, 1955]

SCIENTIST'S STAND OPPOSED—DISSERVICE TO OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM IS SEEN IN DR. UREY'S STATEMENT

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Once more the question of government by law or government by scientists has come to the fore. Prof. Harold C. Urey, at a dinner in Chicago February 12 reported by the Times on February 13, is quoted as being convinced that a grave injustice has been done the Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell, who were convicted in connection with treason to the United States in revealing secrets of the atomic bomb to Russia.

It is every man's right to adjourn to the nearest tavern and revile the court which may have rendered an adverse decision, but when it comes to a question of standardizing justice, how can one better the process of assuming that truth has been served by the hands of the United States district court (in which Judge Irving R. Kaufman did a palpably honest job), the circuit court of appeals, and the United States Supreme Court, which had the Rosenberg case before it three times.

How is our thinking to be formulated? Is it to be based upon the convictions of an individual or the concerted efforts of the courts, acting on a verdict of our fellow citizens sitting as a jury—a method that represents the highest form of public opinion?

DEFENSE METHODS

Professor Urey is undoubtedly a scientist of high order, but does that fact equip him to hold an opinion better than the rest of us who may not know how to make heavy water, but who know and feel the claims of justice? The explanation does not lie in the superiority of his opinion nor that of his fellows. It lies in the curious belief that certain types of scientists are laws unto themselves. They have not yet become certain that, for better or for worse, nationalism is still prevalent. Accordingly, self-protection of a country requires an immediate and an adequate defense against any form of security violations.

Perhaps in the future we will have outgrown nationalism. Personally, I doubt it. But until that time comes I do not see that the attitude of men like Urey or J. Robert Oppenheimer, for whom I hold in other matters a good opinion, should be permitted to destroy the methods of defense through our courts that have been so laboriously built up since Magna Carta.

I think that Dr. Urey's utterance was incendiary. He has a right to an opinion, but I submit that, airing it in the manner in which he did, supported by a galaxy of names, it is not inclined to strengthen our judicial system.

Mind this: I am not one of those who demand conformity. Hitler made "Gleichformigkeit" an abhorrence. To me, democracy is defined best as dissent. But dissent can be expressed in a less arrogant and provocative manner than Professor Urey em-

ployed. I would not stop him from a free expression of opinion, but I ask that the forces of those who do not agree with his views become articulate so that their silence will not be taken to mean their assent.

SCIENCE OF LAW

Let them believe that the science of law, even though it be occasionally in error, is as important to us—even more important—than the nuclear sciences. We live under the first every day, but the second, praise be, is one that touches us only occasionally and up to now it has done us no good except in the increase of knowledge.

And knowledge, too, is restricted. Not long ago a distinguished scholar, Dr. Grayson Kirk, who is doing so well at Columbia University, used a slogan for the university's bicentennial celebration, "Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof." The first part of the statement, "Man's Right to Knowledge," is sound; but the second part—"and the Free Use Thereof"—is not true. There is much knowledge that we dare not employ freely; for example, the use of knowledge that has to do with our defense.

Much that I have said about Professor Urey applies to other scientists; and I would not exclude Professor Einstein from that group.

The Times, always seeking to be scrupulously fair, printed Urey's statement at length. It owes at least one dissent to the opposition. This, then, is an effort to express that right.

HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE,

New York, February 14, 1955.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of February 7, 1955]

WHERE TO EMPLOY AN EXPERT

The very heart of the most dangerous problem of this democratic age was reached in a speech before the Edison Pioneers by Senator BAICKEK, of Ohio, when he questioned the competence of great scientists in specialized fields to lead society in political and moral fields.

This is a most dangerous problem because the scientist today is a great hero who has accomplished breathtaking wonders and overshadowed all the heroes of bygone ages.

The scientists have given us wonder drugs, radio, television, a greatly lengthened life span, a myriad of labor-saving devices—and now the awesome atomic bomb. The scientist has, indeed, a great deal of prestige weight to throw around, and he seems, in some instances, determined to do the throwing.

This democratic age is innately dangerous because it gives everyone an equal voice in public affairs, but fails to give everyone an equal sense of responsibility. There is no way, of course, of conferring equal understanding upon all the people.

This equality of power against a background of unequal knowledge and competence creates the greatest danger of self-destruction that any society has ever faced.

Self-discipline is the only hope of a democratic society, the self-discipline that compels the average man to restrain the exercise of his power in fields in which he lacks knowledge and competence, while impelling him to seek knowledge and competence.

The average man, however, is less dangerous to society in this respect than the great expert who, still human despite his specialized brilliance, partakes of the sin of assuming his own infallibility.

The adulation of the world is a heady thing, and it is entirely understandable that a man who has wrought great miracles in science should come to value his opinions even in fields unrelated to his specialty.

To make matters worse, the glamorous scientist finds his modesty, even when he

strives to retain it, attacked and besieged by his idolatrous admirers. He is constantly importuned to identify his name with seemingly noble causes and to strike a lance for advanced ideas in politics and morality.

Only an uncommonly wise man could resist the idolatrous pressures of the mob. Senator BURCKE in his speech the other night said that the late Thomas A. Edison was such an uncommonly wise man, having refused to throw his great weight around in the area of public affairs.

There may be other such men in science today who possess an equal share of the wisdom of modesty, but they are far less known and numerous than the many experts in specialized fields who allow their fame and prestige to be exploited for propaganda.

Some liberal intellectuals have expressed great alarm over what they believe to be a wave of anti-intellectualism that threatens to destroy all knowledge.

They should worry more about the danger of deification and self-deification of the experts, and be thankful that there is some resistance in our society to this madness.

An expert, no matter how brilliant in his field, does not necessarily have a more valuable opinion on matters of public affairs than a nonexpert. The nonexpert is less likely to throw his weight around and, in any event, has little potential for misleading others. But the famed expert becomes a danger when he so forgets himself to address his vast audience on matters of which he is ignorant.

Democracy is in far greater danger from the trespassing expert than from its avowed enemies.

Benefits for Dependent Parents of Old Age Insurance Beneficiaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is my desire to call attention to a bill, H. R. 4072, which will provide monthly benefits, under the Social Security Act, for the dependent parents of individuals receiving old-age insurance benefits.

The problem which this bill is designed to meet was called to my attention by a constituent who is over 65 and is supporting his 91-year-old mother. At first blush, I thought it was a very unusual problem. But when I began to check into it, I was astonished to discover that there are many similar cases.

What this gentleman pointed out to me, in effect, was that under the present social security laws, if he were supporting a wife or dependent children, he would be entitled to additional benefits. Supporting his own parents, however, he receives no such benefit. That seemed obviously unfair and improper to him, and it does to me. The income-tax laws, by way of contrast, permit the same deduction for any person, young or old, who is living in the taxpayer's household and receiving more than half his support from the taxpayer.

My bill would only add dependent parents on an equal footing with other dependents of the recipient of old-age

insurance benefits. It does not put them in any special class.

The entire social-security program might well be subjected to a study and reexamination with respect to its benefits for elderly people. I think it is quite likely that other provisions in the law may be similarly discriminatory with respect to people of advanced years.

The life expectancy of our people is increasing so rapidly that we have not kept pace with it. Today thousands live comfortably and happily into their nineties. On the basis of 1950 figures, our average life expectancy is now 68 years, a gain of something like 21 years since 1900. Among people who have now reached the age of 65, the men have an average expectancy of 13 more years, while the women have 15 years. And the span is increasing further all the time.

This longer life that has been given us is a wonderful thing, and I am sure that Congress will not lose sight of the legislative problems it creates. I hope I shall be around to introduce a measure for dependent grandparents when that becomes necessary.

Address of Welcome by Merton B. Tice, Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Dinner Honoring Members of Congress Who Have Served in the Armed Forces, Statler Hotel, February 15, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address given by Merton B. Tice, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, before the annual VFW dinner held in Washington, D. C., at the Statler Hotel, on February 15, 1955. This dinner is an annual occasion by the Veterans of Foreign Wars honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces.

The address follows:

Honored Members of the Congress of the United States, distinguished civil and military officials, and my comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, welcome.

I know that I speak for our 1,250,000 members when I say that we are exceptionally proud of our guests who have honored us by their presence tonight.

We profoundly appreciate that at a time of great international crisis, you to whom the guidance of public affairs is entrusted, have taken time from your important duties to break bread with us.

May I say, at the very outset, that although I am keenly aware that we are in a city that is, both by custom and necessity, uncommonly vocal—a city where speeches, good, bad, and indifferent, may be heard

daily—I promise there will absolutely be no long speeches tonight.

I am glad that so many of our VFW officers and members have come from our various States to meet their legislators; some have come from long distances. Many have called upon you, and a number have requested that I thank you publicly for the very cordial reception you accorded to them.

Primarily this traditional annual dinner of tonight is a sincere gesture on our part to honor the Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces. However, for those here who did not have the opportunity to serve, we also extend a very hearty welcome.

As an organization of overseas veterans, we shall ever think that the dangers and sacrifices of active duty creates a definite bond between all who defended our country. And now that you have, in a time of uneasy peace, the high duty of preserving the basic objectives of the American system—which includes legislating for the veterans of past wars, and determining the size of the forces that may have to fight another—God forbid—all of these responsibilities taken together makes all of us deeply conscious of your importance as representatives of the people—our people.

We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have an unshakable confidence in representative government, and although we may not always agree with you on some phases of legislation—for what we deem valid considerations—we shall ever stand beside and behind you in resisting any and all who try to subvert or dynamite our way of life.

For example, in the matter of national security, we may want to go a little farther than some of you in determining the size of our Armed Forces. We would prefer to be wrong on the side of safety. When there are international stresses that make the world tremble—as of the present—we are reminded of some sad days in our history when it was too little and too late. We all can recall tortured periods when time had to be bought by the sacrifice of precious lives. That, we do not want to happen again. The stakes are too great to hazard long-shot gambles for the purpose of economy. There is no second money in modern war and little first. Nevertheless, the stakes are all or nothing.

We are confident that you will give a most realistic and objective consideration to the military budget, not only with a view to its overall defensive aspects but particularly to its offensive aspects. I am sure that you will all agree that wars are won by speedy, adequate, hard-hitting offense.

Every intelligent American knows that the threat of force is all that counts in the sinister policies of those men in the Kremlin who now pull the strings of 800 million subjugated people. May we show no weakness at this crucial period of civilization, no whitening away at the size of that splendid body of men that as a force in being protects us all tonight. We of the VFW salute them—the men and women of the Armed Forces.

A number of our most distinguished civil and military leaders are our welcome guests tonight. We thank their spokesman for briefing us while here. As an organization, we commend their patriotism and devotion to duty as they make plans and train officers and men for only one purpose—the security of our country. To those dedicated to that task, goes our heartfelt gratitude.

Again we thank our distinguished guests of the Congress for coming. May you preserve the peace, but about the only way we know how you can do it is to be ready for any eventuality.

And as we—Americans all—do our part to counter the Godless philosophy of communism, I know of no finer advice for all of us than:

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit ye like men, be strong."

Chinese Can Be Led To Win Own Freedom From Red Communist Masters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in an article published in many newspapers in the United States, Mr. Vicente Villamin, distinguished Filipino economist and writer, presents a new approach to the Communist problem in China which is worth the attention of our Government.

He starts with the premise that the Chinese Communist regime has an economic program similar to, and an improvement on, the program that built Soviet Russia into a formidable industrial nation and military power.

Then he proceeds to say that in less number of years than it took Soviet Russia to develop, Communist China would become a much stronger nation than she is today, and that as a result the two nations combined would be a tremendously threatening menace to the free world.

Mr. Villamin proposes an economic program for the Chinese people that is better in every respect than the Communist program. Such program should be offered as an incentive for them to cooperate actively with Nationalist China to overthrow the Communist regime. By its very nature and purpose, it is conditional on the Chinese people putting down that regime first.

The 13 million Chinese who live abroad will be the sponsors of such a program. The free world, especially the United States, could help. These Chinese, particularly the 12 million who live in southeast Asia, know, or must know, that if the countries in which they reside should go Communist their businesses and holdings will be confiscated by the Communist government. It is, therefore, to their best interest to invest a part of their vast holdings to stop the Communists in China, for in stopping them there they are stopped in other parts of Asia.

I wish to make a part of my remarks the following article of Mr. Villamin as it appeared in the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News:

MEETING THE COMMUNISTS IN CHINA WITH AN ECONOMIC PROGRAM FOR THE PEOPLE (By Vicente Villamin)

The Communists everywhere are on the offensive. They have their militant mission to perform. The best the Europeans can do is to organize an effective defense. The chief function of the Americans is to deter the Communists from aggression and to help those who are resisting and fighting the Communists. Averse to initiating aggression, the free world is indeed on the defensive.

The Communists are gaining in number, prestige, and territory. How and where to stop them is the free world's most serious and urgent concern. It is in China where they can be stopped and communism overcome. And that can be done if the Chinese people should give their complete cooperation in overthrowing the Communist regime.

The formula of victory is this: To convert China from an enemy under the Communists to a friend and ally under the Nationalists. If that is accomplished, China will become an enemy instead of an ally of Soviet Russia as she is now. And that the basic transposition would be a lethal blow to Russia and might well start the weakening and disintegration of communism in the world.

The danger of the free world from the combination of Soviet Russia and Communist China is clear and formidable. All free men should know it by heart.

Associated with Soviet Russia, China increases tremendously and aggressively the communist menace to the free world and makes it irresistible even now to many free countries or a combination of them. That will be more so as China becomes stronger every year, industrially and militarily.

Pitted against Russia, China, collaborating with the free world would greatly debilitate that country, upset her plans of world conquest and thereby initiate the beginning of the end of communism in the world.

On the one hand, with China's enormous manpower and natural resources utilized with her own, Russia could overwhelm Western Europe. When Europe realizes that possibility, it would perforce quit considering Asia as but an inconsequential, subordinate element to Europe in the global struggle against the Communists.

On the other hand, with the aid of Russia's industrial and military potentials, China could dominate east and south Asia and the island countries of Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States fortified islands in the western Pacific.

Then their next target would be the Western Hemisphere, North and South America, with China approaching on the Pacific side and Russia on the Atlantic.

On April 19, 1951, Gen. Douglas MacArthur stirred the United States Congress with these words: "I have strongly recommended in the past as a matter of military urgency that under no circumstances must Formosa (the seat of the Nationalist government) fall under Communist control [applause]. Such eventually would at once threaten the freedom of the Philippines and the loss of Japan, and might well force our western frontier back to the coast of California, Oregon and Washington."

Contemporary events—Hainan, Korea, Indochina, Quemoy—show that the Russo-Chinese combination is moving forward according to a blueprint and is succeeding. This must be stopped before its momentum acquires irresistibility, which, unfortunately to the free world, it is acquiring every day.

It cannot be stopped simply by the United States recognizing Communist China and approving her admission to membership in the United Nations. Like Soviet Russia, which has that recognition and membership in the world organization, Communist China will continue to be an enemy and tormentor of the United States.

It certainly cannot be stopped by continuing to be on the defensive, or by being indecisive, or by believing that the Communists are people whose practice of right and wrong is the same as that of the rest of the world. Peaceful coexistence (love and help each other) is the mandate of God, but the Communists do not believe in God and His mandates.

The Russo-Chinese combination can be stopped and destroyed in China and nowhere else because of the special conditions prevailing in that country of more than 500 million people. The cooperation of the Chinese people in this work is the categorical and imperative essential. That cooperation could be expected for at least three reasons: Firstly, they have found communism wicked and unbearable. Secondly, they are not yet so shackled by the Communist iron discipl-

pline as the Russian people already are, as to prevent them from planning and acting together and rising in revolt against the Communist regime. And, thirdly, they have seen Nationalist China improve and strengthen herself for the reoccupation of the mainland and earning the respect and support of the United States and the rest of the free world.

But the Chinese people must have a spearhead and a rallying point. And they must be inspired and induced by something at once vital and concrete to fight for besides the beatitudes of freedom and democracy. For, after all, they are of blood and flesh and need the things that sustain mortal life and make it worth living.

The libertarian army of Nationalist China under President Chiang Kai-shek provides the spearhead and rallying point when it lands on the mainland. It should have on hand for distribution, as surely it would, an adequate supply of arms and ammunition. President Chiang has already many extra trained officers to command the people's fighting contingents. And he has the model government on Formosa, honest, free, economical and effective, that will be established on the mainland over the ruins of the Communist dictatorial and conspiratorial government.

What is that vital and concrete inducement that would make the Chinese people more ready to risk their lives and join the libertarian army? The answer is an economic aid program to improve the living condition of the Chinese people, promote social justice, ensure freedom, and create a good government according to the native genius and noble aspirations of those ancient people.

Here is a specific suggestion advanced for what it is worth. Let the United States and other free countries, which are able and willing, endorsed by the 13 million Chinese who live outside of China, announce that if and after the Chinese people have overthrown the Communist regime they will finance a 5-year economic aid program costing, say, \$2 billion a year for the benefit of the Chinese people.

That program should be conceived by Chinese and be a Chinese program and not any other people's program. They would have the assistance of their friends all over the world if they ask for it, as surely they would, in the program's preparation, implementation and execution. They would want especially the close collaboration of the United States, which would furnish in the beginning the greater portion of its financial support.

From the Chinese living overseas could be expected contributions of brains, experience, work, and money. The loyalty of the overwhelming majority of them is to Nationalist, not Communist, China. Among them are many successful businessmen, bankers, industrialists, engineers, chemists, farmers, shippers, educators, scientists, and other professions and occupations. They must know, or be made to know, that if the countries where they live go Communist their property would be confiscated and their freedom restricted. Patriotism and self-interest would lead them to give the economic aid program their full approval and support.

It is absolutely necessary to have this program, not only to encourage the people but also to take the place of the Communist program which is now in operation. To be attractive and powerful, it will have to be much better than the one it will displace. From what is known of the Communist program, the new one could be made easily more advantageous and acceptable to the Chinese people.

In advancing this program, the free world is not taking a military offensive but one to liberate the people from the Communist economic machine that makes them robots and slaves. It would be exerting its eco-

conomic power for good. As to the United States, she would be simply continuing her work of assistance and cooperation for the welfare of the Chinese people that had been going on for 100 years until rudely stopped by the Communists. It is the Chinese people themselves led by the Nationalist government that will have to exert whatever effort is required to eliminate the Communist regime, so the economic aid program could be put into operation.

The cost of the program is little, considered in the light of relevant comparative statistics, as follows:

The amount of \$2 billion, the annual investment on the program, is roughly one-half of 1 percent of the annual income of the American people. It is about 3 percent of the annual budget of the Federal Government.

The 3-year inconclusive war in Korea had cost the United States alone \$15 billion and 142,000 human casualties. And hundreds of millions of dollars more are being spent for Korea's rehabilitation and aid to the government.

The United States Government spends approximately \$50 billion a year for defense and security. This is largely the result of Russian pressure, direct and indirect. When, say, 10 years from now Communist China becomes stronger, industrially and militarily, as she is bound to be, the defense and security expenditures of the United States would surely be much greater.

If the economic program succeeds, as it should, apart from the abolishment of the menace of communism, it would bring tremendous economies to the United States Government and peace of mind to the American people and the rest of mankind. It would bring progress and prosperity to China as well as to other countries in Asia. Defeatism, neutralism and fear will disappear. It would truly lead to universal tranquility. Thus the investment in the economic aid program would prove to be the best investment conceivable from every standpoint of the world's well-being.

The author was in Formosa early this year when the last batch of the 14,000 war prisoners from the Chinese Communist army arrived from Korea. Asking hundreds of them with the aid of an interpreter what was the first reason why they, their relatives and neighbors in China did not like communism, he received the significant answer that under communism the Chinese family was being broken up to make the individual's loyalty and allegiance to the state total and overpowering in his life. They all said they would fight to the death to prevent such unspeakable outrage.

That voluntary act of those men to choose Nationalist over Communist China leads to two fundamental conclusions: (1) that the Chinese people are definitely against the Communist regime for good and sufficient reasons, and (2) that substantial segments of the Communist army could be expected to defect to the Nationalist army to which most of them formerly belonged. A welcome message from Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek would be a potent call to them to return to their old fatherland cleansed of godless communism and brutalitarian Russianism.

Of course, there are other reasons that make the Chinese people thoroughly disgusted with the Communist regime. For instance, on mere suspicion of disloyalty or lack of enthusiasm for the regime, after a mock trial and defying all human sensibilities, millions of people have been worked to death, maltreated, humiliated, hounded, imprisoned, or liquidated outright. No people on earth would stand that for long. The Chinese people have already had enough of that merciless terrorism.

What if Russia should go to the aid of China in the event of the Chinese people siding with the Nationalists to liquidate the

Communist regime? If Russia did that, it would unite the Chinese people and reinforce their determination to do away with that regime and its Russian malodorous influence. If the Chinese people detest the Chinese Communists, they intensely hate the Russian Communists who are trying to run and ruin their country. They will assert themselves as Chinese, and they will prove invincible.

Resolutely facing the urgent and challenging realities of the present, let the free world now recognize the dynamic and decisive role that China could play today in annihilating communism in Asia first and then starting its discrediting and disintegration in the whole world.

If communism is not defeated in China soon, then woe to the free world. Marching together for power and loot, China and Russia will stalk arrogantly upon the entire face of the earth and cover it with the bones of the free peoples who resisted them and lost.

Congress' Pay and Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

CONGRESS PAY AND INTEGRITY—\$25,000 IS NOT TOO MUCH SALARY FOR A LAWMAKER IF HE IS TO SERVE HIS CONSTITUENCY HONORABLY

(By David Lawrence)

If the conscience of any Member of Congress hurts him about voting for that pay raise of \$10,000 a year, there is an easy way out—to give back to the Treasury as much as he likes.

There's precedent for such a gift. Herbert Hoover gave back most of the presidential salary he received while in the White House. He himself never revealed that fact but his friends have told about it. Maybe there are other public servants who have done the same thing and kept it secret.

What a proper salary for Members of Congress should be is a very serious matter and goes to the heart of the question of integrity in government.

Many of those in the House of Representatives who voted against the proposed increase—which has yet to pass the Senate—did so because of a conscientious belief that the voters wouldn't approve of it. But it is important that the voters should know all the facts. For many Members who voted against the increase really deserve to have the higher salary to cover those expenses they have been trying to meet out of their own pockets. Likewise, some who voted for the increase did so out of consideration for the plight of their colleagues, though they themselves didn't need the extra money.

It all comes down to a simple proposition—the American people certainly don't want only rich men in Congress, nor do they want to see Members accepting gratuities from constituents or big campaign contributions in appreciation of service they may have rendered.

Members of the House come up for election every 2 years, so they are constantly in need of campaign money. Many of them supply it out of their own pockets rather than solicit gifts from constituents who seek special privileges. But the worst phase of the

matter is the drain on the funds of a Member of Congress by residents of his district or State who feel their Congressman or Senator is something of an errand boy or personal representative in Washington.

Lots of the things done by Members of Congress for people back home are worth thousands of dollars to those who are benefited, yet there is no such thing as a "service charge" or "fee" to be paid. Indeed, it would be highly improper for any such payment to be made.

If, for example, a new post office building or a defense installation or some other Federal project involving huge sums of money is brought to an area as a result of the efforts of a Member of either House, there are citizens who profit by the rise in real estate values and in other ways. They cannot and should not pay for that service. Yet, in the doing of that chore for the people, various expenses are often incurred and in many instances it is the Member of Congress who foots the bill rather than become involved in some transaction which a political opponent could some day uncover and use as a smear.

It is odd, but members of national legislatures the world over have trouble about the size of their salaries. In Britain the Churchill government almost was overthrown last spring because the Labor Party insisted on a pay raise and the Conservatives opposed it. Many of them are wealthy and carry on extensive business interests. Only after some Conservatives deserted their leadership was the issue compromised. Today the pay of a member of the House of Commons is the equivalent of about \$2,800 a year, with an extra allowance they may request for each day the House sits. This amounts approximately to about an extra \$740 a year. Curiously enough, the House members in London have no private offices or staffs provided by the government.

In France, the pay is equivalent to about \$5,000 a year and the 100 Communist deputies contribute about \$3,000 apiece directly to the party fund, or approximately \$300,000 a year, which is quite a sizable help in carrying on Communist propaganda.

In the State legislatures in this country members are poorly paid and it is a scandal that corporations with business before these bodies often retain as counsel for other services members who are lawyers. The labor unions do the same thing.

Many Members of Congress have outside incomes. Some earn it by getting large fees for speaking before labor unions and trade bodies of various kinds. Others still practice law before State courts. Some have large business interest, or derive big income from investments.

The raise in pay is needed in order to permit the election to Congress of citizens irrespective of their income status. A total of \$25,000 a year, out of which comes \$4,500 for taxes, or a net of \$20,500, is not too much for a Member of either the House or the Senate to receive if he is honorably to serve his constituency.

Thirty-fourth Anniversary of the Temporary Establishment of Freedom in the Armenian Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that today, Friday the 18th,

marks the 34th anniversary of the temporary establishment of freedom in the Armenian Republic, a freedom which only lasted a few months and was then overthrown by the dictatorship of the Soviet Union.

I am pleased to call the attention of the House to this anniversary in view of the often-expressed hope of the administration and the Congress that the day will soon come when all subjugated peoples now behind the Iron Curtain will again enjoy the right of self-determination and a government of their own choice. I, therefore, trust that the Armenian people will continue to keep alive the spirit of hope for the time when they, too, will once again breathe the air of freedom which they enjoyed so briefly 34 years ago.

A Memorial to the Late E. B. Aldrich, of Pendleton, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM COON

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, on April 30, 1953, I introduced a joint resolution entitled, "To Designate the Lake To Be Formed by the McNary Lock and Dam in the Columbia River, Oreg., and Wash., as Lake Umatilla"; however this bill was not acted upon. Today I am introducing a bill asking that this body of water be named Lake Aldrich as a memorial to the late E. B. Aldrich, of Pendleton, Oreg. This action is taken after a great deal of thought on my part. The Umatilla Indians have been immortalized in our State, as well they should be, and it is unnecessary to name anything more for them in order to accomplish this. The Umatilla Indians can never be forgotten in eastern Oregon.

The West is loaded with Indian names, practically every State has counties, lakes, and rivers named after the Indians but very few counties, lakes, or rivers are named after our pioneers. Those men and women who had the fortitude to make this wilderness and sagebrush country into one of the most productive areas in the world. I think it is high time that we publicly recognize these fine men and women who made the West what it is today.

The lake which I am asking be named for Mr. Aldrich came into existence largely because of his efforts. Ed Aldrich was untiring in his work for the civic welfare. He has left in the Northwest, monuments as great as the pyramids. It was he who was head of the organization that made the first survey of the Columbia River for its potential powers. It was Ed Aldrich who went to Washington and lobbied a few hundred thousand dollars for the first Army engineers' survey. As a result of that survey numerous locations were found along the river for damsites. The final result of that survey is Grand Coulee and Bon-

neville, and now McNary Dam. Ed was the man who turned the first spade in these gigantic enterprises.

Mr. Aldrich was a staunch, energetic, and active Democrat all of his life. I was born, have lived, and will always be a Republican. Therefore it may appear strange to some people that I would sponsor legislation to immortalize this man's name. Politics has nothing to do with it. Mr. Aldrich loved eastern Oregon just as I do, and no one man has done more for his community than he did during his lifetime. He and I may have differed often as to what we thought was good for our people, but I never doubted his sincerity, his loyalty to country, or his integrity, and I am certain that he never doubted mine. I believe that the vast majority of the people who benefit from this lake, and the project which formed it, will subscribe wholeheartedly to the sentiments which I have expressed today, and will be with me in asking Congress to make into law the bill which I am now introducing.

Government Competition With Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Government competition with business enterprises has in the past two decades reached alarming proportions both in its volume and the variety of activities which Federal agencies have entered. This has had increasingly adverse effects on many of our industrial producers who have found themselves confronted with competition from high-cost Government plants supported with their tax dollars. I commend to the House the following editorial which appeared in the *Daily Times of Marietta, Ohio*, on February 16, which addresses itself to this problem:

DON'T STOP WITH COFFEE

Former GI's who believed the black brew served at Army mess halls was something distinctive, not to be found anywhere in the civilian world, were absolutely right. The United States military services have long been in the business of roasting and grinding their own coffee to supply their farflung posts and ships. Now they are going to get out of that business, as soon as they have liquidated—or liquefied—the beans on hand.

The Army has announced decision for closing coffee processing centers in Atlanta, Ga., and Seattle, Wash. The Navy is closing down similar centers in Brooklyn, N. Y., and Oakland, Calif. Officials say the decision is in line with Defense Department policy to get the military services out of competition with private enterprise and to save money.

Coffee processing, of course, is just one of many lines of business in which the military services are engaged. And such businesses under the Defense Department are just a portion of the overall Federal competition with private industry. Taxpayers are supplying funds for such Government enterprises as manufacture of rum, fertilizer,

spectacles, sleeping bags. They have supplied the capital to make Uncle Sam the Nation's largest electric-power producer; largest lender; largest insurer, landlord, and tenant; largest warehouse operator, shipowner, and truck fleet operator. In short, government is big business operating in unbusinesslike manner.

Efforts are being renewed in various quarters to get Uncle Sam out of some of his diversified fields of business. Democratic Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, has introduced a bill with provisions for aiding industries suffering from bureaucratic competition. Practically the same legislation has been introduced in the House by two Republicans, FRANK C. OSWERS, JR., of New Jersey, and CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan.

Senator McCLELLAN says it is all right for the Federal Government to engage in such businesses as running the post office, operating navy yards, and producing electricity through TVA. But when Government agencies make helium, false teeth, paint, and furniture; sell insurance, operate hotels and laundries, retread tires, or hunt fur-bearing seals, it's a "matter of serious congressional concern," he says.

It is about time legislators on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress showed such concern. The House passed something similar to the McClellan bill last year but it died on the Senate Calendar.

A Tribute to Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial entitled "A Tribute to Lithuania," published in the February 16 edition of the *Evening Herald, Shennandoah, Pa.*:

A TRIBUTE TO LITHUANIA

Although its status as a free republic was relatively brief, spanning the period between February 1918, and May 1940, Communist-enslaved Lithuania today nevertheless is mindful of the 37th anniversary of its independence.

There are no public demonstrations in that unfortunate country on what would otherwise be a joyous national holiday. Any such exercises would be immediately halted with force and result in additional harsh punitive measures on the suffering populace by the Red tyrants. No matter how gallant the spirit of a people may be, it is suicidal to take issue with firing squads.

Consequently, this 37th commemoration of Lithuania's Independence Day by its sons and daughters at home is necessarily highly secretive; only behind locked doors, and then in whispers, is there recognition of a sacred date.

Americans, however, along with those exiles who have found haven in countries making up the free world, and other admiring friends, are happily in a position to salute the fortitude of the millions of Lithuanians held in bondage by the Communist dictators.

It comes as solace to these unfortunates to know that their great national holiday is perpetuated elsewhere in the world. Our messages of encouragement cannot fail to buoy the spirits of the enslaved. Their hopes for future deliverance are nourished

by the knowledge that they have not been forsaken outside the grim and brutal Iron Curtain. Our prayers for an eventual restoration of their precious liberties surely provide heartening consolation.

In a historical sense, it would be difficult to match Lithuania's tribulations with any other country on earth. Despite foreign domination and oppression for a full 125 years, exclusive of that brief period of respite from 1918 to 1940, the Lithuanian spirit remains unbroken.

Over the long years of Czarist Russian rule, when relegated to an inferior status and deprived of true freedom, gallant little Lithuania managed to survive. Then, when its national status was ruthlessly wiped out by Communist Russia, Lithuania has endured horrors almost to exceed the imagination. These fearful conditions have not diminished; the deportations to Siberia go on daily and the wanton slaughter of those who resist has not lessened.

Yet in the face of this devilish Red plan to eradicate Lithuanian nationality, how remarkable it is to comprehend that the brave people have managed to secretly keep aflame that precious light of liberty.

Plainly the Lithuanian nation is indestructible; its people remember with pride a great historical past. The Reds have never eliminated the inner sense of national destiny, handed down from father to son over succeeding generations.

If Lithuania's modern ordeal teaches anything it is that the liberty of a people cannot be stamped out by the tyrant.

Hence, on his 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, Voice of America broadcasts penetrate the Iron Curtain, to bring messages of hope and future salvation.

Sooner or later, the Lithuanian people shall again enjoy the God-given and natural right of every country to be free, to resume the happiness once enjoyed, and to once more proudly take their rightful position among the sovereign powers of the world.

Impact of Foreign Trade on the Rochester (N. Y.) Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, in order to determine the impact of foreign trade on the Rochester, New York, area, much of which lies within my district, I have requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to conduct a survey which will highlight the extent of exports and imports in the area. The survey is being directed by Dr. Howard S. Piquet, senior economic analyst of the Library.

In addition to questions covering the type and volume of business in the area, the questionnaire sent out in connection with the survey was designed to determine the extent to which Rochester industries rely upon raw materials from abroad; the extent of their imports and/or exports; the degree to which their business is affected by imports; the amount of export business which results from United States foreign economic and military aid programs; the effect of a 15-percent reduction in tariffs over the

next 3 years; and, finally, the anticipated effect on business in the Rochester area of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The survey has not yet been completed, but it has gone far enough to indicate certain significant factors and trends.

As of February 16, 130 firms, with a total of 74,306 workers had responded to the survey. Of that total, about one-third of the firms, employing about one-fourth of the workers, have an interest and a stake in exports. One-fifth of the firms are dependent upon imported raw materials. Seven firms, with 2,830 workers have no interest in imports, insofar as dependence on raw materials goes, or in exports, insofar as selling their products abroad is concerned, but foreign imports are making substantial inroads on their markets.

A dozen large firms in the area have mixed interests in the foreign trade program: That is, they have foreign markets, but they are also confronted by competition from imports, and thus, in some measure, there is a dichotomy in their interests.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the preponderant number of firms—although they cover only a minority of the workers—expressed no interest in either imports or exports, their businesses being wholly concerned with the domestic market.

Tenth Anniversary of the Yalta Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as February 11 marked the 10th anniversary of the completion of the Yalta agreements, it is rather interesting to journey back into the past and note how accurately this situation was assessed at the time by those who had intimate information of what was happening.

I have particular reference to two columns which were written by Constantine Brown, of the Washington Star, one of which appeared on January 30, 1945, under the title "This Changing World," and the other of which appeared on February 11, 1945, under the title "Japanese May Seek Peace To Avoid War With Russia."

Here then was an accurate indication of what was in the wind and what might happen, and history vindicates the opinions and conclusions expressed by Mr. Brown 10 years ago.

How strange that the whole story has not been officially verified since those who participated in the conference in some degree are still available and in a position to do so. Former Senator Byrnes, of South Carolina, could provide some interesting footnotes to history. Averill Harriman, who drew up the

China agreement with Malenkov, is the Governor of New York. Mr. Charles E. Bohlen is our Ambassador to Moscow. Even Alger Hiss is alive and free from prison and would be able to talk.

The history of that period will not have been completed and properly documented until those who were a part of the Yalta undertaking oblige the American people with the whole story.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Mr. Brown be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 30, 1945]

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

A definite agreement for Russia to join the United States and Britain in the war against Japan is expected to be one of the results of the next conference of the big three. Usually well-informed military quarters here believe the Russians will move against the Japs as soon as they can open a second front without fear of weakening their position and jeopardizing the victory against Germany, and after the necessary political arrangements have been made between President Roosevelt and Premier Stalin.

According to various hints received from Japanese sources, it appears there has been suspicious activity at Vladivostok and on the Siberian-Manchurian border. The Red Army is reported strengthened in the last few months.

Earlier in the war, when the Germans were driving toward the Volga River, a large part of the forces in Siberia had been sent to fight the Germans. Since surrender at Stalingrad and the resumption of the offensive of the Red Armies, the Siberian forces were sent back to their old stations. Today, according to some reports, about 500,000 men comprise the forces.

Much lease-lend and Siberian manufactured war material has been gathered in the area. The Siberian railroads have been improved and extended. New factories have been created to serve, at the time of their erection, as an additional feeder to the supplies received from the United States and Great Britain. Many of the war plants which had been evacuated from the areas invaded by the Germans were set up in various parts of Siberia.

The population of Siberia was substantially increased by the addition of millions evacuated by force or otherwise from Poland, the Baltic States, occupied Russia, and more recently from Rumania and Bulgaria. While no statistics are available, it is generally believed that this gigantic migration has added at least 6,000,000 to the former population figures.

Siberia, once described as a wasteland, is teeming with activity. Thus, while the Russians were anxious not to provoke the Japanese at a time when they were fighting desperate defensive battles in European Russia and their huge Asiatic territory had to rely principally on supplies from Europe, they are no longer under the same handicap and can decide at will whether and when they wish to attack the Japs.

According to some observers, the whole matter will depend on the conversations of the big three. While there is no definite information, it is generally assumed that the Soviet leader will require a certain price for intervention against the Japanese. Russia is likely to require the restoration of her power in the East to the position it held before the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 and possibly a little more. In diplomatic quarters which have followed Moscow's policies closely

it is believed that Premier Stalin will require that Manchuria, a border state of Siberia, be taken from Japanese tutelage and made into an independent republic with a government friendly to the U. S. S. R.

The same request is expected to be made in regard to Korea, with Port Arthur, which until 1905 was the foremost Russian military naval base in the Far East, restored to the Russian control. Representatives of the United States Government, including Ambassador Patrick Hurley, already are attempting to bring about a better understanding between the Chungking government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Communist government in Sinkiang Province, which is on the borders of Moscow-controlled Outer Mongolia.

Should such an attempt prove successful, a reshuffled Chungking government would become more Moscow-minded than the present government.

Under these circumstances Premier Stalin will be able to breathe easier, since he will have only "friendly governments" along the entire border of his huge empire. Manchurian and Korean problems might thus be solved to the satisfaction of the U. S. S. R. without giving offense either to the Chinese Government or to the Korean people. Manchuria and Korea would become independent entities under the unofficial protectorate of the strong neighbor in the north.

[From the Washington Star of February 11, 1945]

JAPANESE MAY SEEK PEACE TO AVOID WAR WITH RUSSIA—ONE GROUP REPORTED ASKING NEGOTIATED UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER FEARING DEFEAT OF NAZIS MAY ADD TO PACIFIC BELLIGERENTS

(By Constantine Brown)

The war is rapidly coming to an end. In Europe, the organized resistance of the German forces is likely to be terminated within the next 2 months.

A major sea battle may soon take place in the Pacific. American high officials do not question its outcome, and it may be the Japs' last major naval effort of the war.

The Tokyo Government may be forced into surrender sooner than most optimistic observers believed possible. Within a short time Japan's home islands are expected to be the daily targets of American land-based aviation.

The establishment of American naval bases in the Philippines and other places will sever the lines of communication between the Japanese homeland and the rich islands in the South Pacific which since the end of 1942 have been providing the Japanese factories with vital raw materials.

The probable intervention of Russia in the war against Japan will further tax the defensive ability of the Japanese land forces in Asia. But even without that intervention, most military observers who have returned from the Pacific and have leaned toward optimistic estimates in the past, feel that the Japanese resistance is rapidly dwindling.

HOPE TO SAVE SOMETHING

This unexpected turn is not due so much to the exhaustion of Japan's ability to continue to fight as to the desire of a large and heretofore unheard group of Japanese who want to save something out of the wreck. This group believes the American Government is understanding and that the overthrow of the clique which has developed the idea of Greater East Asia under the domination of Japan might be accepted as unconditional surrender in the United States.

According to reports which appear reliable, the Japanese believe the American people would not be opposed to the maintenance of the dynasty. The Emperor of Japan would form a government, choosing as his advisers those remaining liberals who have not been

purged but have gone underground since the outbreak of the war. Such a government would agree to a withdrawal from all the ill-gained possessions in China and the South Pacific, agree to whatever military terms might be exacted by the United States, and throw Japan at the mercy of this country.

Little has been revealed about the devious approaches of some of the Japanese liberals who have suggested that America's own future defenses in the Far East will have to depend on a friendly Japan in the same way Russia's security and power in Europe depends on friendly border governments in Poland, the Balkans, and, in all likelihood, Germany. In plain English, some of the Japanese liberals who did their utmost to avoid war with America suggest that Japan become a puppet of the United States. And they argue that in self-defense America should accept this suggestion, particularly if it is clothed in humility.

ADMIT JAPAN VULNERABLE

This will be still easier if Russia, after the collapse of Japan, is successful in forming "friendly" governments in Korea, Manchuria, and northwestern Chinese provinces.

Does America want to see totalitarian government in Asia as well as Europe? Ask those who are making approaches with a view to America's accepting surrender from Hirohito on "equitable terms." They admit that Japan can be crushed forever. But they ask, How will the American people who must think in long-range political terms benefit by the total destruction of the Japanese Empire?

The Japanese, we are being told, no longer have any illusions that they can ingratiate themselves with the 480 million Chinese. Their policies in occupied China have been so stupid and ruthless, it is admitted, that the Chinese will never agree to cooperate with the present oppressors.

The Chinese will certainly accept the outstretched hand of the United States. But will America have a free hand to help China in the manner she desires if Chiang Kai-shek is compelled to knuckle down to his communist opponents and they have a free reign throughout that vast country?

FEAR RUSSIA MOST

America does not intend to settle on the Chinese mainland with important forces. Russia will be the strongest power in Asia and will be in a position to help not only "friendly" governments but also will see that its pupils trained in Moscow remain in the saddle throughout the vast Chinese areas. Under these circumstances, there is little that America can expect in the future from China either politically or economically.

In order to offset these future problems, the spokesmen of Japan advance the suggestion that the American Government should not cast aside the proposal for a "negotiated unconditional surrender."

These suggestions are reaching Washington in a roundabout way and are interpreted to mean not only that the Japanese leaders have come to realize that the war is being lost but also that they are more afraid of the consequences of Russia's entering the war against them than to surrender to their present enemies.

WANT TERMS LIKE ITALY'S

The form of this humility would be the acceptance of all the unconditional surrender demands with the tacit understanding that they will be no harsher than those imposed on Italy. The Japs indirect efforts are concentrated particularly on the United States since already there is a fairly strong group which is advocating an early peace with Japan. The possibility that Russia soon may enter the far eastern arena with a strong force from Siberia has hastened the efforts of "negotiators." These men are not necessarily

Japanese but they claim to speak for Emperor Hirohito and the few remaining political leaders who opposed the war against America because they realized it would end in a disaster for Japan.

The reported approaches started about 3 months ago when the Japanese gained the definite impression that as soon as the Germans were defeated the Russians would turn their forces to the Far East. Recent dispatches from Moscow which described the Japanese as aggressors were only the outward signs of what Premier Stalin had in mind. The Japanese became fearful of Russia's intervention when their agents in Siberia began to report a significant concentration of Russian troops, planes, and war material at strategic points north of Manchukuo. They were equally suspicious of Russia's intentions when a little publicized Free Korean government was organized in Siberia.

In a nutshell, the individuals who say they are speaking with the consent of Emperor Hirohito assert that Russia's intervention in the far eastern war will result in the establishment of a free Korea and Manchuria and the setting up of a "friendly" government dominated by the Communists in northwestern China. They point out that the free Korean and Manchurian governments will be equally dominated by individuals who have been coached recently in Moscow and will direct their activities toward a full political cooperation with the U. S. S. R. They admit that under such circumstances Japan will perish or—under the best circumstances—will become a 10th-rate power such as Thailand.

STALIN DOESN'T FORGET

The old antagonism between Czarist Russia and Japan which was climaxed by the defeat of imperial Russia in 1905 has never been healed in spite of the apparent improved relations between Russia and Japan in the last few years. In spite of his apparent friendliness toward Tokyo immediately after the outbreak of the war, Stalin has never forgotten that Japan joined the anti-Communist Axis on the side of Germany and Italy of its own volition. He also remembers that after the world war Japan did her utmost to oust Russia from Asia.

In fact, the Japanese-Russian conflict which started in 1904 has never really ended. This the emissaries of Hirohito frankly admit and say that the fear of Russia becoming the dominating power in Asia, is prompting the Emperor to seek an understanding with the English-speaking nations.

But these intermediaries, whose names and nationality are only known to a very few, are willing to interpret our own position in the world today and draw the conclusion that it would be to the advantage of the United States to accept a negotiated unconditional surrender from Japan, possibly before Russia became a cobelligerent.

Most of the hatred of the American people for Japan is directed at the military leaders who staged the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and have been guilty of unbelievable cruelties against prisoners of war. We are being told that Japan is quite prepared to hand over all these war criminals, regardless of rank or position. Japan, we are told, would not quibble on this question in any way. Japan, we are also told is willing to accept the strictest American control over her armaments and industries. She proceeds on the theory that world politics is elastic and that the time may come in the distant future when the United States might be glad to have a potentially strong Japan in the Far East.

RUSSIAN STAR RISING

The unofficial spokesmen for the Japanese liberals make the following analysis of the world situation:

Russia they say, unquestionably will be the dominating power in Europe. In the

Middle East the British prestige and power are on the wane. The Moslem world, from Afghanistan to Arabia and Egypt and possibly even as far as Morocco on the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, now believe that the long pan-Islamic dream may come true, thanks to the support they expect to obtain from Russia.

In the Far East, the influence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek hangs on a thin thread. The representatives of some 60 million Chinese Communists schooled in Moscow are now attempting to impose themselves on the Chungking government, and the American officials themselves are urging Chiang to reach a compromise. The generalissimo knows as well as any one else that a compromise with the Communists, even if they have no direct ties with Russia, will mean his eventual disappearance from China's political life. Any compromise with the Moscow-trained Communists must end in their dominating the political scene. Hence the United States, which is now gently pressing the generalissimo to cooperate with the Chinese Communists, must know that sooner or later it is this group which will take over the government of China.

Postal Salary Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EARL CHUDOFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement submitted by me to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in support of an adequate and realistic salary increase for postal workers:

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I greatly appreciate this opportunity of presenting my views on pending legislation to provide much-needed and well-merited increases for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

I had the pleasure last year of supporting increases which, while admitted small, would have given at least some measure of relief to these employees and I regret that this legislation was given a pocket veto by the President.

I hope that this committee, after consideration of the bills before you, will find it possible to report the bill H. R. 1592, by Congressman MORRISON, of Louisiana, and I hope that action will be taken promptly so that, in the event a further veto results, the Congress may have the opportunity to override such veto.

I am sure I don't have to remind the members of this committee that it has been almost 4 long years since postal employees have received a salary increase. As I recall it, the last increase granted was effective July 1, 1951, and we now lack only 4 months of the complete 4 years during which time postal employees have received no increases whatsoever, while the salaries of those in private industry have been increased twice and in some cases three times during the same period.

I am sure I don't have to remind this committee that postal employees generally have earned an increase at this time. All of us that have had the opportunity to look at the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, must have been impressed, as I was, with the story of efficiency which

is carried on page 885 of that weighty document. I note that mail volume is expected to increase another 3 percent in 1956 over the current year and this increased volume, like the increases which have preceded it, will be largely absorbed by the employees of the postal service. I don't think it is at all unreasonable that these employees expect to be paid for their increased efficiency. That is a standard operating procedure in private employment and might well be adopted by our Federal Government.

Last year in announcing the withholding of his approval of the postal and Federal employees' salary increase, the President stated in effect that his action was predicated upon the fact that no postal-rate increase was provided to pay for the salary increase and that the bill failed to contain provisions for a reclassification of postal positions. Insofar as a rate increase is concerned, I believe that the question of proper salaries for the employees of the postal service is a matter entirely independent of postal rates and that there is no justification whatever for tying these two questions together.

With respect to the need or desirability of a reclassification of postal positions, postal employees with whom I am familiar and who have an adequate knowledge of the problem have convinced me that the proposal of the Postmaster General as contained in the bill H. R. 2987 is at least as unsatisfactory as the proposal of last year and I cannot help but believe that the only way a solid reclassification of postal positions can be arrived at is to refer this matter to a joint committee composed of Members of both the House and the Senate, with representatives of the Post Office Department and the employee organizations. I am confident that such a committee would arrive at a solution which would do justice to the public, the Post Office Department, and the employees.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will report the bill H. R. 1592 at an early date so that justice for postal employees may no longer be delayed.

United States Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, at its convention in Boston in December 1954 the American Veterans Committee adopted a resolution favoring extension of the reciprocal-trade program and endorsing the trade-adjustment bill which I originally introduced last year and which carries the number H. R. 229 in the 84th Congress. This bill has also been introduced in this House by Congressman EBERHARTER and others. I believe the Congress should be aware of the position of the American Veterans Committee on this question; and, therefore, under unanimous consent, I include their resolution in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON UNITED STATES TRADE POLICY

Whereas the reciprocal-trade program of the United States is a crucial part of United States efforts of free-world leadership; and

Whereas the Congress has failed to adopt a trade policy for 2 years while the Soviet Union and Communist China have nego-

tiated 36 trade agreements with the free world; and

Whereas the liberal trade policy as outlined in the Randall Commission report would not only permit the United States to assume trade-policy leadership but also benefit our domestic economy; and

Whereas the implementation of a liberal trade policy such as recommended in the Randall Commission report inevitably requires the United States Government to consider possible damage to a small number of affected United States industries; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the AVC supports the adoption of a reciprocal-trade policy based on the recommendation of the Randall Commission report and be it further resolved that the AVC endorses and supports positive governmental action to assist affected industries as proposed by the Kennedy-Williams bill; and be it further

Resolved, That the national AVC representative to the Committee for a National Trade Policy urge said committee to also endorse this bill as a method of accomplishing a positive trade policy.

Formosa: Risks and Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Speaking at the 25th anniversary of the Hoboken Club, Milford, yesterday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, hailed the Formosa policy as a long-overdue favorable change in United States foreign policy.

"There are risks involved in the course we have selected," said PHILBIN. "In fact there are risks whatever course we may follow because we are living in a very dangerous world. But the alternative of appeasement and vacillation would constitute, in my opinion, a far greater risk. If we stand by, while world communism directed from Moscow conquers one nation after another by force and insidious conspiracy, the time would ultimately come when we would be outflanked militarily, economically, and in every other way. That would be a prospect of real peril.

The present situation is grave, but we are acting from a position of strength. Our own Armed Forces are in a high state of efficiency and the military and economic resources of the free world plus our power to strike, if attacked, with overwhelming nuclear force will continue to be the great deterrent to Soviet aggression. We must continue to build this great strength for the long haul. It will best guarantee the national security and the peace.

The Congressman also touched briefly on present immigration laws which he said were working great inequities upon many American families and veterans who, despite their fine citizenship and loyal service, are prevented by law from having their relatives join them in this country. "There should be a rule of reason in these matters. These laws should be liberalized," he said.

PHILBIN congratulated the members of the Hoboken Club who, he said, had conducted themselves in the best traditions of the Nation. "Your contributions to Milford and

to the Nation in war and in peace represent the highest type of citizenship. And your devotion to the cause of your own people has heightened your allegiance to this country. I wish you many more years of useful service and happiness," he concluded.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 17, 1955:

H. R. 1

The House of Representatives begins 2 days of debate today on a bill that the chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee describes in these terms: "In my opinion, there is no one piece of legislation coming before the Congress this session which will contribute more to our own prosperity and at the same time to the solidarity and security of the free world." This bill is H. R. 1, which would extend for 3 years the reciprocal trade-agreements program and give the President moderate additional powers under it to make further tariff reductions.

Though it is confidently expected that the bill will pass in its present form, the opposition to it is considerable; and it is not confined to the Republicans. Contrary to tradition, there is such a thing as protectionism among Democrats, too. Where it exists it is frequently based on strictly local interests.

There is nothing disgraceful in this, but it ought to be recognized for what it is. The potters, the lacemakers, the candle-makers and many others may have a point when they say that they have been or will be injured by a liberal national trade policy. As a matter of fact, we would agree that the Government ought to give temporary help in cases where an industry that can no longer compete with foreign products is trying to switch to more profitable lines of manufacture.

But surely such situations must not interfere with the broad principles of competitive international trade which are necessary to our continued prosperity and our position of political leadership of the free world. We are a tremendous exporting as well as an importing nation, and we cannot continue to be one without being the other—unless, of course, we go on subsidizing the rest of the world forever, which we clearly don't intend to do. Furthermore, American trade policy needs a guaranteed stability that it has not had for some years and that the present bill would give it. Finally, if we do not insure a relatively liberal approach to trade, we are inviting—in fact we are practically forcing—our present friends of the free world to turn to the countries behind the Iron Curtain in search of commercial possibilities.

The pending bill is anything but an extreme or radical method of dealing with these matters. It is less courageous and far-reaching than a truly sound trade policy requires; but it does set this country's face firmly again in the direction charted by Cordell Hull 21 years ago. We hope it is passed by a strong bipartisan majority.

Let Us Protect American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that this Congress take action to protect our domestic industries. I recently appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and urged that H. R. 1 be properly amended to provide this needed protection. On Tuesday of this week, I appeared before the House Rules Committee and opposed the granting of a closed rule on this legislation, because a closed rule would not permit those of us who are Representatives from industrial areas to amend the bill so as to afford relief to the mining industry, the chemical industry, the glass industry, and others. Yesterday on the floor of this House, I again spoke in opposition to a closed rule. Our forces were outnumbered by a very narrow margin, and we lost the battle. I, therefore, hope that this House will take action today to retrieve that which we lost yesterday, and I urge the membership to support a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee to bring the bill back out under amendments which will provide the kind of protection our industries need and deserve.

My district is the largest coal-producing district in America. The largest chemical plants in the Western Hemisphere are located in my district, as is one of the largest window-glass plants in the world. These industries are basic to the defense of this Nation, and they have suffered under the present law, largely because the escape clause is treated as a joke and trade agreements are used as pawns in the field of international diplomacy.

A case in point is the plight of the chemical industry, one of tremendous importance in both peace and war. It faces serious problems from foreign competition and many of its leaders have protested any reckless across-the-boards cut in tariff rates on chemical products. Because it is a very large industry which provides substantial payrolls and an important outlet for investment, its spokesmen deserve a hearing. I do not ask you to reject H. R. 1 in its entirety, but I do suggest that the chemical industry is typical of those groups in the country that are worried about foreign competition. An examination of their problems in specific form may well suggest that very specific answers to tariff problems are required, too. Generalizations are not enough basis to form a national policy. By this I mean that across-the-board cuts in tariffs represent a superficial approach. It would be more scientific and show better deliberation to study the needs of individual products and industries, adjusting each rate to specific requirements. This is not too much to ask in so important a matter.

The spokesmen of the chemical industry have come before the hearings of the Randall Commission and have released statements to the press which suggest in unmistakable form the problems they face as a result of foreign competition. They suggest that if the present uncertainty over possible reductions in tariffs continues, then the expansion of the industry at home will be threatened, and new investment important to the growth of the industry will be lost. Because the chemical industry has been growing at something like four times the national average of all industries, its continued progress is of concern. If its high growth rate is continued without interruption, some hundred thousand new jobs in this industry will be created during the next 10 years. If this kind of progress is threatened by foreign competition made possible by tariff cuts, it is important that these facts be given the same careful consideration as the proposals to create export trade and economic solvency abroad through our tariff reductions. Any one-sided review of all the aspects of trade policy is a guarantee that all of these problems will have to be reconsidered by every succeeding Congress. For fatal weaknesses written into our laws make themselves felt inexorably. Let the decision of this Congress be so carefully laid as to avoid at least the obvious flaws of past acts in foreign trade policy.

Can we afford to be without a strong chemical industry? That question answers itself in the negative, for a great country such as ours with its variety of needs for an advanced technological society and its grave responsibility for the defense of the free world must have an assured supply of a wide range of chemical products. Many of these are products whose very names seem strange to the layman, yet any engineer, chemist, or specialized consumer could explain to us how these seemingly obscure substances, processed and combined, give us dyes, drugs, plastics, fuels, and the advanced materials of military armaments, without which our high standard of living and military survival would be impossible.

It may seem a long way back in history to some of us, and yet it was not many years ago that the First World War ravaged Europe. One of its early effects, long before we became involved in the fighting, was to cut us off from a variety of essential supplies previously turned out by German industry. It was at great effort that we painfully constructed a chemical industry of our own and learned enough secrets of research to make it possible to fulfill our needs. It is indicative of the progressive nature of the chemical industry of America today that it spends \$200 million a year on research. This is obviously not the hallmark of a moribund segment of the economy. If it can continue to enrich American life with the marvels of the laboratories as it has in the past, its contribution will be one to recognize with pride.

Let us pause to consider the plight of the glass industry, and I would like to

direct your attention to the adverse effect upon one of the glass plants in West Virginia. The rapid increase in imports of European window glass made under low-wage conditions resulted in shutting down of a production furnace and an experimental furnace last year at the Charleston plant of Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., and 240 employees lost their jobs as a consequence. This condition followed the closing down of 2 tanks at the end of 1953, and brought the total layoff to 500 seniority employees directly due to the increased glutting of the window-glass market by foreign glass.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-three imports of window glass totaled 100 million square feet of glass, as contrasted with imports of less than 1 million square feet in 1948. In other words, 1953 imports of window glass were equal to 1,020,000 man-hours of work in modern window-glass factories.

The average wages of the American window-glass industry run about \$2.40 an hour. European manufacturers pay from 37 cents to 45 cents an hour for the same type of work, and I am told that almost identical machines are used in European and American plants. Low-cost water transportation enables cheap European window glass to reach American cities on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts with lower freight rates than those prevailing from Charleston, W. Va., to markets in this country. I am told that the freight weight from Charleston, W. Va., to Miami, Fla., is three times that from Antwerp, Belgium, to Miami. These figures should be enough to convince anyone that a further lowering of tariffs will be disastrous to our own industries, and that they cannot meet such competition without some reasonable protection.

Let me, in conclusion, make my position clear. We are engaged in an important review of our international trade policy. As previously on the floor of this House, I have made a strong plea for adequate protection of the coal and textile industries, I here state that the chemical industry is yet another of critical importance to the livelihood of the American worker and to the prosperity of the Nation. These important industries must not be destroyed nor can we afford to see them seriously injured. It is up to the Congress to prevent such a catastrophe.

I urge the Members of this House to support the motion to recommit. If we are successful in our efforts to recommit H. R. 1, it will be brought back with safeguards included, after which we can all conscientiously support the bill.

This, Kiwanians Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me here-

tofore so to do, I have the privilege of presenting herewith the text of the wording of a beautifully colored and framed plaque containing said text which was presented to me as a former member of the Kiwanis Club and to each and every other Member of Congress who either is now an active Kiwanian, or is a "has been" Kiwanian. It was on the occasion of the biannual international Kiwanis banquet honoring Kiwanians at the Statler Hotel here in the Nation's Capital on February 17. On each such occasion there is always, in addition, the international president of this international service organization of almost 250,000 members and 4,000 units. Also in attendance is always the international board of trustees thereof.

We were last night informed that 1 out of every 5 Members of this great legislative body are in this Kiwanis family.

THIS, KIWANIANS BELIEVE

Kiwanis believes in the free man.

The free man is a free citizen. He is free to think, to learn, to speak, to worship, to meet with other free men, to elect his representatives, and to limit their power. He may be accused and tried only by the due and historic process of the law.

The free man is responsible. As he prizes his own freedoms, he jealously guards them for his fellow citizens. He studies the issues of his day and his community. He decides them on merit. He utters and votes these decisions. He is loyal to his country. He is loyal to the ideal of freedom for men in all countries.

The free man is a gentleman. He knows that democratic government operates by resolving controversies within the limits of law and mutual respect. He debates issues and not personalities. He respects the rights, customs, beliefs, and institutions of other men—requiring only the same of them.

The free man is a spiritual man. He ascribes all wisdom to the Creator and not to men. He believes he can earn his spiritual way only by service to others. He seeks blessings for all, and not credits for himself.

He is the man we Kiwanians pledge ourselves to try to be.

He is the man, who, one day, with God's help, will set our world firmly upon its spiritual axis.

He is the free man.

Address by Arthur B. Homer, President of Bethlehem Steel, Before Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of President Arthur B. Homer, of Bethlehem Steel, before the annual meeting of the Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce.

The text of his address follows:

Mr. Ecker, distinguished guests and members of the Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce, I am very happy to have the honor of speaking to you tonight. My pleasure comes not only because I am participating in a meeting of the members of such a worthwhile and

successful organization as the Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce, but also because I feel right at home when I see so many of my good friends and neighbors.

The good friends and neighbors are not only those here who live in Bethlehem. This occasion is designed to record and salute the achievements of the whole Lehigh Valley and I am fortunate in that I can claim acquaintanceship with a number of those who make the Valley what it is in the industrial life of our Nation. It is certainly not just steel. What the area has to offer covers textiles, electronics, cement, good farming, metals fabrication, superior retail distribution and a host of other activities. In short, ours is an area which more than pulls its own weight and I am proud to participate in its contribution and growth.

"BESSIE STEEL"

As I stand here, I am also not unmindful of the fact that the city of Bethlehem has played an important role in my life. Important because, among other things, my family history will record that on or about the year 1920 I made two discoveries here in Bethlehem which had a great influence on my life and career.

First, I discovered a Bethlehem girl who became my wife. Secondly, I discovered the great Bethlehem Steel Co. Ever since, I have been trying to solve the intricacies of both, but I can assure you that 35 years of devotion have brought no regrets, even though my wife may sometimes wonder whether I married her or the other girl—"Bessie Steel."

The demands of the latter have moved me about the country to a considerable extent, but now I am back again as a member of your community and I like it.

ABSENT 20 YEARS

As I did not live in Bethlehem for a period of about 20 years, the changes that have taken place in the city during my absence and since my return in 1945 are particularly impressive to me. The great strides that have been taken in matters such as slum clearance, water supply, and street improvement; developments such as the expansion of hospital facilities, the construction of a modern airport, and the new vocational high school speak very well indeed for the forward-looking spirit of the community as a whole and of its civic and political leaders.

I am aware of the outstanding work your organization has done in connection with such projects as the vocational school, rezoning, the development of a modern building code, and redevelopment in general. You are to be congratulated and so is the city administration.

Many of the steps which have been taken to make this a better area in which to live and work and raise children have been assisted by our company through direct contributions of money, time and services of personnel. This is as it should be. It is not only fitting but also imperative that our company with its general offices located in this community should play its part in local affairs and in maintaining the welfare and happiness of its citizens, so many of whom are employed in the steel plant and offices.

HOME OFFICE

We are fully aware of the effects on the community of both our size as an enterprise and of fluctuations in our business. Therefore it is my desire tonight to tell you a few things about how we function from general headquarters in this city and also to give you a brief story of what our company has accomplished in the last decade and hopes to accomplish in the near future.

I feel strongly that an understanding of some of these matters on the part of the community will bring us closer together in our mutual efforts to improve and grow.

We have all heard of communities which have been at bitter sword points with a great industrial concern in their midst, and there are communities which have been completely

dominated and controlled by their largest industry for its selfish interest. Either of these situations represents extremes which are not good for the success of the community or the industry involved.

We believe in the friendly and cooperative recognition of the problems, responsibilities and objectives of both the civic and the industrial organizations in a community. We believe in the maintenance of mutual respect between the company, its employees and the labor organizations representing any of them.

In brief, we believe that good relationship all around will accomplish more for the good of the whole than can be achieved by any other method. I assure you it is our policy to cooperate on a constructive basis with the communities in which we operate. That is simply good business and good citizenship combined.

While I do not wish to overemphasize the contributions of our company to the community, I would like to point out that when we make available upward of \$3 million to hospitals in the Bethlehem-Allentown-Easton area over the past 10 years; or share to the extent of \$800,000 toward a vocational school; or contribute \$150,000 to Bethlehem's recreational program we do so to the mutual advantage of company and community.

AMONG BIG 10

Furthermore, our employees are encouraged to participate as fully as they can in the life of the community as citizens, irrespective of their status with the company.

Now, as all of you know, Bethlehem Steel is ranked among the 10 largest industrial corporations in the United States, whether you figure in terms of total assets, dollar value of annual sales, or total employment. We are a national organization. Most other large industrial corporations have their general offices in major metropolitan centers. We have chosen to do things differently, and I think this has important implications for both the company and this community.

Today you will find that the responsible executives in charge of every aspect of this company's business live and work here in Bethlehem. The only exception to this is our shipbuilding division which heads up in New York.

CENTRAL CONTROL

I would point out that centralized control of a vast enterprise, such as we have here in Bethlehem, has its very distinct advantages. Our top officials have no other conflicting business interests. Every problem that arises for top-policy determination can be considered immediately by men who are friends and neighbors as well as fellow managers, and actually the noonday luncheon at the office becomes, in effect, a board meeting. Here in the city of Bethlehem we do not have that impersonality that is inescapable in a metropolis. Here the team lives, works, and plays together.

I mention this to emphasize the fact that here in Bethlehem we have more than just a large steel-making and related product operation. Bethlehem is also the brain and nerve center of our whole national and international enterprise. This is what makes necessary our elaborate physical setup in the home office building, which, incidentally, houses over 4,200 employees in working space which is larger than the United Nations building in New York.

A few statistics showing the magnitude of some of the various services at this office might interest you. For instance, our telephone system handles about 5,000 outside calls and the internal system completes about 24,000 dial calls daily. An average of 10,000 messages a day go over our telegraph lines, and our central mail division handles each working day an average of 98,000 pieces of mail.

COORDINATION

Thanks to the facilities which enable us to maintain communications of this scale, we can tie together and efficiently coordinate from one central location.

Today, I believe that people generally have a wider appreciation of the function of large, integrated corporations in our society. There appears to be a better understanding of the fact that big business increases the opportunities for new enterprises and greater employment. Also, it is increasingly recognized that large companies may provide diversified opportunities for individual employees to develop their capabilities.

We are all aware that big business and little business are mutually dependent. You cannot strengthen small business by weakening big business, or vice versa. Artificial restrictions on growth—as contrasted with necessary safeguards against monopoly—carry with them the threat of a stagnating economy rather than the dynamic, expanding economy which all of us want to see maintained in this country.

POLICY FORESIGHT

Companies grow because they successfully perform the job of producing and distributing products which the public wants. Public demand makes them successful when efficient operators can turn out reliable products of superior quality at lower prices. When this is being done, growth is inevitable, given courage and foresight at the policy level.

Because people in general today have a keener appreciation of the important part that large industrial enterprises play in our economy, it has become increasingly important that management live up to its responsibility for keeping the public informed on its policies and accomplishments.

Accordingly, I feel that all of you here and the people of Bethlehem would be interested in my telling you the extent and significance of some of the programs which the Bethlehem Steel Co. has planned and carried out since the end of the war. In addition, I'd like to give you some thoughts which we have for the future which may influence our planning in the years ahead.

LIGHT PRODUCTS GAIN

When I first came to Bethlehem we were primarily producers of structural steel, heavy forgings and castings, armor plate, and miscellaneous ordnance items. As we expanded in the twenties, through the acquisition of our Lackawanna and Johnstown plants and through the expansion of our Sparrows Point plant, our production began to become more and more diversified. This process of growth and change has been greatly accelerated following World War II.

During the 25-year period from 1930 to 1954, we have made many additions to our facilities, especially those for the production of the so-called light steel products such as sheets and strip, tin-mill products, bars, pipe, wire rods, and wire products. In 1930, of the steel products shipped by Bethlehem Steel, only one-third were light products, while two-thirds were in heavy products. Today, our situation in this respect has been practically reversed in that our light products represent two-thirds of our shipments, and our heavy products represent one-third. We have accomplished a change which greatly diversified our outlet for steel. This is especially important because light products constitute a large proportion of the steel requirements of such industries as automotive, container, and other consumable goods manufacturers.

LONG RANGE

While this change represents a significant accomplishment which occurred gradually over a considerable period of time, we faced certain specific problems at the close of

World War II. We had then a highly integrated operation—the second largest steel company and the largest shipbuilding company in the world. But after working under forced draft during the war years, we were faced with problems of depletion and obsolescence. Turning out steel and ships was our big job during World War II and we did this with all we had, day and night, 7 days a week. Time and material were at a premium or controlled by the Government and even ordinary replacements of worn-out facilities were difficult, while new facilities were out of the question.

You will recall the atmosphere of official and expert pessimism which prevailed in the immediate postwar period. Government economists, and others as well, regarded as inevitable the postwar slump. Our problem was—do we sit on our hands, hoarding our cash and fearing a crash? Or do we forge ahead, confident in the country's economic future and determined not to lag behind? These were the conditions and problems we faced in 1945, when I joined my associates in Bethlehem Steel as president under the guidance of our great chairman and chief executive officer, Mr. E. G. Grace.

Our decision, as you know, was to launch a two-phase campaign aimed at looking forward, not backward over our shoulders at past achievements. During the war especially, many advances were made in the technology of steelmaking which rendered obsolete some of our facilities and practices. Accordingly, we set out first to modernize our steel plants, our iron and coal mines, and our transportation services, so that we would be in a strong position for a return to highly competitive conditions in the industry. Secondly, we began to expand on a fully integrated basis—from raw materials to end products—our basic steelmaking and finishing capacities in line with our projections of the part Bethlehem should take in supplying the future national requirements for steel.

As to expansion, our view of the matter was that with the population growing, with the sum total of goods and services known as gross national product following its historical pattern of increase and with per capita consumption of steel rising every year, the long-term demand for steel simply had to go up. We couldn't afford to think in terms of the short-range possibilities of a postwar slump. And we couldn't afford to think in other than very large terms if we were to make up for time unavoidably lost during World War II.

BILLION PROGRAM

Accordingly, since December 1945 we have spent or authorized for expenditure more than \$1 billion in a carefully conceived program of expansion and modernization of which approximately 75 percent is for additions and improvements to steelmaking, fabricating, and other miscellaneous facilities, and the balance for mining, transportation, and shipbuilding facilities or properties. We have increased our annual ingot capacity almost 50 percent to a total of 19,100,000 tons as of the first of this year with a corresponding percentage increase taking place in our capacity to turn out rolled steel and other finished products. All of this has been financed out of earnings to date and it is not contemplated that outside financing will be required to complete the program.

Our answer to the expansion problem has been to add new and improved steelmaking and finishing facilities at our existing plants, where it can be done far more economically than by the creation of new plants. And we have good reason to believe that this approach is paying off handsomely, as evidenced by improved efficiency and earning power.

I should imagine that a fair number of you are Bethlehem stockholders. As such, you may have been framing some questions in your minds. You might be saying to yourselves, "To be sure, \$1 billion is a lot of money, and 19,100,000 net tons of ingot capacity is a lot of steel. But what does this mean in terms of the value of my investment?"

STOCK INVESTMENT

The question is pertinent and some of the answers I can give you should be quite reassuring. For instance, if you had bought one share of Bethlehem common stock at the end of 1945 for the then existing price of \$96, you would have received 3 shares for that 1 share in 1947, and today would be enjoying a market value of about \$115 per share on each of those 3 shares. In other words, your investment of \$96 would have grown to a market value of about \$345, and during that period of 9 years the dividends paid would have totaled \$91.95. You can draw your own conclusions as to whether or not the stockholders have benefited.

To be sure, these figures are expressed in terms of dollars and we have to make allowance for inflation. But discounting this factor there is a healthy gain in terms of increased efficiency and earning capacity. And for further proof of the pudding, there is the record of the year just past which has considerable significance because of reduced operations.

When demand for steel was high, we never were quite sure what the results would be when operations fell off. The period of reduced operations in 1954, from which we are now emerging, offered us an opportunity to get a good look at what Bethlehem Steel got for the money expended for modernization and expansion. The increased operating efficiency resulting from our outlays went a long way toward maintaining good costs in spite of reduced operating rates and helped materially toward showing a return in net income which was very nearly as good as that of the full operation year of 1953. This simply would not have been the case if we had not gone ahead with our postwar expenditures.

BUILD FOR FUTURE

Our stockholders, our customers, our employees, and the communities where we operate are the ultimate beneficiaries of this postwar program, which, though largely completed, is by no means at an end.

With specific reference to the Bethlehem plant, we are completing an extensive modernization program. We have rebuilt the blast furnace department and enlarged steel-ingot capacity. The 50-percent increase in structural mill capacity now being built will add 70,000 tons monthly to what was already by far the largest structural mill in the East, giving us a monthly total of 210,000 tons capacity.

Although we have had some layoffs locally because of the character of our operations here, our payroll for this area is running at the annual rate of some \$110 million. The development of the new Grace mine near Reading offers assurance, if any be needed, that, with this nearby ore supply, steelmaking on the banks of the Lehigh has a secure future.

CONFIDENCE KEYNOTE

Now, I have been talking almost exclusively about Bethlehem Steel. Before concluding, however, I would like to generalize briefly about the State of the economy as I see it. I have stressed the fact that our company's postwar expansion was predicated on our confidence in national growth in a dynamic economy. The results would indicate that the reasons for expansion were sound. I believe that fundamental factors can, within reason, be projected into the future for as far as it is practicable to go.

Let me say that we at Bethlehem Steel place little emphasis on short-term business forecasts. We prefer to be set to roll with the punch, or to land a good, hard one of our own. That is, we believe in staying financially strong as a protection against hard times and we believe in maintaining sufficient production capacity to take care of any reasonable commercial demand, plus a margin of safety for national security purposes.

Our planning is long range and our basic premises are three, namely, that—

1. This Nation of ours will continue to grow.
2. The steel industry must continue to keep pace with the growth of the Nation, because steel is a basic commodity with a growing per capita use.
3. Bethlehem Steel must be progressive in planning and courageous in decision, not only to maintain but to improve its position in the industry.

FACTS AND TRENDS

Now let us look at a few facts and trends which may guide us. For instance, how much growth in the economy and in the steel industry can we expect? Regarding the economy as a whole, our economists believe that we might expect a gross national product—that is, the sum of all the goods and services produced in the Nation—at perhaps \$425 billion annually for the 5-year period of 1958 to 1962 and an annual average gross national product at \$575 billion for the period 1968-72, say, 15 years from now.

Last year, as you know, the gross national product approximated \$356 billion, and most observers look for something in the neighborhood of \$365 billion this year. This would indicate a growth in gross national product of 60 percent in the next 15 years. The growth in the demand for steel in the past years has closely paralleled the growth in GNP.

If the projections for the economy as a whole are realized, then steel production should average around 118 million tons for the 1958-62 period and approximately 145 million tons in 15 years from now, as against an average figure of 92.4 million tons in the period 1948-52.

These projections have just recently been underscored by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. I am glad to find our economists in accord with those who have the job of peering into the crystal ball for President Eisenhower. What impressed me most about the President's message, however, was the underlying philosophy expressed, not just the predictions as to the Nation's economic potential.

I believe the President and his advisers hit upon something basic in compiling the economic message. They set forth an outline of the Government's proper role in our economic affairs which strikes me as being eminently sensible. In fact, the points made in that message are so fundamental that I would like to reiterate them before this audience. I am sure you are in accord with the philosophy they reflect.

The first of the basic propositions is that competitive markets, rather than governmental directives, are, as a rule, the most efficient instruments for organizing production and consumption. This is one of those obvious truths which unfortunately needs to be reemphasized time and time again. There just is no substitute for the free play of market factors in organizing production and distribution of goods—if we want to remain free as individuals.

EISENHOWER'S IDEAS

Secondly, the President noted that a free economy has great capacity to generate jobs and incomes if a feeling of confidence in the economic future is widely shared by investors, workers, businessmen, farmers, and

consumers. This may seem like a truism also, but we need to remind ourselves that our system is built upon faith in what free men can do. Ours is a confident Nation, which believes in rewarding achievement, and that is one of the secrets of its greatness.

Thirdly, as the message points out, the Federal Government creates an atmosphere favorable to economic activity when it encourages private initiative, curbs monopolistic tendencies, whether of business or labor, avoids competing with business and carries out as much of its own work as is practicable through private enterprise. I doubt if anyone in this room would disagree with these expressions.

President Eisenhower goes on to state that the Federal Government generates confidence when it restrains tendencies toward recession or inflation and does this by relying largely on indirect means of influencing private behavior rather than by direct controls over people, industries, and markets. This implies wise and courageous management of the national debt and monetary and credit policy in general. On the record to date we have reason to be thankful that Federal Reserve and Treasury officials give every evidence of being on top of the problem.

Taken together, as an expression of a philosophy of Government's proper role in the Nation's economic life, these principles can, as the President says, "continue the framework of an economic system that provides both greater material abundance and a better quality of living."

As I see it, the elements for steady economic growth are all at hand. We have a people enjoying the highest standard of living ever achieved in history. We have a system of business enterprise which offers the maximum rewards for successfully competing for the market place's favor. We have the skills and the wills.

Barring catastrophe of some sort, or major errors in national policy, the United States economy should continue to grow at an accelerating pace. We have the people, the tools, the desires and the raw materials. If we continue to keep the climate free so that the dynamic possibilities of our system can be realized, there is no limit to possible achievement. Let us hope that all of us will have the perception and judgment to use our blessings wisely.

With these remarks on the national picture, I would like to conclude by leaving with you a word of appreciation.

I have noticed that in its literature the Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce frequently refers to this general area as the Great Lehigh Valley. All of you will agree with me, I am sure, that it is a great place in which we live. We at Bethlehem Steel are proud of the part we have had in making it an outstanding industrial area, outranked in Pennsylvania only by Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

LEHIGH VALLEY GREAT

Here in the Lehigh Valley are operations of many nationally prominent industries. Here is the center of the cement industry for the United States. Here, too, is the greatest concentration of the textile and garment trades outside of New York City. Here are manufactured transportation vehicles and component parts that are internationally known. Here is turned out fine woodwork. Food products from this area are famous for their quality. Keeping pace with the great technological advances of this age are vigorous and ever-growing chemical, electronics, and electrical industries. These are but a few of the hundreds of industrial establishments that stamp the Lehigh Valley as a most diversified manufacturing area, offering job opportunities in thousands of different occupations. In addition we en-

joy the advantages of the institutions which make the valley a great educational center.

Because Bethlehem Steel is the biggest single industry in the valley, people are sometimes not aware of how dependent we are upon you, our neighbors and friends. The great majority of you business people, whether large or small, are our customers or suppliers, either directly or indirectly. To you we owe much and if we work together and do business together, we both may look forward to even greater prosperity and economic growth.

That is why we at Bethlehem Steel are proud to join in this salute to our industrial neighbors, not only in Bethlehem, but throughout the entire Lehigh Valley which, to borrow from the slogan of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, "Truly has everything."

Unanimity on Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the unanimity of view of the Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New York delegations with regard to the proposed legislation by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON to make the Delaware River an avenue of seaborne commerce is most rewarding. Commendation is certainly due Congressman THOMPSON in his spearheading of this far-sighted legislative effort, and I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the following editorial which appeared in the *Trentonian*, February 9, 1955:

UNANIMITY ON DELAWARE

Last week in Washington, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware launched an all-out legislative battle to obtain the money to deepen the Delaware. Reporting on the moves made, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., said in his column in the *Trentonian* Monday morning that the "unanimity among the Representatives of three States is almost unprecedented."

This is cheering news indeed for those who are interested in the Delaware as an avenue of seaborne commerce, as well as for those who believe that the city of Trenton can become the port of Trenton.

THOMPSON is spearheading the legislative machinery. He has introduced a bill calling for an immediate appropriation of \$25 million to get the project started. With Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, he forms a bipartisan committee to represent the New Jersey congressional delegation in coordinating action with Pennsylvania's delegation.

The unanimity of which THOMPSON speaks should put tremendous weight behind the tritrate drive for a deeper Delaware. And it should be noted that both Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, and Governor Leader, of Pennsylvania, are playing leading roles. They were in Washington last Thursday and helped no little in forming the coalition. Although Governor Boggs, of Delaware, was not present, he sent assurance of his support and that of Delaware's congressional delegation.

Certainly we cannot say that our elected representatives are not doing their utmost to obtain an appropriation of sufficient funds to get the project underway. But they have to overcome a rather formidable hurdle, President Eisenhower's recommendation that

a portion of the overall cost be borne by "private interests."

Lurking in the background is some administrative thinking along the lines of making the Delaware a "toll" waterway. Neither device seems to possess merit.

The fact of the matter is that the Delaware, as a channel to the sea, would pay for itself many times over in years to come.

But more important is that it would open up the great Delaware Valley as a new industrial empire.

What that could mean to Trenton can be gleaned from the story of what has happened and what is still happening in Houston, Tex., as told in the *Trentonian* yesterday by Edmund Goodrich, editor and publisher. Houston, 50 miles from the sea, became a great port because a bayou was converted into a ship channel. And the Federal Government paid the entire bill.

As we stated above, our elected officials are carrying the ball. But they can't get it over the goal line unless they are assured of the united support of their constituents. Those of us who have the future welfare of Trenton and the Delaware Valley at heart, should lose no time in advising our members of Congress that we are backing their play.

The overall expenditure of 91 million dollars seems like a staggering sum. It really isn't. It's a good, sound investment in the future of this great segment of our country. The preliminary appropriation of 25 million should be voted by Congress without delay.

Need for Postal Service Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the proposed increase in postal service pay. Such an increase is overdue not only in justice to the postal employees but also for the sake of long-range economy in the handling of mail.

Postal employees need a salary increase to give them as much real income as they received prior to World War II. Since 1939 such factors as the increased cost of living, higher income taxes, and larger deductions for retirement have combined to reduce the purchasing power of many classes of postal workers. In spite of a series of pay increases, the most recent of which took effect in July 1951, the average postal worker's take-home pay today buys less than it did 15 years ago. This is especially true for supervisors and other employees in the higher-income brackets.

In the past decade and a half the pay of the largest groups of postal workers has tended to increase less rapidly than the pay of production workers in private industry. A year ago the Postmaster General submitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service information indicating that between 1939 and 1953 the average weekly earnings of all full- and part-time unskilled and skilled workers in manufacturing industries—up to and including lead foremen—rose at a considerably faster rate than the earnings of regular clerks and letter carriers. In addition, it is generally agreed

that the salaries of executive-level employees in the postal service have lagged behind the salaries of top-management staffs in private enterprise.

To the extent that differences between postal salaries and pay in private industry result from the fact that Federal Government employees cannot apply certain economic pressures—for example, strikes—available to workers in private industry, Congress has a special obligation to view generously the postal workers' needs.

Adequate postal service pay contributes to long-range economy in the handling of mail through attracting better employees, reducing turnover, and improving the efficiency of people on the job. Little question exists as to the value of increased pay in the recruitment and retention of qualified staff. Although salary constitute only one of several factors affecting whether or not a person takes a job, the Nation cannot reasonably expect good workers to accept or remain in positions in the Post Office if they can earn more money or have more opportunity for advancement in similar employment outside the Government. When postal salaries fall too low, the Post Office must employ less efficient workers and devote excessive time and energy to the training of replacements.

While we have yet to develop methods for measuring with precision the effects of pay levels on the efficiency of workers who remain on the job, commonsense suggests that services to the public will suffer when postal workers must secure additional part-time employment, put their wives to work, or borrow excessively to meet their normal living expenses. It is worth noting that of 800,000 postal and civil service employees surveyed by the executive council of the American Federation of Labor last year, about half had outside jobs; and about 40 percent of those who were married had wives who worked.

Last year Congress approved an adjustment in the salaries of postal employees, but the form of the adjustment failed to satisfy the President of the United States. This year no barrier must stand in the way of the needed increase in pay.

Value of Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am calling to your attention the value of irrigation to the future growth of our country.

Last year a drought much worse than that which caused the Dust Bowl in the thirties parched the lands of Colorado and surrounding areas. Soil moisture content had shrunk to approximately 15 percent of normal; precipitation aver-

aged about 50 percent of normal; natural runoff from the usually abundant snow-pack in the mountains dwindled to 40 percent of normal, and the streams fed thereby became trickles. Crop failures and financial ruin seemed inevitable, and prayers for rainfall went unanswered.

Northern Colorado is normally a rich, fertile, and productive agriculture basin. Its economy and well-being depend almost entirely upon agricultural crops, which, in turn, depend upon the water supply from natural precipitation and from irrigation. To those farmers in this area who were not equipped to irrigate their croplands, this drought meant the loss of an entire year's work, the hardship and privation of at least a year with no income, the necessity of depleting their investment and retirement savings, and in some cases, complete failure. To those farmers in the 615,000 acre area served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project, the drought of 1954 was a challenge that could be met and beaten. Because this project water was available, nearly normal farm production was attained by these users. Had the project water not been available, less than one-half a crop would have been harvested; and translated into dollars and cents, the value of this project water was \$22 million.

Weather Bureau officials predict the record-breaking drought will continue throughout 1955, but the people within the area served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project know they will have over 300,000 acre-feet of water, brought from the other side of the Rocky Mountains, available to meet their needs.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

The rich agricultural lands served by the Colorado-Big Thompson project, an area half as large as the State of Delaware, slope eastward from the foothills of the Rockies in the northeastern part of Colorado. Intensive irrigation development in this area during the half-century between 1860 and 1910 brought the inevitable over-appropriation of the available natural stream-flow, and growth of these facilities reached a stalemate. The Colorado-Big Thompson project was initiated in 1938 to overcome the problem.

This project is one of the most complex and spectacular the Bureau of Reclamation has ever undertaken. For many years, the 14,000-foot granite barrier of the Continental Divide presented an insurmountable obstacle to the dream of tapping the water-wealthy headwaters region of the Colorado River, which lay only a few miles to the westward. American ingenuity and energy went to work. The Divide was pierced by a tunnel 13.1 miles long, more than 9 feet in diameter, and sloping gradually from west to east in order to carry the diverted water by gravity flow from West Slope to East Slope.

After emerging from the east portal of the tunnel, the diverted waters drop nearly 3,000 feet down the mountain slopes, spinning the turbines of hydroelectric plants on their way into 2 major storage reservoirs to be held until needed on the farmlands below, and sending out 179,000 kilowatts of criti-

cally needed electric power to large areas in Colorado, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Kansas.

Although the project was not yet completed in 1954, the major portion of construction had been finished when the irrigation season began. The system was ready to serve some 400,000 of the 615,000 acres which ultimately will be served when construction is completed in 1956. Total cost of the finished project will be \$159.8 million.

Unlike flood-control projects of the Corps of Engineers and public works projects of other departments of the Government, irrigation and reclamation projects pay back the major share of their costs with revenues realized from the sale of water and hydroelectric power. In 1954 alone, sale of power from the Colorado-Big Thompson project brought in a gross revenue of \$2.8 million, and it is quite safe to assume that this annual income will increase yearly as the project is completed and the functions expand.

FAILURE AVERTED

This storage water meant the difference between success and failure to these Colorado farmers. What might have been in 1954 without project water at hand can best be appraised by comparing what did happen with the effects of the worst previous drought year in the same area, 1934. In most respects, 1954 presented greater handicaps to successful crop production than did the 1934 season, and estimates based on 1934 losses provide a conservative view of what might have happened in 1954.

In 1934 crop yields totaled approximately \$19 million.

In 1954 crop yields from lands irrigated under the project totaled \$41 million.

Translating this \$22 million differential into terms of buying power, multiplied by the number of similar irrigation projects sprinkled throughout the 17 reclamation States, and the impact upon our national economy is terrific. Practically all manufacturing, trade, and transportation involves agricultural commodities; an irrigation water shortage affects the entire economy.

BENEFITS UNLIMITED

Irrigation has contributed directly to the building of cities, to the development of fertile acres, to the homes of more than 35 million Americans who supply nearly half of the entire Nation's demand for choice vegetables and truck crops; to the development of a \$40 billion annual retail market, averaging \$1,139 per capita—retail sales for the Nation during the same year averaged \$1,023 per person—and to the development of a new outlet for the products manufactured in our bustling industrial areas of the East.

What has this new market, this new development, this growth of our dynamic country cost the American taxpayer?

Money spent by the Department of Defense during the month of January would pay for all reclamation since it was started in 1902.

Money spent to finance our foreign aid program for 6 months would pay for all reclamation since it was started in 1902.

On the other hand, money spent on reclamation during fiscal year 1953 would have financed the Department of Defense less than 3 days, or the foreign assistance program or the Veterans' Administration less than a month.

Actually, the cost to the Federal Government is negligible. Money appropriated for power aspects of the projects is paid back to the Treasury with interest. Money appropriated for irrigation aspects is paid back without interest. The only outlay from the Treasury is for non-reimbursable features, that is, flood control, stream-pollution abatement, recreation, and fish and wildlife propagation.

The cost of these nonreimbursables is more than compensated by the additional Federal tax revenue created by reclamation. Based on a sample study of 15 selected reclamation projects, individual income taxes paid directly by irrigation farmers and by persons directly affected by the project were estimated at \$800 million. Corporation and excise-tax revenues collected from the same area total nearly \$500 million. Cost of these projects totaled \$269 million. In other words, Federal taxes collected have exceeded the Federal investment in irrigation features in these projects by about five times.

Now let us take a look at irrigation and reclamation expenditures from the standpoint of their justification in our budget. Many billions of dollars have been spent for flood control, harbors and docks, and agriculture conservation payments. This money is not returned to the Federal Government. I have no arguments against these projects, for I feel they are an essential part in building a greater America for ourselves and our posterity.

However, the comparison should be drawn so that all will know that the biggest share of money appropriated for irrigation and reclamation projects is returned to the Federal Treasury.

The Corps of Engineers has spent, since its inception, more than \$7.245 billion on water-conservation and flood-control projects—nearly 4 times the total spent on irrigation and reclamation. Money spent by the Corps of Engineers is nonreimbursable.

Total Federal investment in irrigation and reclamation projects is about \$2.2 billion. It should not be forgotten, however, that local citizens have been active partners—paying partners—in each of the projects, and repayment contracts are negotiated before work on the project is started.

Reclamation is paying its own way.

The crops produced on these projects add very little to our present surpluses. We never seem to have enough vegetables and fresh fruit to meet our diet requirements. These products, together with alfalfa and sugarbeets, essential to the livestock industries, are the principal irrigated farm crops. They are not on the surplus list.

Our investment in irrigation and reclamation has paid special dividends. We should continue to invest in this field as long as there are feasible projects to be developed.

Pennsylvania State University, at State College, Pa., Will Observe Its 100th Birthday on February 22, 1955

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, February 22, will be an important day in the history of the Pennsylvania State University when the centennial of the Nation's 11th largest university will be observed.

Established under an act of the General Assembly in 1855, the Pennsylvania State University this year celebrates its centennial with a program emphasizing its services to the Commonwealth during 100 years of educational advancement.

The movement for establishing the institution, first called the Farmers High School of Pennsylvania, was started by farm leaders who realized that progress in agriculture involved the application of scientific methods as well as labor and fertilizer.

Thus they planned a school that would give instruction in the sciences bearing on agriculture and that would operate an experimental farm on which the students would do all the labor.

At the time the project for combining practical and theoretical education was a startlingly new concept. Dr. Evan Pugh, the school's first president, described it in his inaugural address:

We are here for the avowed purpose of trying an experiment which has never been successfully performed in any country in the world.

Four years after the Governor signed the charter, the school opened its doors to 69 students in an incompleting building rising from the fields of Centre County.

Those 4 years had been marked by discouraging setbacks. The trustees had contracted for a 5-story building costing \$55,000 to accommodate 400 students.

In addition to a State appropriation of \$25,000, they had in cash \$10,000 received from the Pennsylvania State Agricultural Society, \$10,000 raised by Centre County residents, and \$5,000 willed by a Philadelphia benefactor. The school was located on 200 acres donated by James Irvin of Bellefonte.

The legislature promised an additional \$25,000 if the trustees could raise a matching sum by subscription throughout the State.

The building was costing more than expected and crop failures and a money panic prevented the raising of the money needed to get the second \$25,000 installment from the State.

The first students who arrived on February 16, 1859, found only one wing of the school building completed. Living conditions at first were crude: lighting was by lard-oil lamps and construction shacks converted into dining halls were cold and drafty.

There were few books in the library and apparatus for instruction in science

was negligible. Students worked 3 hours daily on the school farm and at such tasks as clearing stones from the campus and making the main building livable.

Pugh arrived to assume the duties of president 9 months after the school term opened. A native Pennsylvanian, he had conducted a boys' academy before deciding to go to Germany to study. At the time he was chosen to head the school, he was in England where he had spent 2 years in agricultural research.

Wholly dedicated to the idea of education of the founders of the school, Pugh worked without stint to put theory into practice, to win support from over the State, and to get money from the General Assembly.

In spite of the disruptions of the Civil War, Pugh graduated his first class of 11 students in 1861, won an appropriation from the General Assembly and completed the main building in 1863, and secured for the school recognition as the land-grant college of Pennsylvania under provisions of the Morrill Act signed by President Lincoln in 1862.

Pugh and the school's trustees were backers of Representative Justin S. MORRILL in his efforts to get Congress to pass his bill, and in anticipation of success changed the name of the Farmers High School to the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania early in 1862.

Weakened by overwork, worries and an injury suffered in an accident, Pugh died in 1864. The next 20 years were to be a period of drift and disillusionment during which the college had five presidents who put into effect different programs in futile attempts to stabilize the institution so precariously started in 1855.

The problem was developing a program that combined practical and theoretical training. Since this goal of education was almost entirely new, there were no models to go by. Pugh's early description of the school as an experiment was too true. A lot of experimenting had to be done before a successful formula could be evolved.

Pugh was followed as president by William H. Allen, head of Girard College. Allen fought off before the legislature efforts of other State schools to be named land-grant beneficiaries and obtained permission for an \$80,000 loan for the college to pay its debts.

Allen left to his faculty the job of working out an instructional program that, to comply with the Morrill Act, should include training in the "mechanic arts." But discouraged by the school's prospects, he resigned in 1866 and returned to Girard College.

His successor was John Fraser, who had headed the faculty committee working on the reorganization of the curriculum. The enrollment decline that had set in after the Civil War continued, dropping to 30 in 1868. Fraser, differing with the trustees on policy, resigned.

Fraser's innovations in starting courses in technical subjects as well as in agricultural science and in abandoning the requirement of student labor on the farm were dropped by his successor, Thomas Henry Burrowes.

Burrowes, making fun of the "parade of the long list of 'ologies,' 'onomies,' and

'ographies' which grace some catalogs," restored the emphasis on agriculture and turned his students out to work the farm as provided for in the college's charter.

A popular State figure and for years a leader in the establishment of the common-school system, Burrowes succeeded in checking the enrollment decline and in winning friends for the college. He talked up the college in speeches over the State and instituted a Harvest Home which in its second year in 1870 attracted more than 2,000 persons to the campus.

After Burrowes' death in 1871, the trustees brought in James Calder, of Hillsdale College in Michigan, as the new president. He remained 9 years.

In his first year Calder secured the permission of the trustees to open the doors of the college to both sexes without distinction as to qualifications or privileges, and six women attended classes in 1872.

Calder's administration also saw a change in name from the Agricultural College of Pennsylvania to the Pennsylvania State College, enlargement of the board of trustees to include representatives of the alumni and of the State's manufacturing industries, and amendment of the charter to drop the student-labor rule.

A growing emphasis on classical studies and neglect of the scientific, agricultural, and mechanical arts studied led to growing criticism that the college had lost sight of the goals of the founders and was not living up to the Morrill Act.

Calder resigned to be succeeded by Joseph Shortlidge, head of a boys' school at Concordville. Shortlidge did not get along with the trustees, his faculty, or students and resigned after 9 months.

Not since the school's beginnings had the fortunes of the school been at such a low ebb, Gov. Robert E. Pattison himself remarking that—

The past history of the State agricultural college is not such as to induce the belief that any practical good has or ever will come from it.

But though no one realized it at the time the college was at a turning point. The trustees chose as the new president George W. Atherton, head of the political science department at Rutgers University. He was to head the institution for 24 years of steady growth.

Against a proposal of the governor that the college's faculty be cut in half and that the course of study be made exclusively agricultural, Atherton was able to persuade the trustees that the school's future depended upon developing a program in the mechanic arts.

Within a few years the wisdom of his program was seen. The college's enrollment picked up, reaching 244 in 1892. In 1887 Atherton won a \$100,000 appropriation from the legislature for new buildings and by 1892 the State had spent \$305,500 for new buildings and \$102,000 for equipment.

A few years later, in 1896, fulfillment of the goals of the founders and of the Land-Grant Act was seen in the reorgan-

ization of the college into 7 schools—School of Agriculture, School of Natural Science, School of Mathematics and Physics, School of Engineering, School of Mines, School of Language and Literature, and School of History, Political Science and Philosophy.

A college spirit was also developing. School colors were chosen in 1887 and a school song in 1901, the first intercollegiate football game was played in 1887, a yearbook was begun in 1889, a student handbook appeared in 1895 and a weekly student newspaper was started in 1904.

Toward the close of Atherton's administration trustee Charles W. Schwab donated money for an auditorium and trustee Andrew Carnegie money for a library building. Other new buildings at this time included a men's dormitory, a dairy building and a main agricultural building.

When Atherton died in 1906, the president of the board of trustees, former Gov. James Addams Beaver was chosen acting president. Beaver saw the enrollment grow within 16 months from 800 to 1,151. Beaver turned over the administration of the college in 1906 to Dr. Edwin Erle Sparks, University of Chicago historian.

No advocate of the ivory-tower theory of education, Sparks embarked on a program of enlarging the college's services to make them statewide. His oft-repeated slogan was: "Let us carry the college to the people."

He fought for funds for setting up an extension division, getting his first appropriation for this purpose in 1913. Though a strong supporter of the college's practical education program in agriculture, engineering, and technology, Sparks urged more courses in the liberal arts. As a result of his efforts, the present School of Liberal Arts was formed in 1909.

The steady progress of the college educationally was disrupted by the entrance of the United States in World War I. It made major contributions to the war effort, training 1,500 Army and Navy trainees in the Students' Army Training Corps, in addition to regular students enrolled in military science and tactics; turning over laboratories and scientific equipment to wartime research; and dedicating other resources of the college to boosting civilian morale.

His health broken by his own war efforts Sparks resigned in 1920. His successor, Dr. John Martin Thomas, of Middlebury College in Vermont, launched an immediate program for more buildings desperately needed because of the cessation of construction during the war.

In a 2-year drive for building funds, the college secured \$1,727,272 in pledges by 17,000 alumni and friends of the college.

Besides the building program, the Thomas administration saw the establishment of a graduate school and a school of education, a reorganization of the school of agriculture and the formation of a school of chemistry and physics from the former school of natural science. When Thomas resigned in

1925, the college's enrollment had reached 3,854 students.

The new president, Dr. Ralph Dorn Hetzel of the University of New Hampshire, headed the institution during the boom days of the late 1920's, the depression of the 1930's and the war and post-war readjustments of the 1940's.

Two large-scale building programs took place during the Hetzel administration and a third was planned when he died in 1947. The first received its impetus from President Thomas' drive for funds. When it ended in 1932, the college had spent about \$5,500,000 for buildings. The second, from 1937 to 1939, involved the expenditure of about \$5 million by the general State authority.

The depression was a difficult period because of cuts in appropriations for maintenance and teaching, and World War II meant a greater tax on Hetzel's administrative and leadership powers.

Adopting a year-round schedule, the college trained thousands of soldiers, sailors, marines and aviators in special programs requested by the military services; put in special courses for training women for work in industry; gave instruction to more than 140,000 civilian workers in extension classes held over the State; and carried on extensive research to meet the needs of the war effort.

At the war's end the college was faced with a stack of 22,853 applications for admission to classes, most of them coming from veterans.

The need was met by utilizing every useful nook and cranny for class and laboratory space, by using war-surplus materials for emergency dormitories and classrooms, and by overloading professors with classes and students.

These devices were those adopted by all colleges and universities to handle swollen enrollments, but Penn State developed another that received nationwide attention.

This device was that of enrolling first- and second-year students at Penn State centers, at the State teachers colleges, and at private schools in order to make space available on the campus for upperclassmen studying professional and technical subjects. Twenty-two schools cooperated with Penn State in this program.

After Hetzel's death in 1947, James Milholland, president of the board of trustees, served as acting head of the college until the election of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower as president in 1950.

Milholland started the long-range building program that was designed to meet the college's needs for the enrollment increases predicted for the post-war period. This was a \$10 million program to be carried on under the General State Authority.

Reporting on the campus plant in 1954, Eisenhower said that the buildings were valued at \$66 million, and that 58 percent, or \$38 million, was new construction since 1946. Seventy percent of the new construction was accomplished without the use of tax money.

For many years there had been a growing sentiment that since the Penn-

sylvania State College was a university in size and in the broad scope of its work the word "college" in the name should be replaced by the word "university." This was accomplished in the fall of 1953.

Under Dr. Eisenhower, the onetime Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania enters its second century as the Pennsylvania State University—the 11th largest institution of higher learning in the Nation.

In its 100-year span the institution has awarded 53,000 degrees, beginning with 11 granted in 1861. The institution now grants about 3,000 annually. It has seen its student body increase from 119 to 14,000 and its faculty from 4 to 1,400. Its research program has grown from a few dollars spent on nursery stock to one costing about \$6 million annually. Through its extension program, its instruction is now given on a campus that may be considered statewide.

The untried experiment of the founders of the institution in 1855 is now acclaimed a resounding success, as evidenced by the following accomplishments of which Penn State is proud:

Penn State is proud of—

The first use of the practicum method of instruction on a wide scale, 1866.

The first soil fertility experimental plots in the United States, 1881. The only prior fertility plots were in Rothamstead, England.

The first correspondence instruction in agriculture. Chautauqua home reading courses begun in 1892. Formal correspondence courses begun 1893.

The first organized extension instruction in mining in the United States 1893-94. First mining bulletin published January 1, 1894.

World's first respiration calorimeter for domestic animals, 1902. Prior ones were adapted for use with human beings only.

The first college forestry building in the United States—Fergie's woodshed, 1906.

The first formal training program in industrial engineering, 1908.

The first establishment of student gardens as regular practicum training 1909.

The first mineral industries experiment station, 1919.

The first organized curriculum in fuel technology, 1931.

The first institute of local government in the United States, 1935.

The first organized curriculums in meteorology, mineral economics, mineral preparation engineering, 1946.

The first climatometer for studies in dehumidification, 1948.

The first department of biochemistry accredited by American Chemical Society's committee on professional training, April 26, 1950.

The first establishment of a foreign training center by an American institution for industrial education, Formosa, June 1, 1953.

The first conference of insurance buyers held on a university campus, 1953.

Pioneer work in chemical engineering. A course in industrial chemistry was taught in 1890.

Pioneer work in safe-driving instruction. The first driver-training course for high-school students was taught in the State College High School in 1933. The first training course for teachers of safe driving was offered during the summer session of 1936.

Pioneer conference of dentists and oral surgeons, March 15-17, 1943, which led to the founding of the American Academy of Cleft-Palate Prosthesis, April 4, 1943, which in turn became the American Association for Cleft-Palate Rehabilitation.

Only mineral industries art gallery in the world, established 1930.

Only mineral industries museum in Pennsylvania, established 1930.

Only university in the world offering courses in Pennsylvania German language, culture and folklore, 1946.

Only institution in Pennsylvania giving work in home economics leading to the Ph.D. degree.

Only institution in Pennsylvania giving work in hotel administration.

Only home economics research center in Pennsylvania.

Largest enrollment in home economics in the State, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Largest enrollment of nonhome economics majors in any land-grant institution in the United States.

World's largest water tunnel—Garfield Thomas Memorial Water Tunnel, test chamber 14 feet long, 4 feet in diameter; dedicated October 7, 1949.

Largest engineering, science, and management defense and war training programs, 1940-45—155,000 enrolled.

One of the largest university film libraries in the East, established 1941.

Largest flower test gardens in the United States; first approved by All-America Selections Committee for testing of new flower varieties before they go on the market, spring 1941.

A low-temperature laboratory second only to that of the United States Bureau of Standards.

First Witness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which was contained in the New York Times of January 18, 1955.

While the article, because of the date-line, might appear to be somewhat outdated, the subject is certainly of vital importance to us in the current consideration of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1955.

A liberal trade policy is the cornerstone of our foreign policy, and I believe that an extension of our trade agree-

ments program, as set forth in H. R. 1, will aid our economic growth in the future as it has in the past since its inception some 20 years ago.

The editorial follows:

FIRST WITNESS

The vigorous position taken by Secretary Dulles as the first witness has got the hearings on the 3-year reciprocal-trade bill off to a good start. It seems that the administration is determined to fight for this measure in a way that it was fought for only by the Democrats last year.

There will be serious opposition, especially on the part of representatives of specific interests that honestly feel they are endangered by extension or even continuation of the reciprocal trade system. Overconfidence on the part of proponents of the bill could be disastrous. Yet the broad welfare of the United States as an economic unit and the position of this country as leader of the free world combine to make the arguments in behalf of the reciprocal trade program so overwhelming that it is difficult to believe it can be defeated if the administration really puts its weight behind it.

Mr. Dulles based his argument for the bill squarely on its effect on the foreign relations of the United States. One of the major complaints of our friends abroad, to whom we ceaselessly lecture on the virtues of a liberal trade policy, is that they never know just what our own policy is going to be from one year to the next. The habit of extending our reciprocal trade bills for 1 year only, plus the occasional changes in policy that take place—as in the instance of Swiss watch imports or the earlier cheese amendment—leave foreign traders in an almost perpetual state of uncertainty and tend to discourage them from attempting to build up new long-range trading relationships with this country. The more basic fear that we might shift our general trade policy away from liberalism and toward protectionism must, as Secretary Dulles said, be stamped out unless we want the Soviet prediction of economic warfare among the free nations to come true.

This is no idle fear. There are very strong advocates of protectionism in all the leading manufacturing countries of the world. If the United States falls at this juncture to adopt even so moderate a bill as the pending one we have to face the possibility of a general free-for-all among all of our friends, with the most direct and serious consequences to our own economy as well as to theirs.

Our American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Union of American Hebrew Congregations convened in Los Angeles, and in that connection I am pleased to direct to the attention of our colleagues the following words of Rabbi Samuel D. Soskin which appeared in the February 11, 1955, issue of the Truth, weekly publication of Temple Beth Emeth of Flatbush:

OUR AMERICAN TRADITION

(By Rabbi Samuel D. Soskin)

It is of deep significance that the Union of American Hebrew Congregations convenes

in the month of February. For during this month we are profoundly aware of the tradition symbolized in the birthday celebrations of two great Presidents. This tradition has endured hardship and struggle. Its destiny was hammered out on the burning anvils of war and bloodshed. Upon its survival depends the survival of mankind. At this very hour this tradition is endangered by the ominous threat of Atomic warfare. We cannot deny, therefore, that this is no ordinary moment in the dramatic story of American Jewry.

The very convening of this assembly, however, constitutes a promise and a challenge. By its very nature Reform Judaism commands its adherents to join the forces of liberalism and brotherhood. The inspiration for this duty stems from the doctrines expounded so nobly by the prophets of Israel. This prophetic idealism runs like a golden thread through our Bible and through the sacred documents of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

As citizens of a free land we are pledged to uphold these documents and to fulfill the promise found therein, of a time when all men shall deem themselves equal in the sight of God. As Jews we are to drink deeply from the wells of Jewish learning that we may more faithfully serve our Nation and mankind. Emboldened by the example of great Americans and by the flaming fervor of our faith, let us work for the day when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation nor learn war any more." This is the purpose of the U. A. H. C. Convention. May its deliberations eventuate in success.

Billions, Blunders, and Baloney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Congress will shortly be required to vote on the extension of foreign aid, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a column by James Ratliff in the Cincinnati Inquirer, Sunday, February 13, 1955.

This splendid writer reviews Mr. Eugene Castle's new book, Billions, Blunders, and Baloney, which deals with our foreign aid and information programs.

The column follows:

HARD-HITTING FACTS

(By James Ratliff)

Like a rain shower to the dust bowl of America's international propaganda are the hard-hitting facts in the new book, Billions, Blunders, and Baloney. Its author, Eugene W. Castle, is no literary dilettante blindly convinced that any international giveaway is good just because our motives are decent. As a one-time reporter, Castle wanted the facts, and he got them—traveling 75,000 miles around the world at his own expense.

Mr. Castle found that, despite our giving away \$40 billion since 1948, along with a half billion more for propaganda, we have fewer international friends and sincere allies than in 1948 "and lots of people are beginning to ask why?"

Among those asking is Walter Lippmann, whom Castle quotes as saying recently " * * * what we call psychological warfare is, I am persuaded, doing more harm to the United States than it is to the Soviet Union. In the

near future we shall have to give it an agonizing reappraisal."

Mr. Castle begged a Senate committee last spring to give that "agonizing reappraisal" then and not vote (as they did) another \$77 million to the United States Information Agency to do "more harm to the United States."

What our allies think of our propagandists struck Mr. Castle bluntly in Turkey. He cooled his heels for 15 minutes beside the busy editor of Istanbul's largest newspaper. Asked his opinion about the USIA, the Turkish editor was brisk:

"There are no 'Yanks Go Home' signs in Turkey. Turks like Yanks. Yanks like Turks. The only Yanks Turks don't like are your propagandists all over our country. If they would go home it would be still better for Turkish-American relations." And the Turk shook hands abruptly, bowed, and that was that.

Who could ever have expected anything else after reading Castle's descriptions of USIA palaces like Baron de Rothschild's in Paris where a large number of non-French-speaking news amateurs spread bungling propaganda in the heart of a sophisticated foreign city?

Mr. Castle finds that the USIA has more than 10,000 employees to spread blatant, resented American propaganda in the faces of those who understand it and on the desert air of the countless millions who don't. And the crack Associated Press news service covers the entire world with factual, up-to-the-minute news with a few more than 3,000 persons.

When a Brooklyn Democrat, Congressman JOHN J. ROONEY, heard Director Theodore E. Streibert of the USIA ask in Washington for \$204,000 to propagandize the American people about how important the USIA's propaganda was, he exclaimed:

"Never in the balmy days of the New Deal did they attempt such a thing as this."

"The flow of American money abroad since 1945 has been a reckless and unregulated river . . . in astronomical sums that stagger the imagination," says Mr. Castle. And it isn't the money that appalls him as much as the realization of how much of it is actually working to our disadvantage, what with countries that are cynically "neutral" when we need help and treacherously playing the Soviet game diplomatically or by handing on our bounty in trade.

America appears hypnotized with the philosophy that somehow pouring endless billions will buy a solution to our troubles, for Mr. Castle notes the resolute and futile stands against it. Senator WALTER F. GEORGE told the Senate on July 1, 1953: "As far as I'm concerned Mutual Security is going into its last fiscal year beginning this morning."

Yet the desperately fighting, entrenched bureaucrats simply changed the name of foreign aid for the third time (it's now Foreign Operations Administration) and came up with more than \$3 billion more appropriations despite the fact that they had unspent billions still to play with from previous years. The recipients of aid have long since passed the goals we were to help them attain. It occurs to no one—not even the President—that the men pressing hardest for continued aid are those who would lose their jobs doing it out.

Mr. Castle's book is full of indignation, but also that rare, forgotten American virtue—commonsense. Witness the following truism:

"If we are to wage heated and continuous propaganda wars against the Soviet we must expect that Russia will wage retaliatory cold wars against us."

He notes that President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles sounded off in major speeches about the Soviet menace 39 times in a period of 1 year and a half. Maybe Churchill and Eden did it only three times in that same pe-

riod, because they are aware that most people know Russia is a menace. Or maybe they realize wryly that Russia is where she is today because of the billions America gave to her, even to sending her postwar factories. More billions of the present aid will probably follow the same path, because wasn't that Tito tottering toward Moscow and neutral Nehru?

Mr. Castle, an expert on reaching people through his own one-time worldwide film service, implores us to turn our propaganda back into straight news releases directed by the State Department. How embarrassed our ambassadors must be with an independent propaganda agency speaking down the street from our own embassies.

Any remaining need for foreign aid should also be given to the State Department and handled properly through the Defense Department as military subsidies, Mr. Castle declares. And he closes with food for thought.

"Something has happened to the magic which once invested the name 'American' throughout the globe. We are dangerously alone in a world of envy and hostility. Our dollars have not been enough.

"The decline of American prestige overseas has gone hand in hand with the decline of American patriotism at home."

Federal Control of the Gathering and Sale of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the attached resolution of the annual membership meeting of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, Kansas-Oklahoma division. Because this Congress will deal with the problem set forth in the resolution, I respectfully call it to every Member's attention:

The Kansas-Oklahoma division, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, invites public attention to the following:

The Supreme Court of the United States, in a recent decision, held that sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers to purchasers who transport the gas in interstate commerce for resale are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission under the terms of the Natural Gas Act.

The Federal Power Commission, as a result of such decision, has asserted control over the price at which natural gas subject to its jurisdiction may be sold by producers and gatherers, and over the production and gathering of natural gas in the field.

It was not the intent of Congress in enacting the Natural Gas Act in 1938 that the production and gathering of natural gas or the sale thereof by producers and gatherers should be regulated by the Federal Power Commission.

The production and gathering of natural gas, in contrast, with the interstate transportation and local distribution of natural gas, is not in fact a monopoly or a public utility operation, but, on the contrary, is a risk-taking, highly speculative and competitive business conducted by many thousand producers who compete with each other in acquiring and marketing natural gas which,

in turn, competes as a commodity with other fuels not regulated.

It is in the public interest and essential to the national security that the production and gathering of natural gas and the sale thereof should be left to the forces of supply and demand consistent with our Nation's fundamental philosophy of competitive free enterprise.

The Federal regulation of production and gathering of natural gas and the sale thereof will inevitably result in Federal regulation of the production of oil, in retarding exploration for and production of natural gas, in conflicts with State regulatory measures for the production and conservation of oil and natural gas and in a shortage of available supplies of natural gas for the consuming public, all contrary to the national interest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Kansas-Oklahoma Division of the Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association in annual meeting in Tulsa, Okla., December 15, 1954, That this association does hereby recommend and urge that the Congress of the United States enact at its next session appropriate legislation to clearly exempt production and gathering of natural gas and the sale thereof by producers and gatherers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission: Be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the United States Senators from the States of Kansas and Oklahoma and all other States and the Members of the House of Representatives from the States of Kansas and Oklahoma and all other States."

Attest:

CLAREL B. MAPES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks with respect to the activities which I have planned for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee during the present session of Congress, I wish to inform the House that I feel that the time is long overdue for some forceful action to bring together labor, management, and the Federal Government in a cooperative effort to work out the problems facing the American merchant marine today.

An excellent summary of our plans is contained in the following editorial in the New York Journal of Commerce of Friday, January 7, 1955:

SHIPPING OUTLOOK

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

The expressed intention of Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, new chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, to call top labor leaders in the maritime industry to Washington this session to get their views on the problems of American flag shipping opens a field of inquiry that holds substantial possibilities.

While union leaders have testified at past hearings by congressional committees, the burden of their statements has been to flay management for alleged shortcomings, without making any serious effort to indicate

how labor could assist in promoting a strong merchant marine.

If Representative BONNER's hearings are going to be used as a sounding board to publicize once more much that already is "old hat," then little in the way of constructive suggestions can be expected.

However, if the entire question of management-labor relations is brought under inquiry and the major labor contracts reviewed, as Representative BONNER stated he planned to do, we might get some surprising revelations respecting the built-in "make-work" clauses, special overtime requirements and premium allowances that have been placed into these pacts by seagoing unions over recent years. They all cost money, some of them big money. How and under what circumstances they have attained official status would make interesting reading.

It is, of course, no secret that high labor costs are the main handicap under which American flag shipping operates.

Numerous studies have been made on this subject, all of which show that on a comparative basis the labor cost of operating American shipping is fantastic as compared with most other maritime nations.

Now no one wants to see American seamen working for depressed wages. They are entitled to a good day's pay for a day of good work done. But many of the tasks they do now call for special premiums or allowances and these all add up to bring the average seaman's monthly check considerably above that of workers performing similar tasks ashore.

If the unions really want to aid American shipping they should be willing to sit down and seriously review some of these working conditions. And if Mr. BONNER wants to open an interesting field of inquiry, here is one phase of the national maritime problem that deserves review.

As he says, the taxpayer has spent considerable sums in aiding the merchant marine and deserves to know where it is going.

Why the percentage of our cargoes carried aboard American ships continues to steadily decline certainly merits serious study at this time. This is a broad subject but an important one, for unless we are able to reverse this trend and restore the ratio to a more equitable level our shipping is going to deteriorate regardless of the extent of Government operating and building aids.

The time, therefore, certainly has come to find out precisely why private cargo does not move in greater volume on American vessels, as Mr. BONNER purposes to do.

Lines of inquiry which the House committee might pursue include the following: How our share of trade breaks down as to exports, imports, specific commodities, big trade routes; what foreign regulations or trade practices exist that may result in diverting cargoes to certain national's vessels; to what extent terms of sale of imports and exports influence the manner of shipment; to what extent terms of sale of imports and exports influence the manner of shipment; to what extent currency restrictions serve to discourage use of American vessels. Also, are American-flag lines giving the type of service and frequency of sailings that make them highly competitive with foreign operators; amount of cargo that could be handled.

This, admittedly, is an involved problem, embracing world economics, national policies, and service considerations. It is a market research job that has been tackled piecemeal in the past, whereas an overall, penetrating analysis is needed.

When longshoremen last month turned down their new labor contract at the polls, we observed in this column on December 17, that failure to spell out in detail just what

the working conditions, clauses and the machinery for arbitration would mean aroused suspicion in the minds of many dockworkers that was fanned by opposition labor leaders.

It was suggested here that these two issues be clarified and explained to the men and the contract resubmitted to a vote. This is the procedure that was followed, it so happens, and the strong acceptance vote by the longshoremen yesterday confirms the wisdom of this move.

For the first time in many years, the port of New York now has reasonably good assurance of peaceful labor relations. We are confident that it will work out that way and that, once this is generally realized, much of the business that has abandoned this port will return here.

Tyranny or Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the February 1, 1955, issue of the National Voter, the publication of the League of Women Voters of the United States, is deserving of our attention:

TYRANNY OR LAW?

Few of us today who are in contact with reality, as the psychologists would say, fear an encounter with an Alice in Wonderland queen who shouts, "Off with his head." Nevertheless, this character symbolizes the tyranny of those days in history when dozens of real kings and queens ordered heads and ears and noses off on mere whim, without any kind of trial or any chance for the victim to prove his innocence.

Fortunately for us, our English forefathers gradually evolved a safeguard against arbitrary power—the idea of "due process of law." As Daniel Webster defined it in the famous Dartmouth College case: "Due process of law is that law which hears before it condemns, which proceeds upon inquiry, and renders judgment only after trial. Its meaning is that every citizen shall hold his life, liberty, property, and immunities under the protection of the general rules which govern society."

MORE THAN 7 CENTURIES AGO

Due process had its origins in the action of the English barons who in 1215 secured the Magna Carta, which guaranteed in writing that all the king's actions affecting private rights would be according to the law of the land. The idea of rule of law, as it came to be known in England, flourished in 18th century America and had great influence on the colonial pamphleteers. For example, the argument that taxation without representation is tyranny was simply an application of the basic idea of due process.

Due process was written into our Constitution in the 5th and later in the 14th amendments. It supplements a long list of specific guarantees of fair court procedures which appear in 4 of the 10 amendments in the Bill of Rights. Its application in this country, as in England, was originally against the arbitrary administrator or judge. However, since the latter part of the 19th century the courts have evolved substantive (in contrast to procedural) due process as a curb on legislators. Due process now requires not only that proper procedure be followed but that the law itself be reasonable.

Today due process in this country operates as a safeguard of individual rights against governmental authority at all levels (Federal, State, and local) and thus has an important role in support of individual liberties. Despite its great significance, it has never been fully and conclusively defined. Rather, it has gradually evolved as our courts have determined, in many different cases, what is, and what is not due process. This elasticity has given rise to a tremendous amount of litigation and judicial decisions, especially with regard to the police (public health, safety, morals, and general welfare) power of the States.

The guarantees of due process probably seem more remote than any other guarantees in the Bill of Rights. It is easy to imagine how distasteful it would be not to have free speech, but imagine for a moment that you did not have recourse to the usual protections of due process.

Out of the clear blue, you receive a notice from a State across the country that in 2 days you will stand trial for a crime (no further explanation). Fearful of not having a chance to be heard, you hop a plane and arrive just before the trial. Having spent all your money for the plane ticket, you can't afford a lawyer. Nor is there any time to prepare a defense (which seems rather fruitless since you don't really know what offense you're being charged with).

Under these unhappy circumstances the trial begins. Outwardly everything conforms to a fair trial. You soon find out that you've been accused of "possession of liquor" (this is a State where prohibition exists). Counsel is suddenly produced for you. Even a jury is provided. Your counsel soon whispers to you that you really haven't a chance because the judge gets an additional fee for each conviction, and the natives of this community who comprise the jury are very suspicious of outsiders. Also you are not given the opportunity to confront your accuser, nor are you even told who he is.

The trial lasts three-quarters of an hour, the jury deliberates your fate in less than 5 minutes. So, it's no surprise when the judge pronounces the sentence and you are severely fined and given a prison term.

This make-believe situation is a composite of actual cases which were appealed to higher courts to determine whether the accused had been denied due process. It illustrates some of the protections which the courts have determined fall under due process, as (1) the Government must have jurisdiction over the accused person; (2) the accused must be notified of time and place of trial and nature of charges; and (3) the accused must have an opportunity to be heard and to be tried before an impartial court (for example, the judge should have no financial interests in the case). Another important qualification of due process is that there be more than mere outward compliance to fair-trial guarantees. Actually, the specific forms of a fair trial are not as important as that the procedure suit the nature of the case and be sanctioned by established custom.

We chose for our example a criminal proceeding, although due process also applies to administrative proceedings. Federal procedures were very loosely defined until the Administrative Procedure Act was passed in 1946. This act requires ample notice and hearings, especially by the Government's regulatory agencies.

You might ask, Isn't due process safely imbedded in the Bill of Rights? Is it not the job of the courts in each instance to see that an individual's right to due process is protected? Why should I be concerned about such matters?

First of all, due process of law is much more than a mere legal-sounding term. In its broadest meaning, it implies an essential and fundamental fairness which should guide our daily relations with our fellow men.

Secondly, today's national security calls for further development of due process. For example, due process can serve as a yardstick for considering two current problems—congressional investigations and the Federal loyalty-security program.

Thirdly, through widespread thinking about applications of due process which will help safeguard individual liberties, citizens can influence its development, just as they did when the common law was evolving.

As Judge Curtis Bok said, "Custom should be the evolution of the law. * * * Custom is more efficient than law because it patrols itself."

Twelve Key Facts About H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday next a bill (H. R. 1) to extend the Trade Agreements Act, and give the President power to lower United States tariffs, will be brought before the House for consideration.

This bill is of tremendous importance to the welfare of our Nation and its people. It should have the most careful consideration before enactment. There are rumors that the bill will be considered in the House under a closed rule that will not permit amendments, other than those offered by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. The adoption of such a rule by the House would prevent Members of the House from offering any amendments that they may deem necessary to protect workers in many industries against competition with goods produced in foreign countries by cheap underpaid labor. Our workers should be protected against such unfair competition. If they are to be protected then Members of Congress should have the right to introduce the necessary amendments that would give protection to workers in their respective congressional districts. There is no justification for the adoption of a closed rule that would preclude the offering of amendments to the proposed bill by Members of the House.

In order that the seriousness of the situation can be fully understood, and, without accepting in every particular all that it contains, I am including as part of my remarks a strong and carefully considered statement that has been made by the American Tariff League, Inc., entitled "Twelve Key Facts About H. R. 1."

It reads as follows:

TWELVE KEY FACTS ABOUT H. R. 1.

H. R. 1, introduced by Representative JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, proposes to extend the Trade Agreements Act. In the process it would grant the State Department, via the President, broad new powers for lowering United States tariffs and firmly committing the United States to GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

This bill has unleashed an intense debate. For this debate to produce results in the national interest all the pertinent facts must

be squarely considered. Herewith are summarized 12 facts which are compellingly pertinent.

(NOTE.—The content of H. R. 1 may change or become entangled with other bills during the legislative process. The references here are current as of February 12, 1955.)

I. RIGHT NOW UNITED STATES TARIFFS ARE AMONG THE LOWEST IN THE WORLD

United States tariffs, now at their lowest in history, average only 5.1 percent of the value of imports. This represents sharper reductions than have been made by most other industrial nations; a 68-percent reduction of the 1937 average.

By comparison, Switzerland's tariffs average 8.1 percent of imports, and have been reduced only 47 percent since 1937; France averages 10.6 percent, 43 percent of 1937; and Great Britain averages 25.6 percent, which is 20 percent above 1937.

Among the industrialized nations of the West only Denmark, Sweden, and Western Germany have reduced their average tariff level since 1937 by as large a percentage as the United States. However, even in 1937 the United States had a lower average than Sweden and Germany. Denmark is the only one which was lower then and remains lower now.

N. B.: Tariff comparisons tell only half the story. Import quotas, currency restrictions, monopolies, Government trading, cartels, and other devices are far tighter barriers to free trade than tariffs. Because, except with respect to quotas on agricultural products subject to price supports, the United States does not engage in these practices it actually permits freer trade than any other industrialized country in the world.

II. THE FULL IMPACT OF THE RECENT UNITED STATES TARIFF DECLINE HAS NOT YET BEEN FELT

The first cuts, following the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934, came while the world was still struggling with the effects of a worldwide depression. Since then World War II, the fighting in Korea and Indochina, the continuing cold war and repeated injections of economic aid by the United States have distorted the historical patterns of trade. Only now are other nations approaching full production.

But even during this disturbed period United States imports reached a sustained level of nearly \$11 billion—four times prewar value, twice prewar volume.

III. TARIFFS AFFECT LESS THAN ONE-THIRD OUR TOTAL IMPORTS

Foreign countries earn dollars, and the United States buys its needed imports, for the most part, without any tariff interference at all. In considering the effect of tariffs on imports it must always be remembered that tariffs affect less than a third—\$3 billion out of the total import of \$10.8 billion. A pertinent section of the United States tariff policy statement by the Committee for Economic Development—November 1954—it follows:

"Only a part of our imports are subject to tariffs or other import restrictions. Of our total annual imports of approximately \$10.8 billion in 1951, some \$6 billion consisted of products which enter free of duty or quota restrictions. The rest—some \$4.8 billion annually—were subject to tariff duty or import quotas. This \$4.8 billion included some \$2.5 billion of finished and semifinished manufactures, \$1.8 billion of agricultural products, and \$500 million of metals and minerals. Of this \$4.8 billion of imports, however, only about \$3 billion were subject to import quotas or to tariffs sufficiently high to have an appreciable effect on the volume of import. This \$3 billion consisted for the most part of agricultural products and finished manufactures."

IV. OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE NOT RECIPROCATED

Though foreign countries have made some nominal concessions American exporters still face such barriers as:

Automobiles, charged 63 percent duty in India, 30 to 40 percent in Japan, 15 percent to 33½ percent in the United Kingdom, and 15 to 30 percent in France.

Machinery, charged 10 to 25 percent duty in Britain, 6 to 30 percent in France, 15 to 30 percent in Japan, 5 to 40 percent in Italy.

Synthetic textiles (including rayon), charged 20 to 35 percent in France, 25 to 27 percent in Italy, 22 percent in Norway, 17 to 24 percent in Belgium, and 50 percent in India.

Cotton manufacturers, charged 15 to 30 percent in the United Kingdom, 7 to 30 percent in Germany, 15 to 25 percent in Italy, 18 to 30 percent in Indonesia, and 15 to 27½ percent in Canada.

Grains, charged 15 to 30 percent in France, 15 to 20 percent in Germany, 25 to 30 percent in Italy, 10 to 15 percent in Sweden.

In addition, many countries employ side devices which effectively limit, or even ban, the import of United States goods into their markets.

These devices, perfected by the Nazi economist, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, include: import quotas, currency restrictions, state trading, monopolies, barter deals, and cartels. The use of such devices has increased markedly during the so-called reciprocal trade period.

There has been much talk about relaxing such restrictions but little "do." For example, Great Britain has at last agreed to admit a few United States cars "on trial"—650 to be exact—but subject to duties and taxes which bring the price of an American made Chevrolet in the British market to about \$6,000.

France recently announced "liberalization" for certain selected items—e. g., cotton yarns (but not fabrics), threshing machines (but not tractors), and so on. But at the same moment France turned around and imposed a special import tax of 10 to 15 percent on the items thus "liberalized." And even these "concessions" did not apply to imports from the United States, only to imports from other European countries.

Although Great Britain employs such devices freely, and in addition maintains tariffs at a level 20 percent above 1937, the New York Herald Tribune for January 3, 1955, quoted R. A. Butler, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, as saying:

"We expect some improvement in their [United States] trade practices before there is any question of lowering our barriers any further or indulging in any further nondiscrimination."

V. OUR FREE WORLD ALLIES DO NOT NEED LOWER UNITED STATES TARIFFS TO PROSPER

Congress was told a year ago that further cuts in United States tariffs were needed then to foster world trade and bolster the economy of our allies.

Congress refused. Instead it obtained an agreement by the State Department to make no further cuts for a year.

Here are examples of what actually happened in 1954, without the benefit of additional tariff cuts by us:

1. Italy's national income rose 4 percent, and its exports 10 percent.

2. Austria's income rose 10 percent as a result of increased trade and production.

3. The Netherlands' prosperity lured capital from all over the world; securities on the Amsterdam Exchange are now at their highest point since World War II.

4. West Germany anticipates an 8 percent rise in the gross national product in 1955, and a continuing expansion of exports. Between 1949 and 1953 exports more than quadrupled, while imports doubled; credit

not tariffs has been the exporters' main problem.

5. "Britain Is Tasting New Prosperity as Exports Spurt," headline from New York Times, January 3, 1955.

6. "Persisting Boom Is Seen by Swiss—Prosperity Based on Demand for Manufactures, Credit and Domestic Building," headline from New York Times, January 9, 1955.

7. "Rise in Finn's Timber, Paper Exports Helps Puncture Pessimistic Forecast," headline from New York Times, January 9, 1955.

8. A flourishing export trade gave Portugal an exceptionally prosperous year; as expressed in a New York Times headline, January 4, 1955, "Nation Goes on Buying Spree."

In contrast, the United States experienced a temporary falling off in 1954.

VI. LABOR RATES IN OTHER COUNTRIES REMAIN AT ONE-THIRD TO ONE-TENTH UNITED STATES SCALE

Here are comparative average hourly earnings for industrial workers in the United States and other countries (1952-53 figures):

United States	\$1.79
Switzerland	.57
United Kingdom	.47
France	.43
West Germany	.44
Italy	.35
Japan	.19

N. B.: At one time better machines and more skilled workers enabled the United States to compete with low labor cost imports. Now—largely due to United States aid and assistance programs—other industrial nations have machines as modern and efficient as any we own, and for the most part their workers are as skilled as ours. A recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board indicates that at the same time the real wage gap is spreading, not narrowing.

VII. IMPORTS FROM CHEAP LABOR AREAS DO HURT

Industries already affected include coal, textiles, footwear, glass pottery and china, electrical equipment, lead and zinc, ship building, fishing, and dozens of others. In the textile industry alone, which has been severely affected by competition from Japan and other low wage countries, the number employed declined by 260,000 in 3 years. New England mills took the brunt of this loss; but even in the South, where the most modern mills are located, there was a loss of 40,000 jobs.

State Department negotiators not long ago cut the rate on watches. Last fall the President had to restore the old rate. Too many workers in the United States watch industry, whose precision skills are needed for defense, were losing their jobs—and skills—because of imports.

Workers in the following industries are also threatened: chemicals, radio and electronic equipment, machine tools, synthetic fibers, plastic materials, and—looking at the list proposed for the next round of negotiations by the State Department—literally hundreds of others.

N. B.: H. R. 1, in fact, excepts nothing. It invites a reduction of from 15 to 50 percent in every single rate now in effect, no matter how often or how deeply cut in the past.

VIII. THE PERIL POINT AND THE ESCAPE CLAUSE ARE VIRTUALLY MEANINGLESS

Under the peril point the United States Tariff Commission is required to determine whether or not a proposed cut will injure domestic industry. But such a finding does not bind State Department negotiators. In the past the Commission's findings have been ignored in favor of a hoped for and often meaningless concession from foreign governments. H. R. 1 would make possible the continuation of this practice.

Similarly, the much talked of "escape clause" is no sure remedy for injury to Amer-

ican producers and workers. The Tariff Commission's recommendations of relief can be, and usually are, rejected on advice of the State Department which fears the resentment of other countries.

IX. GOVERNMENT HANDOUTS ARE NO SUBSTITUTE FOR JOBS

Some H. R. 1 supporters have introduced bills to provide Government aid, at the expense of the general taxpayer, for workers thrown out of their jobs by import competition—after the injury has been done. Even the Randall Commission, which originated the H. R. 1 plan, could not go along with this idea. It substitutes a Government dole for a man's wage, or requires workers to move from their homes to strange areas—much as is done in totalitarian countries. There is no way to estimate the cost in advance—it could, and probably would, run into billions.

X. H. R. 1 WOULD ESTABLISH AN ENTIRELY NEW NATIONAL POLICY ON TRADE AGREEMENTS—THE UNITED STATES MAKES CONCESSIONS BUT GETS NONE IN RETURN

Heretofore our trade agreements have required foreign countries to make concessions to us, no matter how nominal, in return for any concessions we make. H. R. 1 abandons this principle.

Right now the State Department is rushing plans for round-robin negotiations with 33 other countries beginning in Geneva next month. It has openly announced its intention to offer wholesale concessions in United States tariffs as a means of inducing these other countries to open their markets to Japan. H. R. 1 expressly permits this one-sided deal.

XI. H. R. 1 CAN INVOLVE THE UNITED STATES IN GATT (GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE) WHICH SUBJECTS THE TRADE OF MEMBER NATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CONTROL, DESPITE OPPOSITION BY CONGRESS

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade provides for a new international organization empowered to sponsor and police a comprehensive code of trade practices among member nations. These rules would cover the whole range of trade, including farm products and minerals as well as manufactured goods.

The Constitution assigns responsibility for the regulation of foreign commerce to Congress. By previous Trade Agreements Acts Congress has delegated a large part of this responsibility, via the President, to the State Department. It has always refused, however, to allow the State Department to redelegate such power to an international body, in which we would have only one vote.

H. R. 1, although amended by committee to appear neutral on GATT, still contains language which permits the State Department to commit the United States to GATT without congressional knowledge of that agreement's changing provisions.

XII. UNITED STATES TARIFFS DO NOT CONTROL UNITED STATES IMPORTS

The policies of foreign producers, much more than present United States tariff rates, determine when, what, and how much they export to the United States. Since the war, for example, British manufacturers have sent most of their exports to countries in the sterling area, where they are protected from outside competition by tariffs, import licensing systems, and currency restrictions.

In 1952, however, when some of the sterling area markets closed up following collapse of the Korean war boom, the British quickly shifted. England's exports to the dollar area jumped 50 percent almost overnight—without any United States tariff changes.

United States tariffs, in fact, are now the least obstacle to world trade. Changeable policies of other countries, reflected in changeable import quotas, changeable cur-

rency restrictions and the like, are the real difficulty.

N. B.: More than a year ago Bernard Baruch said the agitation for lower tariffs in the United States is serving only to provide other nations "with an excuse for blaming their troubles on the United States and, by feeling sorry for themselves, to overlook what they must do on their own."

In his column on January 13, 1955, Walter Lippmann pointed out:

"I wonder whether this (the campaign for lower tariffs) puts the real problem in its proper focus. Perhaps we can reach a clearer definition of that problem by saying that the main trouble today is not the level of the tariff rates. In the United States they are by and large not exorbitantly high any longer."

"The real problem is economic warfare. All the governments have armed themselves with legal powers which they use to interfere with the international markets for goods. They use them offensively and they use them defensively to cut down, to cut off, to divert, to penalize, to subsidize buying and selling so that the pattern of transactions is different from what it would be under the free operation of supply and demand. . . ."

"The characteristic of these weapons of economic warfare is that they are not fixed rules and laws of trade but are operated by administrative decisions made, often under political pressure, by bureaucracies. . . ."

"The essential condition of economic peace is that trade among friendly nations should not be subject to the arbitrary acts of administrative and political officials, that trade should be subject to laws enacted deliberately and openly and after debate and not changeable except by equally careful deliberation."

American Federation of the Physically Handicapped Plaque of Honor Presented to Hon. John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter addressed to Speaker Rayburn:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE
PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1955.
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. SPEAKER: In recognition of the great humanitarian services of Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, members of the National Council of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped will present to him today the APFH plaque of honor, inscription of which is as follows:

"The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, during his entire public career has consistently fought to preserve the rights and advance the welfare of working people and the handicapped.

"Since being in Congress he has authored and fought for many worthy laws to benefit all citizens and particularly those who, because of physical disability, have been and are discriminated against in our economic and social life.

"The National Council of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped,

Inc., in session in the city of Washington, D. C., on September 30 and October 1, 1954, does hereby heartily commend and thank the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK for his brilliant and effective efforts in behalf of our millions of handicapped and, in recognition of this great service, proclaim him a life member of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the public press, and to all interested organizations."

PAUL A. STRACHAN,
President.

Foreign Operations Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a matter which I believe has extremely important ramifications.

Being a firm believer in a bipartisan foreign policy, I regret that the situation I describe below has arisen. The fact that issues in this field can be alleged to have acquired partisan overtones does not contribute to the building of unity in our Nation at this critical time. I have engaged in lengthy correspondence regarding the question of partisanship in FOA without bringing the matter to the attention of the Congress. Only because of the complete failure of the FOA to provide a satisfactory reply, do I now feel compelled to make the situation known.

As a member of the International Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee last year, numerous allegations of systematic patronage clearances in the Foreign Operations Administration were brought to my attention. As a result, I introduced an amendment to the Mutual Security Act prohibiting the application of political tests or criteria in the filling of non-policy positions in FOA. While my amendment barely failed in the House, a similarly worded amendment introduced by Senator HUMPHREY carried in the Senate and through conference and is now a part of Public Law 665, 83d Congress, 2d session.

At about the same time as I introduced my amendment, I wrote to the Director of FOA about a fellow New Jerseyite who had come to me and had called to my attention an example of what he felt was unwise and unjust personnel practice in FOA. I quote my letter to the Director. Incidentally, I have deleted the gentleman's name for obvious reasons:

I am writing you with respect to a fellow New Jerseyite, Mr. W., who was formerly in the employ of the Foreign Operations Administration. Mr. W. has business connections in my district and was in to see me with respect to a private matter. During the course of our conversation he relayed a story to me which sounds fantastic. It is as follows:

On December 12, 1952, Mr. W., left for The Hague, Netherlands, as a \$50-a-day consultant for the Foreign Operations Administration. The original arrangement was for 3 weeks' work as marketing consultant to the Dutch Government. At the conclusion of the 3 weeks, Mr. W.'s appointment was extended for a 3-month period, ending April 1, 1953. At the end of this period the appointment was renewed for 2 more months, to June 1, 1953; and then there was a third extension to July 1, 1953. At the conclusion of this time, Mr. W. returned to the United States. I understand that during his stay in the Netherlands Mr. W. worked 6 days a week and many more than 8 hours a day in his efforts to help the Dutch in improving their marketing techniques. I am enclosing mimeographed copies of the letters of commendation received from a few Dutch organizations which would indicate that Mr. W.'s stay in the Netherlands was highly successful.

Mr. W reports that sometime during July he was approached by an official of the Foreign Operations Administration and asked to take a job as marketing consultant to the Italian Government. He was personally interviewed by a staff member of the Rome mission who requested that the appointment be made immediately. During the course of waiting for this appointment, which to Mr. W appeared to be assured, he took the highly responsible step of attending a language school at his own expense to learn Italian. The contract between him and the Italian Government was prepared, salary was agreed upon, and the Italian Government and the American mission accepted his appointment—in fact, eagerly approved it. Mr. W further reports that his loyalty and security check came through. At the final moment when Mr. W was all prepared to leave, had obtained a passport and doctor's certificate, he was not appointed. He was informed that all the clearances necessary could not be obtained but was given no indication of which clearance was withheld.

I have suggested to him that perhaps another candidate with equal or higher qualifications may have been selected for the position and that this might have accounted for the last-minute decision by the Foreign Operations Administration. However, Mr. W insists that he was the only candidate for the job at the time, which was proven by the fact that no one was appointed to fill the position for several months after he was turned down.

Mr. W has submitted to me a statement of all his allegations regarding the facts of this case, and they go much further than I have done in this letter. However, the principal assertion he makes is that the sole reason he was not appointed to the technical assistance project was the fact that he is a member of the Democratic Party.

I am a very firm supporter of the technical cooperation and foreign-aid programs and believe they constitute one of our really positive answers to Communist propaganda. I believe that the technical assistance program is an outstanding example of America's free world leadership. It therefore disturbs me greatly that members of my party are apparently discriminated against in appointments to nonpolitical technical assistance projects. It is my recollection that under the previous Democratic administration, the first two Administrators of ECA were members of the Republican Party. It is my understanding that every Administrator from Mr. Hoffman to Mr. Harriman has conducted the technical assistance program free of partisan considerations in the appointment of personnel. I am absolutely convinced that this is the correct policy, not only because technical assistance should not be a partisan program but also because it seems to me to be the most efficient way to obtain top qualified personnel. If Mr. W's statement that systematic political tests are now conducted

as part of personnel practice in the Foreign Operations Administration, I believe we in the Congress should know about this fact. Such a practice would, of course, cut the recruiting potential for technical assistance projects in half and would, therefore, make for less efficient operation of the Administration.

I do not believe Mr. W desires the position mentioned above any longer. This letter, therefore, is not about his personal situation but rather about the general practices of your agency.

You will note that this letter stated that in this case all necessary clearances had been obtained for Mr. W's appointment, but that for unspecified reasons he was not appointed to a technical assistance job which had no political aspects. In response to the letter quoted above I received a letter from the Foreign Operations Administration which indirectly implied that Mr. W. was not appointed because the position for which he had applied had been abolished. I have strong reason to believe that was not the fact and that while the position was not filled, recruitment for it continued for many months after Mr. W. had been turned down. The question I raise is this: If Mr. W's allegation that he was not appointed because he is a Democrat is not true, why did the Administration find it necessary to deviate from fact in replying to me and to assert a position which has not been and probably cannot be substantiated?

I answered the letter I received from FOA and I quote my reply of August 5 below:

Thank you for your letter of August 3. I must say I was somewhat disturbed by the fact that my letter of July 6 remained unanswered and unacknowledged for almost a month.

Apparently there is some misinterpretation as to the questions I raised in my letter. I specifically said that Mr. W. was no longer interested in the position and, therefore, my question was whether or not his allegations were true. As you recall, he alleged that in technical assistance projects a systematic political patronage arrangement prevailed in FOA. My question was, am I supporting a program which systematically discriminates against people who are identified as Democrats in obtaining positions of nonpolicy levels as well as on purely technical jobs under the technical assistance program?

I did not receive a reply to the above letter. On December 28, 1954, I again wrote to the Foreign Operations Administration on this problem, as follows:

As you undoubtedly recall, Senator HUMPHREY and I sponsored an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of last year which made the provisions of section 1005 of the Foreign Service Act applicable to the overseas personnel practices of the Foreign Operations Administration. This amendment carried and is now part of Public Law 665, section 527, subsection C (1).

Would you please advise me of the administrative action you have taken to assure the implementation of this legal requirement of your personnel practices. I would appreciate copies of any amendments or additions to manual orders which may have ensued or administrative memoranda to operating personnel which assure the implementation of this amendment.

I have discussed this matter with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, and he is also vitally interested in the question and would ap-

prelate a copy of your response to me on this matter.

I received the following response from the FOA, under date of January 12, 1955:

In response to your inquiry as to what administrative action this agency has taken as a result of the application of section 1005 of the Foreign Service Act to our overseas personnel practices, we are pleased to inform you that we have not found it necessary to take any specific action by way of amendment or addition to existing manual orders.

Section 1005 of the Foreign Service Act provides in part that in the hiring of personnel for overseas assignments "no political test shall be required and none shall be taken into consideration." Since it is the practice of this agency to select applicants for overseas employment purely on the basis of professional qualifications, subject, of course, to necessary security clearances, it has been felt that specific administrative implementation of the prohibition in section 1005 against political discrimination was not required. Our key employment personnel, on the other hand, are fully conversant with the provisions of this section.

The implications of this exchange of correspondence are that if there were applications of political tests prior to the passage of the amendment I sponsored with Senator HUMPHREY last year, this practice still continues, since no steps have been taken to implement the non-political-tests amendment. I submit that political tests were applied to appointments before the passage of the amendment and that they have continued to be applied. Evidence of this, in addition to the above-cited case of Mr. Wilson—which, from the material I have at hand, appears to be clear-cut—is the report by the Republican National Committee quoted in the Congressional Quarterly of February 11 on page 132:

The largest number of placements (by the Republican National Committee) have been made in the FOA (79).

In a 6-month period, 79 people have been placed in the FOA by the Republican National Committee. The fact that a program exists to apply political tests to nonpolicy jobs is a violation of the amendment I sponsored. The additional fact that the FOA has been the most lucrative source of patronage positions is further evidence that laws are being violated in spirit, if not in letter.

I intend to present this material to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and have merely submitted the record here, since I feel that the answers I have received from the FOA have, through their deviousness, been insulting not only to me but to the Congress.

During my recent trip abroad I gathered a great deal of information which shows that the continuation of this patronage practice in FOA is having a serious impact not only on the morale of overseas personnel but on the ability to recruit technical experts for service overseas—a job which is very difficult even under the best of circumstances.

In the near future the Congress will be considering the continuation and, according to recent statements, the expansion of vital economic and technical assistance programs. I feel strongly that such programs are imperative to the

United States position in the free world and to the preservation of freedom and democracy in the face of the widespread and unabating Soviet imperialist menace.

But to be successful our economic aid and technical assistance programs must be administered with wisdom, courage, imagination, and complete integrity. Congressional action can make success possible but only the best type of administration will make it probable. And yet, as of this very moment there is within the FOA an office whose function it is to place Republican political nominees and to apply political tests and criteria to all proposed appointments and nominations. Such a breach of faith with the Congress certainly fails to ensure the kind of administration which is absolutely essential to the continuing success of our foreign aid programs and should no longer be tolerated.

Congressional Salary Adjustment Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, since I was not privileged to be on the floor of the House during the debate on the bill to adjust the salaries of Congressmen, I avail myself of your leave to extend my remarks in the Record in favor of the \$10,000 increase.

Much has been written and said in these times about the advisability of Congressmen increasing their own salaries. It is unfortunate that we must be faced with the decision to enact legislation which on the surface seems to benefit only this body of legislators. Since it is our decision, I feel that we should face it as we do all other issues before us and judge it on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number.

This precept has long been the foundation of our democracy. I am certain that it applies here as it does in other issues. Adequate pay for Congressmen is as much a part of good government as any of the other tenets to which we hold. It is a sound business principle, and the progress of this Nation is marked with the application of these principles.

Do my constituents benefit because I receive more money? Is the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number being served because I have a few more dollars added to my monthly paycheck? I am sure that it does.

True, I knew what the salary was when I ran for the office. I accepted that salary when I accepted the mandate of the people to serve them in the office. My will to serve is not affected by the amount of money I receive. It would not be less if the salary were less. I have an obligation to the people of my district, just as does every Representative here, and we put service above all else.

Why, then, do I favor an increase in congressional salaries in order to per-

petuate the greatest good for the greatest number? Because all of us believe in being fair. The American people are noted for their fairminded approach to problems that confront them. Our reputation for fairmindedness stands out in the day-to-day activity of the family of nations.

The people of my district are fair-minded Americans, too. They want their Congressman to receive adequate pay for what he does. It is part of their pride as Americans that in this country a man is worthy of his hire. They know that they will get better men as Congressmen. They know that they will be better served and that, in the long run, their country will be better served. When their lawmakers are paid on a basis commensurate with what their contemporaries receive in business and industry, the entire business of Government is on sound footing. The people of America know this and they will support that which is fair and just. For these reasons, my vote is in favor of the \$10,000 increase in congressional salaries.

The Regaining of Armenian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in 1918 when the Armenians had succeeded in regaining their national political independence after some 600 years of subjection to alien oppressors it was thought that they were destined to enjoy a measure of peace and freedom in their historic homeland. With great feelings of joy lovers of freedom throughout the world were glad to see long-oppressed Armenians win their independence. As it turned out, however, Armenians were not for long to have their national independence. During the short period of just a little over 2 years that Armenia possessed its freedom, its existence as an independent state was in constant jeopardy. The small and weak country had to fight for its life on many fronts. Finally in December of 1920 Armenia was overrun by its enemies and most of it fell to the Communist Russians. They had come as saviors and liberators, but immediately they established a despotic regime.

The people of Armenia were unwilling to accept this without a fight. In mid-February of 1921 an uprising was underway, and by the 18th it proved so successful that in a few days nearly all the unwanted invaders were expelled. For a brief period of only 6 weeks Armenians again enjoyed freedom.

This uprising is historically significant because it is an instance in which communism was successfully repelled and defeated, and the Armenians regained, even if only temporarily, their political liberty. That is the reason we celebrate this memorable day.

Oil Production in Kansas Expanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, oil producers in Kansas, as well as in other States, are understandably concerned about oil imports. Many independent oil producers from Kansas have urged that I either oppose the bill, H. R. 1, to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act, or support the provisions which would put limitations upon oil imports.

While Kansas is not the largest oil-producing State by any means, oil production is an important industry in Kansas and particularly in my own congressional district. It is important not only to producers themselves, but to landowners, farmers, businessmen, and workmen. I certainly feel that the views of those engaged in the industry should be most carefully considered, but for the present, at least, as well as the foreseeable future, it seems to me that these gentlemen are overconcerned. I do not pretend to be an oil expert, but I wish that every industry in my district were in as good condition as the oil industry. It is growing and expanding, and I am sure it will continue to do so.

Attached hereto is an article taken from the Hutchinson News-Herald for Wednesday, February 16, 1955, showing the oil- and gas-well completions for the previous week in Kansas. Some weeks, more new wells are brought in, and some weeks, less, but I am submitting this article because it covers the latest week available.

I believe that the oil industry in this country will prosper as the country prospers. I believe that a great producing nation like this one must expand its foreign trade if it is going to continue to make progress. I believe that the State of Kansas can only make progress if we expand our foreign trade because Kansas' most important product, wheat, is one which increasingly depends upon an export market for outlets. We cannot sell wheat unless other nations have dollars with which to buy it. Other nations can get dollars only through our purchases of imports in one form or another. Thus the amount of wheat we can export is directly tied in with the expansion of foreign trade.

The expansion of foreign trade offers our greatest hope of reducing and eventually terminating our expenditures for foreign aid.

The expansion of foreign trade will do more than any other one thing to bring about a better understanding between nations and eventually world peace.

For these reasons I am supporting H. R. 1 in the form in which it was reported by the committee and shall vote against the motion to recommit. In doing so, I feel that I am voting in the best interests of the people of my State and congressional district, including those engaged in oil-and-gas production.

The article from the Hutchinson News-Herald follows. It shows the completion of 72 wells last week. Practically all of them were oil wells. A few of them were dry holes. Some were large, and some were small wells, but the fact that 72 new wells were brought in last week in Kansas shows that our producers have faith in the oil business—that they are willing to invest their money in it, and that the oil industry is in a healthy state.

WICHITA.—Four new oil finds and three new gas discoveries for Kansas were reported by the nomenclature committee of the Kansas Geological Society Tuesday. They bring oil discoveries to 25 and gas finds to 7 to date, officially listed for 1955.

The committee, acting jointly for the Kansas-Oklahoma division, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, listed as new oil finds:

Barton County: Claflin Northeast (Lansing) field; opened by Francis Raymon No. 1 Preager northeast corner section 3, township 18, range 11 west; in process of completion. Topped Lansing at 3,029 feet; pumped 85 barrels of oil daily through perforations at 3,040-3,051 and 3,058-3,061 feet, after acid.

Rice County: Windom (Pennsylvania conglomerate) pool; new pay horizon in field already producing from Mississippian; Petroleum Management No. 1 Swanson, northeast corner southeast quarter section 24, township 19, range 6 west; being completed; top 3,400; pumped 58 barrels oil plus 2 barrels water daily through perforations at 3,412-3,418 feet.

Stafford County: Kachelman (Arbuckle) pool, new horizon in field already producing from Lansing-Kansas City; Cooperative Refinery Association No. 1 O'Dell A, southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter section 7, township 25, range 13 west; being completed; top 4,284 feet; swabbed 3 barrels oil hourly at 4,284-4,289 feet.

Sumner County: Padgett West (Mississippian) pool, second pay level in field already producing from Lansing-Kansas City; Ayesh No. 2 Tinsley-Nichols, southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter section 28, township 34, range 2 east; being completed; top 3,491 feet; pumped 25 barrels oil daily plus trace water at 3,519-3,525½ feet.

The gas discoveries included:

Kingman County: Trenton (Mississippian) field; Cities Service No. 1 Voran, southeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter section 27, township 29, range 7 west; gauged 1,047,000 cubic feet daily from perforations at 4,117-4,123 feet; shut-in gas well.

Pratt County: Coats West (Lansing) field; Lario No. 1 Chastain, northwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter section 24, township 29, range 14 west; made 2,485,000 cubic feet daily through perforations at 4,141-4,148 feet; top 3,944; shut-in gas well.

Rush County: Rothe (Lansing) field; Morrison Drilling No. 1 Rother, southeast quarter northeast quarter, northwest quarter section 31, township 17, range 16 west; top 3,270; estimated at 4 to 5 million cubic feet daily through perforations at 3,448-3,452 feet; shut-in gas well.

Last week's completions:

Barber County: Continental Oil No. 14, W. A. Newkirk, southeast quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter section 20, township 33, range 11 west; 540 barrels in chat, 4,516 feet (Rhodes).

Continental No. 5, Rossell, south half south half northeast quarter section 29, township 33, range 11 west; 438 barrels in chat, 4,538 feet (Rhodes).

Graham-Miller No. 1, Lenkner "A" corner, southeast quarter section 24, township 33, range 14 west; 100 barrels oil in Marmaton, 4,666-4,674 feet (new pay in Medicine Lodge gas field).

Aurora Gasoline et al. No. 1, Washburn, northwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter section 10, township 35, range 11 west; dry wildcat in Arbuckle 5,495-5,535 feet.

Barton County: Imperial Drilling Co. No. 1, Hamilton, northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter section 10, township 18, range 11 west; 15 barrels in Lansing, 3,089-3,092 feet (Ames-Northwest).

Petroleum Inc. No. 3, Hertach, southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 24, township 18, range 11 west; 46 barrels in Arbuckle, 3,285 feet (Meadowsdale).

Sitrin & Sohlo No. 4 Yeakley northwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter section 17, township 18, range 13 west; 443 barrels in Arbuckle 3-316 feet (Boyd).

Duke & Wood No. 1 McMullen southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter section 3, township 20, range 13 west; dry wildcat, Arbuckle 3,437-3,510 feet. Tested show. Mostly water.

Clark County: United Producing No. 13 Harper corner southwest quarter southwest quarter, section 34, township 33, range 21 west; 186 barrels in Morrow sand 5,420-5,428 feet (Harper ranch).

United Producing No. 4 M. C. Harper corner northeast quarter northeast quarter, section 4, township 34, range 21 west; 227 barrels in Morrow sand 5,420-5,425 feet (Harper ranch).

Ellis County: GMR Oil Co. No. 1 Walter A northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, section 4, township 13, range 17 west; 35 barrels in Lansing 3,409-3,413 feet (Catherine-Northwest).

Glenn Nye No. 4 Blessing west half northwest quarter northeast quarter, section 28, township 13, range 17 west; dry in Conglomerate 3,592 feet (Sugarloaf-Southeast).

Pam-Kar & NCRA No. 1 Zimmerman northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter, section 12, township 14, range 20 west; dry in Arbuckle 3,862 feet.

Graham County: Francis Oil & Gas No. 6 Bragg east half northwest quarter northeast quarter section 33, township 9, range 21 west; 240 barrels in Arbuckle 3,879 feet (Cooper-North).

Petroleum Inc. No. 2 McCall B southeast southeast quarter northwest quarter section 25, township 10, range 23 west; 242 barrels in Lansing 3,559-3,605 feet (Prairie Glen).

Hull-Wickizer No. 2 Wickizer B northwest quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 28, township 10, range 23 west; dry at 4,088 feet below Kansas City lime (Happy).

Harper County: Texas Co. No. 1 Knowles northeast quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter section 23, township 31, range 6 west; oiler-gasser 5 million cubic feet and 30 barrels oil Simpson sand, 4,670-4,679 feet (Runnymede extension).

Harry Bass No. 6 Ryan southwest quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter, section 13, township 31, range 9 west; 79 barrels in chat 4,416-4,445 feet (Grabs-West).

Stanolind No. 2 Ison northwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter section 24, township 31, range 9 west; 258 barrels in chat 4,415-4,425 feet (Grabs).

Haskell County: William Graham No. 1 Huxman B south half section 1, township 30, range 32 west; gasser, 3½ million cubic feet. Hugoton zone (Hugoton).

Kingman County: Anschutz Drilling Co. No. 1 Goering northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter section 18, township 27, range 5 west; dry wildcat in Arbuckle 4,295-4,336 feet.

Aurora Gasoline No. 1 Conrardy southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter section 11, township 29, range 9 west; 406 barrels in Viola 4,488-4,490 feet (Willowdale).

Cities Service No. 4 Hagerman southwest quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 15, township 29, range 9 west; 282 barrels in Viola 4,495-98 feet (Willowdale).

Amerada Petroleum No. 1 Earl Johnson southeast quarter southeast quarter southwest quarter section 18, township 30, range 7 west; gasser 3 million cubic feet in chat 4,270-90 feet (Spivey).

El Dorado Refining Co. No. 1 Wells northeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 20, township 30, range 7 west; dry wildcat in chat 4,230-4,350 feet.

Marion County: Anderson Prichard No. 3 Youk center half southwest quarter section 20, township 18, range 2 east; 25 barrels in Viola 3,020 feet (Youk).

Beaumont Petroleum No. 4 Hawk northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter section 31, township 22, range 4 east; 25 barrels in chat 2,441 feet (Edmonds).

McPherson County: George Hess No. 3 Akerson northwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter section 27, township 19, range 2 west; 32 barrels daily in chat, 2,957 feet (Lively).

George Hess No. 4 Akerson southwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter section 27, township 19, range 2 west; 33 barrels in chat, 2,963 feet (Lively).

Morton County: Colorado Oil & Gas No. 1-33 Dreyer corner southwest quarter, section 33, township 31, range 43 west, 5,870,000 cubic feet gas, Topeka lime (Dreyer).

Colorado Oil & Gas No. 1-3 Dreyer corner southwest quarter, section 33, township 32, range 43 west, 2,820,000 cubic feet gas, Topeka lime 3,144-3,153 feet (Greenwood).

J. M. Huber No. 3 USA "D" corner northwest quarter southeast quarter section 29, township 34, range 43 west, 669 barrels oil in Morrow sand 4,166-4,171 and 4,178-4,192 feet (Interstate).

Pawnee County: Cities Service No. 1 Franz southeast quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter section 2, township 20, range 19 west, dry wildcat in Arbuckle 4,194-4,260 feet.

GMR Oil No. 1 Sweeney "C" east-half southwest quarter southwest quarter section 5, township 21, range 15 west, 25 barrels in Arbuckle 3,839 feet (Sweeney).

GMR No. 1, Sweeney "B" west quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter section 8, township 21, range 15 west; 35 barrels oil and 1½ million cubic feet gas in Arbuckle, 3,841 feet (Sweeney).

Honaker Drilling Co. No. 1, Hutchinson "H", northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter section 3, township 23, range 17 west; 139 barrels in Conglomerate, 4,150-4,156 feet (Jab).

Honaker & NCRA No. 2, Hutchinson "F" northwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter section 3, township 23, range 17 west; 484 barrels in Conglomerate, 4,178-4,190 feet (Garfield-Northeast).

R. H. Siegfried No. 1, Scharitz, southwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter section 4, township 23, range 17 west; 471 barrels in Kinderhook 4,192-4,200 feet (Garfield-North).

Hilton Drilling No. 3, Scharitz, southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 8, township 23, range 17 west; 348 barrels in chat, 4,244 feet (Garfield).

Honaker Drilling No. 2, Hutchinson "E", southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter section 9, township 23, range 17 west; 2,023 barrels in Conglomerate, 4,200-4,216 feet (Garfield).

Hilton Drilling No. 2, Fertig "A", southwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter section 16, township 23, range 17 west; 44 barrels in chat, 4,290 feet (Garfield).

Hilton Drilling No. 2, Hutchinson "C", southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 17, township 23, range 17 west; 489 barrels in Conglomerate, 4,245-4,254 feet (Garfield).

Pratt County: Petroleum Inc. No. 1, Webster, northwest quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter section 1, township 26,

range 14 west; dry in Arbuckle, 4,445 feet (Tuka-Carmi).

Amerada Petroleum No. 1 Taylor-Mowbray northwest quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter section 28, township 26, range 15 west; dry in Simpson 4,540 feet (Tatlock).

Rice County: Plains Exploration & Sterling Drilling No. 3 Duvall "B" southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter section 27, township 20, range 8 west; 20 barrels in chat 3,390-3,424 feet (Welch-Bornholdt).

Rooks County: Francis Oil & Gas, et al., No. 3 Gerrow west half east half northwest quarter section 23, township 9, range 19 west; 710 barrels in Arbuckle 3,522 feet (Jelinek).

Francis Oil & Gas, et al., No. 4 Gerrow southwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter, section 23, township 9, range 19 west; dry in Conglomerate 3,603 feet (Jelinek).

Midstates No. 2 Ordway southeast quarter northwest quarter southwest quarter section 9, township 10, range 18 west; 47 barrels in Toronto limestone 3,386-3,392 feet (new pay for Williams field).

Sterling Drilling No. 1 Trible northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 28, township 10, range 20 west; 55 barrels in Arbuckle 3,759 feet (Allphin).

I. O. Miller No. 1 McKinna northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter section 32, township 10, range 20 west; dry in Conglomerate 3,790 feet (Allphin).

Cities Service No. 1 southwest quarter southwest quarter northeast quarter section 33, township 10, range 20 west; 3,000 barrels in Arbuckle 3,697-3,708 feet (Allphin).

Rush County: Martin Oil No. 1 Butrus northeast quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter section 1, township 18, range 16 west; dry wildcat in Reagan sand 3,504-3,531 feet.

Russell County: E. F. Wakefield No. 1 Strecker northwest quarter northwest quarter northwest quarter section 25, township 13, range 15 west; 25 barrels in Arbuckle 3,333 feet (Atherton).

Shelley-Miller No. 3 Teppe "B" northeast quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter section 22, township 14, range 12 west; 25 barrels in Conglomerate 3,226-3,230 feet (Heim).

Jones, Shelburne & Farmer No. 3 Gray northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 33, township 14, range 12 west; 25 barrels in Lansing 2,980-2,992 feet (Hall-Gurney).

H. Shumaker No. 1 Morgenstern southeast quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter section 11, township 14, range 14 west; dry in Arbuckle 3,273 (Hall-Gurney).

Simon Lebow No. 3 Gulf-Rusch northeast quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 29, township 14, range 14 west; 15 barrels in Arbuckle 3,246 feet (Gorham).

Sedgwick County: E. H. Adair No. 1 Jeffries southwest quarter southwest quarter northwest quarter section 29, township 28, range 1 east; 441 barrels in Mississippi dolomite 3,141 feet (Gladys).

Diane McCarthy No. 1 Simmon unit southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 29, township 28, range 1 east; 1,192 barrels in Mississippi dolomite 3,143 feet (Gladys).

E. H. Adair No. 3 southwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter section 30, township 28, range 1 east; 1,032 barrels in Mississippi dolomite 3,140 feet (Gladys).

Beardmore Drilling No. 3 Richmond northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter section 30, township 28, range 1 east; 797 barrels in Mississippi dolomite 3,160 feet (Gladys).

Sutton & Beardmore No. 5 Tyson northwest quarter northwest quarter southeast quarter section 30, township 28, range 1 east; 145 barrels in Mississippi dolomite 3,812 (Gladys).

Beardmore Drilling No. 10 Tyson northwest quarter northeast quarter southeast quarter section 30, township 28, range 1 east; dry in Mississippi dolomite 3,225 feet (Gladys).

Laura Jane No. 1 Slade southwest quarter northeast quarter northwest quarter section 30, township 28, range 1 east; 107 barrels in dolomite 3,135 feet (Gladys).

Laura Jane No. 1 Wemple southeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter section 25, township 28, range 1 west; 245 barrels in dolomite 3,199 feet (Gladys).

E. H. Adair No. 2 Wright southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 36, township 28, range 1 west; 178 barrels in Mississippi dolomite 3,209 feet (Gladys).

Texas Co. No. 1 Parsons southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 30, township 29, range 2 west; dry wildcat in Simpson sand 4,078-4,090 feet.

Sheridan County: Empire Drilling Co. No. 1 Pratt: northeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter section 32, township 8, range 26 west; dry wildcat below Kansas City lime 3,850 feet.

Stafford County: Dulce & Wood No. 1 Castleman southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 5, township 21, range 11 west; 20 barrels in Lansing 3,218-4,232 feet (Sandago).

Sumner County: Aurora & Jones, Shelburne & Farmer No. 1 Heasty northeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 30, township 32, range 2 west; dry wildcat in Arbuckle 4,394-4,335 feet.

McNeish & Gralapp No. 12 Airport southwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter section 36, township 34, range 2 east; 25 barrels in Bartlesville sand 3,504-3,154 feet (Hilltop).

Tergo County: C-G Drilling No. 1 Nixon southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 11, township 12, range 22 west; dry wildcat in Arbuckle 4,036-4,063 feet.

Small-Business Needs Cited by Burger in Congress Plea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an item from the Standard Star published at New Rochelle, N. Y., outlining the legislative program urged by the National Federation of Independent Business, of which Mr. George J. Burger, a resident of New Rochelle, is vice president:

SMALL-BUSINESS NEEDS CITED BY BURGER IN CONGRESS PLEA

WASHINGTON.—The National Federation of Independent Business will urge the current Congress to enact legislation making it mandatory to give small business producers a fair share in Government purchases, according to a statement by George J. Burger, 125 Clove Avenue, New Rochelle, vice president of the federation.

Mr. Burger, who says his organization numbers about 100,000 members throughout the country, also declared that a poll showed the majority of the membership expect tax relief legislation during the present Congress. This, he said, would enable small business and professional men to build up

reserves to meet "any and all economic trends."

Also being urged by the federation is continuation of the Small Business Administration which would be subject only to the control of Congress. . . . Small business committees of the Congress should be placed on a parity with all other standing committees and vested with "full legislative authority," the federation urges.

Commending Stanley Barnes, head of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, for his "vigorous enforcement of anti-trust laws," Burger asks for continuation of this practice.

"Needed appropriations for the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department must be supplied by the 84th Congress," Mr. Burger said.

Lithuanian Freedom

SPEECH

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1955, Lithuanians in all parts of the world observed the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

For Lithuania independence was short-lived. Lithuania gained freedom in 1918, and as a nation great strides were made to advance the standards of commerce, agriculture, and industry, and to improve the economic status and the physical welfare of Lithuanian citizens. As an honored member of the family of free nations, Lithuania fulfilled all of her obligations.

In 1940 tragedy struck the young nation, and the Red tide of communism swept across Lithuania wiping out the freedom and liberty so dear to the hearts of Lithuanians at home and abroad.

The people of Lithuania have not despaired, but look hopefully to the West trusting that the miracle of liberation will once more bring independence to their land.

All the people of the United States who cherish individual freedom and national liberty as their most priceless possession join with Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians in the homeland on the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence in the prayer that liberation may not be far off.

The Lithuanians have displayed courage and fortitude in their valiant and ceaseless fight against the enslavement of communism, and they have earned the admiration of the free world which joins them in the struggle to defeat the Communist aggressor everywhere.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., 6 Wesley Circle,
N. Mex.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky.*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Neb.*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*.....3327 Cleveland
Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky.*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex.*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa.*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga.*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, University Club,
R. I.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr.,
Mo.
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
Iowa.....way, Chevy Chase,
Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H.,
Minn.
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okl.*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va.*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F.,
Calif.
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*.....The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y.*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La.*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis.*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham,
Wash.
Malone, George W., *Nev.*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo.*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike,
Okl.
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*.....The Capitol
Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va.*.....
Neuberger, Richard L.,
Oreg.
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., Sheraton-Park
Wyo.

Pastore, John O., *R. I.*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F.,
Kans.
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C.*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase,
(Mrs.), Maine.
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss.*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry
Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations
Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services
Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency
Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia
Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, McNamara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance
Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations
Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart, and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations
Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce
Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible,

Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dill, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. *District of Columbia.*
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. *Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.*
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter (temporary appointment). *Vermont, Connecticut, New York.*
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. *Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.*
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. *Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.*
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. *Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.*
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. *Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.*
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. *Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.*
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. *Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.*
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. *Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.*
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. *Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.*

Appendix

Address by the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at Dinner of Republican State Committee of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which was delivered by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States representative to the United Nations, at a dinner in Philadelphia, on Monday, February 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The size and importance of the State of Pennsylvania and of the city of Philadelphia are in themselves reason enough to make any man proud to be the speaker here tonight, particularly one who, like myself, has seen at firsthand what the influence of Pennsylvania can mean in national politics.

To this pleasure is added the gratification of speaking in a State which is represented in the United States Senate by two men with whom I have served.

The first is Senator EDWARD MARTIN, whose courtesy and patriotism and sincerity are well known to you. I have the finest recollections of my service with him.

And then, of course, it is a unique pleasure to take part in any affair in which JIM DUFF is interested, and JIM has told me of his interest in this dinner tonight. Knowing JIM as we all do, you will believe me when I say that he told me of this interest in no uncertain terms. JIM and I have not only been friends in the Senate, but the closest of fellow workers in the campaign to secure the Republican nomination for General Eisenhower. Without his brilliance and boldness, without his sure political instinct, and his vision, our campaign would not have gotten off the ground.

These then are some of my reasons for being glad to be in Pennsylvania. There is another one, and one which I think entitles all Pennsylvanians to congratulations, which is that our President is making a home for himself in this State in the historic town of Gettysburg.

Gettysburg not only suggests Pennsylvania; it not only suggests President Eisenhower; it also suggests Abraham Lincoln, the anniversary of whose birth we celebrate tonight. One of the things about Lincoln is that he is always up to date. He never grows old or stale. What he says is always modern and to the point.

He guided us through the worst tragedy in our history—for a civil war is the worst of all wars. He can help us today when the big fight in the world is not among ourselves but against the world menace of communism.

To appreciate Lincoln to the full we should realize some fine and unique things about our country—things which we should not take for granted—which were recently sum-

marized by Professor Commager as follows: That we are now the oldest republic, the oldest federal system with the oldest written constitution in the world; that we have avoided a violent revolution from the right or from the left; that we have developed majority rule without impairing the rights of minorities; that we have remained moral without a state church; that we have established a system of universal education without the vulgarization of culture; that we have become a world power without imposing our will on other people; and that we have remained a single nation under one flag instead of fragmenting into a multiplicity of separate—and quarreling—nationalisms.

None of these achievements would have been possible without the leadership of Abraham Lincoln. It is due to him that we are one country today under one flag. It is thus due to him—and to those who laid down their lives at his call—that our country is today the great hope of lovers of freedom all over the world. It is therefore our duty to remember that by our actions, in Lincoln's own words, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

While Lincoln's wisdom and nobility of spirit are timeless and as fresh today as the day he expressed them, the march of science has not stood still. It was Lincoln who said that "all the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

That eventually today is fortunately still highly unlikely. But we must recognize what modern science means—that for the first time since the Civil War was fought, a future war would be brought to our own soil. Ever since the Civil War our wars were all fought outside of the United States. If the tragedy of another war should occur, we in the United States would be the prime target.

National defense and foreign policy have always been the prime responsibility of the President, and this has never been truer than it is today. In 2 years as a member of the President's Cabinet and as the United States representative to the United Nations, I have been able to see at first hand how the President has discharged this duty, and I would like tonight to review briefly with you just 20 of the most important things that have happened in that time.

1. Last spring, world communism, having moved in on Guatemala, was getting ready for aggression into other parts of Central America. We discovered a 2,000-ton shipload of Communist arms being sneaked into Guatemala from Communist Poland. Then anti-Communist Guatemalans, exiled in Honduras, started a revolt to free their country from Soviet Communist domination.

Immediately, Moscow went into action. They asked for a session of the United Nations Security Council. You could see the close teamwork between the Soviets and their Communist Guatemalan stooges. They tried to get the Security Council to send so-called peace observers to Guatemala—with Communists among them, of course—the idea being to stop the revolt and save the pro-Communist regime. This was a bold Soviet bid to torpedo the Monroe Doctrine, and gain a decisive foothold for communism in our

hemisphere. They wanted to make the United Nations Security Council an accessory to their crime.

But we met that challenge head-on in the Security Council in New York—and we defeated it. Communism in Guatemala, as a result, went down the drain. Today Guatemala is once again securely in the free world, once again a loyal member of the Inter-American system, and the Monroe Doctrine remains intact to shield our hemisphere against any outside aggressor.

2. At Caracas, Venezuela, last March, the American Republics agreed to act together against international Communist subversion in our hemisphere, just as they would against military aggression. Thus the Monroe Doctrine has not only been preserved—it has been applied to cope with the realities of our time.

3. In Costa Rica last month a living reality was made of the provisions of the Rio Pact, the purpose of which is to maintain peace in our hemisphere by common action.

4. Moving across the Atlantic to Europe, we see today a new hope for freedom in the London agreement, which has now been ratified by the French National Assembly, on the delicate and vital problem of rearming West Germany. When the old plan for a European Defense Community was defeated we didn't sulk or despair. We moved at once with the other nations most concerned to find a new way to put German military power on the side of freedom—and to end the Franco-German division which has been called the world's worst fire hazard.

The result is the London and Paris agreements, which will give back sovereignty to West Germany, give her an army to help defend Europe, and make her a member of the North Atlantic team. What an historic achievement it will be to get France and Germany solidly together as effective partners in defending Europe against communism. Now it looks more and more certain that a major start toward that goal has been made, in spite of increasingly frantic Communist maneuvers to stop it. The tact and initiative of Secretary Dulles deserve a large share of the credit for this.

5. Another happy development in Europe is the settlement at last of the quarrel between Italy and Yugoslavia over the port of Trieste—a quarrel in which at one time the troops of both sides were almost ready to march. Italy gets the port city and the two countries divide up the outlying districts. The end of that dispute means a much more solid front against Soviet pressure in the Mediterranean. It's a new element of strength for the free world, and American diplomacy had a big hand in bringing it to pass.

Let us move to the Middle East—a vital area in the struggle with communism. For one thing, it contains the world's biggest reserves of oil—which is vital in our strategy. For another thing, it consists mainly of young nations, most of them colonies of Europe not long ago, whose people are often suspicious of the Western World. Communism would dearly love to get a foothold there. In this area we have had a whole series of successes for the cause of freedom.

6. There is a new defense pact between Pakistan on the east and Turkey on the west. Other nations may join that soon, implementing what Secretary Dulles calls the

"northern tier" concept to shield the Middle East from Soviet aggression.

7. We have new agreements with Pakistan and Iraq to strengthen their defense.

8. The knotty problem of how Iran is to sell her oil in the world has at last been solved and thus a chance for Soviet pressure and manipulation has been removed.

9. Then in Egypt, with constant American encouragement, an agreement was reached with Britain last year on defense of the Suez Canal—which means an end to still another trouble spot where, only a short time ago, both sides were getting ready to fight it out if necessary.

10. And meanwhile, in the United Nations Security Council and elsewhere, we have worked successfully with both Israel and the Arab countries to see that the peace there is not broken, although all the problems have certainly not been solved. So in the Middle East, which was a dangerously weak link in our defense against communism 2 years ago, we have now a very promising sight—the growth of a strong international structure in which freedom can develop and defend itself.

In the Far East we must cope with an aggressive communism which is still pushing outward from the Soviet Union and Communist China and with the attitude of countries like India which insist that their foreign policy can be impartial between communism and freedom.

11. The first gain in the Orient came when we ended the Korean fighting and stopped communism dead in its tracks. We have as a result been able to take four American divisions out of Korea and put them in our strategic reserve for use wherever they may be needed.

12. We gave effect to the priceless principle that no Chinese or Korean prisoner of war would have to go back to communism against his will, as a result of which the overwhelming proportion of these prisoners, nearly 50,000 of them, are free men today.

13. There has been no final peace settlement in Korea, because the Communists don't want one, as they proved at Geneva this spring, where they frustrated all Korean proposals and vilified the United Nations at the same time. But we have kept the record straight, and in the United Nations we made sure that in any peace negotiations on Korea the Soviet Union would appear where it belongs—on the Communist side of the table and not as a neutral.

14. In Indochina settlement has been reached to end the bloodshed. It was a sad settlement in many ways, but it was certainly better than continuing a war which couldn't be won without American divisions doing the fighting—and we did not want to send our young manhood to fight in those mountains and rice paddies. The situation in that area is still perilous, and is one which cannot be successfully dealt with exclusively by military methods. We are not just standing by wringing our hands; we are over there helping free Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to get on their own feet and stay free.

15. For the first time we have the beginning of a strong free Asia organization in the Manila Pact, which was signed by eight nations last September. The area it defends stretches from Pakistan to the Philippines. This pact is directed against both armed attack and Communist subversion, and it contains an historic declaration for freedom for the peoples of the Asian and Pacific area.

United States leadership played a tremendous part in that historic Manila Pact. In this treaty plus the new defense treaties with free Korea and free China, we have an emerging pattern of real defense for freedom in Asia. But we have more than that. We have a new start toward a community of Asian nations which stand on their own feet. These nations are seeing more and more clearly that the old colonial-

ism to which they are accustomed is giving way to a new age of freedom, and that the great threat to that new age is not from Europe and the West but from the new Communist colonial system that seeks to enslave people under false banners of so-called liberation.

16. Communist China has been put on notice by the President, with the backing of the Congress, that we will not tolerate aggression against Formosa and the Pescadores. This courageous and timely move is our best insurance against a full-scale war in that area.

17. The United Nations General Assembly, by a vote of 47 to 5 last December, condemned Red China's imprisonment of 11 American fliers on false charges, and took the responsibility to seek release of all United Nations Command prisoners still held by the Communists in violation of the Korean armistice agreement. Thus the United Nations has shown that it believes in the elemental decencies and seeks to look after its own. I believe we will get our men back, and I believe that the General Assembly's action will have been a big step in that direction.

18. Communist China's attempts to get into various United Nations bodies have been voted down every time; a total of 25 times since I have been here.

19. Americans employed by the United Nations have been screened in accordance with FBI procedures for the good and sufficient reason that where there are so many good Americans to choose from, there is no excuse whatever for employing one single American Communist.

20. The high point at the United Nations was President Eisenhower's dramatic plan to set up a world pool of fissionable materials so that humanity may receive the great benefits of the peacetime uses of atomic energy. This plan had seized the imagination of the world so strongly that even the Soviet Union didn't dare vote "no"—and the resolution endorsing it passed the General Assembly by 60 to 0.

To sum up—in 2 years, faced with the unrelenting pressure of communism, we have had bold forward steps and great diplomatic successes for the cause of freedom in every quarter of the globe. We have seen success in Guatemala and Costa Rica, in getting a real start on bringing West Germany into the North Atlantic Organization, in settling the Trieste problem, in the defense pacts involving Pakistan, Turkey, and Iraq, in the Iranian oil settlement, in Egypt, in Korea, in the Southeast Asia pact, and at the United Nations—particularly in the world acclaim given to the President's proposal for the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

I often think that the ending of that dreadful war in Korea in itself is enough to cause us to be thankful—even if all these other good things had not been accomplished. Just the thought that our boys are not being killed any more makes me grateful.

It all adds up to this—that for the first time since World War II there is no large-scale fighting going on anywhere in the world. Of course the situation is precarious and peace is not established on a durable basis. But for the first time we and other nations, instead of rushing from one emergency to another, have begun to settle down confidently to the long haul to defend and strengthen peace and freedom.

It is curious in the face of this record to hear voices raised which complain that the United States world position has somehow weakened in the past 2 years. Hearing these voices calls to mind the fact that we have in the State Department and in the White House two Americans who, leaving out of account all their other qualifications, have been thinking about and dealing with America's relationship to the outside world all of their lives.

John Foster Dulles has been working actively in the foreign affairs field since he was a very young man. From the time he was in college his ambition was to become Secretary of State and he has trained himself deliberately for this work. As one of his close associates, I appreciate this opportunity to pay tribute to his wisdom, his cleverness, his patience, and the deep-seated goodness of his nature.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, as a young Army officer in the Philippines, was dealing at the very highest level with the Philippine leaders of those days and with others on matters which directly affected the United States world position. Later, in World War II and again in the NATO command, as Cardinal Spellman said recently, the American people entrusted him with our two most precious possessions—our liberties and our youth. His success in those great tasks depended directly on his understanding of foreign relations and his insight into the minds of foreign peoples.

Similar thoughts come to mind in connection with national defense. At the present time we have more air groups ready for action than we have ever had before in time of peace—real air groups, not paper ones. We have better than 121 combat-ready air groups today. In 1952 there were 103 groups, but many of them were not equipped with modern aircraft and would not have been effective in combat.

Thanks to the fact that the American people had the good judgment to put our foremost military expert in the White House, we have eliminated much waste from the armed services, yet we are actually getting more defense.

The newspaperman, Holmes Alexander, wrote some paragraphs recently about our President which I would like to quote:

"On a short-term, day-to-day basis, America's best natural resource for 1955 is Dwight David Eisenhower, the good gray rock to which, as it sometimes seems, the Nation's sanity is anchored."

"Only a moderate, as he calls himself politically, could have tapered us off the Fair Deal jag; only a public hero with a puritanical conscience would have accepted the popular power now in one man's hands without abusing it; only a five-star military officer would have the nerve and the knowledge to reduce the Armed Forces—as Ike intends to keep on doing—in the face of real danger and of phony danger—the latter raised like a goblin's head by certain Congress people, the military columnists, the munitions makers, and the Pentagon chiefs, who year after year lobby for more men and more armaments."

"But the vein of gold in this Eisenhower lode is not his politics, experience, or expert knowledge; it's his personal character."

Mr. Chairman, I conclude.

We believe in our wonderful two-party system because competition in politics makes for better politics just as competition in business makes for better business. We in particular are proud of the Republican record of service. But modern Americans do not believe that the party system should be carried to the point where it destroys the national unity.

The big fight today is not between Republicans and Democrats.

In this dangerous world the big fight is between us Americans with our allies who love freedom on the one side and, on the other side, the Communist rulers who would destroy us. This was true when Stalin ruled in Moscow; it was true when Malenkov succeeded him; it is true today; and prudence demands that we expect it to be true in the future.

This means unity at home.

But it does not mean monolithic uniformity. It does not mean the suppression of honest disagreement. It means that our disagreements must be sincere and not in-

spired by political motives. It means that our opinions, whether we agree or not, must be inspired by what Lincoln in his first inaugural address called "the better angels of our nature."

When we see the kind of administration which the President is giving this country—its enlightenment, its generosity, its fundamental decency, and its effectiveness in behalf of our people in our domestic affairs; when we consider its skill, its prudence, and its vision in leading us in the dreadful struggle brought on by world communism, it is natural for us to exclaim that we would like to see Dwight D. Eisenhower as our President without any limit as to time. I predict that the people will not allow him to retire and will surely insist on his serving for another 4 years. In bringing about peace and at the same time preserving prosperity, he has already done what many thought was impossible. The American people know when they have something good, and they have that something good in Dwight Eisenhower.

Just as Lincoln, whose name we revere tonight, was the right man for the tragic crisis of the Civil War, so is President Eisenhower the man to lead us in this perilous struggle with world communism.

The Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered at the commissioning exercises of the 12th officer candidate class, United States Marine Corps, Quantico, Va., on February 19, 1955. The address is entitled "The Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana)

An elected official can hardly expect universal approval of his position on every issue. Almost invariably some people will agree with him and others will disagree, sometimes very vehemently. And I must say that a Member of Congress pricked by public criticism bleeds at least as profusely as any other human being.

In a decade and a half of service in Congress, I have been on sick call for this reason on a number of occasions. I have learned to accept occasional wounds as a part of my job, as an occupational hazard.

There is one issue, however, which I have repeatedly tackled in Congress and have repeatedly come out, not licking my wounds but miraculously unscathed. That issue is the preservation of the integrity of the Marine Corps.

While Members of Congress must out of conviction sometimes run counter to the immediate flow of public opinion, it is not a very pleasant experience. It is always preferable, if you can do so honestly, to find yourself flowing downstream with public sentiment rather than struggling upstream, half-drowned, against it.

Beyond the natural gratification which comes to an elected official when he finds his own heart and the public pulse beating in perfect unison—beyond that, I have a special pleasure in fighting for the integrity of the corps. As a marine, I take personal pride in the marines. Of course, I also take personal pride in the Army and the Navy, as an ex-member of each of those services. But I think I may be pardoned if I tend to be a little prouder of my marine background. I was only a private in the Army. I was only a seaman, second class, in the Navy. But with that same perceptiveness which prompted the Marine Corps to recognize your qualities of leadership the corps also recognized mine. I emerged from my hitch in the Marines as a Pfc.

That distinction, I realize, does not, in itself, qualify me to speak to you on the Role of the Military in American Foreign Policy. Nevertheless, I feel that the subject is of such great importance that it should be considered not only by privates—buck or first class—and Senators, but by thoughtful Americans throughout the Nation. I think it is an especially pertinent one for you men who are graduating today into command positions in the corps. The Marines have traditionally operated with high effectiveness as a principal military instrument of this Nation's foreign policy during peacetime just as they have more than once proved their tremendous capabilities when the peace has been violated.

One explanation for this outstanding service may well be that the corps has always maintained a strict professional regard for the American principle of civilian control of military power. That principle, as I am sure you have been taught, is absolutely essential for the proper functioning of our system of government. It is not enough that Congress determines appropriations and organizational arrangements, and that the President and his civilian assistants direct the administrative management of the military. The American concept goes further. It requires that the military shall only be used whenever, wherever, and in whatever manner the politically responsible civilian leadership shall determine, because only that leadership, through elections, can be held accountable to the people of the Nation.

In the present state of world affairs, a system of civilian control is not easily maintained. It is subject to all the stresses and strains that arise from the tense international situation. In a crisis, with the threat of world conflict ever present, it is not unnatural to turn to distinguished military leaders for guidance, to rely heavily on their judgment, and sometimes it is profitable to the nation to do so. Nevertheless, the principle of civilian control remains essential to democratic government as we know it.

Primary responsibility for the preservation of this principle rests with our civilian leadership; that leadership must be willing to assume the heavy responsibilities of decision in this dangerous world. But I think you will agree that considerable responsibility also rests with the military. They must understand and accept the limits as well as the challenges of their profession in the conduct of the Nation's affairs, particularly its foreign affairs.

Perhaps I can illustrate this point with an anecdote. During the Civil War, the story goes, certain Members of Congress left their desks in Washington and went to the battlefields in Virginia. There they insisted upon assuming the tactical command of the Union forces. After having thrown the campaign into confusion they beat a hasty retreat to Washington where they arrived mud-spattered, trembling, and presumably chastised.

If the story is amusing, it is because it is easy to recognize the absurdity of this escapade. These Congressmen apparently assumed that their training in politics

equipped them to run the Army. They also distorted and distended the functions of their office out of all true proportion.

The moral of the story is simple enough: Congressmen ought not to assume that political training provides an automatic background for military leadership and, in military affairs, their role ought not to exceed the constitutional powers of their office.

Let us put the shoe on the other foot. The moral is now this: Military leaders ought not to assume that military training provides an automatic background for politics, whether national or international, and they ought not in the formulation and conduct of foreign policy exceed the powers of their appointive office.

Just as the distorted behavior of the Congressmen in the Civil War could have produced tragic results as easily as humorous, so too can the distorted behavior of military leaders.

It has never been easy to draw a clear line as to the area of competence and authority of the armed services in foreign policy. Events of the past 15 years have made it even more difficult. First of all, during this period, some among us, civilian and military alike, have developed a distorted sense of the nature of what this country is trying to do in its relations with other nations and how it can most effectively go about doing it. Foreign policy is simply the course by which we attempt to provide for the safety of the Nation and the advancement of its interests in a complex and dangerous world. That is its only reason for being. To carry out our policy we require military strength but we must also bring into play nonmilitary instruments and measures to influence conditions throughout the world. Possibly it is because these nonmilitary measures are less dramatic, less newsworthy, and tend to affect us and our families less directly, that we sometimes lose our perspective and regard them as less important than military actions. Sometimes there is a tendency to view nonmilitary measures merely as supplements of our military policy, when in fact the reverse is closer to the truth.

You men need hardly be reminded of this fact. If you know the history of the corps, you know that the marines have been sent to foreign territories and to overseas bases only from time to time and only after the failure of other methods to protect American citizens and interests. In countless day-to-day situations arising in our foreign relations throughout the world the military instruments is in no way involved.

As for any large scale use of force, it is only when nonmilitary measures fail to produce situations favorable to the vital security interests of the United States, that such use may become necessary. Even then we have invoked military force only in response to aggression. That we have waited for our enemy to show beyond all shadow of doubt that he intends to strike us, rather than strike the first blow ourselves, does not mean that we are slow-witted or even patient. It means simply that we are following a fundamental American principle: that force is the final, not the first arbiter in the affairs of men and nations. Nothing has done more to toughen the moral fiber of this country than that principle. No other single factor has served to sustain our morale during the long and grueling wars which we have had to fight. Nothing has done more to turn the hearts and hopes of mankind to this Nation. And I hope the day never comes when this Nation shall use its might in any way other than for protection against the arrogant, the aggressive, and the ruthless.

The role of the military in foreign policy, then, is to provide a reserve of power to support negotiations concerning our just interests in the world and to defend those interests if they are attacked. I want to under-

line the words "reserve and support." Responsibility for determining what our interests are and when and how they are to be defended is vested in the President and his Secretary of State. The Department of Defense and other agencies of the Government, in the performance of their duties have an influence in this determination, but final responsibility cannot rest in any body other than the Department of State or the President himself.

Since the beginning of World War II, however, the role of the military in American foreign policy has assumed proportions of great magnitude. During the war the armed services inevitably became the foremost element in carrying our American policy. Since the close of those hostilities the services have continued to serve prominently in this connection, due to the nature of postwar diplomacy and developments.

The occupation of Germany and Japan, and the control of trust territories, among other things, has brought the armed services directly into foreign policy to a degree unprecedented in peacetime. To some extent, the same was true of the so-called Truman doctrine of 1947. Under the Truman Doctrine, the Armed Forces not only ran military training missions to strengthen the security of Greece and Turkey against Communist aggression, but of necessity played a significant role in the formulation of policy with respect to those countries. Subsequently, they have had an enormous influence in foreign policy in connection with NATO, mutual aid and military assistance missions in numerous countries, the Korean war, overseas bases, and treaties with nations in the western Pacific.

I think that one of the chief problems emanating from this chain of developments is that in many instances there has been a tendency to treat individual military programs and policies as separate and distinct military affairs, whereas they actually are parts of the totality of American foreign policy. Responsibility for decision making has at times been vested in military officials rather than in foreign-policy officials. In other instances there has been a failure to define and clarify lines of responsibility for policy formulation. I say this, not so much in criticism as in recognition of the fact. It is unlikely that anyone planned it that way; it has simply happened—perhaps largely because it was not planned.

The obscuring of the lines of responsibility and authority is perhaps best illustrated in the issuance of public statements by leaders of the armed services. Such statements are usually expressed in military terminology. Often, however, much of their substance is of a foreign-policy nature. Perhaps this is unavoidable in view of the complexity of the matters with which they frequently deal. One cannot always draw a clear-cut line between military and political and other factors in a given situation.

The question of rearming Germany will serve to illustrate this point, and this example finds a counterpart in practically every other major foreign policy issue with which we are confronted. There are strong military reasons for urging the rearmament of Germany and it is natural for military personnel to see the need in terms of added divisions of manpower, bases, etc. But Germany cannot be rearmed in a vacuum. Rearmament cannot be divorced from a whole range of problems concerning European unity, the fears of France, the role of Britain on the Continent, the reunification of Germany, and the maintenance of the western alliance. It seems to me, therefore, that official statements on this subject under our system of government emanate best from our foreign policy officials. They are presumably kept well informed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the military considerations involved and they in turn are best

equipped to view such considerations and to express them publicly in terms of the totality of American interests.

I cite this example merely to illustrate the problem of defining the role of the military in American foreign policy. It is not difficult to see the principal reason for the expansion of military participation in foreign policymaking. As I mentioned earlier, the nature of wartime and postwar developments and diplomacy has required a vastly increased use of the military as an instrument of policy.

There is, however, still another factor. The military emerged from the war with great prestige, both at home and abroad, and this prestige has carried over into the postwar period. On the international scene this has led to widespread use of prominent military leaders in diplomatic capacities. At various periods since the close of World War II three of our foremost military leaders during the war have served in positions which were more political than military and which roughly corresponded to their wartime military roles—General Eisenhower as NATO commander, General MacArthur in charge of the occupation of Japan, and General Marshall as Secretary of State. Each of these distinguished military leaders had earned the respect of foreign nations, as well as the American people, through their outstanding military service. Each made an exceptional contribution in their postwar assignments.

Other military leaders have also been called upon for diplomatic or political services—Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who served as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Under Secretary of State, and Adm. Alan Kirk, who served as Ambassador to Belgium and Ambassador to the Soviet Union, are two leading examples. I could name two dozen other former generals and admirals now holding civilian positions in the Federal Government. Countless others of field grade are scattered through the civilian bureaucracies of the Federal Government concerned with foreign affairs and international organizations.

This increased use of military leaders in position of a diplomatic or political nature, of course, has often been due not only to carryover of the military prestige of these men but also to their demonstrated ability as well as their availability for such service.

Without in any way reflecting on the capacity of any individual, I do think that the vast expansion in the employment of military personnel in both the making and carrying out of foreign policy is something to which we should give some serious thought. It raises questions not only with respect to our basic values but also with respect to our basic foreign-policy objectives, including our military security.

First, let me say something about the question which I think this trend poses concerning our basic values.

Military officers are not different from anyone else in this country. They come from representative families all over the Nation; they go to the same grade schools and high schools; they hold the same social and religious values. But the military profession exacts from those who pursue it a higher measure of self-sacrifice in the public interest than most other professions. The military as a group must accept a higher degree of training, conditioning, and disciplining toward one objective—to provide military protection for the Nation. That is as it should be and those who enter the profession, like you men today, understand these conditions.

Like any other professional group the military in their dedication to their primary objective may tend to lose sight of other national objectives. It appears to me, consequently, that when the military in fact make policy decisions or when military tech-

niques are excessively applied to carry out policies which can be more appropriately handled by civilian techniques, we are in danger of having military objectives and values emphasized at the expense of other, broader national objectives and values.

With respect to our basic foreign policy objectives, including military security itself, the expansion of the military role in foreign policy poses some more immediate dangers. Responsibility for our entire foreign policy, which is concerned with international economic, cultural, and political relations, as well as with military affairs, is vested in our Secretary of State. Our military objectives have no meaning in themselves except as they tend to further our nonmilitary objectives. If they are given an independent meaning, if they become ends in themselves, we could easily be led into costly adventures which would only add to the financial and human burdens of the American people and which might ultimately result in widespread public reaction against the military. The best way to avoid a distorted emphasis on military objectives, the way that is provided under our constitutional system, is to require that final authority in foreign policy decision making remain unequivocally with the Secretary of State under the President of the United States.

In terms of our military security specifically, as distinguished from the wider range of foreign policy, it appears to me that a further danger exists. Our military experts may weaken their professional stature through overanxious acceptance of an increased role in policy matters.

In recent years military leaders have been brought into the limelight of public discussions of foreign policy largely as a result of their well-earned public prestige. Civilian political leaders have tended to rely heavily on this prestige gained through military accomplishments in order to support policies affecting our foreign policy. Generals and admirals have been called upon or sent to testify regularly before congressional committees, not only in connection with military appropriations and matters affecting the individual services, but also in connection with broad issues of policy, such as economic assistance programs and international alliances. Military officials, moreover, frequently discuss political issues—not necessarily partisan political issues, but issues of a political nature—at public appearances and press conferences. I may say at this point that the Marine Corps has been singularly free of this type of affliction. To the best of my knowledge, the leadership of the corps has successfully resisted the temptation to assert its expertise verbally and publicly not only in military matters but over the whole range of human affairs. Only an elected official, constantly beckoned by the siren call of the press, radio, and television, can appreciate the extraordinary degree of self-control that this represents. It is one more reason for me to be proud of my personal connection with the corps.

Now what is the danger to our security inherent in the exposure of military leaders—whether sought or unsought—to the political conflicts of the day? It is this: Military leaders who are so exposed will find themselves in agreement with one side of a political issue and at odds with the other. They will be applauded by political leaders whose position they uphold and looked upon with suspicion by their opponents. When military officers become subjects of partisan politics they are no longer viewed as unbiased, objective career servants, nor will their military judgments be accepted as those of politically disinterested professional experts. From that, it is only one step to the loss of confidence in the military judgment of our military leaders.

This central problem was clearly illustrated prior to the last presidential election

when a Senator publicly called for a change in the membership of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He had, he said lost confidence in their judgment. The new administration, moreover, subsequently did appoint new Joint Chiefs of Staff to take a new look at the military program. Surely we cannot have Republican generals and admirals for one administration and Democratic generals and admirals for the next without danger to the national security.

Now, possibly as never before, we cannot afford to play politics with our security. No political party, and no faction of a party, stands in the long run to benefit from military insecurity in this country. Certainly, the armed services as a whole do not.

In mentioning this tendency of some military officers to slip into or to be drawn into the political orbit of our system of government, I do not wish to imply that the military experts should have no contact with Congress. Certainly Congress has a right to know what our military experts think about military matters under consideration in Congress. The danger lies, not in this, but in military officers being employed as experts outside the area of their special competence in support of or in opposition to policy matters concerning which political and not military decision must be made.

There is no easy solution to this problem. Part of the answer lies in the restraint which civilian leaders must exercise to avoid placing military officials on the spot in political issues. Part of the answer must also lie in the fortitude with which military leaders resist the temptation to project themselves into nonmilitary questions.

This problem may seem remote to you men now, but within a short span of years as your careers unfold it may well become for some of you a most pressing and difficult one.

As I mentioned earlier, responsibility for maintaining the proper civilian-military balance in our system of government must be shared by both our military leaders and our civilian political leadership. The military must exercise the utmost restraint in policy matters, and our civilian leadership must be willing to take full responsibility for political decisions.

In foreign relations we need constantly to keep in mind the essential relationship of military force to total foreign policy. Military leaders as well as civilian foreign-policy officials must understand the supporting role of military force. Military resources, like other tools of foreign policy, must be available to our politically accountable civilian policymakers when, where, and under conditions prescribed by those policymakers. It is incumbent upon our policymakers that they should take full advantage of military advice; but when the time for decision-making comes, the civilian policymaker must make the choice and take full responsibility for that choice.

How can we preserve this principle and at the same time provide for our own military security? There are no hard and fast rules. There is only commonsense and a few guidelines appropriate to the present state of world affairs.

First, it is essential that we maintain the necessary military strength to meet the threat of Communist aggression.

At the same time, however, every effort should be made to use nonmilitary measures to conduct foreign policy wherever possible. They are less costly and often they can produce beneficial results that are more lasting in their effects. If we are to pursue them successfully, however, we must learn that every nonmilitary action in foreign policy is not an act of appeasement.

I would also suggest that if it becomes clear that we are tending away, rather than toward, a general war, we profit from long

years of experience and place greater reliance on the Marine Corps as the military force to support our diplomacy in foreign policy. In saying this I am fully aware of the basic need for a multiservice fighting force in modern warfare. We share, I know, a great pride in the Marines and believe them capable of extraordinary feats. But we must admit that the corps has not yet rendered the Army, Navy, and Air Force obsolete.

Nevertheless, I still believe that the proper way to fight "brush fires" in various parts of the world is not with the forces trained for general warfare, but with the specially trained self-sustaining, combat-ready forces of the Marine Corps. No other military group is so well suited to immediate service in any part of the world. No other group is more competent to keep the expenditure of force close to the requirements for achieving limited objectives.

Finally, I want to say that the most important element in the preservation of the principle of civilian control of American foreign policy is to require that our civilian foreign-policy officials take full responsibility for decisions affecting foreign policy.

Your share in maintaining the proper role of the military in foreign policy is, it seems to me, to keep in mind that every action you take in your official capacities has a bearing on the foreign relations of the Nation. You will either contribute to the safety and well-being of the United States or you will detract from it; you cannot be neutral. And if you would contribute to it, as I know you wish to do, then you will maintain always a high sense of patriotic and professional responsibility in the fulfillment of your duties. You will find your personal satisfactions in your profession by understanding your part in the perspective of the corps, in the larger perspective of the armed services, and in the perspective of the total interests of our country.

The Decade Since Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Western States Meat Packers Association in San Francisco on Friday last, February 18, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND BEFORE THE WESTERN STATES MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, FEBRUARY 18, 1955

THE DECADE SINCE YALTA

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, 10 years ago 2 conferences of far-reaching significance took place. The first was Yalta held from February 4 to 11, 1945. Its locale was the Crimean Peninsula within the Soviet Union.

Three great powers were represented. These were the United States of America, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union.

The second one was the United Nations Conference held in San Francisco from April 25 to June 26, 1945. At that time 50 nations signed the charter and since then 10 additional nations have done so bringing the total membership to 60.

In that same 10-year period of time to which I have referred, international communism has increased its power, its area and its population. Ten years ago at this time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today over 800 million people live under the most ruthless, godless tyranny the world has ever known.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of free men largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future Communist aggression or threat of aggression.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, United States) mutual-defense pact and mutual-defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate this month.

The Manila pact covering southeast Asia was ratified on Tuesday, February 1, by a vote of 82 to 1, and the one with the Republic of China on Wednesday, February 9, by a vote of 64 to 6. These two ratifications were preceded by congressional action in support of the joint resolution recommended by the President authorizing him to use the Armed Forces of the United States in defense of Formosa, the Pescadores, and additional areas now in friendly hands that might be deemed important for the proper defense of the main bastion of Formosa.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific and lay the groundwork for a conference which would have all the unfortunate results of a Munich, a Yalta or a Geneva wherein the aggressor gains his objectives at the conference table.

Unfortunately, the history of these conferences has been that it is always the free world that gives up territory and surrenders human beings to the control of the Communists. It is never the other way around wherein the enslaved people gain their freedom.

It becomes pertinent, therefore, to examine the various proposals that have been made and what their implications are.

In order to deal with these matters, however, let us first examine the Yalta conference and the significance it had in the events which followed.

At Yalta without the knowledge or consent of the American people or the American Congress, an agreement was entered into which on its face violated the Atlantic Charter declaration and was fatally damaging to our friend and ally, the Republic of China.

Years later, in testimony, Alger Hiss, who had been one of the members of the American delegation stated:

"It is an accurate and not immodest statement to say that I helped formulate the Yalta agreement to some extent."

1. The agreement undercut the free Polish Government in exile and resulted in solidifying the power of the Lublin Communist Polish Government.

2. It carved out of Poland a slice of territory and gave the blessing of Great Britain

and the United States this territorial addition to the Soviet Union.

3. It provided for the use of German labor in the Soviet Union and under Kremlin practices this is closely akin to slave labor.

4. It laid the foundation for the turning over of large numbers of non-Communist Russians to the Soviet Union. Vast numbers of these were executed or sent to slave labor camps in Siberia.

5. It provided that certain areas within the Republic of China should be turned over to the Soviet Union as part of a deal to bring them into the Japanese war though they had twice before promised to come in prior to the Crimean Conference. These included the ports of Dairen and Port Arthur; gave the Soviet Union its former economic rights in the China Eastern Railroad and South Manchuria Railroad; guaranteed the status quo in outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) and pledged that President Roosevelt "will take measures to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin." It did this without the knowledge or consent of the Government of the Republic of China or its President Chiang Kai-shek. It further pledged "the heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan had been defeated."

With sort of a grim humor the Yalta agreement protocol regarding the Far East concluded by stating:

"For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the Nationalist Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance. * * *

It was not until many months later that either the Government of China or the Congress of the United States found out the terms of this agreement. The foundation laid by this agreement has contributed greatly to the loss of freedom in Eastern Europe and in China.

Under the terms of the Yalta agreement the Soviet Union did come into the war against Japan. They came in 5 days before the Japanese surrendered and occupied Manchuria and North Korea. In North Korea they promptly laid the groundwork for a divided country and the ultimate events leading to the outbreak of the Korean war which was precipitated by their satellite North Korean Communist government.

In China, despite the Soviet pledges regarding its dealings with the Republic of China, the Soviet Union proceeded to arm and equip the Chinese Communists under the leadership of Chou En-lai and Mao Tse Tung by allowing them to take over the stocks of captured Japanese equipment estimated to have been sufficient to arm and equip 1 million men for 5 years.

While much more could be said, the sorry story of Yalta gives a clear understanding of why the Communist world wants to get us involved in another conference through which they can gain their objectives.

Now let us turn to the San Francisco United Nations conference of 10 years ago.

World War II had not yet terminated. The people of the world did not know that we were on the threshold of the atomic age though those high in government had reason to believe a vast new power that ultimately could be used for destructive or constructive purposes was soon to be unveiled.

Hopes were high everywhere that the Soviet Union, though a dictatorship, had learned the folly of aggression and of war and because of the vast help given by the free world to them they would be willing to help establish a system of international law and order to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

Unfortunately, both during the San Francisco Conference and in the 10 years that

have followed, a vast propaganda effort has taken place to build the United Nations into something which its charter provisions could not or did not permit it to become. In the United Nations different people envisioned different things.

Some envisioned it as a mighty force of collective security that would rally most of the nations of the world to resist aggression and preserve the peace. In moments of oratorical fancy some even suggested that the fact the United Nations was in being would warrant free nations to scrap most, if not all, of their armed forces and place their reliance upon the police power of the United Nations and the collective moral persuasion of that organization. On June 25, 1950, this concept was shattered shortly after it appeared to be confirmed.

When the Communist forces crossed the 38th parallel, the United Nations Security Council promptly acted and first called upon the Communist aggressor to cease the aggression. The Communists, of course, forthwith showed they were not impressed by a United Nations resolution or the adverse moral reaction of that organization. The Security Council next called on the 60 members of that organization to give aid and support to the victim of the aggression, the Republic of Korea.

What is the record on this? After 3 years of the Korean war, of the 60 members of the United Nations, only 17 contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression. Outside of the United States of America, the other 16 contributed armed forces in the amount of 45,000. The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000 and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Korean theater of war. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, supplied over 600,000.

This means that of the United Nations members the United States of America supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources.

When the forces of the Republic of Korea, not being a member of the United Nations (having been kept out by a Soviet veto), are added to those of the United States, it means that our two nations alone supplied better than 95 percent of the manpower.

Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

With that example are you prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer likewise must be in the negative.

Has the time not come for a realistic appraisal of just what part the United Nations is qualified to play and to stop kidding ourselves into believing it is something it is not, and in my judgment, cannot be?

There are some who have envisioned the United Nations as a world state to which openly or clandestinely, individual nations would surrender their sovereignty. Some of the more enthusiastic proponents of this type of superstate compared the San Francisco meeting with that of our own Constitutional convention at Philadelphia. Of course, the two gatherings are not comparable for the building of a government upon which man might depend for the protection of his life, his liberty, his economic, and his intellectual freedom.

In the first place, those who met at Philadelphia spoke a common language and had a common heritage. True, they had come from different areas of the world, but they or their predecessors had come seeking a new way of life, freedom from old-world tyranny or a desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

They had fought a common battle against the mightiest empire of that time. They had carried over from the old country the background of the Magna Carta and of representative government. They had had experience, some of it not too satisfactory, under the Articles of Confederation, and with that background, under what I believe was divine inspiration, drafted the greatest document produced by the mind and hand of man for his self-government and protection of his rights. A little more realistic understanding of the history of the nations gathered in San Francisco should have made it clear that the organization could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government.

There is no common language or common heritage. Nations which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience. Nations of less than 1 million have equal representation with those of over 300 million. The Soviet Union, which is perhaps the most tyrannical government since western civilization entered the modern era, sits as an equal partner with nations with long-established constitutions of law, order, and a respect of the rights of man. Now, there are those who urge the admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean war. This, together with the other Communist states, would give that system of tyranny over 800 million people that they claim to speak for.

As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guarantee of freedom under our Constitution being diluted or modified directly or indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions.

Lest we be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late wherein we have been taken, I believe that every candidate for public office—executive, legislative, or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue.

The United Nations, if it does not destroy its moral position by actions which I shall mention, does have a function it could perform. It could be a forum wherein the views of the free world and the Communist world might be aired to the benefit of the peoples of the world, provided that there was assurance the debates in the General Assembly or the Security Council were receiving as widespread coverage behind the Iron Curtain as they do in the free nations of the world. Otherwise it becomes a vast propaganda forum for the Communist world wherein the point of view of the West does not have the equal opportunity to get to the people in the Soviet Union and its satellites because of the strict censorship those governments exercise.

Even in regard to its position of moral leadership, the United Nations has allowed itself to become seriously compromised.

Following the intervention of Communist China into the Korean war, the United Nations, after great hesitation, declared Communist China the aggressor. There had been no such hesitation when the small aggressor Communist Korea crossed the 38th parallel in June of 1950.

To close observers this seemed to indicate that there would be alacrity to pass a resolution and to act against a small aggressor, but there would be procrastination and delay in acting against a large aggressor. This seemed to be an abandonment of principle for expediency.

Later, when the evidence was conclusive that the Soviet Union was not only giving moral support to Communist aggression in Korea but was supplying MIG planes, tanks,

artillery, ammunition, and other weapons in clear violation of the United Nations resolution and the charter of the organization no steps were taken to expel the Soviet Union from the United Nations.

Later on, the official representative of the Soviet Union baldly and boldly admitted the fact that such support had been given and in effect defied the United Nations to do anything about it. They did nothing.

Every member of the United Nations knows that the terms of the Korean armistice have been violated on numerous occasions. The Neutral Nations Commission is not allowed to function in Communist North Korea as it was intended though they have complete freedom in the area of the free Republic of Korea. In violation of the terms of the armistice the Communists have brought in equipment and built military air fields.

The most flagrant violation has been the admitted holding of 15 members of the American Air Force, 11 of whom have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years. Under the terms of the armistice it was required that all prisoners of war who wanted to be returned should be allowed to do so.

There is strong reason to believe that there are at least several hundred additional United Nations and United States prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the armistice.

United Nations passed a resolution expressing its concern in this matter. The Secretary General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, made a special trip to Peking. He returned without the release of the prisoners and without any date upon which they might be expected to be returned in the future. It is apparent that they are being held for the purposes of international blackmail on the part of the Chinese Communists.

Impotent and paralyzed, the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly has taken no effective steps to enforce compliance in accordance with terms of the Korean armistice.

In the matter of the Chinese Communist aggression against the Republic of China which is a charter member of the United Nations, that Organization invited the Chinese Communists to come to New York to discuss a cease-fire.

Arrogantly, the Chinese Communists laid down terms that a victor would be expected to lay down to the vanquished—namely, that the Republic of China should be removed from the Security Council and that the Soviet Union resolution condemning the United States should be made the order of business rather than the New Zealand resolution relative to a cease-fire.

When this message was received, the United Nations again demonstrated its ineffectiveness by postponing the whole situation while some of the neutralist friends of the Soviet Union and Red China are trying through diplomatic channels to provide for a far-eastern Munich whereby the Chinese Communists will be given the key coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu. This, of course, would be another defeat for the free world and throughout all of Asia looked upon as another victory for the Communists, comparable to that growing out of the Geneva conference wherein the Communists gained control of northern Vietnam and 15 million more human beings.

These are not pleasant facts, and there are many in this country and elsewhere who, because of the vast amount of publicity and propaganda, have gotten a distorted view of the capabilities of the United Nations Organization.

Certainly in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, a nation can no more return to isolationism than an adult can return to childhood.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there

will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us, will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

The Tariff on Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in the form of an open letter, written by General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 15, 1955.

I believe this outstanding citizen-soldier performed an excellent piece of work in bringing to the attention of the public the raising of the tariff on watches by the President a few months ago.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY I SPEAK UP?

I. In a democracy, every citizen has the right to speak up and be counted. I should like to exercise this right. I have a simple reason: the belief that many people in the United States and in Switzerland largely misunderstand the defense characteristics of the crucially important watch manufacturing industry in the United States.

President Eisenhower last July announced an upward adjustment of tariffs on certain imported watch movements. Many people on both sides of the Atlantic have wondered what the United States really had in mind when this action was taken. What the Government had in mind, I suggest, was national defense and the defense of the free world—nothing more.

You should know that the President made the adjustment after two things happened: the Tariff Commission itself twice recommended the step; a special committee set up by the Office of Defense Mobilization said that the watch industry was vital and had to be preserved for defense purposes.

II. If I were speaking only as a watch company stockholder, I would encourage my company to import an even greater percentage of its watch movements from Switzerland. It can make more profit on these than it can on domestically produced watches.

But I have spent most of my life as a soldier. It is because of my lifetime interest in national defense that I am making this statement. During the two world wars we fought to preserve freedom in the Western World, I saw at first hand how vital were precision devices and precision weapons. Later, as head of the Veterans' Administration, I became more intimately aware of the precision skills required of watchmakers, through training programs which were being conducted at that time. I cannot forget that the instrumentation in a single heavy bomber require over 3,000 jeweled bearings, and that these can only be made by companies possessing watchmaking skills.

No other industry has these skills organized for production. No other industry is prepared to work to tolerances as low as millionths of an inch. No other industry can mass-produce devices sensitive to temperature variations of millionths of a degree.

Some other industry might, of course, "tool up" and train personnel for such precision work. That would take years. And that might be too long.

Only 4,000 precision watchmakers are left in America. There were 10,000 in 1948.

III. Concerned by such facts, the Office of Defense Mobilization (through its Director, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming), told its Interdepartmental Committee to make another special study. The committee was not concerned with questions of commercial competition, but with matters of defense. Among its findings were:

1. The number of workers in watchmaking plants in the United States had fallen below the level required for defense purposes.

2. Watchmaking skills cannot be stockpiled or put on a standby basis.

3. The only way to preserve such skills is to keep the watchmakers busy manufacturing watch movements.

Other committees had reached the same conclusions.

IV. Just recently, confusion has also arisen because the Treasury Department, through the Bureau of Customs, has proposed a ruling to stop the practice of "upjeweling." United States tariff on a watch movement is based on number of jewels or substitute jewels it contains; as jewel count increases, tariff rate increases. "Upjeweling" is a system by which imported watch movements, once through customs on a low-jewel low-tariff basis, can be easily and cheaply "upgraded" by the addition of more jewels—put into conveniently provided places.

Plainly this practice has the effect of evading the intent of United States Government regulations, and the President's decision. The Government simply closed this loophole. Its ruling applied to all imported watch movements—regardless of the country of origin.

This new action on upjeweling does nothing more than give effect to the President's previous conclusion that it was essential, solely for reasons of defense, to preserve a hard core of watchmaking skills in this country.

V. The Swiss are excellent watchmakers. This is demonstrated by the fact that they already have 85 percent of the United States market and 90 percent of the world market. It is relevant that last year, 1954, American production of jeweled watches shrank to 1,700,000 units (down from over 3 million in 1948), although United States citizens last year bought approximately 10,200,000 jeweled watches.

As one who believes in the principles of world trade, I applaud this. Nations which can make good products at low prices ought to have access to the world market. The world will prosper as a result. This is the basic principle behind the Government's reciprocal trade program, in which I deeply believe.

But let us also keep in mind that when Cordell Hull enunciated the principles of the reciprocal trade program more than 20 years ago, neither he nor President Roosevelt was seeking the instant abolition of all tariffs. On the contrary, the idea was that trading nations could negotiate tariffs one with another, to the mutual advantage of the nations involved. It was Cordell Hull's concept that free trade is as strong as its exceptions, and defense industries are the exception which give sense and flexibility to any reciprocal trade program.

Thus it is wholly consistent that President Eisenhower should currently be advocating extension of the reciprocal trade agreements program and, at the same time, should be mindful that watchmaking skills in this

country are vital and must be preserved for the protection of this country and our allies. In case of war, Swiss production facilities might not be available to us.

VI. In a democratic society every principle has its limitations which strengthen it. We believe in free speech, yet we limit it by our libel laws. We believe in freedom of assembly, yet we limit it by laws against riot. We believe in freedom of information, yet we guard our atomic secrets. We believe in free trade, yet we preserve our defense industries.

All Americans who value the friendship of the Swiss, and who understand also the vital nature of the United States watch industry, have reason to hope that our Government's action in this matter will be clearly understood for what it is—an action designed to preserve a crucially important defense industry and thus contribute to the defense of the free world.

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

Importance of Avoiding Waste of Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles to do with the waste of manpower in the case of those over 40 years of age who are unable to obtain jobs, after losing their current employment. The articles appeared in the Penn Progress of January 20 and 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Penn Progress of January 20, 1955]

NATIONAL EQUAL EMPLOYMENT PLAN (NEEP)—WASTE OF MANPOWER SEEN IN PRESENT EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

EDITOR'S NOTE.—The news herewith presents the first of two articles dealing with a problem which should be generally recognized as having a tremendous effect on the national economy. Though its scope extends far beyond our own limited sphere, it, nevertheless, is important to us, since it affects every individual in the so-called middle age and retirement age brackets. A Penn Township resident, who prefers to remain anonymous at this time, has thought through the problem and has come up with what we believe to be a logical, workable, solution. His plan is worth the attention and thought of every adult person in the valley, and, further, is worthy of being publicized nationally and being considered at top levels. We present first the Problem; next week, the Solution. We urge you to read both, then invite your comments.)

THE PROBLEM

For the past several decades except for the period of World War II, the economic trend in the national labor employment field has been the gradual reduction of maximum employable age limits until the situation has developed to the point where many companies will not employ any person over the age of 35, and the great majority of companies will not employ anyone over the age of 45.

This is primarily due to several factors, chief among them being the cost of com-

pany insurance and pension plans and other benefits. It has come to the point where even fiscal officers and other officials of high position are likewise forced to retire from active business life at the age of 65 regardless of their personal wishes and desires, or company need of their services. The fact that some men are old and physically infirm at 50 while others are alert, vigorous and mentally fit at 75 is completely ignored.

The average worker living in a metropolitan industrial area earning the average of \$400 to \$500 per month must, upon reaching the age of 65, retire on a pension income of approximately \$165 per month or less, depending on his marital status. In order to remain living in his home and his neighborhood among friends and relatives and retain the social and fraternal relationships of a lifetime, he is forced to seek any type of menial job to augment his income to the point where he can meet his daily living expense. If unsuccessful in obtaining such employment, he must uproot his family and move to some remote rural area where he can manage to eke out the remaining years of his life which may be many if he is vigorous and healthy.

If a worker over 40 years of age becomes unemployed, he cannot normally find employment in the field in which he is both able and experienced but must take any type of employment obtainable at a greatly reduced wage in order to exist. If unable to find such employment, he will be eventually forced to apply for relief after his life savings, insurance, and home are gone. In a relatively short period of time the one-time up-right hardworking citizen and taxpayer has become an embittered object of charity subject to ill health and mental collapse. If he can find some means of keeping alive until the age of 65 he will then become eligible for a social-security pension generally inadequate to meet his living expenses.

Government recognizes need

Government has recognized the need for social reform only to the extent of providing for those over 65. It has failed to recognize the serious weakness existing in our economic structure due to the failure to provide legislative measures which would encourage industry to ignore age in providing employment for those workers from 40 to 65. Industry cannot be forced legislatively to provide gainful employment to workers in this age bracket, but Government can by legislative means create a system of tax-credit incentives for industry whereby workers from 40 to 65 can be employed by industry solely on the basis of ability, training, experience, and physical fitness without increased cost to industry for high insurance or pension rates over that involved in hiring a younger worker for the same job. For every worker so employed, the Government stands to receive taxes from that worker, tax revenues which are not created under the present system.

When a worker becomes unemployed, the Government loses income-tax revenue based on the worker's earnings. In addition, the worker goes on unemployment compensation for a period of 26 weeks. If unemployment continues, the worker goes on relief indefinitely. If reemployed in some menial capacity, the earnings are too small to be subject to income tax and the job is generally of a temporary nature which means the worker will time and time again be on unemployment compensation and relief rolls. Every worker over 40 who becomes unemployed becomes at the same time a costly liability to the Government and his community. He becomes a burden to the younger employed workers in his immediate family who must contribute to his support. He also becomes a total loss to industry which is not only deprived of his skill, knowledge, and experience, but of his purchasing power as well which has been abruptly terminated by loss of earnings.

Destroys morale

The existing order is responsible for the damage to morale on a nationwide scale through fear—the fear of unemployment after 40 in the mind of every worker. The fear that weds every worker to his job no matter how distasteful and disliked, that creates nervous strain and tension and gradually changes a satisfied worker into an anti-social character who becomes unbearable to those around him both at work and at home and whose work suffers to the extent that it invariably leads to the disaster so greatly feared—unemployment.

The citing of an individual case means little, but multiplied by the hundreds of thousands and more constantly unemployed within the 40-to-65-year bracket, with those added who are employed on temporary or permanent low-paid jobs due to being within this age bracket spells the difference between a constantly maintained high level of employment and one subject to the greatly fluctuating peaks and valleys created through unnatural and abnormal periods of depression, recovery, inflation, and boom aggravated by war and threats of war. Through national indifference and Government failure to act, we suffer the latter.

It is evident the entire approach to national economic studies in the past has been made with too great attention given to factors other than cause and effect. In order for this Nation to achieve the goal of full employment, all employables within all age groups must be equally gainfully employed either in production or rendering necessary services. This goal cannot be attained until the 40-to-65-year groups of employables are proportionately integrated into the national economy as employed workers. This step can be taken by Government through legislative means without disruption of the orderly processes of the economic life of the Nation.

[From the Penn Progress of January 27, 1955]
MAXIMUM PROSPERITY SEEN IF MANPOWER IS STOPPED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Following is the second and concluding article dealing with the problem of present manpower wastes caused by current employment practices. Last week's article dealt with the problem, namely, that of the person in the 40-65 age group, and this week the author discusses a solution to the problem. Written by a township resident who prefers to remain anonymous at present, the national equal employment plan (NEEP) studies an American problem that is becoming more acute with each passing year, and the suggested solution is, we believe, both logical and workable. The plan is worthy of the attention of every township adult and readers' comments are invited.)

THE SOLUTION

This plan is based on the economic theory that to create and maintain a constant maximum high degree of national prosperity the following basic conditions must be met:

1. Every worker must be equally considered for employment principally on the basis of ability, training, experience, and physical fitness to perform required duties.
2. Every worker must be permitted to continue working until the age of 75 if he is physically able and mentally competent and desires to do so, instead of being compelled to retire at the age of 65.
3. Every worker must be able to obtain reemployment in his chosen trade or profession regardless of age.
4. Every worker must be engaged in the production of goods or the performance of necessary services, subject only to control of the natural law of supply and demand.
5. No artificial controls shall be applied to the national economy which tend to limit, unnaturally inflate, or otherwise disturb public purchasing-power volume.

These basic conditions are the only firm foundation upon which a rich and full na-

tional economy can be developed. The elimination of older workers by making reemployment difficult if not impossible for them has been tried, and it has not worked. Compulsory retirement for workers at the age of 65 has been tried—and it has not worked. We have tried reducing purchasing power volume by forcing workers from an income of \$400 to \$165 per month—and it has not worked. We forced out older workers to make room for younger workers and incidentally reducing purchasing power at the same time, and then wondered why jobs dropped off. We have tried reducing each worker's output while raising costs of his production, and it still does not work. We hear mention of lower retirement age, next 60, then 55, eventually 50, or less. Mention has also been made of a 35-hour week, and of a 30-hour week. The course of this line of reasoning has been run. It is time to re-examine our economic position, then do something about it. The purpose of this plan is to do something about it.

Legislative changes are necessary which would be relatively simple to put into effect. Their purpose would be to provide tax credit incentives to industry which would be determined on the basis of a percentage of the annual wages of all workers hired in the age bracket from 40 to 65, such percentages to be on a graduated scale sufficient to meet all expense incurred by employers over and above that which would have been incurred in employment of workers under 40.

By this means equalization of employment between age groups will have been accomplished without undue advantage to any particular group, full employment of all age groups will eventually be accomplished, Government will benefit by the income-tax revenue received over and above the tax credits allowed while at the same time saving large sums which otherwise would have been expended for relief, welfare, and other forms of public aid. All industry will benefit from a greatly increased and constant purchase power volume and the elimination of difficulties in the employment of skilled and experienced workers needing little if any job training.

The necessary changes are as follows:

1. Voluntary retirement at 65 with compulsory retirement at the age of 75.
2. Federal and State income-tax statutes to be amended to provide a graduated percentage table based on the employable worker's age when hired within the 40 to 65 age bracket which when used in multiplying the worker's total annual wages will provide a tax credit equal to the excess costs incurred by the employer as a result of hiring a worker in that age bracket over the cost incurred in hiring a younger worker.
3. Adequate safeguards to be provided whereby the number of employees hired within the 40-to-65-year-age bracket could not exceed a proportionate percentage of the total employees of any employer with furloughs and layoffs governed by present seniority rules and long-established practices.
4. All Government contracts to be let to contractors on the basis of adherence to this plan.

Based on an annual average wage of \$4,000, the following graduated percentage table is shown to illustrate the increasing percentages for each year of employment of a worker hired after the age of 40.

This table is shown for illustrative purposes only. The proper percentage table to be devised should provide tax credits to the employer that would offset all excess costs over the cost of employing workers under 40, with all tax credit cost to the Government absorbed by the income-tax revenues created from the wages of workers employed under this plan. As the average worker with 2 dependents earning an annual wage of \$4,000 will pay about 10 percent or \$400 in income tax, the Government would receive

income tax in excess of tax credits allowed for those workers from 41 to 55 years of age, which excess would apply against the excess of tax credits over income tax received for those workers 58 to 75 years of age.

According to the Census Bureau, the number of persons 45 or over in 1953 was approximately 45 million, or approximately 29 percent of the total population of the country. It is estimated this total will increase to 63 million in 1975 and will then constitute one-half of the total population over 20 years of age. Estimated on the most conservative basis, of the more than 45 million persons now 45 or over, more than 45 percent are workers and of the workers at least 10 percent or approximately 2 million are either constantly unemployed, retired but willing and able to work, or employed on low-paying jobs of menial nature. If by means of this plan, the latter could be returned to productive employment in a freely competitive labor market uninhibited by an age complex, they would earn in excess of 8 billion based on an average annual wage of \$4,000. These wages would create over \$800 million in income-tax revenues and over \$7 billion would flow into purchasing power. The savings to the Government in unemployment, welfare, and public-relief costs would be huge, as well as the large reduction in old-age and survivors insurance payments under the social security system due to workers continuing to work after reaching the age of 65. Large savings would accrue to the employers pension funds due to workers continuing to work after reaching 65.

The effect of this plan would not limit job opportunities for workers under the age of 40 but would tend to create more jobs, both for trained and semi-trained workers seeking reemployment or advancement as well as young untrained workers entering industry, through the constantly increasing volume of purchasing power created by full employment of all workers.

The goal of this proposal is to arouse public interest, discussion and debate, and concerted action in the effort to better an economic condition dangerous to our national welfare and detrimental to the mental happiness and physical and financial well-being of a large and important section of our entire population.

It is realized that giving voice to these thoughts is like the small weak voice of one crying out in the wilderness, but in the knowledge that all things spring from humble beginnings, the belief that if brought to public notice remedial action will inevitably result, and the hope others will join in this service in the public interest—these words are written.

Worker's age	Percent	Tax credit
41	2	\$80
42	2½	100
43	3	120
44	3½	140
45	4	160
46	4½	180
47	5	200
48	5½	220
49	6	240
50	6½	260
51	7	280
52	7½	300
53	8	320
54	8½	340
55	9	360
56	9½	380
57	10	400
58	10½	420
59	11	440
60	11½	460
61	12	480
62	12½	500
63	13	520
64	13½	540
65	14	560
66	14½	580
67 to 75	15	600

Training a Modern Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, we want to keep America strong. We must be able to defend against its enemies, both foreign and domestic.

An adequate Navy, Air Force, and Army, are necessary for our defense. We must maintain our Armed Forces economically, but consistent with adequate protection.

The training of a soldier, by reason of mechanization, has become very complex, and requires much training of the individual. It is expensive to train men, and, therefore, they should remain in the service as long as possible.

Men should be encouraged to stay in the Army by adequate pay and other perquisites. We must have a competent Organized Reserve. To be effective, the reserve must have personnel. In order that we may have a proper defense, universal military training should be immediately put into effect.

Gen. L. V. Hightower, on February 5, at the Shoreham Hotel, delivered a most comprehensive address to the Pennsylvania College Alumni Association on the training of a modern army. It should be read by every American. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TRAINING A MODERN ARMY

(Address by Brig. Gen. L. V. Hightower before the All-Pennsylvania College Alumni Association of Washington, D. C., February 5, 1955)

Training the modern Army is a complex job. It is growing more complex as the machines of war become more technical because machines must be man's servants, not his masters. There will never be a machine that has courage, or that understands why it is fighting. The machine with torn innards cannot, like wounded men, give forth that last ton of energy, that determination to fight and to carry on against all odds. The machine cannot provide inspiring leadership. The Army trains men as warriors, warrior-technicians, and leaders. Modern warfare requires that fighting men be better trained in many more skills than has obtained in the past. Beyond the physical, technical, and manual aspects of training there lies the urgent and continuing need to train and steel men's minds for the potential impact of enemy atomic weapons and enemy psychological methods so that fighting men, and not mere survivors, will emerge. The Army now trains for two types of warfare—the atomic and the nonatomic. This training effort is multisided and it must be geared to constantly changing military needs. It must also be maintained in proper balance. The system must train men to meet all possible conditions and environments of man—and man's greatest test—war itself.

FACTORS

But there are obstacles and limitations. The Army acknowledges them as factors to be reckoned with and overcome.

First there is time. This is a factor that money cannot purchase. For example, the Army's task is magnified under present conditions where our citizen soldiers are inducted for a 2-year period. Approximately 25 percent of the enlisted strength of the Army on 30 June 1955 will terminate their service in the fiscal year to follow. Replacements for total enlisted losses through the year will be about 367,400 of which 240,000 will be untrained input, representing approximately 26 percent of the end enlisted strength authorized the Army for the end of fiscal year 1956. Inasmuch as the technical requirements of the Army are greater than ever before, and the time factor is a pressing one—the Army must select its men for the various career fields in terms of educational qualifications for certain tasks that require rapid absorption and application of knowledge and skills. The Army must utilize the men available, to the best possible advantage. Measured in broad terms in 1954, slightly less than one quarter of all enlisted men were eighth grade level or below. Another quarter had some high school training. Thus 50 percent were below high school graduate level in educational background. Some 35 percent were high school graduates, but only 5 percent were college graduates, the remaining 10 percent having had some college training.

FIGHTER AND WARRIOR-TECHNICIAN

The task is first to train all of these men as fighting soldiers. This is done in 8 weeks of concentrated, rugged training. Following this, every soldier is given another 8 weeks of training designed to fit him for a specific role such as infantryman, tank crew member, radio operator, artillery gunner, clerk, or cook.

Here many men are selected for training in the more specialized skills and techniques. The bulk of the men join various type units after 16 weeks of individual training. However, this 16 weeks of training only qualifies the soldier to join a unit as a team member, but the team or unit has then to be trained. Thus the soldier enters the unit to join in unit training which has two categories: basic unit and advanced unit. Only upon completion of the latter phase, and subsequent field tests and maneuvers under simulated combat conditions, is the unit deemed ready for combat. It is in the category of unit training, or on-the-job training, that the Army finally qualifies the bulk of its men. This requires positive leadership day in and day out. The specialists may be troop trained or school trained only after they have qualified as basic soldiers.

There is a multiplicity of jobs for which men must be trained. This is no longer the army of riflemen, cannoners, cooks, and clerks alone. The artillery gunner of World War II, while he might have served any one of several caliber weapons, must now specialize to serve the 280-millimeter atomic cannon, the Honest John rocket, the Nike guided missile, the Skysweeper antiaircraft gun, the Corporal guided missile, or any one of several types of self-propelled artillery weapons. Even the mortar battalion now embraces its own radar.

The turret of an M48 tank is almost as laden with dials, instruments, devices, and switches as the fighter plane.

The front driver of the 280-millimeter atomic cannon communicates with the rear driver over an intercom set for the simple purposes of transport and directional coordination alone.

MULTIPLICITY OF OCCUPATIONAL TASKS

Within the Army there are, for enlisted men alone, 60 occupational groups within which there are 350 occupational tasks and specialties. This has numbered as high as 570 military occupational specialties under a less simplified occupational designation

(MOS) system. These occupational groups cover such functions as ammunition, armaments maintenance, tanks, artillery, automotive maintenance, chemical, communications, electronics, engineering finance, infantry mapping, medical, military intelligence, personnel and administration, quartermaster scientific services, supply, motor transport, etc. The occupational specialties begin with such combat tasks as tank gunner, infantry leader, and they range through cartographer, mess steward, helicopter mechanic, rocket artillery chief, parachute packer, radar chief, cryptographic supervisor, guided-missile specialists, and atomic-weapons specialists.

It is in the latter fields of endeavor that school training reaches its greatest length. For a guided-missile fire-control maintenance specialist for NIKE it requires 38 weeks of school training alone. To enter this training a soldier must be at least a high-school graduate. A guided-missile electronics maintenance specialist for the same weapon requires better than one-half year of school training. In the field of guided missiles a soldier can spend up to 1 year in training before he joins his unit. The Army constantly seeks to shorten these training periods, but as weapons advance so does their complexity and machinery. The Army must gain return in on-the-job performance from its training investment in each soldier.

However, the soldier is enlisted for a definite period, be he Regular or non-Regular, and at the expiration of his service he can exercise his option to remain in or leave the Army.

EXTREME LENGTHS OF TRAINING

This introduces another factor that must be seriously considered. Many soldiers trained as specialists become highly qualified in a skill or task that often has a counterpart in civil life. This is particularly true in many of those fields which require lengthy periods of training, such as electronics. Accordingly, the Army comes in competition with industry and, as a matter of fact, solves to a degree some of its personnel problems. Inasmuch as civilian jobs pay better than the military, many men in whom the Army has invested great time, money, and training do leave the Army, and replacements must be retrained to fill the vacancies. This requires detailed advanced planning based on experienced attrition rates to insure that the projected specialist requirements of the Army are met.

THE ARMY METHOD OF TRAINING

What then are the Army's training methods to meet its requirements? Our training is based essentially on the explanation, demonstration, application, test and critique methods—given in that sequence. We place a great deal of reliance on the demonstration—followed immediately by student application. The soldier is obliged to work and to concentrate physically and mentally on the radio, machine, weapon, or materiel at hand. He does receive adequate instruction in theory, complemented by application of the theory to practice. In view of the importance which the Army attaches to the demonstration and application phases of instruction, we require training aids in great abundance—both the device and graphics type.

Tank turrets, motors, missiles, and other materiel must be cut apart to permit the maximum number to gain intimate knowledge of the complex parts to facilitate the accomplishment of training in the minimum practicable period of time.

The ratio of men per piece of equipment is carefully measured to insure adequate active student participation.

THE ARMY SCHOOL SYSTEM

To train its leaders and its specialists the Army has four categories of schools: (1) The specialist schools; (2) the Army general

school; (3) the branch schools; (4) the service colleges.

An officer who attends all career schools spends a total of 3.2 years of a 30-year career in school. However, the average officer education is limited to graduation from the basic and the advanced classes of his branch school and the General Staff College—a total of from 1 to 2 years. During fiscal year 1955 a total of 199,316 officers and enlisted men will receive resident training under this system (including training at civilian facilities). They will average 13 weeks instruction per individual. An additional 100,000 will participate in the Army extension course program. As of August 1954 the Army's school system utilized 64,669 supporting personnel including 15,304 school troops. A total of over 500 school courses are taught under this school system which embraces 34 schools.

As the confusion of World War II cleared, those who had been most closely involved in its conduct, again found time for reflective inventory of the actual accomplishments. The United States Army's astounding contribution to the Allied cause probably was summarized best by Winston Churchill who in 1946 paid the following tribute to the preparedness and the flexibility of the United States system of training:

"There have been many occasions when a powerful state has wished to raise great armies, and with money and time, and discipline and loyalty that can be accomplished. Nevertheless, the rate at which the small American Army of only a few hundred thousand men, not long before the war, created the mighty force of millions of soldiers, is a wonder of military history.

"To create great armies is one thing; to lead them and to handle them is another. It remains to me a mystery as yet unexplained how the very small staffs which the United States kept during the years of peace were able not only to build up the Army and the Air Force units, but also to find the leaders and vast staffs capable of handling enormous masses and of moving them faster and farther than masses have ever been moved in war before."

As if in direct reply to Mr. Churchill's mystery, two Chiefs of Staff gave due credit to the Army school system for its role in the achievement.

The Army school system represents the educational progress of over 150 years of constructive evolution. Today the system provides an educational device sufficiently flexible to meet the changing technologies of warfare and world power relationships while at the same time maintaining emphasis on timeless principles of individual competence, leadership, and related soldierly qualities which must always form the ultimate resource in our national defense. As now organized, the system constitutes a vital element of the United States Army mobilization base.

TRAINING OF FOREIGN MILITARY

As a sidelight, it should be noted that since the inception of mutual defense assistance program in fiscal year 1950 over 12,000 foreign nationals have been trained in United States Army service schools and installations. During this year 40 countries will participate. In addition to the MDAP training program, the Army is training about 700 personnel of other friendly foreign countries. The Army also maintains an exchange system with the armies of several foreign nations.

EDUCATIONAL TRAINING OFFERED BY THE ARMY

Outside of military training, the Army's educational services provide mandatory grade-school education for all enlisted men who lack fourth grade level training. Last year an Army course of 8 weeks of English language training was instituted for Puerto Ricans upon induction. Off-duty educa-

tional training is provided from fifth grade to college graduation. In addition, the United States Armed Forces Institute provides civil education extension courses and self study facilities for all enlisted men and officers.

The Army enjoys a close relationship with civil educational institutions and derives much assistance from them in many fields of mutual endeavor and interest.

SUMMARY

The Army seeks to do more than just train a fighter, it endeavors to train Americans as better citizens to acquaint the soldier with the democracy which he represents. This is the purpose of the troop information and education program which is regularly conducted and is successful. Over the years the Army found that a great many Americans still need elementary education concerning their own country—the principles for which it stands and the position it occupies in world affairs. We would like to see this objective better accomplished before an individual enters the Army.

The potential enemies we face have shown that war can be waged not only by fighting and destroying men's bodies, but by destroying the liberty of men's minds.

The Army recognizes with serious thought and effort the growing battle for the minds of men. It is reckoning with the brutal fact that its soldiers can be subjected to inhumane and unorthodox treatment if captured. The United States armed services have studied this matter and they continue to take steps in training to strengthen the individual American in uniform and the military body to which he belongs. It must be recognized, however, that the military has but a short space of time to prepare and train these men for the ordeals of war and its aftermath. By the time an American youth puts on a uniform he is in large part formed by his environment, background, church, and education. Therefore it is first incumbent upon the family, the community, the church, the teachers, and the educators to provide the Nation's youth with mental, moral, and religious strength and foundation to fit him for the age he faces.

The decisive element of victory in war is still the trained fighting man who defeats the enemy's ground fighters, seizes land and holds it. These are the climactic actions that cause the enemy as a national entity to decide resistance cannot continue.

Is Ike Popular Enough To Save the GOP?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Is Ike Popular Enough To Save the GOP?" published in the March 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Ike Popular Enough To Save the GOP?

Is President Eisenhower as popular as ever?

This question is asked frequently these days. It can be answered in any number of ways, depending upon one's outlook, prejudice, wish, or hope. But in Washington many are impressed by the observation of one veteran political writer who says:

"In 1952 most everybody liked Ike. The American people had a great regard for him as a general. In addition, a majority of the people not only liked him but were ready to take a chance on him as Chief Executive, despite their well-founded misgivings about military Presidents.

"Today most people still like Eisenhower and still admire him for his military contributions, but it is more and more apparent that a large number of fair-minded people—Republicans as well as Democrats—have come to the reluctant realization that a great general has not turned into a great President."

Generally speaking, this observation is concurred in by Democratic leaders, but it is not shared by Republican spokesmen. The difference comes down to this:

The Democrats believe that popular esteem for Eisenhower the hero and war leader will not blind the public to his failures as a civil and political leader. The Democrats believe the public is mature enough to make the vital distinction.

On the other hand, the Republicans are betting that Ike can win on personal popularity alone, without regard to his record in the White House. In short, they do not think the average citizen is well informed enough to make the distinction.

There is at least some factual support for the Democratic belief, judging from recent public opinion polls. Certainly in Ike's case, popularity has not equaled voting pull. The proportion of people who tell the pollsters that the President is doing a good job consistently stands well above the percentage who say they would vote for him.

In 1952, for example, he pulled 55 percent of the vote. There was little reason to expect any material change in sentiment by February 1953, when he had been in office 1 month, yet by then some 68 percent of the people thought he was doing a good job.

In September 1954, only 53 percent of the persons polled said they would then vote for Ike, but in the same month his popularity rating stood at 65 percent.

This difference is accounted for by people who think Eisenhower is doing well enough, but who, at the same time, apparently think someone else could do better.

The polls show that public approval of Eisenhower between his first month in office and the time of the 1954 elections declined by over 15 percent. If a decline of similar proportions were to take place in the actual vote for General Eisenhower in 1956, he would now receive only 46 percent of the vote in an election, which would amount to a severe defeat.

The same conclusion is shown by a December poll of Minnesota voters published by the Minneapolis Tribune. It also shows only a 46 percent vote for Ike (in this case as of December). Minnesota, incidentally, also cast about 55 percent of its vote for Ike in 1952. An even larger proportion of Minnesotans, some 66 percent, thought in December that an election at that time would turn the White House over to the Democrats.

Independent Senator Monse, once an Ike man himself, seems to agree. He told a TV audience in December that Democrats could take the White House in 1956.

If the Democratic view is right, and Eisenhower is defeated in 1956, it will not be the first time that the public, either here or abroad, has retired a very popular public figure when it felt he was no longer the man for the job.

After the last war, for instance, the world was surprised when England voted Prime Minister Churchill out of office. But this was not a case of a hero suddenly losing his popularity. Not at all. The English voters simply decided their war leader was not the best man to lead them through the postwar transition period, and they so voted. Even

after the election, however, Churchill continued to enjoy the affections of his people, and he still does today. Indeed, when conditions changed, he was returned to office.

Another example is offered by genial President William Howard Taft. He was a popular man in and out of office. But he was not a strong executive. He was unable to unite his party either while he was in office or at election time. The voters never stopped liking him, but they did not vote for him for reelection in 1912. He got less than 25 percent of the popular vote, a poor showing for the regular Republican candidate even when the vote was split with both the Democratic and the Bull Moose Parties.

Pollsters' figures are not to be taken too seriously, but most political writers do agree that the drop in Eisenhower's public approval seems to stem from a growing feeling that Ike does not have the gift for political leadership, even to leading his own party resolutely.

That is painfully evident to Republican politicians who sense the void in which they are operating, a kind of free-wheeling atmosphere which gives them the leeway to feud more with each other between elections than they do with Democrats.

The depth of dissident Republican feeling against Eisenhower is made plain almost daily by the Old Guard columnists. George Sokolsky, for one, has written at length about the "many dissatisfied Republicans" seeking a conservative party. They are "that large element of the American people which has never become accustomed to the New Deal now pervading both parties."

Sokolsky is convinced that Democrats won the Congress in November only because large numbers of these people refused to vote for Republican New Deal candidates and thereby cut into Republican strength.

"How large that conservative element is numerically, no one can say," Sokolsky complained recently, "because it has never had the opportunity to register its strength in a presidential election since 1932."

David Lawrence's fault finding with the administration is equally outspoken. During last fall's campaign he criticized the Eisenhower managers who thought they could win while alienating many of the members of the Republican Party. There seems to be little thought about how to unite the party and considerable thought on how to keep it disunited.

The group for whom these men are speaking are at odds with the so-called moderate progressive Republicans on almost every issue facing the country, and the rift, instead of healing, is getting deeper all the time.

The McCarthy censure vote split the party down the middle, 24 for McCarthy, 22 against. In other words, had only Republicans voted, McCarthy would not have been censured.

Later McCarthy took exception to the President's call for a progressive moderate policy. "Just what did the President mean?" he asked. "I think he has in mind the re-making of the Republican Party. I am not going to discuss at this time the form of the mold he is proposing for the Republican Party, but I do not believe it is shaped in accord with the policies and objectives which have long guided followers of Republican Party principles."

What will all this mean in 1956, when it is time to choose a President?

According to Republican Congressman PETER FREELINGHUYSEN, extreme right-wing forces in the Republican Party will actually try to defeat Eisenhower in 1956. A New Jerseyite himself, FREELINGHUYSEN was led to this conclusion by right-wing efforts to sabotage Republican Senator CASE's election in New Jersey last November. FREELINGHUYSEN called the anti-Case movement a disguised attack on President Eisenhower and the tip-off to probable old-guard tactics in 1956.

The New York Times seconded this when it reported that there were those who believed that Senator McCARTHY and some of his followers would prefer defeat in 1956 to a victory with Eisenhower, for the reason that the most likely survivors of the defeat would be the rightwing, which would then control the party.

The New Republic summed up the party's problem this way:

"The Republican Party," it said, "is composed of a group on the right which appears to have no interest in giving it majority appeal, and of a man in the White House who wants to give it majority appeal but has few helpers, few techniques, and few opportunities. He survived handsomely, in 1952, the allegation that he could not rise above his party. Next time around, the question will be when are they going to get together, and, politically, where."

A practical politician posed the dilemma in less elegant terms. "It's all very well," he said, "for the Republicans to talk of Ike's popularity rubbing off on the rest of the party in 1956, but maybe it will work out just the other way; in short, maybe the party's unpopularity will rub off on Eisenhower."

For a Second Term: Dwight Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "For a Second Term: Dwight Eisenhower," which was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 20, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A SECOND TERM: DWIGHT EISENHOWER

Dwight D. Eisenhower for a second term as President of the United States.

That, we are sure, is the fervent desire not only of the great majority of the members of Mr. Eisenhower's own party, but of the great majority of the American people, regardless of party affiliations.

The President has as yet made no announcement of his political plans. Many considerations, for and against seeking re-nomination and reelection next year, have doubtless weighed upon his mind.

The rigorous demands of the President's Office take a toll of the sturdiest physique. Mr. Eisenhower is not one to love power for its own sake or to crave the perpetuation of power gained in high office. It would unquestionably be a vast relief to him to lay aside the huge burdens of his position and take up with his wife the private life of a farmer in the quiet of the Gettysburg countryside.

He has served his Nation continuously and in posts of steadily increasing responsibility ever since he graduated from the Military Academy in 1915. As supreme commander of the Allied forces that swept to victory in Europe in the Second World War, as head of United States occupation forces in Germany, as the postwar Army Chief of Staff, as Supreme Commander of the European Defense Force, as President of the United States, his is a record of distinguished service to this country that has few parallels since the days of the founders.

That he is entitled at least to the award of his remaining years to spend in peace and privacy may surely be granted. But the public servant has a demanding master. The American public is not yet prepared to retire Dwight Eisenhower from duty. And as a soldier, and a good one, Mr. Eisenhower is not the type to run away when duty calls.

He has fulfilled, as President, the expectations of those millions who called him to that post with their votes in 1952. He has placed their Government on a firm course of honesty, integrity and sound efficiency. His objectives as the head of state have been in the best traditions of American constitutional Government.

He has been unwaveringly a man dedicated to the cause of peace, while staunchly upholding the cause of freedom.

But his work is unfinished. It would be a grievous blow to America, and to the realistic policy of seeking an enduring world peace which he has pressed, should Mr. Eisenhower step aside and refuse to run for a second term.

That the Republican Party would proudly renominate him by acclamation at next year's national convention has been indicated on all sides. Lacking definite word from the President on the matter, movements to draft him for the nomination have been set in motion in many parts of the country.

At its recent meeting in Washington, where it selected San Francisco as site for the 1956 convention, the Republican National Committee adopted without a dissenting vote a resolution declaring faith in the President's continuing leadership of the party and the Nation.

There is no figure in the Republican Party today remotely approaching the stature of Mr. Eisenhower as a candidate for the presidency. The small group of grumblers and grippers, centering in the Midwest isolationist sector, who have been critical of the President, have no candidate worth the name to rally around. Their opposition movement would shrivel at the first announcement by the President that he will run again.

Outside the Republican Party, Mr. Eisenhower's personal popularity and voting strength seem undiminished. He is the one figure universally dreaded by the Democratic leaders as a candidate next year.

This newspaper was glad to support Dwight Eisenhower for President in 1952. We hope wholeheartedly that he will consent to run again next year to round out his service in the White House with a second term.

Relations With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement inserted in a newspaper by the Laguna Beach Lumber Co. The advertisement was written by Hemlow Harris.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE INVITE THE PIGS TO OUR TABLE

We are not particularly interested in England's wishes to maintain trade with Red China when it involves Red Chinese trespassing on clean American ground.

We have little respect for a crew of diplomats who can apparently overlook American prisoners doomed by fiends to jail for a crime they did not commit but who invite their jailers to sit with them.

To us it seems an all too flimsy excuse to once more temporize with common decency. Freeman cannot do this.

Why the Security Council of the United Nations should suddenly become alerted to the sputtering fuse in the Far East and presume to meddle in an affair that is not theirs is a bit beyond comprehension. The Council was not invited to be an arbiter by either Red China or Nationalist China, and it has no business so doing.

The United States for the first time in years has recently shown signs of again becoming the kind of a nation that once made it respected around the world. It has drawn the line at last. It has shown unlimited patience, a patience bordering on timidity. It has pointed to Red China a way in which an uneasy peace can be kept. This should be sufficient.

If not, it is time that Red China be wiped from the map and if Red Russia cannot see the danger signal then it too should have the same treatment.

Decent God-fearing mankind cannot go on compromising its standards, retreating in the face of threats, backing away from bluster. It must stop somewhere and if the line from Japan to the Philippines is it, then even if the whole world turns against the United States—let us maintain it.

Who carries the banner of a Christian civilization these days? Sometimes we wonder when we see alleged men of honor breaking bread with murderers.

Let the pigs be invited by the Security Council to discuss their pigsty tactics—but let it be in Geneva where the rape of French Indochina occurred.

Diplomacy and world politics is beyond the ken of simple decent people and the further such corrupting influences are kept from our shores, the safer America will be.

As it looks to us we have more to fear from United Nations meddling than from what we may or may not do on our own in the South China Sea.

It is indecent and humiliating that Red China should be implored to please come and be seated. It is an insult to every American that the place of their visit be on our shores, even though it be under the guise of peace as guests of the Security Council.

Most Americans are ashamed of such gutless acts. God Almighty must be a bit ashamed of us also.

LAGUNA BEACH LUMBER CO.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared in commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, which was observed on Wednesday, February 16.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, OF MARYLAND, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Today, February 16, is the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, and the free people of the world pause to do honor to these indomitable people who, despite the engulfment of their land by the atheistic forces of world communism, nevertheless, retain their great spirit of freedom and independence.

As one of the earliest independent states in Europe, Lithuania flourished and prospered as a nation of peaceful and freedom-loving people for several hundred years. Yet, in the 18th century the greed of large and powerful neighbors, in a struggle for the control of Europe, eventually resulted in the enslavement of this small country by Czarist Russia. Though these powerful forces erased the nation of Lithuania from the map of Europe, they could not extinguish the spirit of the people of Lithuania and their strong love of freedom. During the years to follow, the desire for liberty and the constant quest to regain the independence of their nation continued unabated, to be fulfilled after World War I by the establishment of the Lithuanian Republic.

For almost a quarter of a century Lithuania thrived as a nation of free and independent people, only to be overcome by the forces of communism at the outbreak of World War II. As in the past, the Lithuanian people are determined to withstand the forces of slavery and subjugation, and to assume again their rightful place among the people of the free world.

They continue to disregard the atheistic teachings of the Communist dictators. They strive to instill in their youth the great love of liberty, the way of life which recognizes the inalienable rights of man as an individual, and the teachings of God that nourish the spirit of all freedom loving people. Irrespective of what further adversity the future may hold, the Lithuanian people will continue to meet their responsibilities. The flame of liberty will continue to burn in their hearts. The soul of this brave nation will be true to the cause of the free world and, eventually, as in 1918, the independence of the Lithuanian nation will again become a reality.

Until that eventful day, these brave people can be assured of the continued steadfastness of their millions of friends in America. We will never forget the importance of this gallant nation to the economy of Europe, or of its many contributions to the culture of the Western World. Furthermore, the courage and the fortitude of these gallant people will continue to inspire us in our struggle to set men free; to make the world a better place in which to live and where future generations of all nations can live in harmony, peace, and freedom in accordance with God's principles.

Pay Increases for Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Worthy of His Hire," together with an article written by David Lawrence, columnist, in reference to increased pay for Senators and Representatives.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORTHY OF HIS HIRE

Congress is supposed to be embarrassed by one of its current activities. We don't think it should be. For the Constitution says that Congressmen "shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law." They are the lawmakers. And most Congressmen should be able honestly to say that they are worth more than they are now getting.

Compared with the billions they can save or waste, their \$15,000 salaries are small. They are small in comparison with the earnings of a multitude of business and professional men. They are small also in relation to increased living costs and taxes.

Nowadays, too, Congressmen are busy in Washington a far larger part of the year than formerly. They have less time to earn other income. It would be better if they were even more closely restricted as to outside earnings. If Uncle Sam pays more, he might reasonably require their full services. And if the servant is worthy of his hire, the public servant may well be more worthy if his hire is made more worthy. Perhaps an increase of \$5,000 would be enough, but an increase there should be.

The Congressmen's task is made less embarrassing by the fact that their pay bill is combined with one to boost Federal judges' salaries. These raises are at least as well merited. Municipal judges in New York City now receive more than Justices of the United States Supreme Court. Any lawyer of judicial caliber is almost bound to make a financial sacrifice in accepting a Federal judgeship. The sacrifice should be reduced.

SAYS MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CAN RETURN PART OF PAY IF THEY DO NOT NEED IT (By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 17.—If the conscience of any Member of Congress hurts him about voting for that pay raise of \$10,000 a year, there is an easy way out—to give back to the Treasury as much as he likes.

There's precedent for such a gift. Herbert Hoover gave back most of the Presidential salary he received while in the White House. He, himself, never revealed that fact but his friends have told about it. Maybe there are other public servants who have done the same thing and kept it secret.

What a proper salary for Members of Congress should be is a very serious matter and goes to the heart of the question of integrity in government.

Many of those in the House of Representatives who voted against the proposed increase—which has yet to pass the Senate—did so because of a conscientious belief that the voters wouldn't approve of it. But it is important that the voters should know all the facts. For many Members who voted against the increase really deserve to have the higher salary to cover those expenses they have been trying to meet out of their own pockets. Likewise, some who voted for the increase did so out of consideration for the plight of their colleagues, though they themselves didn't need the extra money.

It all comes down to a simple proposition—the American people certainly don't want only rich men in Congress, nor do they want to see Members accepting gratuities from constituents or big campaign contributions in appreciation of service they may have rendered.

Members of the House come up for election every 2 years, so they are constantly in need of campaign funds. Many of them supply it out of their own pockets rather than solicit gifts from constituents who seek special privileges. But the worst phase of the matter is the drain on the funds of a

Member of Congress by residents of his district or State who feel their Congressman or Senator is something of an errand boy or personal representative in Washington.

Lots of the things done by Members of Congress for people back home are worth thousands of dollars to those who are benefited, yet there is no such thing as a "service charge" or "fee" to be paid. Indeed, it would be highly improper for any such payment to be made.

If, for example, a new post office building or a defense installation or some other Federal project involving huge sums of money is brought to an area as a result of the efforts of a Member of either House, there are citizens who profit by the rise in real-estate values and in other ways. They cannot and should not pay for that service. Yet, in the doing of that chore for the people, various expenses are often incurred and in many instances it is the Member of Congress who foots the bill rather than become involved in some transaction which a political opponent could some day uncover and use as a smear.

It is odd, but members of national legislatures the world over have trouble about the size of their salaries. In Britain the Churchill government almost was overthrown last spring because the Labor Party insisted on a pay raise and the Conservatives opposed it. Many of them are wealthy and carry on extensive business interests. Only after some Conservatives deserted their leadership was the issue compromised. Today the pay of a member of the House of Commons is the equivalent of about \$2,800 a year, with an extra allowance they may request for each day the House sits. This amounts approximately to about an extra \$740 a year. Curiously enough, the House members in London have no private offices or staffs provided by the Government.

In France, the pay is equivalent to about \$5,000 a year, and the 100 Communist deputies contribute about \$3,000 apiece directly to the party fund or approximately \$300,000 a year, which is quite a sizable help in carrying on Communist propaganda.

In the State legislatures in this country members are poorly paid and it is a scandal that corporations with business before these bodies often retain as counsel for other services members who are lawyers. The labor unions do the same thing.

Many Members of Congress have outside income. Some earn it by getting large fees for speaking before labor unions and trade bodies of various kinds. Others still practice law before State courts. Some have large business interests or derive a big income from investments.

The raise in pay is needed in order to permit the election to Congress of citizens irrespective of their income status. A total of \$25,000 a year, out of which comes \$4,500 for taxes, or a net of \$20,500, is not too much for a Member of either the House or the Senate to receive if he is honorably to serve his constituency.

Democracy Out Loud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Democracy Out Loud," which was written by Rev. George W. Casey, and was published in the Febru-

ary 5, 1955, issue of the Pilot. Copies of the editorial have been sent to me by a number of Massachusetts citizens.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRACY OUT LOUD

(By Rev. George W. Casey)

Al Smith, who, in his day, possessed the minds of American Catholics more completely than Father Coughlin or Senator McCARTHY in their respective days, used to say that the cure for the ills of democracy was more democracy. It sounded grand away back there in the confident twenties, like everything else Al said, I know that I regarded it as little more than divine revelation.

Now I wonder. One day years ago, when I was, 'alas, less experienced with Sippl powders than I now am, I felt poorly. Since I felt that my health depended on those powders, and that if one was good, two were better, I took an extra one. I felt worse, so I took another. This went on until the situation got desperate and I called the doctor. When I told him the measures I had taken, he could not keep from laughing. I had almost killed myself with the cure. I am beginning to feel that way now about Al Smith's cure, wondering if we have not taken a little too much democracy, here in America, and in other of the world's republics.

Take that Roman holiday at the State prison 2 weeks ago, the people really barged in there didn't they? Everybody, his mother and his brother, got in on the act. The frustrated convicts appointed their own committee, which appeared duly grateful for the honor. The press hung from buckets and helicopters, peered through every crack, explored every mind, pictured every expression. A bath of bathos.

The politicians rushed in with a whoop. Wherever people appear in the raw, that's for them. The Boston City Council came in with a unanimous recommendation for a pay raise for all prison guards in county employ. More power to the guards. Theirs is a dreary job with few compensations but the pay checks. But why now? Have the guards around here done anything lately that is heroic and over and above the call of duty, anything that calls for the gratitude of the community? Anything that should make us all sleep better in our beds at night? Did we miss something?

The fact of the matter is that the people, as people, as a mass, are not equipped or disciplined for such difficult business as prison control, police work, and public safety. Nor for most of the tasks of Government and administration in our complex civilization. They cannot just pour in off the streets and do the jobs of specialists and professionals. Jobs that require training, experience, and the sense of responsibility. Jobs that require sound knowledge of psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, economics, geopolitics, military science, logistics, pedagogy, education, and so on ad infinitum. Jobs that require poise, detachment, and broad concern for people who are not around, people who are not represented, for people who may not yet be born.

The people as such, the people in the mass, even the people gathered in town meetings, that classic symbol of democracy at work, cannot, or at least do not, rise above local and personal self-interest. When the east-west toll road through Massachusetts was being laid out every town and city in its way rushed into popular assembly, and availing themselves of the great American democratic right of free speech, furiously demanded that the road go through the next town instead. If there was not some authority to beat the people down you would have to hang the road on the moon.

France is just about as sick as any of the great republics are at this point in history,

and I think that it is fair to say that its trouble is rather too much than too little democracy. Its Chamber of Deputies is so responsive to the popular opinion and will that it is almost incapable of decision. Its splinter parties represent every shade of opinion and political theory, every clique and special interest. Unless the political genius and energies of Mendes-France can lift it above the sectional, class, business, industrial, and agricultural absorption in selfish privilege and advantage there is little hope for it to regain its former greatness. France has proven that the voice of the people, at least as it is voiced there, is not the voice of God, nor even of reason.

Maybe if the people, all the people of France, the dispossessed as well as the propertied, the soldier as well as the parliamentarian, the people of the past, and of the future, as well as of the present, the non-voters as well as the voters, could be apprised of the issues and polled as to the answers, true and glorious direction might emerge. What has happened in France, and elsewhere in the great democracies, is that fragments of the people, the most voluble, the most self-interested, the most susceptible to prejudice and demagogues, have called themselves the people and have sought to govern all.

People in the plural are not much of an improvement over people in the singular. They can be just as selfish, cruel, opinionated, fickle, and tyrannical as kings and emperors at times. It is hard to tell from this far away just how representative those People's Courts are of the common people of China, but they do not seem to show a lot of enthusiasm for the unjust and savage punishments they inflict upon non-Communists, both native and foreign.

Should we say then, that the democratic dream is over, that the dreadful wars of our century and the current retreat of the democracies have dispelled it? That what is left is to go back to the most benevolent form of authoritarianism we can set up?

By no means. Our democracies have given us the most just and equitable government humanity has known. Or at least knows about now. They have secured for the common man the widest diffusion of prosperity, opportunity, and dignity he has yet had. But democracy must be chastened; must recognize the ills and errors that this century has revealed, and it must move to mitigate them. It must admit that the majority of the voters at a given time are not always right, that they can indeed be very wrong. They must restrain their nationalism. Especially here in America we must not proceed on the fallacy that what is good for America is necessarily good for the world, and all who do not follow American policy are ingrates and weaklings, or worse.

Probably most of all we must restore respect for government, as something above and apart from contemporary voters, responsible ultimately to the people, but as an institution ordained by the nature and needs of man and the will of God. St. Paul speaks of the powers of authority deriving from above. We must desist from pressurizing legislatures and congresses by organized campaigns and from intimidating presidents, governors, and mayors and forcing them to our way of thinking and acting. We must resist the sweep of passion and the sway of demagogues, and serve our laws and traditions, or change them.

Just as we choose doctors, lawyers, and plumbers, and then let them do the job, unless it is clear beyond peradventure of doubt that they are failing, so we should let government and administration do its job, while it has it. For we, the people, are not all equipped to administer jails, dispense justice, carry on foreign affairs or wage wars any more than we are severally equipped to take out tonsils or repair the kitchen sink.

Movement of Relief Shipments in American-Flag Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

MR. BEALL. Mr. President, one of the vital accomplishments of the 83d Congress was the passage of the 50-50 cargo-preference law under which at least one-half of all cargo financed by the United States Government for relief and rehabilitation shipments must move in American-flag ships.

Under date of February 16 the New York Journal of Commerce, which specializes in marine news, published a searching editorial on this important subject which I believe my congressional colleagues will find very interesting. In brief space, the editor summarizes the practical benefits to United States shipping which devolve from Public Law 664, known as the Butler-Tollefson Act.

At the same time the friendly nations of the world are benefiting from the sales of these surplus commodities received from us. They are not only getting these goods for relief and rehabilitation, but the proceeds are reverting back to them for additional internal development. Thus, these surplus commodities they receive from us are not only helping our own agricultural economy but benefiting the friendly recipients not only by making these goods available to them but they can also utilize the proceeds turned back to them as well.

The introduction and passage of this legislation was a real tribute to our distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], whose able efforts on behalf of a strong American merchant marine have attracted national attention.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT DOESN'T COME FREE

There have been indications from Washington recently that some Congressmen—primarily those from the farm States—want to take another look at the so-called cargo-preference law, under which at least one-half of all cargoes financed by the United States Government—whether inbound or outbound—must move in American-flag ships.

This policy, applied to all relief and rehabilitation shipments since the war, on a temporary basis, became the law of the land last year with the enactment of the Butler-Tollefson Act. More recently lingering doubts as to its applicability this side of the Federal courts were cleared up when Attorney General Brownell gave it as his considered opinion that the act applies to surplus farm commodities exported by the Government under Public Law 480.

The reason for renewed congressional interest in the issue is obvious. Some foreign countries are reluctant to negotiate purchases of United States surplus farm stocks if one-half the shipment must be carried in American vessels, and at least one of these

nations is understood to have turned down such an agreement entirely. In the eyes of some farm State legislators, therefore, the Cargo Preference Act is beginning to look like an obstacle to the administration's farm-surplus-disposal program.

This newspaper has supported the 50-50 principle from the outset, although with misgivings.

We supported it originally because, while realizing it was an extraordinary measure for a great creditor nation to undertake, the circumstances were also extraordinary. UNRRA, the Marshall plan, NATO, and point 4 were all unprecedented programs.

The United States had just emerged from a war which showed clearly that a strong merchant fleet was essential to its mere survival in a clash of great powers. If this merchant fleet were itself to survive, it would have to find work; and if it were not given a half share in these great programs, where, indeed, would it have found it in view of its high operating costs and the worldwide scarcity of dollars to buy its services? Subsidies, paid to a relatively few shipowners, provided only part of the answer.

The cargo-preference policy could not be judged by normal commercial standards because there was nothing either normal or commercial about the programs under which it was adopted. If it prevented foreign owners from earning some dollars they would otherwise have earned, their loss was nothing compared with the gain these programs brought to their national economies, and the policy literally kept American shipping afloat.

So far as Government aid programs are concerned, stockpiling and the like, we see no reason for modifying this policy.

The misgivings we held at the outset we still retain, however. We retain them because we know that nothing comes free. The 50-50 rule has established a precedent which is not in all respects pleasant. What one nation can do to protect its shipping, another nation can also do. And if one such act detonates others, the outlook for a reasonably free market in shipping—shaped by the old laws of supply and demand—is poor indeed, and so are the prospects of nations which depend heavily on shipping earnings.

The Onassis agreement with Saudi Arabia was one of these portents, but not by any means the only one. There is a danger inherent in going too far—and we believe the United States went as far as it ever should go when it arranged the recent sale of coal to England for sterling on condition that half the cargoes move in American ships.

The deal was advantageous to the British, for it saved them dollars, but the transaction came close to being of a straight commercial type, and the attachment of the 50-50 cargo preference principle left a burning question in the air as to whether there would be more of the same. Thus far there has not been.

The farm surplus export program is not of this variety, however.

It is a Government operation, and, while we have had as many misgivings about it as about the 50-50 rule, we accept the assurances of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson that sales will be handled in such a way that they do not disturb ordinary commercial marketings, either of United States citizens or those of friendly foreign countries.

If one accepts those assurances, this program cannot be considered a commercial venture and there should be no question as to the applicability of the Cargo Preference Act to shipments made under it. The Attorney General is on firm ground in taking this position.

It would be a little ironic, however, if farm interests should take the stand that the Cargo Preference Act should go because it seems to interfere with sales of Govern-

ment-owned agricultural surpluses. They would be skating on thin ice indeed.

Let there be no mistake about it: Both the crop-support program, and the cargo-preference policy are, in one way or another, forms of subsidy, and there is no occasion whatever for the recipients of either to take a holier-than-thou attitude toward the other.

Both bear the seeds of possible future trouble. It is safe to use them only so long as their potential dangers are kept in mind, and those who administer them do so with restraint.

The National Reserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Burgess Calls Reserve Plan Boon to Service, Individual," written by Steve Tillman and published in the Army Times of February 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURGESS CALLS RESERVE PLAN BOON TO SERVICES, INDIVIDUAL (By Steve Tillman)

WASHINGTON.—Assistant Secretary of Defense Carter L. Burgess said last week that failure to recognize equitable features of the National Reserve plan "will work to the detriment of all it seeks to help." The manpower and personnel chief told this writer in a special interview that such a failure could result in "imposition of far less desirable solutions than are provided within the plan's framework."

Burgess repeated his earlier declaration, made at the plan's unveiling last December, that NRP provides the maximum equity feasible for both the services and affected individuals.

Pointing out that the plan was arrived at after more than a year's intensive study, he said it was formulated after achieving agreement on various active service viewpoints and after exhaustive efforts toward reaching fair and workable solutions to the complex manpower problems.

The plan recognizes the primary fact, Burgess said, that it takes time to train men in the techniques of modern warfare, and that without a large number of men at least partially trained and organized at the outbreak of a war the military establishment would have great difficulty assembling them.

The assistant secretary said NRP "offers what a nation occupying our position in world affairs really needs—a mandatory program under which the defense requirements essential to our security are maintained at safe and ready levels."

By use of trained reservists, Burgess said, we can more than double our active military, naval and air forces in the event of a sudden emergency without the necessity or expense of maintaining large active forces in the meantime.

"Broadly speaking," he said, "the National Reserve plan is a continuation of the existing Reserve program, but incorporating a number of additional features."

He went on to name expansion of the Ready Reserve, emphasis on an effective

screening process in building the Standby Reserve, the service "choice" features for obligated men, improved training and other features previously disclosed.

Burgess, a man who will exert considerable influence over the Nation's young men, has come up fast in Government.

A native of Roanoke, Va., he has been adopted as a "native son" by South Carolina. He was assistant to the president of the University of South Carolina before coming to Washington to take the defense job formerly held by Michigan's Dr. Joseph A. Hannah.

Burgess's military career began in 1941, when he became a lieutenant in the Military Police Corps. At the end of the war he was secretary of the SHAEF general staff as a "bird" colonel, and thereafter held several Government jobs in Washington before going to South Carolina.

The Budget Can Be Balanced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a bulletin entitled "The Budget Can Be Balanced," which I received from the Southern States Industrial Council. I ask that only the front page of the bulletin be printed.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET CAN BE BALANCED

Some of us have difficulty in understanding the failure of the Federal Government to balance the budget when there is really no secret about the cause for this failure. The budget can be balanced if there is an honest effort to determine the money that will be available for spending and to keep expenses within this amount. But we don't do it that way. Spending is attractive, so we have adopted the custom of estimating our wants and then trying to raise money enough to cover the cost. In short, it has become a habit for us to spend more than we have, and in the past 22 out of 25 years annual deficits have increased the national debt from \$16 billion to \$280 billion.

A long step toward balancing the budget depends on whether the Congress will stand by the position taken when it appropriated funds for foreign aid in 1955. The Mutual Security Authorization Act for 1954, Public Law 665, set up 1955 funds and provided that economic aid to foreign nations should end June 30, 1955, and FOA was terminated as of the same date. This feature was not mentioned in the appropriations act.

The President's recent budget message completely ignored the termination provision in Public Law 665 and asked for \$4.7 billion to be spent in 1956, compared with the \$4.3 billion asked for 1955. Of this new asking \$1 billion is earmarked for economic aid and \$3.7 billion is marked for military aid. The Budget Bureau estimates that \$7.9 billion of funds already authorized for foreign aid will be unspent and carried over into 1956—even if the Congress votes no new money. Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, says this carry-over is about \$10 billion, and even if \$7 billion of this amount has been obligated, but unspent, as claimed by agencies handling the

funds, there would still remain about \$3 billion unobligated and unspent.

The estimated deficit for fiscal 1955 is \$4.7 billion, and the predicted deficit for 1956 is \$2.4 billion.

If the foreign economic relief program is to end on June 30, 1955, then the \$1 billion earmarked for that purpose in the recent budget message would not be needed. A credit of this amount would reduce the predicted 1956 deficit to \$1.4 billion. Just what amount is marked for economic aid in the unspent funds constituting the foreign aid carryover is unknown, but even if all of this should be marked for military aid it is obvious that whether the carryover be \$10 billion or \$7.9 billion, a serious question arises about the advisability of appropriating the full \$3.7 billion asked in the budget message for military aid.

Will the Congress take advantage of this opportunity to relieve the Nation of at least a small part of the burden it is now bearing? The attitude of our citizens toward this foreign relief program is evidenced by the termination provision of the 1954 Authorization Act. If the Congress will give the people an opportunity to vote for a constitutional amendment limiting congressional appropriations to a sum no greater than estimated Federal revenues, except in time of war or national emergency, the response for the amendment will be overwhelming.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. REDMOND,
President.

Christ, the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am including a impressive sermon delivered at the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on August 1, 1954, by Louis Evans, D. D., LL. D., former pastor of the Hollywood Presbyterian Church and presently representing the Presbyterian Church on a nationwide basis. I believe Members of Congress and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be deeply impressed by this splendid message:

These are arresting words for any man to say. In fact, no man can speak them truthfully. These are glorious words even for a God to speak. It would be quite interesting to know which of these three pictures of Christ you hold most closely to your heart—as the Way, as the Truth, or as the Light.

All three are necessary: He is Truth and you must learn of Him; He is Life and you must live Him; and when we take this Truth and live it, then you are "on the way"—this is the Way. Someone has said that what we need today is men and women of "conviction"—men and women who are "convicts of this great ideal"—powerless but to follow Him at any cost, at any time, and in any place.

Of course, we start with Christ as Truth. We begin with our Christology—our science of Christ. Here we must first draw a mental picture of what He is, who He is, and what He desires us to be. Prithe, the great artist, said that he never splashed any paint on canvas until first he had completed the picture in his mind's eye. Before we can begin

to splash Christ with the brushes of life we must first picture Him in truth; as we grow in knowledge, He becomes more and more our intelligent way of action.

The Greeks helped us here. They worshipped an intellectual god. Aristotle in his "Metaphysics" pictures the Grecian god as the "Eternal Thinker." The Greek god spent his time ruminating, contemplating, thinking—almost to the exclusion of action. The Greeks were wiser here but they also failed here. Truth lacked the realism of life. They spoke words but they did not put the words to work. They had an ideal, to be sure. Infinite, D-duty; E-each; AL-to all. "Infinite duty of each to all." But they wanted to keep their slaves and here the truth broke down and Greece died.

There have been periods in the history of the church when the church has given itself to mysticism altogether; when there has been truth unmarried to life. Monks ran into monasteries and divorced themselves from living. Men in the pulpit attempted to become mystics and they mere became misty. Theology was confined to the brain and had nothing to do with brotherhood or the problems of the day. Love became a sentimental something that was altogether divorced from wages, living conditions, the diseases, the comforts, the sorrows of men. The parable of the Good Samaritan was perfectly characteristic of some of the church eras—when the priest and the Levite, religious leaders, felt no compunction of conscience as they passed by on the other side and allowed the man to perish from his wounds without giving aid.

Then there came two forces that shocked us awake.

First of all, there was youth who insisted that we marry our words to works, and our faith to action. One day, the statue called the Thinker, the form of a man in meditation with his chin cupped in his hand, suddenly disappeared from the home mantel. At the dinner table, the father asked the question, "What became of the Thinker?" The college junior of the family very frankly pleaded guilty in these words, "I put the Thinker up in the attic. I'm sick and tired of this family doing nothing but thinking—it's time we gave ourselves to action." These young people realize we live in a pragmatic and experiential age when contemporary psychology is always studying the effect of belief on behavior. They insist that we marry truth to life—that this is the only way.

Then came communism. Mr. J. Middleton Murry in his work on communism said, "communism is the one living religion in the Western World today." I contest that and yet it seems at times that they are striving to live their diabolical creed more than other people. Karl Marx took God as a person and destroyed Him and made a god out of a program. The mental denial of God was displaced by a program. They adopted a way without the truth.

They scoffed at our "other-worldliness" and boasted of their "this-worldliness." They said that they desired to salvage this present day and to make it without hunger, without war, without class, and without sorrow. They scoffed at us, saying "You Christians say that you will have pie in the sky, by and by." But there is Bob Ingersoll, the agnostic, laying in his casket as immaculately dressed in death as he had always been in life. One acquaintance stopping at the casket and gazing at him for a moment passed on with the words, "Poor Bob, all dressed up and no place to go." That is tragic. What do men do without a "by and by"—with "no place to go"—with no future?

But our answer is that Christianity also has it today. We not only desire someday to pass from earth to heaven, we desire to bring heaven down to earth now and pray "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Communism has now become a diabolical

challenge to the Christian to make his religion work now.

Of course our answer to communism is that the Kingdom of God is realism.

We Christians do not wish to escape the obligation of the belief in the "law of embodiment." God was embodied in Christ and when Philip said "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us," Jesus replied, "He that has seen Me has seen the Father." God was in Christ; Christ was God in the flesh—this was the incarnation. When He gave us a sacrament, He gave us a realistic sacrament. The bread and the cup representing the body and the blood; there was reality. When He taught us to pray, He said, "Give us this day our daily bread"—there is something edible and practical.

We are told that "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature"—that is the new birth and that is spiritual regeneration. The verse goes on to say that then "Old things are passed away and all things become new"—the new man changes things. When they saw the Christians entering the city of Thessalonica, those watching from the ramparts cried, "These that have turned the world upside down have come hither unto us also." You can expect that of the Christians—when things are wrong side up they will turn things upside down. It's said that Christ went into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing all manner of diseases. Christ was interested in the human being as a dichotomy—both body and soul. There was realism in His ministry. When the church is described for us it is described as a building with Christ as the chief cornerstone. And you and I, Peter reminds us, are all lively stones built up into an eternal temple. There it is—the church is solid as cement, functioning in an outward organization as well as a spiritual organism.

The answer of Christianity to communism is this: Christ has taken the truth and married it to life and this is our way.

Now if we have found this way it will evidence itself first of all in Christian character; it will add conduct to creed.

Sitting in the church does not make you a Christian any more than sitting in a henhouse makes you a hen, or sitting in a classroom makes you a scholar. "The redeemed of the Lord must walk redeemedly," wrote a sage.

The Church of Jesus Christ must never lose its power of differentism. Nothing worse could be said of the church in this day of a demand for a realism in life than that it had lost its sense of having a way about it.

It was not easy to walk in the Christian way in that early Roman society, any more than it is easy today. That, too, was a society that built on the mudsills of the sensate. The Christian life was no more honored then than it is now. The problem does not change. Society will always try to grind the Christian down to its size on the lathe of its brutal compromise.

Nor do our characters change. The story is told of a young woman who was going out for an evening of pleasure with a young man, and her mother called after them from the porch, "Goodnight, dear, be good and have a good time." To this her daughter called back, "Oh, Mother, why don't you make up your mind?" Yes, there are some that feel that being good and having a good time are the enemies of each other. There is nothing better that you can do, mother, than to live such a life that your daughter will think "it's fun to be faithful," and you, father, living such a life that your son will think it is "great to be good."

Of course, in this sense we all "preach." Preaching is truth through a personality. If you should write "mene, mene, tekel, upharsin," on the wall, that would not be

preaching; it would be the truth, but it is not delivered through a personality. If you could teach a parrot to say the Twenty-third Psalm, he would not be preaching, because he would be powerless to live it. Francis of Assisi invited a young monk to go with him into the city and preach. They walked up and down the crowded streets for an hour; folks curtsied to them, listened to their conversation, and watched them. They returned to the monastery in an hour. The young monk remonstrated, saying, "I thought we were going to preach a sermon today." To this Assisi replied, "We did preach our sermon today. Everybody was watching us as we walked, everybody was listening to us as we talked; that was our sermon for today." So you laymen are also the priesthood of the laity. You, too, preach for Christianity, after all, is something demonstrated more than it is debated; it is something practiced even more than it is preached. The word "Christian" is made by taking the word "Christ" and adding the letters "i-a-n" to it; this suffix meaning "a little model of the big thing." This carries with it a tremendous sense of obligation. To belong to Christ is to be like Christ.

Alexander the Great once espied one of his soldiers in the uniform of his army in a drunken stupor. He said, "Stop there, what is your name?" To this the soldier replied, "My name is Alexander, sir." The emperor said, "Do not jest with me. I say, what is your name?" Again the soldier replied, "My name is Alexander, sir." Alexander the Great took him by the nape of the neck and hurled him sprawling on the sand with the words, "Either change your conduct or change your name." We who bear the name of Jesus Christ upon our foreheads are either His labels or His libels.

In the second place this Christian way is an unusual way. They said of the early Christians they were drunk with a new wine. If there is anything of which we are afraid today, it is of being considered abnormal. But many folks have been abnormal who have been leaders in history. Susan B. Anthony, when she took her courageous stand, was considered so; when Martin Luther stood alone against kings, prelates, and cardinals, he said "I can do naught else, so help me God." They thought him mad. When Sally Butler, of Seneca, stood up a hundred years ago and began to challenge our modern philosophy of war they said the same of her. When Florence Nightingale was able to stand the licking fires of gossip and go on with her nursing in the Crimean War, it was because Christ had commanded her to do so. When Carey Nation took her axe and demolished a score of bars, people thought her a little pilled, but if we had a few more like her, America would perhaps not sorrowfully be infected with about 5 million alcoholics a year. When Mary McLeod Bethune began to contest that colored people should have their place in this world, and that no one plays a rich piano forte leaving out the black keys, they thought she lacked balance. When Abraham Lincoln said, "If there's a place for me to be offered, I am ready now, for I know equality is right, for Christ teaches it and Christ is God" they thought him beside himself.

But you noticed this, that only those people have stood out in history who have stood up for something. The trouble with us Americans is that more and more are we standing for less and less, and if we do not stand for something we shall fall for everything. A subnormal world will always think a person of normal temperature abnormal and a subnormal world in ethics will always think a normal ethic of the Christian is a high fever.

The Christ way is also the way of patience and courage. Oliver Cromwell's mother once warned him by asking him if he were counting the cost of standing up to the

tyrannical Charles. To this he replied, "Mother, there are times when we may not count the cost."

Christ said, "If they persecuted me, they will persecute you." It has always been true. The Christian way has been one or more or less protracted pain. "The moment you take the church down from one cross, they are setting up another for her." Three things were said of the early Christians. First of all they always paid their taxes; second, they were ecstatically happy; and third, they were always getting into trouble. Christians always will. There are three classes of citizens. There are the "sublegal." If you are below the law, they will put you in jail. There are the "superlegal"—if you are above the common herd they will burn you at the stake of ridicule or fasten you to the block of torture. The only people that seem to get along easily in this world are the "legal" folk who do what the law requires, no more, no less. They are the people of the "cheap average"—these are the "escapists" of society.

It is much easier to accept Christianity as a way of death than as a way of life, for it takes more courage to live for Christ than even to die for Christ. Now these few lines of a poem:

"So he died for his faith, that is fine.
More than most of us do,
But say, can you add to that line
That he lived for it too?"

"It is easy to die—men have died
For a wish or a whim
From bravado or passion or pride,
Was it harder for him?"

The Christ way is also the way of love. If God is love, then to act with God is to act like God—lovingly. As one writer said, "Karl Marx scoffed at love as mere sentimentalism. He threw out love and put in force." * * * Men first became animals and then the animals became cogs of the great machine. Then came their loveless parade of pretended love. To hear them talk you would have supposed that they had great wounded feeling and pity for those who had been the victims of industrial injustice, but as a writer said, "In one century communism gave birth to the worst slavery man has known." They offered the finely woven shawl of liberty for chilling shoulders but when men began to wear that shawl it proved to be a net of chains. I think it was Dr. Lowry in his splendid book on communism, Communism and Christ, who said, "Communism is become the inhumanity against which it protested." All communism did in China was to change hatreds. Czarism hated the poor and loved the rich; communism came in and loved the poor and hated the rich. This was just simply a change of hatreds and this is not progress at all.

But Christianity came along and demonstrated a way of love.

In the early church men with their masculine traits suddenly added pity to their power, purpose to their purse, and mercy to their might, and they formed the first board of deacons in the great triumph of masculine tenderness.

The women looked about and their needles were married to needs, seen for the first time. I do not know what the I. Q. of these early churchwomen might have been, but Helen Jackson once said of a woman, "She was not a brilliant woman but there is such a thing as genius for affection and she has it." These early Christians had it. They had a genius for affection and even old age knew how to handle the problem of service.

Then there grew up this Christian program of benevolence and philanthropy. * * * There came nursing, invented by the women of patrician Rome; then came hospitals, as inseparable from the churches as an apple from the tree; then came homes for the aged,

as men became mindful of others; and slavery had to go because love was becoming realistically belligerent; child labor was abolished and missions began to sweep the world. These Christians had a way with them—it was the way of love.

It was also a family way. God made of "one blood all the nations of the earth" and the early Christians could not forget it.

When the Holy Spirit came at Pentecost every man "heard the Gospel in his own tongue." This Gospel was for every man. On the cross the words "Jesus of Nazareth, King" were written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, for all men must read it—He died for all.

You remember Paul and Barnabas took the problem of their missionary journey to a court of authority. In Acts 13 you are told of the nature of that group—"Now there were in Antioch, in that church that was there, prophets and teachers; Barnabas and Symeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, the foster brother of Herod, and Saul." Notice in that church court the various racial backgrounds: Barnabas, either a Jew or a Greek. Symeon that was called Niger and that word "Niger" means Negro; and Lucius of Cyrene—probably another of dusky countenance; and Manaen, the foster brother of Herod—with royal blood in his veins; and then Saul—Roman and freeborn, and Hebrew in his blood. There you had the great races of the world represented in this common Christian family.

To this sense of oneness the Holy Spirit must lead us and in this sense we must solve our problems of today. Mary had her arms around her father's neck telling him how much she loved him, but at the same time, over his shoulder unseen of him, she was sticking out her tongue at her brother Tom. Her mother saw this and came over and said, "Mary, take your arms down from around your father's neck. Your father loves Tom, too. And you cannot love your father and stick out your tongue at Tom." And if we are sticking out our tongues at any of the Toms of other races, let us take down our arms from around our Father's neck. The Christian way is a family way.

Finally, this Christ way was a way of confidence. An uncanny sense of pessimism has been getting hold of the press, the platform, the pulpit, and our personal attitudes of late and we must stop it. We Christians, too, have our dream—"Jesus shall reign where'er the sun doth its successive journeys run." Whatever school of prophecy it might be to which you belong, Christ ends up at the end, King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Someone has said, "The operational code of the Communist Politburo will never be a match for the operational code of the Kingdom of Christ."

The statue of Christ is not carved out of the soap of the sentimental. * * * We have carved Him out of the rock marble of an eternal Divinity. Christ has conquered every dictator that ever ruled against Him. God's Kingdom has outlived Pharaohism, Babylonism, Caesarism, Napoleonism, fascism, nazism, and it will outlive communism.

There may be times when you Christian women feel that apart from the pageantry permitted to men there is little that you can do to change this world, but you have tremendous power and courage when properly expressed.

And yours is the "only way." You have the dream and you must teach it and live it by the crib, in the house, in the kitchen, in the club, society, factory, office, and everywhere—Jesus is the way.

You men, too, must march on with a masculine confidence.

It has looked bad for the church before. There was a time in the history of Rome

when Julian, the Apostate Emperor, thought he had completely destroyed Christianity as he closed the churches, but one day he was riding along on his steed and he heard an aged Christian singing a Christian hymn. He called, "Stop there." Then he said, scoffingly, "Well, what is your Jesus Christ doing now?" The aged Christian drew himself up to his full height and said proudly, "Just now, sir, Jesus of Nazareth is busy making a coffin for the Roman Empire." And you remember it was not long before Rome used it, when Julian the Apostate Emperor in an act of suicide drew the sword from his side and, cupping his lifeblood in his hand, threw it to the winds and shouted, "Galileo, Galileo, viciati, viciati—Galilean, Galilean, thou hast conquered." And Christ will, again, and again, and again.

Remember what John Foster Dulles said—that "faith is as contagious as fear." God give us faith in this eternal way.

Let us pray:

"It is hard to work for Thee, O God,
To rise and take Thy part,
Upon this battlefield of life
And not sometimes lose heart.

"Thou hid'st Thyself so wondrously
As though there were no god;
Thou art least seen when all the powers
Of ill are most abroad.

"Thou doest desert us at the hour
The fight is all but lost;
And seem'st to leave us to ourselves
Just when we need Thee most.

"But mighty God! We'll not lose heart;
But learn that Thou art like
And in the darkest battlefield
We shall know where to strike.

"Thrice blest are we to whom is given
The instinct that can tell
That Thou art on the battlefield
When most invisible.

"For right is right, since Thou art God
And right today will win;
To doubt would be disloyalty
To falter would be sin."

Monopoly in the Power Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 19, 1955, which I received from the Osage Valley Electric Cooperative Association, dealing with REA.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OSAGE VALLEY ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Butler, Mo., February 19, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to extend to you our thanks for the interim report on monopoly in the power industry furnished with yours of January 31, 1955, and to request that you furnish us with 10 additional copies. You may feel free to render us statement for any costs involved therefor.

We take this opportunity to express our deep appreciation of the fine work you and

your committee have been doing and we trust that you will continue in this endeavor. It is very gratifying to know that we do have in our Congress, men who have such a sincere interest in public welfare and who are willing to put forth an effort on behalf of the individual citizen and his inherent rights by virtue of living in a democracy.

If we can be of any assistance, please feel free to call on us.

Very truly yours,
OSAGE VALLEY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE
ASSOCIATION,

By J. F. LAUDERBACK, Manager.

Do Not Discount Grandpa—This Country Must Stop Wasting the Brains and Skills of Mature People, Says the Forty Plus Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present a letter recently received by me from Paul Bussard, Catholic Digest, 44 East 53d Street, New York, N. Y. With said letter was enclosed the article by J. L. Rawlinson which Mr. Bussard's letter called my attention to.

Also, I just wish to briefly remind you and all my colleagues of this great legislative body that on frequent occasions during these 8 years I have already been a Member of this House I have called attention to the problem of the elder citizens. Therefore, I am pleased to present the letter from Mr. Bussard and the article to which he calls my attention:

DEAR SIR: One of the greatest problems facing our economy today is that of the average worker. Forty has become the arbitrary gateway beyond which a man shall not pass if he is unemployed and seeks a new connection. Even women of 30, especially in business offices, are daily confronted with the same age barrier.

The story of the Forty Plus Club and its fight against this age discrimination is told by J. B. Rawlinson in the March Catholic Digest, a copy of which is enclosed.

Age discrimination, Rawlinson warns, has resulted in dumping on the labor scrap heap of thousands of healthy, active men at the height of their skills. This discrimination will be disastrous to our economy if nothing is done.

I believe this article will be of interest to you. If there is any additional information you would like to have, I shall be happy to send it to you.

Very truly yours,

PAUL BUSSARD.

DON'T DISCOUNT GRANDPA—THIS COUNTRY
MUST STOP WASTING THE BRAINS AND SKILLS
OF MATURE PEOPLE, SAYS THE FORTY PLUS
CLUB

(By J. L. Rawlinson)

The Forty Plus Club is a cooperative, non-profit organization of mature men who work without compensation for one another. Their greatest reward, next to getting jobs for themselves, lies in helping to get a job for the other fellow. They share the expense of maintaining and promoting club activi-

ties. Every working day in the year they are in the field, at their own expense, calling on employers to show that there is no substitute for the experience and know-how of older workers.

Other club members are in the office, where they serve on committees preparing and placing advertisements, writing radio or television scripts, and securing, whenever possible, free time on the air. Others make up and mail pamphlets, brochures, and news articles. Still others address business and civic group meetings. The average number of men in the Forty Plus Club is 80, the average age 55. As some find jobs, others who are trained for the work immediately take their places.

But why, in these prosperous times, is all this work necessary? There are two big reasons. First, prejudice against the aged in business and industry is still widespread. In this, the greatest country on earth, opportunities which are pressed upon young people are denied to their elders. Forty has become the arbitrary gateway beyond which a man shall not pass if he is unemployed and seeks a new connection. Many women of 30, especially in business offices, are daily confronted with the same cruel age barrier.

Pension plans, too, are formidable obstacles for older workers, especially executives. The premium paid by the employer to an insurance company to enable an employee of 50 to receive a pension at 65 is much higher than for a man of 30. When a job seeker offers to waive all pension payments and other rights, the answer, all too often, is that this would involve too much bookkeeping. And so the upgrading of youth and the downgrading of age continues, year after year, a shameful waste of brains and manual skill.

A number of retired Army and Navy officers, including a rear admiral, have joined the civilians who have passed through the Forty Plus Club at 220 Broadway, New York City. Many of them take an active and continuing interest in its activities by turning in job leads.

The club solicits no donations and has no endowments; it is entirely supported by active and associate members. These men are justly proud of its continuing success. Now in its 16th year, the club has found jobs for 3,500 men. In the files of the club are many heartening stories of members who nearly broke under the shock of finding themselves out of jobs they had ably filled for years. Laid off because of a merger, a reorganization, the closing of a branch, or any one of a dozen reasons, they came broken in spirit. In the cheerful, optimistic atmosphere of the club, their confidence was restored, their self-esteem was rebuilt.

A distinguished-looking gentleman of 72, once retired but now sadly in need of employment because of unfortunate investments, was accepted as a member. He had been seeking work for 2 years and had begun to feel that opportunity had passed him by for the last time.

Association with club members, observing their ways, listening to their talks, gave him new courage. He was assured that somewhere a good place awaited him. Today he is vice president of a bank, earning a high salary.

An unemployed engineer of 45 had tried everything he could think of to make a new connection. He had paid \$300 for employment counsel and \$100 for a résumé, and had answered scores of help-wanted ads. Fighting alone, he got nowhere. At the suggestion of a friend, he applied for membership in the Forty Plus Club, and was accepted.

Immediately he went to work, not on a payroll but as a volunteer. No salaried, he went through an intensive 3-day indoctrination course, during which he was trained to go out and sell the club to top-management executives. Amazingly soon, this engineer found that the work which he thought would

be distasteful and beyond his capabilities was just the work he could do well. Today he is a highly successful sales engineer.

Forty Plus-ers have proved so dependable that some employers, regrettably few, it is true, rely almost exclusively upon the club to fill their vacancies. At times, concerns that have tried all other sources without success turn to the club for help.

An amusing instance of this occurred some time ago. At 3 p. m. in the afternoon one of the phones of the placement committee rang, and a troubled voice said, "I wonder if you fellows could help us out of a jam. We're in the business of supplying special props for television shows, and we've had a call for a milking cow for a show tonight. The animal must be at the studio not later than 6:30. If you have a man there who can get a milking cow to the studio on time tonight, he can have a job, sight unseen, at seventy-five hundred a year."

Immediately, an unemployed salesman reached for his hat. "I'll get that cow," he declared with conviction.

Rushing to the subway, he took the first train to Long Island City, then a taxi to a large dairy concern. Using all his persuasive powers and supersalesmanship tactics, he talked the general manager into furnishing, free of charge, not only the cow but the truck to take it to the studio and back. The man from the Forty Plus Club, unemployed because of old age, got the cow to the television studio and the job. He still has the job.

All the known facts offer no justification whatever for age prejudice. Studies have been made by various organizations, including the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Problems of Aging. The facts demonstrate that mature men and women are usually the most conscientious and dependable. At desk, shop, or store, such workers have learned not only what to do but what not to do, and can save their employers costly mistakes. They take pride and pleasure in doing an honest day's work for a day's pay; they rate higher in efficiency and productivity, and have lower absentee records. They do not jump from job to job.

Physical age—biological age—is what truly counts, not calendar age. Some men are young at 70, others old at 30. Then, too, life expectancy has grown by leaps and bounds, and it is still growing. At the turn of the century, it was about 45 years. There was then no old-age problem to speak of because so many people died before they became old. Today, life expectancy is over 65. Unprecedented advances in medical science, together with new discoveries in the art of living, have made older people of today as young in spirit, resourcefulness, and all-round good health as younger people of a few years back. In addition, they have the wisdom and experience that come only with age.

The heads of most large corporations are often well along in years, a vigorous 65 or 70. Not a few have even reached 80. Yet, often those very concerns follow a policy of not hiring people over 40. That is why the Forty Plus Club idea has spread and why there are now similar organizations in Philadelphia, Washington, D. C., Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

The need is great, for thousands of healthy, active, middle-aged men at the very height of their professional or industrial skills are being thrown upon the scrap heap. Those men have been good citizens. They have educated their children, paid their taxes, contributed to the Red Cross, the church, and other worthy causes. Now they are cut off from the busy workaday world in which they spent so many years. Not infrequently an employer, unable to find the right younger man, will keep a place vacant for months rather than take one overaged.

The present do-nothing policy of the Government in the matter of older workers must not continue. We have outlawed racial and religious bias, but unjust age discrimination remains, an appalling waste of manpower and a reproach to our national leaders. A full-blown congressional probe is needed to uncover the extent to which older workers are discriminated against by reason of age and also by pension plans. Such an investigation would demonstrate that fair-employment-practices legislation is sorely needed. Such legislation is bound to come if the American way of life is to recognize the dignity of the individual and his right to earn a living as long as he is able and willing to work.

And It Could Be You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the United States, and indeed the entire civilized world, will be eternally grateful for the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose birthday was recently celebrated. The district that I represent in Congress has particular reason for depth of feeling about the unparalleled services of this great President of the United States and world leader. One of the ablest journalists from my district has written a tribute to him that was published recently in the East Side News that deserves to be widely known. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the editorial entitled "And It Could Be You," by Harry H. Schlacht:

AND IT COULD BE YOU

The 75th anniversary of the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt will be observed throughout the country on Sunday, January 30. It was he who founded the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. It was he who mobilized the people for war on this dreaded disease. It was he who became the symbol of this crusade.

Polio has ravished mankind throughout the ages. It is written that Ruma in 1400 B. C. was the earliest victim of infantile paralysis. It is said in the Old Testament that Mephibosheth was "lame of feet." It is recorded in the Gospel, according to St. Mark, that Jesus cured an atrophied arm.

History abounds with famous men who were victims of polio. The great composers, Mozart and Chopin; Charles Darwin, the father of the theory of evolution; and Sir Walter Scott, the novelist, were among them.

Polio is as great a problem today as when the malady was first described. It must be our problem until science can proclaim its conquest of this crippling foe. It is no respecter of persons. It is the dreaded disease of childhood. It strikes swiftly and silently. It strikes without warning. It is the great crippler. Whose child will be next?

The national foundation does not recognize race, color, or creed. It seeks to help those who cannot help themselves. It seeks to strike back when the cripple strikes. It is a unique institution. It is the property of the American people. It must have the support of the American people.

Today, when a person is stricken with polio, a report is made out immediately to the nearest health center within 24 hours

after the physician has diagnosed the case as polio. The nearest chapter of the national foundation communicates with the parents of the patient and all arrangements are made for the victim. The foundation assumes all financial obligations, thus giving all an equal chance to fight this scourge.

There is no greater call to which we can rally than to free little children from a life sentence in a wheelchair. No writer, however talented, can adequately portray the joy of a little stricken girl when she shouts to her parents: "Look, I can walk again." Yes; that little sentence, that happy exclamation tells more strikingly and dynamically than any article could tell what the National Foundation has accomplished.

Why not give gladly and generously to the March of Dimes? You give so that the lame may walk again. You give so the healthy may be protected. Why not give until it heals?

Did you know, perhaps you may have forgotten, that a man is never so tall as when he stoops to help a child. May God hasten the day when "Look, I can walk again" becomes a willing cry of triumph in all afflicted homes—a triumph over the most crippling disease known to mankind.

Give to the March of Dimes. Give to stop the march of polio. For the child you help may be your very own.

New York Court in Historic Ruling on Communism—The Lightfoot Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent I present to you and my other distinguished colleagues the text of an article by Mr. Godfrey Sperling, Jr., appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, February 17, 1955. In view of its pertinency and timeliness and in view of the present status of the subject discussed by Mr. Sperling in this Lightfoot case, I felt sure that the text thereof would be of special value and interest to all the Members of this great legislative body:

LIGHTFOOT CASE: COURT IN HISTORIC RULING ON COMMUNISM

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

CHICAGO.—A judge who said he was guided in his pronouncement of sentence by the punishment meted out to the 11 top Communists in New York has sentenced Communist Claude M. Lightfoot to 5 years' imprisonment and a \$5,000 fine.

Thus the defendant becomes not only the first Communist to be convicted under the membership provision of the Smith Act, but also the first Communist since the Medina trial to be judged, in terms of punishment, a revolutionary threat to the Nation.

As the historic landmark case heads toward the Supreme Court, it seems probable that the high court may again invoke the doctrine of "clear and present danger" as it did in the appeal of the top Communists case.

This time, however, the court will have to decide whether Lightfoot's admitted affiliation with the Communist Party is in itself sufficient to constitute a "clear and present danger" to the United States.

In the New York case, evidence was presented of overt conspiracy to overthrow the Government by force and violence. Then the defendant's acts were weighed against the clear and present danger doctrine.

Both the New York court and the Supreme Court decided that the American Government did not have to stand by quietly until a Communist revolution was launched before it could take measures to save itself.

PRESENT DANGER

"When does the conspiracy become a present danger?" the New York court asked. "The jury has found that the conspirators will strike as soon as success seems possible, and obviously no one in his senses would strike sooner."

The court decided that the Communist conspiracy is a clear and present danger.

Observed the Supreme Court, in agreeing with the lower court on the application of this danger doctrine:

"Obviously, the words cannot mean that before the Government may act, it must wait until the putsch is about to be executed, the plans have been laid, and the signal is awaited.

"If the Government is aware that a group aiming at its overthrow is attempting to indoctrinate its members, and to commit them to a course whereby they will strike when the leaders feel the circumstances permit, action by the Government is required."

Before handing down the sentence, District Judge Philip Sullivan commented that, from the documentary evidence and testimony, "the jury could hardly have found that the defendant did not have knowledge that the Communist Party advocates overthrow of the Government by force and violence."

POLICY OF OVERTHROW

Further, he said, the jury could reasonably infer "that the defendant intended to bring about the overthrow of the Government as speedily as circumstances would permit."

Under the heretofore untested provision of the Smith Act, membership in a group seeking to overthrow the Government is not quite enough to bring about a conviction. Also, the provision states, the defendant must have knowledge of the group's criminal objective.

During the trial, voluminous citations from Marx and Lenin were admitted in evidence, to show that Communist Party doctrine dictated overthrow of the government.

The Government also put witnesses on the stand to testify to the defendant's active role as executive chairman of the party in Illinois to show that, from his leadership and from his talking and teaching of communism, only one inference could be drawn: That Claude M. Lightfoot knew what the Communists were doing.

No evidence, however, pictured the defendant in the over act of trying to overthrow the Government. His objective was preconceived by the jury through inference, an inference which the judge has pronounced reasonable, in light of the entire evidence.

In deciding on the heavy sentence, the judge also said that he was considering the Smith Act revision which is now pending in Congress. This revision calls for a doubling of the maximum penalty for convicted Communists, to \$20,000 and 20 years.

The Lightfoot case has recalled to many observers here the closing hours of the last session of Congress, when a group of Senators almost stampeded the Congress into adopting new laws that would have punished membership in the Communist Party.

This effort to outlaw membership failed. "But how is this case to be distinguished from outlawing the party," some observers join the defense in inquiring. The prosecution answers, in effect: "There has been proof of knowledge of the purpose here."

River Basin Development in Turkey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Philip P. Dickinson, chief, United States reclamation advisory team in Turkey, is well known to all who are interested in western reclamation.

He is doing an excellent job in the Republic of Turkey in building up cordial relations with this country through the assistance program.

He recently addressed the Rotary Club of Ankara on the subject of river basin development in Turkey.

Here is the story that appeared in the Turkish-American News:

RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT IN TURKEY

(By Philip P. Dickinson, Chief, United States Reclamation Advisory Team)

I am a civil engineer, not a public speaker, but I do appreciate the honor to have been invited to address this distinguished group. I have found it a real pleasure to meet with you. I have a team of 10 American engineers and economists here in Ankara, working with the Ministry of Public Works and the Ministry of Agriculture on a long-range program of water and power development for Turkey. We believe our work is of mutual assistance. Our objective is not only to help Turkey, but equally, by doing that to help America.

Water is fundamental to life everywhere on earth, but in some places it is taken for granted. In the humid areas, like most of Europe and the eastern half of the United States, water comes free; the supply is virtually unlimited; abundant rainfall nourishes the land and the crops and provides drinking supplies for humans and animals. But in arid zones like Turkey, in most of the Middle East, as well as the Western States of America, no one takes water for granted. It is too precious for that. Here, water is treated like land, as a strictly limited natural resource, of equal or perhaps even greater value.

This eastern Mediterranean area is known as the cradle of western civilization. It also is the birthplace of irrigation. It was in the valleys of the Tigris, the Euphrates, and the Nile Rivers that man changed from a hunter to a herdsman, from a food gatherer to a food grower, and thereby started the processes from which our western civilization evolved. Man did this by learning to domesticate animals and by learning to use the floodwaters of the rivers to grow crops.

So, Turkey has been engaged in irrigation and flood control for a long time. But most of its projects, even in the present day, have been single, individual projects for small areas, not particularly connected one with the other. In my present work in Turkey we are giving special emphasis to a particular aspect of water and power development which we call river basin planning. This concept has been applied in the United States for some years now. You may have heard of it under names like the TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority), or the Columbia Basin development, or the Central Valley project. The basin concept is based on the simple fact that water, wherever it falls, flows downhill; in other words rivers follow natural rather than political laws, they flow unimpeded across State and provincial boundaries. For that reason, a geographical river basin, including every tributary from the

mountains to the sea, is the natural unit for planning and developing water and power projects.

We have selected one major river basin in northern Turkey as a model or training ground in which to work up a complete comprehensive multiple-purpose river basin plan. That is the basin of the Yesilirmak which flows into the Black Sea near Samsun. A river basin planning staff of Turkish engineers, economists, and technical aids has been established in Devlet Su Isleri (director of state hydraulic works) to do this job. We Americans from the United States Bureau of Reclamation are stationed with this staff in the same offices at Bakanliklar, all working intimately together.

I used the term multiple-purpose. By that I mean the planning and construction of water projects to serve more than one purpose—not just irrigation, not just flood control, not just electric power, but all of these together—plus, very often, other related purposes, such as furnishing water supplies for cities and villages, and for industries; improving river channels for navigation; draining swamps; controlling the salt or alkali content of water; improving conditions for fish life, and providing recreation opportunities on rivers and reservoirs. Almost all of our big water projects these days in both the United States and Turkey are multiple-purpose projects.

All of us are security conscious today. In the current struggle for world power much of our thinking and a large part of our energies are devoted to making our countries strong. We learned in World War II that to do that, to remain strong, and to preserve our democratic way of life we have to think of more than military strength; we also must press forward with continued development of our basic natural resources—our minerals, our forests, our lands, and our water. Most important of these, in my opinion, is water, especially in Turkey and the western part of the United States. Because without water none of the other resources would be any good to us.

This work is proceeding in Turkey. Before the Yesilirmak plan is completed, engineers of Devlet Su Isleri will be started on preparing a plan for the Kizilirmak Basin. The basins of the Tigris and Euphrates will follow in order. Attention also will be given to perfecting river basin plans where individual projects already are under construction such as on the Sakarya, the Seyhan, and the Gediz Rivers.

These projects have profound influence on Turkey's security. River basin development can and does contribute substantially to the productive strength of the nation.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a telegram I received from Mrs. A. A. Guastead, chairman of the hot-lunch program, North Dakota Congress of Parents and Teachers.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JAMESTOWN, N. DAK., February 21, 1955.
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As State chairman of school-lunch program for North Dakota Congress of Parents and Teachers with 40,000 members and our association sponsoring 128 hot-lunch programs, I earnestly urge no reduction in funds and beg that section 6 covering canned fruits, canned vegetables, citrus products, and peanut butter be not eliminated. Letter following.

Mrs. A. A. GUASTAD,
Chairman, Hot-Lunch Program, North
Dakota Congress of Parents and
Teachers.

To Live in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following report from Israel, written by the Honorable Denis Healey, member of the British Parliament, is worthy of our attention. It appeared in the January 3, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine.

REPORT FROM ISRAEL—TO LIVE IN PEACE
(By Denis Healey, Member of Parliament)

I do not think there is any historical precedent for Israel's extraordinary success in taking almost a million immigrants from all parts of the world and within a few years turning them into a nation. Where America was a melting pot, Israel is a pressure cooker.

Defying every law of economics, her trade gap is still more than \$200 million a year—a colossal sum for a country of only a million and a half inhabitants. For another 12 years or so, German reparations, American aid, and the contributions of Jews abroad will help to cover this. But then Israel will have to pay her own way, and it is an open question whether she will be able to do this while maintaining a West European standard of life.

Today the country is like a beleaguered garrison. On all sides press hostile Arab states, which refuse to recognize Israel's existence and whose leaders are always talking of the second round, in which they will avenge the humiliating defeat they suffered in 1948. The border settlers are living under almost intolerable moral and physical strain. More important still is the impact on the economy of the infant state. Defense takes an enormous toll of money and manpower. The Arab blockade cuts off all the most promising markets for Israel's export trade, in east Africa, southern Asia, and the Middle East itself.

In the long run Israel's very life will depend on achieving friendly cooperation with the Arabs for economic and political development throughout the Middle East. With nationalism raging like a fire throughout Africa and Asia it is inconceivable that Israel could hope to survive as a "white colony" in the Middle East, however strong her army or broad her frontiers. But Israel has very little scope for compromise. So long as the Arabs flaunt their intention of wiping her off the map Israel cannot be expected to throw away the few concessions she might ultimately afford for the sake of

minor agreements which leave the central issue untouched.

Everyone knows that Israel is tied to the West by both political principle and material interest. But the Arab leaders can flirt dangerously with Moscow in the knowledge that even if the worst happens they can fly to Monte Carlo or Buenos Aires and live the rest of their lives in luxury. So the Western powers concentrate on winning friends among the Arabs. Some of their advisers regard Israel simply as an obstacle to stability in the Middle East whose disappearance would have advantage. And Russia pursues a 100 percent pro-Arab policy.

In spite of some bitter memories, many Israelis are beginning to look on Britain as their best friend among the great powers—she is already their main market. But Britain is handing over her responsibilities in the Middle East to the United States. And, America, having played the central role in getting the state of Israel established, has moved to the other extreme. Her generals hope to train and equip strong Arab armies in the Middle East on the South Korean model—they have not yet learned from their more recent experience with Syngman Rhee. In any case, the Arab states have plenty of money to spend on arms so even if American policy changes, Arab armed strength will increase considerably in the next few years.

On the other hand the unity of the Arab world is under growing strain. Egypt may turn increasingly from the Middle East and seek her future in Africa. Iraq may desert the Arab League for the Turkey-Pakistan pact in the north. Jordan and the Lebanon for various reasons both distrust the remaining Arab powers. Before long the stage may be set for a real improvement in Israel's relations with her immediate neighbors.

The real question is whether she can get through the next year or two without a new flareup. At present Israel is feeling desperate. If the western powers do not show a more urgent and effective interest in Israel's survival, pressure inside Israel for a preventive war may mount dangerously. At the moment Israel's army is probably stronger than all the Arab armies put together. So there are already some Israelis who feel it would be better to have the second round now than wait until American aid and training tilts the balance of power toward the Arabs.

Israel's present leaders see clearly that such action would be ultimately suicidal. But unless she can be shown some peaceful way out of the present deadlock, desperation may produce a change in both opinion and leadership.

By now there is little chance of stopping the Arabs arming if they want to. So the immediate task is to see that Israel is able to keep pace with them. In the second place the west must make it much clearer to the Arabs that it would intervene to crush any Arab attack on Israel—and vice versa. Now that Israel has offered the Arabs a nonaggression pact, there is a strong case for some Locarno type arrangement in the Middle East to which the Western powers would also be a party. Words alone will not convince either Israel or the Arabs that the West means business unless Israel too can be associated in some way with the framework of Western defense. Direct military links with Britain or the United States are unlikely in the immediate future. But there may be some way of associating Israel with the new Balkan pact—incidentally Yugoslavia is now her closest friend after Burma.

Unless Israel's influence in the Western World can be increased in some such way, she will not feel any confidence in third-party mediation, and the Arabs will feel no incentive to make a settlement with her. I believe that a final settlement is unlikely to come about except through Western media-

tion—the scope for improving relations through direct talk is very limited. But in the right conditions outside intervention might help produce and guarantee a settlement. The recent agreement over Trieste is an example of what this kind of secret diplomacy can achieve. From such a start, positive cooperation could follow. And we might then see Israel lead the whole of the Middle East along the road to democracy and prosperity.

The Man Who Replaces McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1955

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, in the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, February 20, 1955, there was published a fine article entitled "The Man Who Replaces McCarthy," written by Allen Drury. It is an interesting article about the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN WHO REPLACES MCCARTHY (By Allen Drury)

WASHINGTON.—Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN is a man on a spot who thinks he knows how to get off. If past performance is any guide, he will manage. The Arkansas Democrat, successor to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, as chairman of the Government Operations Committee and of its noisy stepchild, the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, is under no illusions about the problems his job poses.

"I'm under the gun on this," he says, "but I'm not worried. The duty of the subcommittee is clear. We've shaken up the staff and we're going to go ahead and clean up the cases that are hanging fire. Then we'll go after the things that need going after, not just the Communists, who of course will remain a major concern, but corruption and inefficiency and waste and the general field of Government operations that is our chief responsibility. We'll try to do it without smearing anybody, and with a decent regard for the rights of American citizens and the dignity of the Senate."

Whether anyone, however well-meaning of purpose and firm of intention, can restore decorum and integrity to the conduct of the Senate's most notorious forum, after some of the things which happened under its former management, remains to be seen. But his colleagues are agreed that the senior Senator from Arkansas, on balance, probably has a better chance than most.

The authority of his committee is as broad as any on Capitol Hill. It covers budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations; reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government; and the study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the various States and municipalities, and between the United States and the international organizations to which it belongs.

In addition, it has the duty of "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." It is from this au-

thority that most of the committee's activity and publicity have sprung.

In the Republican 83d Congress the phrase was seized upon by the then chairman to justify creation of a Permanent Investigations Subcommittee. Since the phrase was vague enough to include almost anything, the chairman turned it to his own purposes and declared that it covered the investigation of Communists in the Government.

There followed the series of sensational hearings with which the country became all too familiar. McCARTHY never lacked for targets; he could always find a suspect or suspects suitable for a well-publicized hearing, and he possessed the personal characteristic of being either hated or idolized with no inbetweens. The committee was entirely overshadowed by his flamboyant personality.

Such is the background of controversy that JOHN McCLELLAN inherited with his chairmanship. But most of his Senate colleagues look confidently to him to repair the subcommittee's reputation, while carrying on needed constructive work.

This confidence, which is general, save for the little band still clustering defensively around his predecessor, is based almost entirely on personal character and record of performance. McCLELLAN is not one whose adherents find their judgment of his ability affected by excessive personal attachment. A dark-visaged, seldom smiling, highly complex man who goes about the Capitol with an air of knowing exactly what he wants to do, he is much respected but little known by his colleagues. In a body where the easy joke and the casual manner are more often than not the surest passports to popularity, he slaps no backs, indulges in no marathon handshakes, keeps his own counsel, and goes his own way.

He does not discourage friendship, but he is not cordial to familiarity; and in the Senate, where the one frequently is used as the standard substitute for the other, he has many partisans but almost no real intimates.

It is through the highly publicized sessions of the subcommittee that McCLELLAN is best known to Americans and there are two characteristic glimpses of him there. The first appears after he has spent many long and patient minutes listening to some willfully recalcitrant witness duck and dodge and evade the subcommittee's questions. There comes a time when the Senator from Arkansas suddenly decides that he has had enough.

His face black and scowling, his eyes staring angrily, his voice rising to its full, impressive volume, he pounds at the witness with all the sledgehammer force and persistent skill he learned as a trial lawyer years ago in the back-country areas of his native State. While he does not always attain his objective, not even the most glib and hostile witness emerges unabashed from this ordeal.

The Senator from Arkansas speaks with a Puritan wrath on such occasions, and only the black, peaked hat is lacking to make the picture complete.

The second characteristic scene occurs at the end of a hearing, when Senators are emerging from the room to meet the waiting press. Somebody is always standing squarely in the glare of the television lights, giving forth with words of wisdom for the world to hear. Silent and almost unnoticed, JOHN McCLELLAN comes out, glances at what is going on, gives a dry and ironic little smile, shakes his head at the waiting reporters and glides quietly away down the hall. Although he is by no means inaccessible to the press, and has a reputation for dealing with its members fairly and frankly, he does not believe in the grandstand play.

The Senate's new chief investigator brings to the difficult task the personal expe-

rience of 4 years in the House, 12 in the Senate, and a youth and early legal career filled with the practical lessons of life among the "woolhats."

Born on a farm near Sheridan in Grant County, Ark., on February 25, 1896, McCLELLAN attended Sheridan public schools and then went directly into his father's law office, prompted by the dazzling example of a youthful barrister who helped his father collect a debt of \$200 owed him in a town some distance away. To obtain this sum, the lawyer took a train in the morning and returned in the same conveyance in the evening, receiving for his labors a fee of \$25 from the Senator's father. "When I saw that a lawyer could make \$25 and get to ride on a train, too, that was enough for me," the Senator says with a grin. "I made up my mind to be a lawyer right then and there."

He says that he became a candidate for Congress at the age of 8. That happened when the future Senator and a playmate got into a fight at school and wound up with a whipping from the teacher, who happened to be a Republican.

"There weren't many Republicans in Arkansas in those days," the Senator remarks thoughtfully, as though there were now, "and my father was so incensed at the thought of a Republican whipping his son that he had me memorize a Democratic speech to give at our class-day exercises. I remember it concluded, 'Vote for William Randolph Hearst, a great and noble man.'"

"Unfortunately, 3 days before I was scheduled to make it the Democratic convention decided it was going to nominate Judge Alton B. Parker instead of Mr. Hearst, so I had to revise it. But it was a great success. That fall our Congressman, John S. Little, wrote me a letter predicting that someday I would be a Congressman. I still have the letter."

As with so many people, the urge to be a lawyer and the urge to be a Congressman ultimately dovetailed into two phases of the same ambition. The Senator helped his father, studied and absorbed the law, and at the age of 17, 4 years under the legal minimum, was permitted to enter practice by special act of the State legislature. Shortly thereafter he moved out from under his father's wing and into the world of the Army, where he was on his own.

He says this of his experience in World War I: "The Army taught me self-reliance and it taught me that when the chips were down there wasn't anybody to depend on but myself. I've never forgotten that lesson. It taught me to make up my own mind. I don't think a fellow suffers as much from a wrong decision, if it's sincerely made on the facts as he believes them to be, as he does from not making a decision at all. There comes a time when decisions have to be made. I learned that in the Army."

Back from the war, where he served as a lieutenant in the Infantry and the aviation section of the Signal Corps, he spent a while trying cases in the county courthouse and then in 1928 ran for the job of prosecuting attorney for the seventh judicial district of Arkansas.

He held this post until 1930, when he returned again to private practice. In 1934 he ran for Congress from the Sixth Arkansas District, was elected, and in 1936 was re-elected. From 1939 to 1942 he was in practice. Then in November 1942 he was elected to the Senate. He has been reelected twice, having started his third 6-year term in January.

Although he made a speech condemning communism on March 4, 1936, in the House, it was not until 16 years later, as ranking Democrat on the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, that he was drawn directly into the vortex of that explosive issue. In the interim his concerns were those characteristic of his party in the Midsouth.

"I've always been called a conservative and I've never resented it," he once remarked. Another time he said: "I did not become a Senator to transfer the United States into a socialistic, paternalistic state."

Yet, like many southerners, while he was to be found always on the expected side of civil rights questions, he was also to be found supporting such progressive extensions of Federal authority as the soil conservation program, the national forestry program, the school lunch program, the vocational education program, social security, Federal aid to hospitals, agricultural research, and extension services, emergency drought relief, rural electrification, Federal aid to highways, and wildlife conservation. As with others from below the Mason-Dixon line, the harsh facts of an impoverished economy inspired a type of liberal conservatism.

Ultimately there came the reorganization of the legislative branch of the Government, and with it the creation of the Government Operations Committee of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas was assigned to it, and in time, moving steadily up the ladder of seniority, he became the ranking Democrat. Approaching the same high status across the party aisle was the junior Senator from Wisconsin. In the 83d Congress the two men took over the committee and began a partnership which, at first harmonious, soon became uneasy and then explosive as McCARTHY created the Investigations Subcommittee and launched forth upon his hectic crusade.

For a time, the senior Senator from Arkansas regarded this spectacle with misgivings but without open protest. Fully as anxious to rid the Government of subversives as the chairman professed to be, he rode along, taking the snubs and the discourtesies and the deliberate exclusions from subcommittee business which were the lot of most members of the subcommittee. Behind the mask, however, one of the most powerful tempers in the Senate was slowly gathering steam; and when the activities of the chairman's two youthful assistants began to move out of the realm of cloak-room gossip into front-page notoriety, the Senator from Arkansas decided to act.

His first move was to approach the chairman privately, which led, characteristically, to many little jokes, many amiable half-commitments, many half-promises and tantalizing intimations that possibly changes might be made, so don't worry. When changes were not made—when, in fact, the situation was allowed to deteriorate even further—the McCLELLAN temper boiled over.

The occasion for giving it expression arose when the chairman abruptly hired J. B. Matthews as executive director of the subcommittee and then, under public pressure aroused by an article he had written on alleged Communist infiltration of the Protestant clergy, as abruptly fired him. Accompanied by his two Democratic colleagues, STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, JOHN McCLELLAN left the subcommittee with an angry blast against one-man rule. The event occurred in July 1953 and it was not until January 1954 that the three returned.

When they did, it was with an understanding with the chairman that things would be different in the future. But they did not become much different, and the central situation involving the chairman's young friends was still going on and getting worse. Before long John McClellan, Joe McCarthy, Roy Cohn, G. David Schine and the whole subcommittee were sitting in the glare of the spotlights, and one of the most fantastic proceedings in the history of the American Congress was under way.

After the Army-McCarthy hearings ended, and after the McCarthy censure hearings and the McCarthy censure debate were also concluded, the Democrats came to power on Capitol Hill and the Senator from Arkansas

assumed the chairmanship. He has proceeded so far with a calm determination to get the subcommittee back on the track and move ahead constructively with its business.

Already the Senator has indicated his intention to clean up once and for all the case of former Army dentist Irving Peress, called a Communist by the former chairman. He has indicated the same treatment for any other legitimate inquiries left over from the old regime. And he has restated a philosophy of investigative procedure which he deems worthy of the Senate and the task which needs to be done.

"When those who come before the committee resort to the fifth amendment," he says, "they command no respect from me, as individuals. I respect their right to resort to it if they feel they must, but it carries with it an implication I am compelled to consider, and not favorably. A man who cannot face competent authority and say he has no affiliations with any subversive organizations, has no right to employment with the Federal Government in a sensitive or any other position.

"At the same time, I don't believe in permitting smears and slanders which can't be answered before the same tribunal. Anyone named as subversive by another witness should have the right to present his side of it to us, and as long as I am chairman he will have the right, and he will be given the opportunity, to do so."

The senior Senator from Arkansas is embarking upon at least 2 years as the wielder of the Senate's best known weapon in the fight against Communist infiltration of the Government. The job is not easy, but for a man who understands that there comes a time when decisions have to be made, its difficulties do not promise to be insurmountable.

Lithuanian Declaration of Independence Day, February 16, 1918

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, all of us, I am sure, appreciate the fine contribution which a million or more Americans of Lithuanian descent are making to America.

All of us, I know, deeply sympathize with the 3 million or more Lithuanians in the homeland in the situation which confronts them as a country which has been forced behind the Iron Curtain.

We admire greatly the progress which Lithuania made during the period of her independence from 1918 to 1940.

We deplore the forceful termination of that independence.

We join in the hope that Lithuania may one day again play her part in the world as a member of the family of free nations.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Lithuanians of the town of Norwood, Mass., at their observance of the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania:

Unanimously adopted, by the Lithuanian Americans of the town of Norwood, at the observance of the 37th anniversary of the

declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania held at St. George Hall on the 13th day of February 1955.

"Whereas Lithuania for almost 15 years has suffered under the yoke of slavery forced upon her through the brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Soviet Union;

"Whereas the plan of physical extermination of the Lithuanian Nation has been carried out by the Kremlin on a scale unheard of heretofore;

"Whereas the Kremlin by nature is totalitarian and global in its politics, lasting peace and security in the world are impossible;

"Whereas the line of peaceful coexistence proffered by the Kremlin masters is merely a subterfuge to gain time for the purposes of destroying the alliances existing among the nations of the free world and thus leaving the way open to subsequent world conquest; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this gathering of loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of the town of Norwood fully aware of the gravity of the present international situation and deeply concerned over the fate of the Lithuanian Nation, pledge their wholehearted support of this great country's genuine quest for lasting peace and justice in the world, and urge the Federal Government of the United States to continue to respond with a dynamic and positive program against the threatening Communist conspiracy; be it further

"Resolved, That in the opinion of the Lithuanian-Americans of this town, in any program with respect to enslaved nations, the following steps should be undertaken:

"That special stress be given to the necessity of hastening the liberation of the captive people and all acts or omissions confirming their enslavement be rejected.

"That Congress encourage and support through authorized funds the resistance movements of the enslaved nations.

"That Congress continue to investigate the facts and techniques of Communist aggression through proper committees.

"That the United States Government sponsor a resolution in the United Nations supported by the findings and conclusions of said investigation, denouncing the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all the Communist-enslaved nations.

"That the Genocide Convention be immediately ratified by the United States Senate so that the Soviet Union may be held criminally responsible for the genocide perpetrated in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it finally

"Resolved, That this gathering express its deepest gratitude and appreciation to the Federal Government and Congress of the United States for their sympathetic and unwavering stand and attitude toward the eventual restoration of independence of Lithuania."

LITHUANIAN ROMAN CATHOLIC FED-

ERATION OF AMERICA, No. 10.

WILLIAM KUDICKA, President.

ANDREW T. VENSUKS, Secretary.

Resolution on Communist Control Act of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following resolution

adopted by the eighth annual convention of the American Veterans Committee at Boston, Mass., on December 4, 1954:

RESOLUTION ON COMMUNIST CONTROL ACT OF 1954

Whereas AVC believes that the Communist Party is in fact an instrumentality of a foreign-controlled conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States in enacting the Communist Control Act of 1954 has made certain findings of fact as to the organization, purposes, and membership of the Communist Party of the United States of America, and has purported to outlaw the Communist Party of the United States of America and has imposed certain sanctions on membership or participation therein or in any other proscribed organization and on labor unions found to be Communist Party action, or Communist Party front, or Communist Party infiltrated organizations; and

Whereas the said act is loosely and badly drawn and was hastily adopted without hearings, adequate debate or deliberation, and sets up arbitrary and ill-considered standards for determining membership or participation in the Communist Party of the United States of America or other proscribed organizations and for determining whether a labor union is a Communist Party action, or Communist Party front, or Communist Party infiltrated organization, thus violating traditional American freedoms embodied in the Bill of Rights:

Now, therefore, the delegates to the 1954 national convention of the American Veterans Committee urge prompt reconsideration of the Communist Control Act of 1954 in the light of and together with preexisting laws so that well-conceived legislation may be adopted consistent with traditional American freedoms and due regard for the national security and welfare.

They Who Have Sown the Wind—An Editorial Naming Harvey Matusow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me heretofore so to do, I present the text of an editorial printed in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, February 17, 1955.

In view of the fact that this editorial deals with Harvey Matusow, and with former Communist and self-styled witnesses, it would appear appropriate that I incorporate in these remarks part of a question and answer period on July 2, 1954, when Harvey Matusow, he being the same person as is identified in the editorial, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the 83d Congress.

Mr. DOYLE. You have enumerated some 7 or 8 boards or committees before which you have testified since February 1952. Before any of those boards or committees were you paid a professional fee for so testifying?

Mr. MATUSOW. Sir, yes; let me say 1, 2, 3, maybe 4, maybe 5 occasions, and that was the Subversive Activities Control Board, they gave me a fee of \$25 a day and once before an Immigration Service had me in New York and I don't remember the individual, but

they paid me a fee of \$25. On a number of occasions when I received that fee I turned it over to a charity of some sort.

Mr. WALTER. That is the usual fee provided for by law.

Mr. MATUSOW. As the per diem?

Mr. WALTER. That is provided by law.

At the time Mr. Matusow said "I turned it over to a charity of some sort," I regretted I did not have time to have him name the charity of some sort.

Also, his recent swearing that he lied and testified falsely before some Government committees, including the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which I am a member, further substantiates the position taken by me as a member of that committee; to wit, that said committee and all congressional committees must be increasingly on the alert to search and discover, so far as it is possible, the creditability of all witnesses before congressional committees. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the earning of \$25 a day, as earned by Mr. Matusow before various Government boards and congressional committees, together with the fact that he, and also other similar witnesses, had recently testified that they had falsified in testimony before these boards and committees should make us all wary and most cautious about being placed in the position where we are expected to fully believe and give full face to their testimony.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

THEY WHO HAVE SOWN THE WIND

Implications of the Harvey Matusow recantations continue to spread out like the ripples from a stone dropped into a pond.

The admitted former Communist and self-styled professional witness now declares under cross-examination that he was hired to prepare black lists by at least two big advertising agencies and as a consultant on subversion by New York City's superintendent of schools, and that he made false accusations. His testimony as a witness for the Department of Justice in several trials involving alleged Red activities he had previously sworn was false.

We cannot be sure that what he declares to be the truth now can be relied on any more than what he declares was false. That remains to be proved. Nor does the recantation of one ex-Communist prove that all the Red apostates have given false testimony. But dependence upon paid informers is a risky business under any circumstances; retention by congressional committees and the Department of Justice of a string of them for use on call in a semipolitical field has made many people, no friends of the Reds, uncomfortable.

Now to learn that at least one of them has been instrumental, presumably, in hazing, if not damaging, careers of actors, artists, and teachers confirms something we said over 3 years ago when the question was being asked, "Who's harmed except the Communists?"

"The fact is that we are all harmed. The virus of indiscriminate suspicion has made everyone pause before the costs of free discussion as Americans have known it. It has driven teachers to avoid classroom discussion of controversial subjects. . . . It has frightened legislators and other public officials. . . . It has so blurred crucial distinctions in the thinking of many people that real subversion is often confused with all sorts of useful leavening minority movements."

Those who have sown the wind may now be feeling but the first faint gusts of a whirlwind yet to be reaped.

Why Russia Should Be Expelled From the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a thought-provoking editorial by David Lawrence, appearing in the U. S. News & World Report of February 25, entitled "Why Russia Should Be Expelled From the U. N." This editorial raises the following fundamental questions: What force prevents us from saving the U. N.? Is it appeasement? Is it Kennanism that stops our acting in accordance with moral principles? Our soldiers fight and die for moral principles. Should we expect less of our leaders, even though they are sitting behind desks in the U. N. and the Department of State. Under leave granted, I insert the editorial in the RECORD:

Much of the trouble in which the free governments of the world find themselves today is due to a failure to steer by the compass of moral principle.

Governments that appease the aggressor go from the frying pan into the fire as they build up complications for themselves by their successive retreats.

The indictment was summed up succinctly last week by Secretary of State Dulles when he said:

"The United Nations Charter of 1945 binds 60 nations to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. But there has been armed aggression in Korea which was promoted by Soviet Russia, and later Communist China was found guilty of armed aggression there."

The world for some time has known about the repeated violations of the U. N. Charter by the Soviet Union. The principal evidence was furnished by its own representative, who publicly boasted to the U. N. in March 1953 that the Soviet Union had supplied armaments to the Red China government throughout the Korean war. In that war more than 33,500 American boys were killed and 103,000 wounded.

The Soviet Union, moreover, gave military assistance to Red China notwithstanding the fact that in February 1951 the Peiping government was formally declared by resolution of the U. N. to be an aggressor. The Moscow government ignored the U. N. warning that all members should refrain from rendering assistance to the aggressor.

The act of aggression is even more flagrant because it has been directed against the Armed Forces of the United Nations itself.

The United Nations is still in a state of war with both the Communist Chinese and the Communist government of North Korea. An armistice has been signed, but no treaty of peace has been consummated. Nevertheless military aid to the aggressors from Soviet Russia continues. Russian-built MIG's are commonplace in the skies of Korea.

This is in the face of the plain language of article 2 of the charter, which provides:

"All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

The United Nations Charter specifies exactly how offenses of a traitorous member shall be dealt with by the other members. Article 6 reads as follows:

"A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

It will be argued, of course, that the Security Council would not so recommend because the Soviet Union could block such a step by exercising her veto in the Council. The fact is, however, that the Soviet Union, being a party to the dispute, would have no right to vote at all. Article 27 of the charter covers that point by declaring that decisions of the Security Council shall be made by an affirmative vote of 7 members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members, provided, however, that a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

It has been contended that the Soviet Union had obligations under a treaty with China to come to the assistance of that country on the basis of an offensive and defensive alliance. But article 103 says:

"In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail."

The charter declares that membership in the United Nations shall be open to peace-loving states willing to accept the obligations of membership. The Soviet Union, however, has disregarded its obligations to the U. N.

By aiding Red China and North Korea, which are at war with the United Nations, the Soviet Government has forfeited its seat in the U. N. That seat should be declared vacant by a formal resolution. It would constitute notification to the people of Soviet Russia that their government had demonstrated its incapacity to fulfill international obligations, and had become a menace to peace-loving nations. The kind of government a nation chooses is its own affair, but only up to the point where such a government does not become a threat to world peace.

Some day, when a free government arises in Russia, the seat in the U. N. declared vacant could be awarded to such a new government. But today the Moscow regime must be expelled if the United Nations is to retain the respect of the world as an organization obedient to law; the words of its own charter.

Fritz Kreisler at 80

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Washington Star of February 6, 1955, entitled, "Fritz Kreisler at 80":

President Eisenhower spoke for thousands of his countrymen when he wrote to Fritz Kreisler: "Your musical artistry has become an unforgettable part of the experience of people the world over." The compliment has been justified by 80 years of living and working for the most popular of all the arts—the art of melody, the art of harmony. Nobody who ever has listened to the greatest of violinists can have failed to be grateful for his magic. He served not only the heart of music but also the heart of humanity. Fate cast his days in a time of trouble, and

he often must have been discouraged. Yet, like a good physician, he rose to minister to those in need of such healing as he could give. He carried his fiddle wherever suffering was. His philanthropies were numberless. One of them is the donation of his precious Guarnerius, the manuscripts of Brahms' violin concerto, Chausson's Poeme and more than 50 of his own works, plus his decorations, medals, and citations to the world's greatest library—the Library of Congress.

It seems too much to hope just now that Fritz Kreisler will live to see peace on earth again. The immediate outlook is, to say the least, bewildering. But how good it is that this good man should care so much and still strive so earnestly for brotherhood among men. As it was claimed long ago for the painter Raphael that he made humanity proud to be human, so it may be affirmed for the greatest of modern virtuosi that he helps us all to be our best, our noblest selves.

Two Lies Do Not Make a Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend the reading of the editorial entitled "Two Lies Don't Make a Truth," taken from the February 5, 1955 edition of the Morning News, of San Leandro, Calif., to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

It is a hard hitting, timely editorial, and is as follows:

Harvey Matusow may be many things, but chief among them now is the fact that he is a liar.

Matusow says he was a Communist. Matusow says he stopped being a Communist. Matusow testified before many congressional subcommittees. Matusow testified against Owen Lattimore. Matusow testified against 13 men tried and convicted for being Communists. Matusow campaigned on behalf of Senator McCarthy and against such men as Senator Mansfield.

Matusow made his charges under oath. Now under oath, he says he lied under oath. There's no question that he is a liar—but which times did he lie? And what did he lie about?

It is rather important, that last question, What did he lie about?

Did he lie about overt actions, about specific criminal deeds, about tangible things? Or did he lie about ideas, thoughts, impressions, attitudes, beliefs?

The charge against Owen Lattimore was that some of his writings follow the Communist line. In other words, the charge is that Lattimore has advocated some of the same things which Communists advocate. Liar-witness Matusow testified against Lattimore. Even before Matusow recanted, a Federal judge threw the charges out as meaningless, because there is no way to interpret either Lattimore's mind or the Communist line.

Lattimore, and all others, should be judged by their acts, not by beliefs or advocacies.

William O. Douglas, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, says this: "We have staked our security, our ability to survive on freedom of the mind and conscience. That conception of freedom is

the most novel principle that the world has known. It leaves political and religious discourse unlimited and unrestrained. It leaves the mind free to pursue every problem to the horizon, even though the pursuit may rile a neighbor or stir his ugly prejudices.

"History has recorded example after example of rulers who decreed what men must think, what cause they could espouse, what views they might embrace.

"Man's experience with those laws and practices was a bitter one. The persecutions and oppressions of those early days make up some of the blackest chapters of intolerance.

"History shows that the main architects of repressive laws were often men of good intentions. Their reasons sometimes had the ring of patriotism to them: protection of the safety of the state against subversive ideas. Their reasons often had overtones of religious fervor; the conviction that the soul of man needed but one faith and creed. . . .

"The Founding Fathers believed that the antidote to advocacy was counteradvocacy. They believed that if a subversive idea was presented from a platform or soap box, the remedy was not to jail the speaker, but to expose the fallacy or evil in his cause, to submit his ideas to pitiless analysis, to explode his thesis in rebuttal.

"The concept of our Bill of Rights is the concept of a politically mature people. It is the concept which makes the American way of life the ideal for every people. For its essence is tolerance for all shades of opinion, persecution for none. Under our way of life, a man should never go to jail for what he thinks or espouses. He can be punished only for his acts, never for his thoughts or beliefs or creed."

So says a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. So say many of us.

Yet the fact is that our laws now make certain beliefs a crime. And that is not all.

The prosecutors of Lattimore also attempt to make it a crime to believe any one thing which is also advocated by a person whose thoughts are labeled criminal.

And some of our Government (pretending lately to speak with sublime conceit as also the voice of God) go further. They say that to hold Government office is a "privilege"—that innocence is not enough—that one must not be accused, even by liars. A neighboring district attorney says the Constitution does not protect atheists.

To be accused, to be "controversial," has become a governmental sin. We are afraid of any clash of ideas, we are fearful of comparison, analysis, debate.

We are confounded when some informers confess to having lied to please us. We then tangle ourselves in mental confusion, some insisting that Matusow now says he is a liar, so he must be lying when he says he was a liar—therefore "two lies must make a truth."

What essential difference did it ever make what liar Matusow thinks of Lattimore's beliefs, or Mansfield's, or McCarthy's?

Let all ideas contend in the public forum. Let the false be exposed, so that the truth may be known. Let the courts judge only the acts, so that the mind can be free.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily Record at \$1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va. ---
Abernethy, Thos. G., Miss. --- 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind. --- 3971 Langley Ct.,
Apt. 596-B

Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J. _____
 Albert, Carl, Okla. _____
 Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C. _____
 Alger, Bruce, Tex. _____
 Allen, John J., Jr., Calif. _____
 Allen, Leo E., Ill. _____ University Club
 Andersen, H. Carl, Minn. _____ 4545 Conn. Ave.
 Andresen, August H., Minn. _____
 Andrews, George W., Ala. _____ 3108 Cathedral
 Ave.

Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y. ----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill. ----- 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio ----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C. ----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo. --- 5309 2d St.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J. - 113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.

Avery, William H., *Kans---*
 Ayres, William H., *Ohio---*
 Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va---*
 Baker, Howard H., *Tenn---*
 Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif---*
 Barden, Graham A., *N. C---* 2737 Devonshire
 Pl.

Barrett, William A., Pa-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn-----
Bates, William H., Mass-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio-----
Beamer, John V., Ind-----110 Maryland

Ave. NE.
Decker, Frank J., N. Y.-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bell, John J., Tex-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich-----7304 Bradley Blvd.,
Bethesda, Md.

Bentley, Alvin M., Mich---
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak-----2720 Terrace
Road SE.

Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*-----
 Blatnik, John A., *Minn*-----
 Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*-----
 Boggs, Hale, *La*-----
 Boland, Edward P., *Mass*-----
 Boiling, Richard, *Mo*-----
 Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*-----2301 Wyo. Ave.
 Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*-----
 Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.*-----The Dorchester

Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill.*-----
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*-----
Eray, William G., *Ind.*-----

Brooks, Jack B., Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., Ind.-----
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buchanan, Vera, Pa.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho-----
Burdick, Usher L., N. Dak.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.

Burnside, M. G., W. Va.-----
 Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
 Byrd, Robert C., W. Va.-----
 Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
 Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
 Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carlyle, F. Ertel, N. C.-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., Pa.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., Nebr.-----
Chatham, Thurmond, N. C.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----

Chipperfield, Robert B., III--1713 House Office
Building

Christopher, George H.,
Mo.
Chudoff, Earl, Pa-----
Church, Marguerite Stitt, 2122 Mass. Ave.
Ill.

Clark, Frank M., *Pa.*-----
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y.*-----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*-----
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.*-----The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, *Oreg.*-----
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn.*-----The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y.*-----
Cramer, William C., *Fla.*-----4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn.*-----
Crumpacker, Shepard J.,
 Ind.-----

Cunningham, Paul, Iowa--
Curtis, Laurence, Mass-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo-----

Dague, Paul B., Pa-----
Davidson, Irwin D., N. Y---
Davis, Clifford, Tenn-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., Wis-----2550 South Joyce,
Arlington, Va.

Davis, James C., *Ga.*-----
Dawson, William A., *Utah*-----
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*-----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C.*-----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*-----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex.*-----2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*-----
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*-----
Devereux, James P. S., *Md.*-----
Dies, Martin, *Tex.*-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*-----The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-----
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*-----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*-----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*-----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondoro, George A., *Mich.*-----The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*-----
Donovan, James G., *N. Y.*-----
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*-----
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*-----
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.*-----3377 30th St. N.,

Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----Arlington, Va.
The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., Pa. 3101 4th St. N.
Arlington, Va.

Edmondson, Ed, *Okl.*-----
 Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*-----
 Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg.*-----4301 Mass. Ave.
 Engle, Clair, *Calif.*-----3840 Lorcom Lane
 Arlington, Va.
 Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.*-----5044 Klinger St.

Fallon, George H., *Md.*-----
 Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*-----
 Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-----
 Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.*-----3725 Macomb St.
 Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex.*-----200 C St. SE.
 Fine, Sidney A., *N. Y.*-----
 Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*-----
 Fisher, O. C., *Tex.*-----Calvert-Woodley
 Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont.*-----
 Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.*-----The Congressional
 Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*-----
 Fogarty, John E., *R. I.*-----3627 Chesapeake

Forand, Aime J., <i>R. I.</i>	St. 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., <i>Mich.</i>	1521 Mount Eagle Pl., Alexandria, Va.

Forrester, E. L., Ga-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C-----3251 Q St.
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., Tenn--Fairfax Hotel
Frellinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.

N. J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gamble, Ralph A., N. Y.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
Gentry, Brady, Tex.-----
George, Myron V., Kans.-----3801 Rodman St.

Gordon, Thomas S., Ill-----
 Granahan, William T., Pa-----
 Grant, George M., Ala-----4801 Conn. Ave.
 Gray, Kenneth J., Ill-----
 Green, Edith, Oreg-----
 Green, William J., Jr., Pa-----
 Gregory, Noble J., Ky-----2401 Calvert St.
 Griffiths, Martha W., Mich-----
 Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
 Gubser, Charles S., Calif-----
 Gwinn, Ralph W., N. Y-----
 Hagen, Harlan, Calif-----
 Hale, Robert, Maine-----2722 N St.

Haley, James A., Fla.....	
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.....	4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, N. J.....	
Harden, Cecil M., Ind.....	The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.....	
Harris, Oren, Ark.....	1027 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr F., Va.....	4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.

Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr.*—
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*-----110 Maryland
Ave. NE.

Hays, Brooks, Ark-----314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio-----The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, Mich-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La-----104 Cockrell St.
Alexandria, Va.

Henderson, John E., Ohio.....
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.....
Heselon, John W., Mass.....
Hess, William E., Ohio.....
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.....
Hill, William S., Colo.....110 Maryland
Ave. NE.

Hillings, Patrick J., Calif--
 Hinshaw, Carl, Calif-----
 Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa--2108 Sultland
 Terrace SE.
 Hoffman, Clare E., Mich---Methodist Bldg

Hoffman, Richard W., Ill. ---
 Hollifield, Chet, Calif. ---
 Holmes, Hal, Wash. ---
 Holt, Joe, Calif. ---
 Holtzman, Lester, N. Y. ---
 Hope, Clifford R., Kans. --- 3541 Brandywine
 St.

Horan, Walt, *Wash.*-----
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.

Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-----
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-----
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*-----
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*---

James, Benjamin F., Pa-----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, Okla-----
Jenkins, Thomas A., Ohio-----The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, Va-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa-----The Washing-
House

Johansen, August E., Mich.
Johnson, Leroy, Calif.-----630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.----215 Constitution Ave. NE.

Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.
Jones, Paul C., Mo-----3613 Greenway
Pl., Alexandria,
Va.

Jones, Robert E., Jr., Ala---
Jones, Woodrow W., N. C---
Judd, Walter H., Minn-----3093 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo-----
Kean, Robert W., N. J-----2435 Kalorama
Road

Kearney, B. W. (Pat), N. Y.
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., N. Y. 1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth W., Va.-----
Kelley, Augustine B., Pa.-----

Kelly, Edna F., N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----

King, Karl C., Pa-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio--
Klein, Arthur G., N. Y----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill---
Knox, Victor A., Mich-----
Knutson, Coysa, Minn-----
Krueger, Otto, N. Dak----- The Coronet

Appendix

Simple, Direct, Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, if you are looking for a simple, direct program for aid to education, free from Government controls, without costly administration, and devoid of any "share-the-wealth" attributes, the joint resolution I am introducing today deserves your consideration and support.

Although most State treasuries are in better shape financially than is the Federal Treasury, there is no doubt but that in many States the demands, especially for education, call for more finances than the States are able to raise to provide needed buildings, maintenance, improved equipment, increases in teachers' salaries, and other items. The combined debt of the 48 States is about \$20 billion. Uncle Sam owes over \$275 billion.

With the enormous increase in Federal expenditures over the past 25 years the Federal Government has tapped every practical possible source of tax revenue, with little consideration for the tax needs of State and municipal governments. The States are now dependent almost entirely upon direct taxes on real estate and personal property, duplicated income tax and sales taxes which fall heavily on persons of low income. In seeking new revenue the States find available sources already drained by Federal taxation—income taxes, admission taxes, beverage taxes, luxury taxes, transportation taxes, tobacco taxes, excise taxes, to name but a few. Enormous sums, billions of dollars annually, are siphoned out of the States in individual and corporate income taxes. The remaining revenue available to the States is inadequate to meet rising local costs of government and provide adequately for growing educational needs.

It is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums from the States and then have a portion of these funds trickle back under any of the proposed bureaucratic-administered programs of aid to education. If any of the presently proposed and pending programs are adopted, a large overhead for administration is unavoidable, and in some instances the only thing offered the State is an opportunity, lured on by Federal dollars in matching funds, to go into debt, and even this is prohibited by law in some States.

Under the best-intentioned Federal administration, there remains the well-founded objection that the compulsory requirement that each State meet conditions imposed by law and regulations of the administering bureau must be complied with to qualify for benefits. Furthermore, there is a deep-seated fear—also well founded—that with Government intervention in education programs, opportunity might well be found for channeling propaganda into our schools, along with Federal controls which naturally follow Federal dollars flowing from Washington.

With a modest beginning, these programs, with almost no exception, follow a pattern of growing and growing, until it is possible that the training of our youth throughout the Nation could some day be directed from one central Federal bureau, and that bureau would be headed by someone appointed, not elected, and thus not directly responsible to the taxpayers whose funds he was spending.

The prime responsibility for education programs is in the local community and the State. Conditions now existing are not emergency short-time situations, and can be expected to continue for the long indefinite future, as more children are born.

To easily, simply, cheaply, and efficiently provide the States with some financial aid for meeting their needs for the improvement of their respective educational programs, without increasing their debt, without building up a huge Federal bureaucracy, without fear of Federal controls, dictation, or propaganda, without the slightest element of distribution of wealth, I am proposing, by a joint resolution which I am today introducing, a simple, direct, unrestricted plan for aid to the States and the Territories to help them meet the educational demands within their respective borders.

House Joint Resolution —

Whereas the Government of the United States, through taxes, is siphoning a great part of the wealth of our Nation out of the several States and Territories into the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is collecting taxes from nearly all sources of revenue, including taxes on individual and corporate incomes, admissions, beverages, communications, gifts, luxuries, transportation, and from excises and other taxes, leaving to the States little but real and personal property and consumer sales as sources of tax revenue; and

Whereas at rates approaching confiscation of property, States are still not able to raise revenue sufficient to carry the rising costs of State and local governments, and especially not to meet the demands for needed improvements and higher salaries for the training of our youth; and

Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government grant aid to the States for educational purpose; and

Whereas it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums out of the States and Territories and redistribute funds under bureaucratic regulation from the Federal Treasury, and

Whereas it is desirable that such aid be accomplished by a simple, easy, direct, and efficient method, not hampered with bureaucratic restrictions, directions, or distation: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate incomes under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

SEC. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an amount equal to 1 percent of the taxes from individual and corporate incomes collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

SEC. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received by said State official.

Under this plan the handling of funds through Washington and back will be eliminated; the amounts available to each State will be determined annually by individual and corporate incomes within that State. The money will remain in the several States where it was collected. The total amount to be thus collected through Federal facilities for the States each year will be automatically geared to the national income for that year. There will be no danger or possibility of Federal control or dictation, and no opportunity for channelized propaganda. It will provide many States with a larger amount than would be available under many other plans which have been proposed. There would be no need for a growing bureaucratic horde with an insatiable hunger for power ready to consume ever-increasing amounts of taxes.

For example, in fiscal 1954 the district director for internal revenue for Kansas collected in individual and corporate income taxes approximately \$407,343,360. On this basis there would have gone to the State of Kansas under this plan, for the fiscal year 1954, \$4,073,433 every cent of which would be available for use within the State.

This is not a new proposal. I first presented it in 1949—H. R. 1582—at

which time several various proposals were pending.

In the 80th Congress—1946—the Senate passed S. 472. Under that measure, the only direct aid to education bill to pass in either House of the Congress, the estimated initial contribution Kansas would have been required to make to the Federal Treasury would have been \$2,552,000. From the benefits authorized by S. 472, Kansas could have received back as aid to education a total of \$1,960,000—a net loss of \$600,000. The other proposals so far advanced would operate to take out of most States more to support the proposed program than would be returned in benefits, and on the whole would provide less in effective aid than is offered by my proposal.

Certainly under the plan I propose, the States, generally, by having this 1 percent of the individual and corporate Federal income taxes paid by its citizens withheld for use within each of the respective States for educational purposes, would be much better able to cope directly, as they deemed best, with their educational problems than they would under any program directed from a Washington bureau.

This proposal will be a step toward retaining our constitutional Republic and a move away from centralized government.

Such legislation will be in keeping with suggestions made by the then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, by keeping the control and responsibility local. He said:

When financing of schools is turned over to the Federal Government you get bureaucracy, and this is the approach to statism.

Every advocate of aid to education to whom I have talked insists he wants no Federal control, no bureaucracy. This resolution will meet that desire, for it need not add a single person to the Federal payroll and will certainly eliminate all possibility of Federal controls—even those found in most other proposals before the Congress.

From the table below based on tax collections for the fiscal year 1954—approximately—you can see the benefits for your own State. The logical appeal and the elimination of the danger of Federal bureaucratic controls under this plan would enable your State to provide more adequately and more efficiently for the needed enlargement of educational facilities and the necessary increase in salaries of teachers.

This direct use of income taxes is possible. It can be done. Precedent is established by Public Law 630 of the 81st Congress, where it is provided that all of the taxes of incomes earned by American citizens in Guam, while resident there, including stateside Americans, both civilians and military, should be turned over to the Government of Guam. Not just 1 percent, but all of the income tax collected from Americans there—and Guam is merely an unincorporated Territory.

TABLE I

	Income tax collections, fiscal year 1954 (including tax for old-age insurance)	1 percent of tax collected
Alabama.....	\$355,904,000	\$3,559,040
Arizona.....	153,119,000	1,531,190
Arkansas.....	148,110,000	1,481,100
California.....	4,671,633,000	46,716,330
Colorado.....	553,265,000	5,532,650
Connecticut.....	1,108,589,000	11,085,890
Delaware.....	869,525,000	8,695,250
Florida.....	599,990,000	5,999,900
Georgia.....	581,573,000	5,815,730
Hawaii.....	126,170,000	1,261,700
Idaho.....	100,902,000	1,009,020
Illinois.....	4,926,633,000	49,266,330
Indiana.....	1,205,079,000	12,050,790
Iowa.....	494,575,000	4,945,750
Kansas.....	437,870,000	4,378,700
Kentucky.....	441,333,000	4,413,330
Louisiana.....	459,357,000	4,593,570
Maine.....	159,030,000	1,590,300
Maryland.....	851,777,000	8,517,770
Massachusetts.....	1,708,884,000	17,088,840
Michigan.....	4,857,146,000	48,571,460
Minnesota.....	417,255,000	4,172,550
Mississippi.....	129,336,000	1,293,360
Missouri.....	1,472,722,000	14,727,220
Montana.....	109,285,000	1,092,850
Nebraska.....	320,620,000	3,206,200
Nevada.....	70,308,000	703,080
New Hampshire.....	118,150,000	1,181,500
New Jersey.....	1,745,232,000	17,452,320
New Mexico.....	99,351,000	993,510
New York.....	11,626,091,000	116,260,910
North Carolina.....	673,436,000	6,734,360
North Dakota.....	60,929,000	609,290
Ohio.....	4,147,301,000	41,473,010
Oklahoma.....	504,410,000	5,044,100
Oregon.....	403,821,000	4,038,210
Pennsylvania.....	4,531,795,000	45,317,950
Rhode Island.....	271,663,000	2,716,630
South Carolina.....	239,806,000	2,398,060
South Dakota.....	67,056,000	670,560
Tennessee.....	463,856,000	4,638,560
Texas.....	1,969,318,000	19,693,180
Utah.....	135,924,000	1,359,240
Vermont.....	70,790,000	707,900
Virginia.....	641,430,000	6,414,300
Washington.....	711,456,000	7,114,560
West Virginia.....	270,198,000	2,701,980
Wisconsin.....	1,121,973,000	11,219,730
Wyoming.....	51,761,000	517,610
Alaska.....	45,843,000	458,430
District of Columbia.....	707,455,000	7,074,550
Puerto Rico.....	(9,571,000)	(95,710)
Total.....	58,578,533,000	585,785,330

NOTE.—Because collections for old-age insurance are not shown separately in internal revenue reports, actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown here when adjustment made for that factor—an average of about 7.2 percent.

Time for Realistic Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Time for Realistic Appraisal—KNOWLAND Asks: Just What Part Is U. N. Qualified To Play in the Future of United States and the Safety of Its People?" The article was written by David Lawrence, and was published in the Washington Evening Star of February 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR REALISTIC APPRAISAL—KNOWLAND ASKS: JUST WHAT PART IS U. N. QUALIFIED TO PLAY IN THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES AND THE SAFETY OF ITS PEOPLE?

(By David Lawrence)

For some unexplained reason a rather sensational speech delivered in San Francisco last Friday afternoon by Senator KNOWLAND was not widely reported in the press.

When the Republican leader of the United States Senate issues to all candidates in the 1956 election—both for the Presidency and for Congress—a challenge to make their position clear with respect to any future reliance on the United Nations by the American people, it would seem to be news of major importance.

After reviewing the facts about the Korean war wherein the United States "supplied 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources," Senator KNOWLAND asks:

"Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

"With that example, are you prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer likewise must be in the negative. Has the time not come for a realistic appraisal of just what part the United Nations is qualified to play, and to stop kidding ourselves into believing it is something it is not, and in my judgment cannot be?"

Mr. KNOWLAND asserts that the United Nations "could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government" because its members have no common heritage, and because nations "which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience." He then says that there are those who now urge the "admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean War," and that "this, together with the other Communist states, would give that system of tyranny 800 million people that they claim to speak for." The California Senator thereupon proclaims his challenge as follows:

"As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guarantees of freedom under our Constitution to be diluted or modified directly or indirectly by any organization having nations in powerful policy positions which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions. "Lest we be gradually edged into such a world order before we learn too late wherein we have been taken, I believe that every candidate for public office, executive, legislative or judicial, should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue."

Mr. KNOWLAND thinks the United Nations could perform useful service as "a forum wherein the views of the free world and the Communist world might be aired to the benefit of the people of the world, provided that there was assurance the debates in the General Assembly or the Security Council were receiving as widespread coverage behind the Iron Curtain as they do in the free nations of the world." The Senator adds:

"Otherwise it (the United Nations) becomes a vast propaganda forum for the Communist world wherein the point of view of the West does not have the equal opportunity to get to the people of the Soviet Union and its satellites because of the strict censorship those governments exercise."

Mr. KNOWLAND reminded his audience, moreover, that "the evidence was conclusive

that the Soviet Union was not only giving moral support to Communist aggression in Korea, but was supplying MIG planes, tanks, artillery, ammunition, and other weapons in equal violation of the U. N. resolution and the charter of the organization." Despite this, as he points out, "no steps were taken to expel the Soviet Union from the United Nations."

In the same speech the Republican leader draws attention to the arrogant boast by the Soviet Union that it had helped Red China, and he recalls that the Soviet representative in the U. N. "in effect defied the U. N. to do anything about it—and they did nothing."

The California Senator stressed that "every member of the United Nations knows that the terms of the Korean armistice have been violated on numerous occasions," and he cites examples, including the imprisonment of 11 members of the American Air Force. Then comes this startling declaration:

"There is strong reason to believe that there are at least several hundred additional U. N. and United States prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the armistice."

The foregoing would seem to be news of interest to the American people. Newspapers, which must depend daily on the selection of news made by the press associations at the point of origin, may well be curious as to why they didn't get a comprehensive report on it for either Saturday morning or afternoon editions, even though the speech was available in Washington in advance of delivery in San Francisco.

Official Briefings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very significant article entitled "Official Briefings," which was written by Mr. James Reston, of the staff of the New York Times, and was published in that great newspaper on February 16, 1955.

As one who has been a journalist all of his adult life, I share Mr. Reston's concern over the failure to provide the American people with adequate information on the most important matters affecting their lives and welfare.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OFFICIAL BRIEFINGS—BACKGROUND ON THE "BACKGROUND" CONFERENCE—ITS MERITS AND PITFALLS

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 15.—The Formosa controversy has produced a rash of dope stories, that purport to disclose the elusive official lowdown without disclosing the source of the information.

Thus, the readers of this morning's newspapers were told that the United States had not promised Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek that it would defend Quemoy and Matsu, but that Washington might go to war if these islands were invaded.

Who says so? The reader is not told, but at least he is entitled to an explanation of how and why these mystifying clarifications suddenly appear on the front pages.

The truth of the matter is that the Government is faced with a dilemma. It wants to warn the Chinese Communists that an invasion of Quemoy and Matsu may mean war with the United States, but it does not want to commit itself in advance to go to war.

If Washington says officially it will defend Quemoy and Matsu, it pledges its honor and destroys its freedom of decision at the moment of attack. But if it says it will not defend Quemoy and Matsu, it encourages the Communists to attack, and at the same time lowers the morale of the Nationalists who must bear the brunt of the attack.

BACKGROUND DEVICE

The "background press conference" is the device used to avoid this dilemma. Some "unimpeachable source" or even some "well-informed circle" will give a luncheon or accept one, and explain the Government's position. But the reporters will not be permitted to quote him or even to attribute his remarks to Government sources.

This is the explanation of dispatches that undertake to inform the reader of policies that may involve war and peace, yet do not tell him the source of the information.

There is a great deal to be said for the conferences. They enable officials to inform the public of their policies, to warn the enemy, and—especially in the Formosa case—to put some of the claims of the Nationalists in better perspective. Yet there are some dangers in the system.

First, there is always the danger that the "unimpeachable source" may go "peachable" on you half way through and give you, not official policy, but his own interpretation of what it is or ought to be. After all, the reporter has to pass along the information on his own without authority and can always be repudiated.

AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY

Second, there is a danger that officials may use the background-conference device as a safe way of avoiding responsibility for public information that could be and ought to be put out officially and publicly through the open press conference or the committees of Congress.

Third, there is a danger that the reporters may be used, not as a vehicle for passing accurate information to the American people, but as an instrument of the Government's diplomacy or propaganda in the "cold war."

For example, the Government's policy on whether or not it will defend Quemoy or Matsu is left on a maybe-we-will-and-maybe-we-won't basis. This is not an accident. The Government wants it this way and for good reasons.

Nobody can foresee the conditions in which the Communists might attack. They might come at Matsu and Quemoy and simultaneously launch a million men at our thinly defended lines in Korea. In this situation, is it reasonable to suppose the 7th Fleet would be permitted to defend Quemoy and Matsu when South Korea—and therefore Japan, the main Communist objective in the Far East—was in danger?

CREATE IMPRESSION

Nevertheless, just because the Government's policy is purposely left vague, those officials and politicians who want us to defend these islands at almost any cost can give the impression that this what we are "almost certainly" going to do.

There is a tendency on Capitol Hill now being scrutinized by the Rules and Administration Committee of the Senate, to have more and more of the testimony by top officials of the Government in secret.

All the testimony on the Formosa question in congressional committees, for example, except Secretary of State Dulles' formal statement, was undisclosed. In this case it may have been justified, but in many other cases, secrecy is involved merely for personal convenience.

The most striking case is that of Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr. He was nominated for that post last August 17. The Foreign Relations Committee questioned him very briefly and secretly the following day and he was confirmed that night. He refused to see reporters before he was confirmed, and after he was confirmed, he still refused on the ground that his predecessor, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, had not yet left office.

REFUSES TO SEE PRESS

When General Smith finally left, Mr. Hoover still refused to see reporters. Although he has been Under Secretary and even Acting Secretary since then, Mr. Hoover has seen the press only once, when he agreed to join Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey in a conference limited to the recent economic conference at Rio de Janeiro.

This is convenient for Mr. Hoover. He is a sensitive man. He is afraid he will be asked to compare his views on foreign policy with his father's, a point on which nobody has much interest anyway. But the fact is that, for the first time in many years, we have an Under Secretary of State who insists on exercising authority without explaining publicly what he is doing.

Nor is he alone. Nelson Rockefeller, the new foreign affairs adviser to the President, is doing the same thing. Joseph M. Dodge, the new foreign economic policy adviser to the President, flatly refuses to discuss his job with anybody.

In short, important areas of policy are being pulled under the cloak of secrecy at the White House and even at the State Department. Ambassadorial appointees are now seldom questioned by congressional committees in the open, and the "background conference," which undoubtedly has important uses, is tending to replace open testimony.

Political Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Political Tax Cut" which was published in the Washington Daily News of yesterday, Monday, February 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POLITICAL TAX CUT

Democratic leaders in Congress are doing neither the taxpayers nor themselves any favor by proposing a new cut in income taxes at the beginning of 1956.

So long as the Government must borrow money to make up for the loss of revenue from tax cuts, the Democratic proposal is merely passing the debt buck on to taxpayers of the future.

Any tax cut which merely increases Government borrowing is a phony. In the end, the taxpayers will pay back more than they gain for the \$20 pittance the Democrats are proposing. For every \$20 the taxpayer doesn't pay next year, the Government will have to borrow another \$20, and pay interest on the borrowing.

All this taxpayers by now know well. So the proposal, concocted to lure votes to Democratic candidates, fools no one. And since it won't fool anybody, it has no political value, in the long run, to the Democrats. They simply are kidding themselves—

and at a serious risk to the financial stability of the Government and, indirectly, to the economic stability of the country.

The proposal doesn't gain in virtue, either, by the tricky way the Democrats plan to put it over.

They propose to tie it to the administration's bill for extending the present corporate income tax and a half dozen sales taxes at present rates. These taxes are due to be reduced April 1. President Eisenhower wants them extended another year, and Congress recognizes that need.

By tying the \$20 personal income tax reduction to this extension, the Democrats figure they can force the President to withhold his veto—since the extension means some \$3 billion in revenues for the debt-ridden Government.

The scheme is strictly political—and not very clever politics at that.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement:

STATEMENT OF D. G. ROGERS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ANILINE DIVISION, ALLIED CHEMICAL & DYE CORP., BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON H. R. 1, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1955

My name is D. G. Rogers. I am president of National Aniline Division, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp. Allied was formed in 1920 because our experience in the First World War proved the folly of relying upon foreign sources of supply for many vital chemicals. It was nurtured and grew because a wise tariff policy adopted in 1922 equalized the great disparity between costs of production at home and abroad and enabled domestic chemical manufacturers to expand along with the rest of domestic industry.

Allied is both a pioneer and one of the largest domestic producers of intermediates. It has the know-how and enjoys whatever advantages accrue from large-scale production and integrated operations. Its predecessors, now its operating divisions, developed and operated the first coal-tar still in the United States in 1854, constructed the first byproduct coke ovens in the United States in 1892, and produced the first coal-tar intermediate ever made in the United States (aniline) in 1914. Allied has long been recognized as one of the leaders in the fractional distillation of coal-tar products, in the recovery of the valuable constituents of coal for use in making intermediates, and in the production of intermediates and thousands of organic end products.

During World War II, the company was able to fulfill the goal of its founders by responding to all the demands made upon it by the war production program. In addition to its all-out production of industrial war materials, intermediates, and dyestuffs for military uses, the company developed and produced highly essential military products and successfully completed a number of important research projects for various agencies of the Government, including the Ordnance Department, the Army Medical Corps, Chemical Warfare Service, Rubber Reserve Corporation, Army Surgeon General's Office, War Production Board, Office of Scientific Research and Development, and

Maritime Commission. These things the company was ready, willing, and able to do because it had an ample reservoir of skilled labor, technologists, and management actively working at their specialties.

Today, Allied makes over 3,000 different chemical products in 26 States. But I am going to direct my testimony primarily to the organic chemical field, with which I have been associated for over 39 years. National Aniline Division is a producer of over 2,000 distinct chemical compounds. It has plants in Buffalo, N. Y., Hopewell, Va., and Moundsville, W. Va., and employs over 2,500 employees.

We support the views expressed here by the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, both for ourselves and for our fellow members in that association. We hope to help you understand the nature of the organic chemical industry's problem in relation to foreign competition and the reasons for its position on H. R. 1.

Our industry produces over 7,000 finished organic chemicals in commercial quantities. Amazingly, these all stem from a handful of crude organic chemicals which are the starting point of our manufacturing process. These crude materials, chiefly benzene, toluene and naphthalene, each duty-free, are used for their carbon content, the one common ingredient of all organic chemicals. By complicated processing steps, these crudes are combined with still other elements, such as oxygen, nitrogen, chlorine, or sulfur to make new and more complex compounds. Such compounds, known as intermediates, become in turn the starting materials or stepping stones to hundreds of other intermediates and ultimately to thousands of finished products, such as dyes, medicinals, pharmaceuticals, explosives, synthetic rubbers, plastics, resin materials, agricultural chemicals, detergents, flavor and perfume materials, and miscellaneous chemicals.

As you might imagine from the great variety of chemicals referred to, our operations quickly cease to bear any resemblance to mass-production methods. Most of our chemicals are made in relatively small quantities. Each finished chemical may require the prior and successive production of as many as 20 intermediates in its production. All but the few primary intermediates are made by batch processing. Each is produced in a series of processing steps in which the physical influences of heat, pressure and mixing are combined with the chemical reaction of oxidation, reduction, chlorination, hydrolysis, halogenation, caustic fusion, alkylation, carboxylation, nitration, sulfonation, condensation, liming, diazotizing and coupling. Close attention and expert manipulation by highly trained chemists, engineers, and skilled workmen are required. The processing involved in producing a particular finished chemical may take weeks or even months, and a final product may weigh as little as one-eightieth as much as the materials used in making it.

The synthesis of organic compounds inevitably yields isomers, coproducts and byproducts, in addition to the specific intermediate or finished chemical under production. It is therefore necessary for the organic chemical producer to give very careful consideration to the chemical he wishes to include in his product line. Unless the producer has a market or a use for each, his entire operation may prove uneconomical. For the most part, the 1,200 odd intermediates made commercially in this country are produced by dyestuff manufacturers in the course of making more than 2,000 dyes, colors and pigments which are needed by the textile, food, printing, and paint industries and the medical profession. For example, our own company makes more than 700 different dyes, each a distinct compound. We produce over 300 intermediates required in their

production—and, from them and their byproducts, co-products and isomers, make several hundred other products. Our dye manufacturing operations would be uneconomical if we were unable to sell or use all of them.

Because of the interdependence of the entire product line, foreign competition in respect of one of our products impinges not only on that product but on all related products as well. Of equal importance, if tariff reduction on finished products makes it uneconomical for a domestic producer using our intermediates to continue in their production, the effect would be felt in our entire product line.

The branching structure of the organic chemical industry, and the reciprocal relationship which nourishes it, is like that of a tree. The coal-tar crudes represent the roots, the simpler intermediates the trunk; the more complex intermediates, the main branches; the finished chemicals, the smaller branches and twigs; and the textiles, medicines, plastic products, etc., which consume our finished products, the leaves. Such an organic entity with all its parts interrelated is essentially inseparable; no part can be disturbed without affecting in some degree all other parts. Injury to the roots, trunk, or branches, or defoliation damage will damage the whole.

The manifold operations involved in civilian manufacture are, with slight variations, indispensable to national defense and the public welfare. The quick convertibility, abroad as well as at home, of the industry's plants, equipment, and technologies from the production of peacetime dyes and intermediates to those required in wartime, for drugs, explosives, synthetic rubber, etc., has been the major reason for the tariff protection (or other protective measures) provided for the industry by every major industrial nation in the world. Each has recognized the vital importance of fostering such an industry in the interest of its own national defense.

As a result of expansion to meet defense mobilization goals and other factors, overall capacity of the industry is today far in excess of present needs. As a result of this excess capacity and increased import competition, domestic producers have reported many plants have been operating as low as 50 to 70 percent of capacity and prices have been depressed. From August of 1953 to August of 1954, our industry experienced a decline in employment from 229,000 to 201,000 production workers. This loss of 28,000 workers represented a 12-percent reduction, exceeding the decline in the same period of all manufacturing (11.5 percent), the non-durable goods industries (6.2 percent), and the larger chemicals and allied products group (6.4 percent).

Today, substantial areas of our business are essentially at the crossroads. Many of our production facilities are old and will need substantial replacements in the next few years. Yet by any normal standard substantial segments of this business cannot be considered profitable, even under present tariff rates. The present outlook offers little inducement for management to invest additional large sums of money in plants and equipment, or for prospective employees to spend years in educational or training programs for work in this field.

Without adequate tariff protection our industry cannot successfully compete with the foreign producers. The batch processing methods required in our industry give our products a high labor content. These are the same methods which are used in the great chemical producing nations abroad. Average wages paid to chemical production workers abroad range from 26 to 52 cents an hour depending on the country, compared with an average of \$1.90 for employees in our industry.

The foreign chemical industry has more than recovered its prewar strength—in some instances production has doubled. The chemical industry in the United Kingdom, for example, is the strongest and most vigorous of British industries, having increased its production over 50 percent between 1948 and 1953.¹ West Germany has done even better. During 1953 it boosted its production of chemicals to 182 percent of its prewar output, and in 1954 it reached 215 percent. In 1953 West Germany increased her chemical exports by 31 percent, despite intense competition with the British. According to the OEEC's December 1954 report on economic conditions in Germany, expansion of production in the chemical industry is still proceeding rapidly (through the first 8 months of 1954).

The OEEC's November 1954 study of economic conditions in Italy reports that the greatest proportionate increase in chemical production of any of its member countries since 1950 occurred in Italy, with a 57 percent increase. This increase also exceeded the rate of increase in total industrial production in Italy.²

In France there has been a steady rise in production in the chemical industry since the war (except for 1952). Based on 1950 as 100 the index of production of the French chemical industry rose to 128 by January 1954, compared with 121 for all industrial production. The French have also developed a new organic chemical industry based on petrochemicals, and new plants have commenced operations in plastics production. The French dyestuffs industry is carrying out a large-scale mobilization program.

Between 1951 and 1953, the OEEC countries turned a deficit of 14 percent in chemical trade, with the so-called dollar area, into a surplus of 28 percent.

The ability of the foreign organic chemical industry to compete in the United States at existing tariff levels is shown by the steady increase of the value of United States imports postwar, from \$9 million in 1947 to nearly \$51 million in 1953 (table I).

The competitive advantage of foreign intermediates and dyes is illustrated by actual prices pertaining to recent transactions between foreign countries which have come to our attention. Of 52 intermediates and dyes for which actual prices were obtained, selling prices on 21 products was so low that their landed-cost duty paid in the United States would be below the domestic prices on comparable United States products. (See table II.)

The competitive impact of imported dyes at the present duty level is further illustrated by four military vat dyes, Golden Orange RRT, Brown AR, Brown AG, and Khaki 2G. The accompanying chart (following the tables) shows the scheme of chemical synthesis involved in and the many products entering into the batch production of these colors. Imports of these four military dyes increased from 263,000 pounds in 1952 to 531,000 pounds in 1953, over 100 percent. Domestic sales of these four dyes declined nearly 100 percent in the same period. (See table III.) Imports of vat dyes as a class

increased from 500,000 in 1952 to 1.2 million pounds in 1953—a 120 percent increase. This large line of vat dye imports is impairing the industry's capacity required for the production of defense colors in the event of mobilization.

The important position of anthraquinone (an intermediate) in the synthesis of the military dyes is also shown in the accompanying chart. The anthraquinone vat dye capacity prior to January 1951 was 37 million pounds per year. Under the mobilization program, this was expanded to 48 million pounds. Sales of domestic anthraquinone vat dyes in 1953 amounted to only 32.5 million pounds, leaving an indicated idle capacity of 15.5 million pounds. The sales trend for vat dyes was off somewhat in 1954, so that we estimate 1954 sales of anthraquinone vat dyes to be about 23 million pounds. On this basis, indicated idle capacity in 1954 was about 25 million pounds or 52 percent of the industrial capacity projected in new defense requirements.

It is, of course, obvious that imports are not responsible entirely, or even in major part, for this measure of idle capacity. Under existing policies of the Government, however, it is desired to keep mobilization capacity in readiness for instant use in the event of a full emergency. As the Joint Committee on Defense Production recently said:

"Adding new capacity (for mobilization) can be futile . . . unless the mobilization base, built at great cost, is maintained in the maximum possible state of readiness."

Idle chemical plant capacity does not remain in existence for long. It must be kept in use, or it rusts or will be diverted to other uses. National defense interests strongly suggest that imports should slacken off until domestic production at least reaches total mobilization needs.

As the committee knows, there is no existing procedure under which action can be taken to protect our mobilization base from idleness resulting in whole or in part from import injury. With any further extension of the trade agreement authority, there should be a suitable provision such as has been recommended by SOCMA to require that tariff policy be measured by proper Government agencies against our overriding national defense policy of maintaining total capacity in a state of readiness to meet a full mobilization emergency.

As I explained to you, import displacement of finished chemicals feeds back to displace intermediates used in making them. In the example of the four-vat defense chemicals, anthraquinone would be affected, and so it has been. One domestic producer has stated that mobilization capacity added by it during the Korean emergency in the amount of 792,000 pounds is now standing idle. In addition, imports of anthraquinone, under the existing duty, reached 730,000 pounds in 1953. This represented a 40-percent increase over 1952's imports of 511,949 pounds.

It took special tariff treatment to bring our industry into existence and foster its expansion. The Nation has been repaid many times over by the great contribution which the industry makes to the strength of the domestic economy, to better living through the products of our unparalleled research activities, and to the fiber and sinew it puts into our Nation's industrial might for defense. In nearly every State of the Union organic chemical plants and laboratories offer inspiration and opportunity for students who are attracted to the professions of chemistry and engineering. The race for technical manpower is in many ways as vital as that for industrial might itself, and our industry through its steady growth in professional and scientific opportunities makes a rich contribution to our national resources in scientific personnel.

Whatever course foreign economic policy is to take, it should be deeply concerned with maintaining a vital, dynamic, basic industry such as ours. America will lose far more than the payrolls of our plants, the taxes of our establishments, and the steady impetus we have been giving to our gross national product, if we allow the enthusiasm in certain quarters for leadership in lowering tariffs to sap the vitality of the synthetic organic chemical industry. We urge you to reexamine existing procedures; the protection they provide is too little and too late. The dynamic quality of our industry should be recognized and preserved for its present and potential contributions to our general welfare.

TABLE 1.—United States imports of synthetic organic chemicals
[Value in dollars]

1947	9,340,467
1948	18,239,890
1949	18,012,534
1950	32,414,471
1951	38,982,327
1952	44,518,387
1953	50,600,696

Source: Data for 1947-52, Trade, Strength, and Security, SOCMA, N. Y., 1953, p. 157; data for 1953, Bureau of Census, Foreign Trade Rept. No. 9011, August 1954.

TABLE 2

Product	Foreign port	C.I.T. New York	United States price	Price differential	Duty
Intermediates					
1	Bombay/Rotterdam	\$0.66c	\$0.90	\$0.207	\$0.26
2	do	.677	.82	.143	.24
3	do	.719	.94	.221	.27
4	do	.323	.39	.067	.133
5	do	.679	1.43	.751	.393
6	do	.934	1.50	.566	.410
7	do	.734	1.00	.266	.285
8	do	.481	.730	.249	.218
9	do	.918	1.20	.282	.335
10	do	1.738	3.21	1.472	.838
11	do	.192	.20	.008	.075
12	do	.232	.345	.113	.121
13	do	.183	.220	.037	.000
Dyes					
14	Mexico	\$0.69	\$0.93	\$0.24	\$0.372
15	do	.85	1.78	.93	.712
16	do	1.62	2.296	.676	.918
17	do	1.395	2.296	.901	.918
18	do	.75	.89	.14	.356
19	do	.83	1.45	.62	.78
20	do	1.29	1.58	.29	.632
21	do	2.12	3.85	1.73	1.54
22	do	.667	1.03	.423	.412
23	do	.74	1.09	.35	.496
24	do	1.09	1.22	.13	.488
25	do	.786	1.415	.629	.560
26	do	7.33	8.78	1.45	3.512
27	do	9.02	9.61	.59	3.844
28	do	6.09	7.62	1.53	3.048
29	do	6.81	8.93	2.12	3.572
30	do	10.31	10.62	0.31	6.648
31	India	2.34	3.60	1.26	1.44
32	do	.69	2.15	1.46	.86
33	do	1.64	4.98	3.04	1.872
34	do	.80	1.14	.34	.456
35	do	.99	1.89	.90	.750
36	do	1.23	2.10	.87	.84
37	do	1.33	1.71	.38	.684
38	do	.48	.85	.37	.34
39	do	2.01	3.91	1.90	1.864
40	do	2.90	3.91	1.01	1.564
41	do	.93	1.18	.25	.472
42	do	1.61	3.09	1.48	1.236
43	do	.14	2.04	.90	.816
44	do	1.40	3.12	1.72	1.248
45	do	.67	.94	.27	.376
46	do	.52	.80	.28	.32
47	do	1.72	2.05	.33	.82
48	do	.56	.86	.30	.356
49	do	1.58	3.16	1.58	1.24
50	do	.38	.50	.12	.20
51	do	1.92	2.28	.36	.612
52	do	1.56	1.81	.25	.724

NOTE.—To protect the source of these data, product names have been omitted. If the committee desires this information we shall be happy to submit it in conference.

¹With 1948 as 100, the British chemical industry increased its production by 1953 to an index of 151, with the next closest industry, motor vehicles, at 138. The average for all British industry was 121. The British chemical industry was little harmed in the war, and the 1950 production was at least six times that of 1935. Nearly \$2,500,000,000 has been budgeted by the British industry for expansion since 1948.

²The report refers to Italy's "striking advances in the chemical industry due to petroleum refining and petrochemicals, fertilizers, explosives and synthetic fibres."

TABLE 3

Defense color	Imports (computed weight)		Sales		Percent imports to domestic sales 1953
	1952	1953	1952	1953	
	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Percent
Khaki 2G.....	204,478	272,090	3,427,000	2,620,000	10
Brown AG.....	250	155,192	591,000	780,000	19
Brown AR.....	44,726	83,390	1,162,000	686,000	12
Golden orange RRT.....	13,660	20,809	3,427,000	405,000	5
Total.....	263,114	531,391	8,607,000	4,506,000	

Source: Import data, U. S. Tariff Commission, Imports of Coal-Tar Products 1952, 1953; domestic sales data, U. S. Tariff Commission, Rept. No. 174 (2d series) and No. 190 (3d series).

The Democrats Rescue Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks an interesting and objectively written article by Roscoe Drummond entitled "The Democrats Rescue Eisenhower," appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of February 21, 1955.

The article follows:

THE DEMOCRATS RESCUE EISENHOWER
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—On the most important piece of domestic legislation this year, the Democrats in the 84th Congress are today redeeming, to the brim and overflowing, their unorthodox campaign argument of last fall. The Democratic campaign appeal was: "Elect us and the President's program will be better off."

The Republican campaign appeal was: "If you want to support President Eisenhower, elect a Republican Congress."

As the result of the breathlessly close votes in the House of Representatives last week on the trade bill and Democratic Speaker SAM RAYBURN's powerful intervention in its behalf, the record now shows:

That the Democrats are making good on their pledge.

That the Republicans are making bad on theirs.

These contrasting facts are, I think, essential to appreciate the full scale of Democratic support of the White House on a measure which the President considers the very heart and core of his domestic program:

Four out of five votes against the trade bill in committee were Republican.

The Democrats voted 14 to 1 in committee in favor of the trade bill.

The initiative, the leadership, and the steam, which at times in the House came within one vote of defeating the President's measure, came from Republicans led by Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York.

The initiative, the leadership, and most of the strategy essential to the President's success came from the Democrats, led by Speaker RAYBURN. Mr. RAYBURN, whose rare intervention in House debate is influential, took the floor personally to rally the Democrats more strongly behind the President. Single-handedly he rescued the bill from a Republican motion which at one time would have opened the way to a series of crippling amendments. The ultimate outcome was still uncertain, so the next morning Mr. RAYBURN entertained at breakfast some 20 freshman Democratic Congressmen and let them know that if they went along with the Demo-

cratic leadership, which was backing the President, they would likely get along better themselves.

This wasn't pro forma Democratic support of the White House. This was active, decisive Democratic support of the White House.

Mr. Eisenhower's willing ally was Republican leader, JOSEPH MARTIN. Mr. Eisenhower's effective ally was Democratic leader, SAM RAYBURN.

The House Republicans voted preponderantly against the President's position. The House Democrats voted preponderantly for the President's position.

On the 2 really critical test votes—1 on whether the measure could be riddled with amendments from the floor and the other on a DAN REED proposal which could bring about increased, not decreased, tariffs—the Republicans voted 106 to 62 against the President and 119 to 66 against the President.

If you add up the 4 principal votes taken on the bill during the 2 days of House action, you find that the Democrats provided 570 votes for the President, while the Republicans provided only 302 votes for the President.

On the trade bill it seems clear that if more Republicans had been elected to Congress last fall there would have been more votes cast against the President; that on this issue a higher percentage of Republican membership in the House would mean greater opposition to the President.

Can this Republican revolt against the President be written off as a passing political development or is it an ominous, deep division which the voters will weigh when it comes to deciding whom to elect in 1956? Mr. Eisenhower can hardly fail to feel or to admit that he has been grievously let down by his party. This trade bill wasn't just another piece of legislation. The President deemed it a cornerstone of administration policy and declared that "if we fail in our trade policy we may fail in all."

Thus far this cornerstone of administration policy has been kept in place only because of the Democratic leadership and the Democratic Members of the Congress.

Golden Anniversary of the United States Forestry Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1955, the American Forestry Association sponsored a dinner in honor of the golden anniversary of the United

States Forest Service created February 1, 1905, when the Bureau of Forestry and the Forest Division of the General Land Office were merged under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture.

It was fitting that Mr. True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, should be one of the principal speakers of the evening. His speech follows:

FOREST SERVICE FOR 50 YEARS

(By True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture and President, Commodity Credit Corporation)

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has asked that I express his regret that he is not able to join in this golden anniversary dinner—commemorating the completion of 50 years by the United States Forest Service. He has constantly stressed the importance of forestry and conservation and recognizes the great works of the Forest Service. On various occasions he has made such statements as:

"Let us not forget that forestry is inseparable from agriculture. . . ."

"The soil, water, range, and forest resources of the United States are the natural foundation of our national economy. . . ."

"Adequate natural resources are indispensable to our security and welfare. . . ."

"Forests are composed of plants, and trees are a renewable crop. . . ."

"As basic policy, we want to continue the sound development of the national forests; . . . and we want to aid and encourage and cooperate in the development of State and private forestry. . . ."

"I am proud of the national forests and the many services they provide the American people."

"Under our administration the national forests will be carefully managed."

The entire United States Department of Agriculture joins with me in saluting the Forest Service as it rounds out 50 years of splendid service. We are proud of our Forest Service and its great accomplishments over half a century.

It has a reputation for integrity and square-dealing—through 50 years.

It has a reputation of getting work done—no matter how tough the job.

Its people have a strong devotion to public service.

The word "Service" is in the name—Forest Service. As we look back over the 50-year record at this golden anniversary—we can say it has been golden service.

The annual cut of timber under sustained yield management from the national forests has increased from about 2 million board feet in 1905—to more than 5 billion. Now it is not 2 million, but 5,000 million board-feet.

National forest receipts have increased from about \$73,000 in 1905 to as many million dollars today.

Watersheds are being protected. This will become increasingly important as man becomes more and more dependent on full use of water resources.

The forests have provided grazing and forage for a sizable part of the Nation's meat supply. The wise use for this purpose is a major asset.

This golden service can be measured in human values, too. Until 1912 Forest Service reports didn't even mention recreational use. In that year there were less than 1.5 million recreational visits to the national forests. Now there are 40 million visits a year.

There is more than an acre apiece of the national forests for every man, woman, and child in the United States. One of the national forests, and oftentimes several, can be reached from practically any locality in the Nation within a few hours, or, at most, a day's driving time. "The groves were God's first temples." There are human values in

our forests and timber lands as they invite more and more people for picnicking, camping, fishing, hunting, hiking, and motoring.

Through 50 years the Forest Service has helped inspire great advances in the work of the State forestry departments, in industrial and other private forestry enterprises, and in forestry research and education.

Through 50 years our Forest Service has built a foundation for even greater achievements for the future.

The national forests must be protected and much further developed.

Timber harvest is not yet up to allowable sustained-yield standards.

Facilities and services must be provided for the ever-increasing millions of recreational visitors.

Discovery and development of needed minerals must be encouraged. But there is concern over a situation where only 2 percent of an estimated 84,000 mining claims in the national forests are actually being commercially mined.

Multiple use of the national forests is essential to realize their full value.

President Eisenhower has said the Nation must adhere to the fundamental policy: "To develop, wisely use, and to conserve basic resources from generation to generation."

Further, he says, a main purpose of our Federal Government is "to keep our economy vigorous and expanding, thus sustaining our international strength and assuring better jobs, better living, better opportunities for every citizen. . . ."

"The wise course for Government in 1955 is to direct its program principally toward fostering long-term economic activity."

Forestry must be a sustained long-term development.

Our vast forests and timberlands have helped make the United States a great Nation. They will continue to help shape our destiny.

Such is the challenge to the Forest Service on its golden anniversary—as we together build through the years a stronger America.

Economic Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the Record the lead editorial of the Washington Post and Times Herald which appeared on Saturday, February 19, 1955.

It was most hardening to me that it did not escape the notice of the editorial press of the significance of the struggle that took place on this floor last week during the consideration of the reciprocal trade bill. I think it will that my able colleagues in the future consider seriously that the American public will no longer tolerate from their representatives delimited views that in the long run work to harm the best interests of our Nation.

The important thing is that this most needed legislation is passed, but the manner of its passage, I am sure, did not escape the attention of those people whose welfare depended greatly upon the liberalization of our trade laws. In our crucial struggle with world commu-

nism I am convinced that provincialism will reward us with disaster.

It is my sincere hope that the future finds us exerting our role of world leadership with a greater stature than was demonstrated here last week.

The article follows:

ECONOMIC ISOLATIONISM

The almost successful revolt of the House against the President's reciprocal trade program is deeply ironical. Mr. Eisenhower had pointedly asked Congress to give him authority to lower tariff rates moderately in agreements with other countries as a means of strengthening the free world and thus enhancing our security against Communist aggression. Yesterday he reiterated that plea in a letter to Minority Leader MARTIN. The underlying issue before the House was, therefore, the economic health of the free world. Yet 192 members (only two short of a majority) of that body on Thursday voted against a rule that was necessary to passage of the bill without destroying amendments. Again yesterday the bill escaped mutilation by a margin of only seven votes before it was passed. This near upset is a shock that the country ought to contemplate with the utmost seriousness.

To place this action in perspective one has to remember that only 3 weeks ago Congress was debating the President's resolution on the defense of Formosa. In effect, the President had asked that Congress rest the issue of war or peace in Formosa Strait with him. The House approved by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by 85 to 3. Yet when the President asked continuation of a trade program to underwrite free-world solidarity in the interests of peace, more than half the House went against him on the first vote, including a large majority of the Members representing his own party. Only after Democratic Speaker RAYBURN pleaded with the House did it give the Ways and Means Committee rule for consideration of the trade bill a one-vote margin.

This is a deplorable state of affairs because it indicates that a large number of Congressmen are letting their judgments be warped by little facts. Many members were concerned about unemployment in their districts. Others seemed to be chiefly interested in preserving special privileges for some industry. Still others revolted against what they described as a "gag" rule. What they lost to sight was the larger vision of the national welfare in an age when international commerce is a vital part of our defense system.

Speaker RAYBURN had the proper answer to the legislators who were thinking about local interests in their home districts. Said he:

"Everybody want labor employed at good hours, at reasonable wages; but suppose we do not trade with the rest of the world. . . . We are no longer a debtor Nation; we are the great creditor Nation of the world. We are no longer a small producing Nation; we are the greatest surplus-producing Nation upon the face of the earth, and we have got to have it so that we can trade freely with the rest of the world, or our factories will close and more thousands upon thousands of laboring men will be turned out of their jobs just because we refused to trade goods for goods with them."

In our diplomatic relations with other countries we have thrown off the shackles of isolationism because a vast majority of the people are convinced that our national interests can be protected in no other way. Having made that decision, we cannot rationally undercut it by slipping back into economic isolationism. This is the basic consideration underlying the reciprocal trade bill, and it should have been in the mind of every legislator as he cast his vote. As matters stand,

it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that about half the Members of the House are willing to trust the President with the lives of their constituents but not with power to make minor adjustments in trade barriers.

Bankers' Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent previously obtained to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial entitled "Bankers' Bill," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Tuesday, February 22, 1955:

BANKERS' BILL

The President's proposal for emergency school construction seems to have found pretty nearly universal disfavor among education experts and State school officials. Such unpopularity can hardly be altogether undeserved. The overwhelming view appears to be that the plan would provide too little help, would provide it much too late, and would hedge it about with crippling restrictions and controls.

President Eisenhower's preference for an emergency-aid measure which would lend Federal money to State public school systems instead of giving it to them directly is based on two expressed considerations: (1) That education is a local responsibility which should not be lifted from local shoulders; (2) that control of the public schools ought to be retained resolutely in local hands. These are, of course, valid considerations, and no program which ignored them would be consonant with the American system.

But so far as the first consideration is concerned, local school districts have already strained their capacities and would be required to strain them still further to meet the requirements of a direct Federal grant-in-aid program such as the bipartisan bill sponsored by Senators HUMPHREY and IVES and by Representatives BAILEY and KEARNS. Many of them have already reached the limits of their local revenue-raising ability as well as the limits of their capacity to borrow under restrictions imposed by State constitutions. The bipartisan proposal, which would require matching contributions by the States, would entail no sloughing off of local responsibility; it would make local efforts more effective by providing Federal aid to meet an emergency which has the gravest national implications and which the school districts cannot meet solely out of their own resources. As for the second consideration, it seems to us self-evident that there would be less danger of Federal control in an outright grant than in a loan which would keep the school districts long in debt to the Federal Government.

Behind the President's plan there appears to be a third unspoken consideration—to avoid a major addition to the Federal budget. This is thinly disguised by the argument that it is somehow nobler for the States "to help themselves," as Senator SMITH, sponsor of the President's plan, put it, than to "wait for a Federal handout." Senator McNAMARA punctured this argument. "There is no great stigma," he said, "in the taxpayers receiving their own money from the Government to build schools." One way or another, the cost of school construction must come out of tax

revenue and ultimately out of the same taxpayer pockets. The Smith bill aims to do it clumsily and by indirection. Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, was quite right in calling it "a bankers' bill." The bipartisan bill's more direct, candid, and generous approach will meet the school emergency far more effectively and speedily.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the Record the following statement:

STATEMENT OF ERNEST M. MAY, PRESIDENT,
OTTO B. MAY, INC., BEFORE THE HOUSE
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, ON H. R. 1

I am Ernest M. May, president of Otto B. May, Inc., dyestuff manufacturers of 52 Amsterdam Street, Newark, N. J. My family has been operating a dyestuff business at this location since 1919 when my father first started to manufacture coal-tar colors in response to the great demand after World War I. When he started he had a small factory of 5,000 square feet and employed approximately five persons. We now have approximately 100,000 square feet of space and employ 100 people. At the present time we are manufacturing dyestuffs for the textile industry.

I am completely in accord with the views expressed here today by the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of which we are a member. More than half the members of SOCMA are small companies such as ours whose total annual payroll is less than half a million dollars.

Because of the nature of the production of organic chemicals, our industry is one in which there are unusual opportunities for small companies to exist and to prosper side by side with the giants of the industry. The larger companies produce many chemical by-products which they must find commercial outlets for in this country. A smaller company such as mine is well situated to secure a dependable supply of the chemicals which it needs in its production operations. Our existence and profitable operations are essential to the health of the industry as a whole. We are as important to the large companies as consumers of their byproducts as they are to us as dependable sources of raw materials in the competitive economy.

My company's specialty is a rather small line of dyes and color bases. We buy the basic intermediates from other companies in the industry and from them we make the more advanced intermediates which are required in the production of the dyes and color bases which make up our finished product line.

Since the smaller companies such as ours tend to concentrate on the production of those specialized or fine organic chemicals which are in relatively small demand on a nationwide basis, it doesn't take a very large volume of imports to interfere seriously with our operations. For example, we make 13 intermediates. Ten of these were imported in significant quantities in 1953. With only two exceptions, the volume of imports in 1953 was considerably greater than in 1952. This indicates to us that at

present tariff levels we can expect an increasing trend in imports of the intermediates which we produce. While these imports have not created any critical situation for us thus far, you can understand that with a small operation such as ours we feel some concern about a program of further tariff reduction under these circumstances.

There were significant imports in 19 of the 22 dyes in our product line in 1953. On 12 of these the volume of imports in 1953 exceeded those in 1952. Again the conclusion which I draw from these data is that at present duty levels there is ample opportunity for an expansion in imports of dyes competitive with those which we manufacture. Table 1 sets forth the identity of our intermediate and dye products which are affected by these imports together with the data on the volume of imports in 1952 and 1953.

Without laboring the point, I wish to call your attention to the fact that our plant is operated with equipment and technology basically similar to that used in the manufacture of a great variety of synthetic organic chemicals. Our firm during World War II produced dyes for uniforms, and again in the Korean emergency we converted our facilities to making entirely different dyes which were required at this time. This we did without coming to Washington for certificates of necessity since this would have delayed our program by months and we wished to be in production as soon as possible. These efforts of ours and other companies were responsible for the production of a rather great variety of urgently needed chemicals, including sulfa drugs and nerve gas components. The significance of the figures in table 1 is that they reflect imports of products which have come into the United States at landed, duty paid, delivered prices below the prices we must maintain to insure our staying in business.

I would like to cite the instance of another firm of approximately our own size which manufactures intermediates for the pigment and dye industry. This firm is a resourceful one like ours and when the emergency in World War II came, quickly converted from making these intermediates to the manufacture of napalm. As a matter of fact, it was 1 of the 3 firms in this country chosen to manufacture napalm and it manufactured 10 percent of the entire United States output. When the Korean emergency came, it again was pressed into service at the time when the Chinese crossed the Yalu River and we had to destroy our supplies. Large-scale production facilities in the United States were behind schedule and again this firm came through to produce much-needed napalm which was so urgently needed that it was flown to Korea. In 1951, the duties on the principal product which this firm manufactures were cut in half, from 40 percent to 20 percent, plus 3½ cents per pound. As a result of this cut, this firm is now manufacturing this intermediate with no profit. The price has dropped from \$1.46 per pound to \$1.18 per pound, and material of Italian origin is offered delivered, duty paid, in New York at \$1.05 per pound, which is below his cost of manufacture.

Because of our size we are vulnerable to shifts in Government policy which affects business operations. As the president of our company, I took particular comfort in the statement contained in President Eisenhower's economic report to the Congress just a week ago. In it he stated:

"The need of our times is for economic policies that, in the first place, recognize the proven sources of sustained economic growth and betterment, and in the second place, respect the need of people for a sense of security as well as opportunity in our complex, industrialized society."

There should be no doubt in your minds that the chemical industry is a proven source of sustained economic growth. You would

also agree, I am sure, that our industry plays a rather big role in providing opportunities to our young people for professional careers as chemists and engineers in our complex industrial society.

I would also like to point out respectfully to the committee that only in the United States is the climate such that small chemical firms can find a place in the sun. In every other principal manufacturing nation in the world the great bulk of chemical manufacturing is done by 1 or 2—at the most, 3—firms. Now the position of our firm today, competitively speaking, versus foreign imports is that the tariff protection which we enjoy at this moment enables us to compete. Should the envisaged tariff reduction program go through, we feel that we would be injured and, indeed, would finally be driven out of business because, gentlemen, there is no way in the world that we can compete with 50 cents an hour labor and \$2,500 a year doctors of philosophy, which is what the current scale in Europe is. We cannot do as some of our giant brothers do—set research programs in Belgium and other countries and actually set up manufacturing subsidiaries abroad as a hedge so that in case Congress and the President slash our tariffs to the bone, they will have foreign facilities and will be able to import chemicals into this country. We will simply have to shut our doors because we will be unable to compete. We do not have the power to set up our manufacturing facilities abroad, particularly since we do not believe the large cartelized firms which dominate the chemical manufacturing scene in Europe would ever allow us to have the chemicals which would be necessary to allow us to engage in competition with them.

We hear much about the need for further tariff reduction as a means of making our foreign friends feel more secure about their opportunities in the United States market. I have been unable to understand why the same concern is not felt for the need for American businessmen to receive some sense of security in anticipation of stable policies which affect their operations. We have the right, it seems to me, to expect the kind of security from stable policies which many are so anxious to extend to our foreign competitors. In this industry we are not advocating rolling back the tariff to pretrade agreement levels. We are calling attention to steadily increasing imports at present tariff levels and we are asking that you not authorize the Executive to embark on a new program of tariff cutting without insisting upon the adherence to dependable procedures which preserve the splendid vigor of our industry with its great importance to both our national security and the national welfare.

In this connection, a problem of particular importance to small producers such as our company is that the present escape-clause and peril-point procedure are keyed solely to the concept of serious injury to a domestic industry. A lot of producers such as my company could be seriously hurt before an industry as large as ours could be said to be seriously injured itself. Yet we have the right, it seems to me, to expect the Government's trade program to be carried out in such a way that our operations are not seriously injured. For this reason I believe that these trade-agreement procedures should be amended to make them apply whenever there is serious injury suffered or threatened by domestic producers or segments of an industry. We should not wait until the industry itself is seriously injured before making adjustments in our trade concessions.

Obviously I am not an expert on foreign-trade economics. Not many people are. As a businessman I have some definite views on what the foreign-trade policy of our country should be if we are going to adhere at all to the concept that our Government is obliged to work for the general welfare and not

merely the welfare of a particular group, such as export industries.

It seems to me that an important factor has been overlooked in most discussions of our tariff policy. Experience shows that with a 1-percent increase in our gross national product, the physical volume of finished manufactured imports increases by 1 percent. Many groups predict a doubling of our gross national product by 1975 compared with 1950. If this occurs as past trends seem to indicate, our imports of finished manufactures will double without any adjustment of the tariff while imports of raw materials increase in only a slightly smaller degree.

One needs only to glance at the text and tables in the President's economic report of a week ago to note that most of the countries of the free world continued to improve their financial position in 1954 for the third year in a row. Most of the countries of Western Europe experienced a decided improvement in the balance of payments situation last year, and the gold and dollar reserves of the free world continued their upward climb. Rather significantly, the industrial nations of Western Europe did not experience a recession during 1953-54 as we did here in the United States.

I think it a strange policy which fails to take account of the de facto strength and vigor of the economics of Western Europe, for example, in the consideration of any real need for further tariff reduction. If you are convinced that further gestures are needed to encourage our strong and prosperous allies, you should at least give equal deference to our home producers as you feel impelled to give the producers of other nations. If you would offer them encouragement, you should at a minimum offer equal encouragement to the producers in this country. Reduce tariffs further if you must, but require that the items subject to reduction be carefully selected so as to avoid injury to companies like mine who are doing their part in supporting the expanding economy of the locality and State and Nation.

Thank you for letting a small-business man present his views on the important topic which you have before you.

TABLE 1.—Imports of organic chemicals competitive with those produced by Otto B. May, Inc.

	Imports—	
	1953	1952
INTERMEDIATES		
1-aminanthraquinone	Pounds 18,725	Pounds 45,063
1-anthraquinonesulfonic acid	43,236	0
7-Benz(de)anthracene-7-one (Benzanthrone)	35,801	41,041
1-4-bis (1-anthraquinonylamino) anthraquinone	1,557	0
1-chloroanthraquinone	1,577	0
5-chloro-o-toluidine hydrochloride	18,126	0
16, 17-dihydroxyviolanthrone	3,669	528
2-nitro-p-anisidine (NH ₂ -1)	1,102	0
4-nitro-o-anisidine (NH ₂ -1)	16,629	125
5-nitro-o-anisidine (NH ₂ -1)	14,429	14,708
Total	154,851	101,525
DYES		
Fast red GL salt	3,000	33,190
Fast red B base	250	1,970
Fast blue B salt	6,156	613
Anthraquinone vat jade green	5,681	8,035
Anthraquinone vat olive R	18,019	1,437
Fast scarlet 2G salt	3,000	6,500
Indanthrene brown RR	56,545	73,000
Fast Bordeaux GP base	760	0
Fast Bordeaux GP salt	2,500	4,409
Fast orange GC base	10	0
Fast orange GC salt	1,550	0
Fast orange GR salt	2,100	0
Fast red 3GL salt	10,000	40,000
Fast red KB base	1,100	250
Fast red RC base	10	0
Fast red TR salt	1,219	186
Fast red TR base	10	0
Fast yellow GC base	2,010	1,235

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—Imports of organic chemicals competitive with those produced by Otto B. May, Inc.—Continued

	Imports—	
	1953	1952
DYES		
Fast yellow GC salt	Pounds 350	0
Indanthrene olive green B	66,932	0
Naphthol AS-TR	1,704	0
Varilamine blue BD salt	4,500	0
Varilamine blue "B" salt	0	0
Total	187,406	170,745

¹ Computed weight.

Source: Import data, U. S. Tariff Commission, Imports of Coal-Tar Products, 1952, 1953.

Men and Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial entitled "Men and Ships," appearing in the Boston Traveler of January 24, 1955, and a letter on the same subject written by John A. Gaffney, of Plymouth, Mass., appearing in the Boston Traveler of January 28, 1955.

It would be a mistake and false economy if through failure of appropriations the existing State maritime academies were compelled to close.

The failure of President Eisenhower to recommend the appropriation, about \$650,000 in his budget message is difficult to understand. The Congress should rectify his failure.

The article and letter follow:

[From the Boston Traveler of January 24, 1955]

MEN AND SHIPS

A nation's merchant marine, no matter how small or large, is no stronger than the men who run the ships.

You can have the biggest merchant fleet in the world, but it's no good unless you also have well-trained officers and men.

In view of this fact, then, it was not surprising that the part of President Eisenhower's budget message that dealt with the merchant marine caused some consternation.

This budget calls for \$103 million to help build up the merchant marine, and at the same time eliminate all Federal aid to State maritime academies.

The result, as we see it, will be some fine new ships and an eventual shortage of properly trained men to run them.

The argument that is used to justify the withdrawal of \$660,000 in aid for the maritime schools is economy. It looks very much like false economy.

The Massachusetts Maritime Academy, for instance, has been getting about 40 percent of its necessary operating revenue from the Federal Government and the rest from the State. This year's State appropriation is \$292,000.

The probable result of this slash, then, would be to cut the number of officers turned out by the school by at least 40 percent. It

should be turning out more marine officers, not fewer.

Fortunately, the objections in Congress to this cut were immediate. Senators LEHMAN and IVES, of New York, where the King's Point United States Merchant Marine Academy is located, registered strong protests and promised vigorous action to get the cut restored.

We can certainly expect the Members of our own congressional delegation to join in the protest.

But though the strongest protests will come from the States affected, this is really a national problem, and we hope Congress will see it that way.

The merchant marine has been dwindling for years. Now that the Federal Government is taking steps to build it up, it's no time to propose that we run more ships with less men.

[From the Boston Traveler of January 28, 1955]

TAX TRICKS

We should have an all-out investigation (with no whitewash) of American-owned merchant marine ships that are being registered under foreign flags to avoid heavy payments to the United States Government. An honest investigation would show that the loss to this country through this tax dodge is several times the amount of the President's budget item of \$103 million for an expanded merchant fleet. We could have one of the greatest merchant fleets afloat simply by checking the evaders of taxes and registration fees.

JOHN A. GAFFNEY.

PLYMOUTH.

A Warning Against Rigging Coffee Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include herewith the following telegram I have received from Joe G. Wick, president of the Old Judge Coffee Co., St. Louis, Mo., urging action by the Federal Government to keep coffee prices from advancing again:

St. Louis, Mo., February 17, 1955.

Representative MELVIN R. PRICE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Believe something should be done immediately to keep coffee from advancing again. Roasters have just declined and looks as if they are rigging it again making it necessary to advance roasted coffee. World's supply of coffee is greatest in a decade. Far more coffee available than before the phony freeze of a year ago. Vice President Nixon's good will tour? Producing countries minority few are rigging it again, making it necessary to advance coffee to the American public. Present prices of green coffee still over four times the 1945 ceiling and poor American public gets it again. Are we going to loan them more millions and have the American public pay for it by ridiculous prices?

JOE G. WICK,
President, Old Judge Coffee Co.

Trade Act Balloting Is Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, Friday's House vote on H. R. 1, extension of the reciprocal trade agreements, has been variously diagnosed, interpreted, and analyzed for purposes of trends, cooperation, or opposition to President Eisenhower and his administration on legislation to come to the House for consideration and action in the 84th Congress.

Different from others that I have read and differing, too, with conclusions heard on Capitol Hill since Friday is the detailed survey of Robert D. Byrnes, veteran correspondent now in Washington for the Hartford (Conn.) Courant.

This compilation will interest our affable Speaker as much as it will, I feel, arouse the speculation of all Members.

This article as it appeared in yesterday's issue of the Hartford Courant follows:

TRADE ACT BALLOTTING IS ANALYZED

(By Robert D. Byrnes)

WASHINGTON, February 20.—The Reed amendment to the Reciprocal Trade Act, strengthening the position of the Tariff Commission in proposing increased quotas to protect domestic production, would be adopted by the Senate if the Senators vote the same way on it as did the majority of their States delegations in the House Friday when the Reed proposal was defeated by seven votes.

A breakdown of the House vote shows the majorities in the delegations from 22 States favored the Reed amendment, the majorities in 19 States opposed it, and in six other States the division for and against was even. One State, Nevada, is not included, as the one Nevada House Member was absent and was not paired.

LOCAL INTERESTS

Analysis of the vote by regions and States shows the dominant influence of local economic interests as contrasted with partisan alignments. New England, with 28 House Members, 18 Republicans and 10 Democrats, voted 22 to 6 for the Reed amendment, thus giving the present law only 21-percent support. The 3 Pacific Coast States, with 41 House Members, 28 Republicans and 13 Democrats, voted 17 to 24 against the Reed amendment, thus giving the present law 57-percent support. This same percentage of support for the present law, 57, also showed for the East Central States, where the 77 House Members comprise 50 Republicans and 27 Democrats and voted 30 to 44 against the Reed amendment. The South, with 106 House Members, 96 Democrats and 6 Republicans, voted 46 to 54 against the present law.

The present law, on the basis of the votes to change it by the Reed amendment, has the least support in the Mountain States, where only 1 of the 16 House Members voted against the Reed proposal. These States are represented by 9 Republicans and 7 Democrats in the House.

The textile industry was probably the basis for most of the New England votes for the Reed amendment. The 3 Republicans from Maine, for example, and the 2 Democrats from Rhode Island were all against it. The 6 New England votes against the amendment came from 4 Republicans, MORANO, of Con-

necticut; BASS, of New Hampshire, HESLTON and MARTIN, of Massachusetts; and 2 Democrats, MCCORMACK and O'NEILL, both of Massachusetts.

The textile industry also was credited with being influential with Members from the South who, now that they have textile mills in their own districts, are no longer exclusively concerned with free trade in order to export cotton. South Carolina, for example, lined up 5 to 1 for the Reed amendment, North Carolina 7 to 5 for it, and Georgia 8 to 2 for it. There is 1 Republican among the 28 Members from these States.

Texas, despite the great influence of Speaker SAM RAYBURN with his colleagues in that delegation, voted 11 to 10 for the Reed amendment. Oklahoma, another State where foreign oil imports are viewed with alarm, voted 5 to 1 for the Reed amendment.

The coal States also reacted on oil, but they are against imports of residual fuel oil as a competitor to the products of their mines. West Virginia, which also claims to have suffered in its pottery and clothespin industries, as well as coal voted solidly for the Reed amendment. Representatives of the Pennsylvania coal regions had been expected to go for the Reed amendment, but they were joined by the 5 Democrats from Philadelphia, so the State lined up 22 for and only 7 against the Reed proposal.

Philadelphia, where only the one Republican House Member voted against the Reed proposal, was the exception among the big seaports to whom foreign trade is a factor, and whose Representatives appeared to react to that. The New York City delegation, including 3 of the 4 Republicans was virtually solid against the Reed amendment. Similar attitudes were reflected in the votes of Members from New Orleans and San Francisco.

Only 2 States, Arkansas with 6 Democrats, and Nebraska, with 4 Republicans, voted solidly against the Reed amendment. Three States with solid Democratic delegations, Delaware, West Virginia, and New Mexico, and four with solid Republican delegations, Maine, Vermont, Wyoming, and Utah, voted solidly for the Reed amendment. In the cases of Vermont, Wyoming, and Delaware, however, the solid delegations comprise only one Member each.

The States which, in the House vote, gave majority support to the Reed amendment were Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wyoming, and Wisconsin.

Those which cast the majorities of their votes against the Reed amendment were Alabama, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Tennessee, and Washington.

States whose House votes were evenly divided on the Reed amendment were Arizona, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, and Virginia.

Disposal Program at Linda Vista, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the problems faced by Eisenhower administration agency heads who

are forced to accept unsympathetic holdovers in top policymaking jobs was never more apparent than in the Public Housing Administration today. PHA Commissioner Charles E. Slusser has a distinguished record as an administrator. He served with outstanding ability as mayor of Akron, Ohio, for many years prior to his acceptance of his current position as head of PHA.

One of Slusser's chief responsibilities at PHA, in addition to developing slum clearance projects, is an orderly and quick disposal of war-built housing projects where they are no longer essential to national defense. Congress has given him almost unlimited authority to complete the disposal program.

Yet today Mr. Slusser finds much of his program in the hands of holdovers from the previous administration. One of these men in a top policy job is Mr. John G. Melville, chief of the western region of PHA, who evidently has little sympathy with the mandate of Congress to dispose of these houses at the earliest possible moment.

The disposal program at Linda Vista, Calif., is a good case in point. Because of a dispute over payment of a \$30,000 charge for relocation of utility poles, the Linda Vista disposal program has been again delayed approximately 60 days, at a loss to the Government of considerably more than that amount, due to loss of rental revenue from over 700 forced vacancies in the homes scheduled for sale.

This is just one of the irritating and costly delays that has resulted from decisions emanating from Melville's office. The people of Linda Vista have waited for years while the promised sale of homes has had every conceivable delay. They have reached the end of their patience. So have I. If these delays continue I shall insist on a full-scale investigation of the San Francisco PHA regional office to find the reasons for such tactics.

An interesting and informative commentary on the situation appeared recently in the San Diego Union. Under unanimous consent, I include it as a portion of my remarks:

LINDA VISTA STALL BECOMING HABITUAL

(By Gene Fuson)

From some angles Public Housing Administration's San Francisco stall order on Linda Vista housing sales to private buyers looks like a bureaucratic mountain made of a technical molehill.

The most recent postponement is not the first one.

After Congress first ordered Linda Vista liquidated in April 1951, sales had to be postponed until the end of the Korean fighting.

Mrs. Faye Hartman, PHA special field representative, got the wheels rolling again in January 1954, only to hit several more snags from higher office.

The spring stall was budget trouble. The United States Public Housing Commissioner, Charles E. Slusser, ordered the subdivision budget cut from \$2½ million to \$1¼ million.

The summer stall came when John G. Melville, PHA regional director at San Francisco, ordered the sale stopped when the city refused to rescind a housing ordinance preventing reerection of 3,500 temporary housing units in the city.

Slusser overruled Melville and ordered the machinery back in motion.

In the fall, Melville stopped everything again in a hassle over what kind of appraisal should be made on the houses.

Again Slusser overruled him and ordered sale plans underway.

The latest indefinite postponement boils down to Melville's crew stalling a \$15 million sale over dispute whether San Diego Gas & Electric Co., or PHA should pay \$30,000 to move some power poles in line with subdivision requirements.

Proportionately it's the same as stalling a \$1,500 sale over a \$3 dispute.

The gas company and PHA say they disagree over meaning of the word "removal" in the utility permit, which prohibits the Government from paying for removal of utilities.

Gas company argues that moving a pole 6 inches or a few feet constitutes relocation and not removal under which case PHA should pay. The permit was issued to bypass delay in the World War II rush to build Linda Vista. It was never corrected.

Relocation and removal also involve those of PHA executives who will have to seek jobs in other agencies when Congress' liquidation order is carried out. Some of them are in policymaking positions getting \$7,000 to \$12,000 a year.

They have jobs as long as PHA has public housing not sold.

If the \$1½ million subdivision is not allocated by June 30, the money returns to the general fund to wait for Congress to reallocate it—possibly 6 months to a year.

Linda Vista was carved out of raw material and cactus land and occupied in little over 2 years.

It has been 3 years since Congress ordered it sold, and less than a third of the job is finished.

Slusser's orders from Washington indicate he is trying to get the job done.

Mrs. Hartman has a unanimous vote of confidence on the job she has done.

That leaves Melville in San Francisco.

A turn of Slusser's pen could make Linda Vista a separate field office responsible to Washington only, as it did when the business area was sold.

Comptroller General Campbell could order the \$30,000 paid, as Representative Bob Wilson, Republican, of San Diego, has requested.

Mrs. Hartman could be relieved of personal responsibility; the PHA could pay the \$30,000 and let the case be settled by court action after the sale.

This reporter, attempting for the fifth time to contact and question Melville by telephone, was told, "If Mr. Melville has anything to tell the press, he'll call you."

Maybe it has been forgotten that Joe Public pays the freight on that operation.

Attack on Dollar Is Seen in \$20-Tax-Cut Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. KEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the New York Herald Tribune:

ATTACK ON DOLLAR IS SEEN IN \$20-TAX-CUT PROPOSAL

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—The Democratic majority in Congress has apparently

decided to constitute itself a "wrecking crew" with the obvious purpose of wrecking the Eisenhower administration, even if it means wrecking the Nation's economy at the same time.

The party that promised the electorate in the congressional campaign last autumn that it would uphold the hands of the President and support his measures now has turned on him and on the country, too, and has embarked upon a course of irresponsibility which cannot be justified even on the ground of partisan benefit. For the new proposal to buy the American voters by giving everybody \$20 off his tax bill and also freeing nearly 5 million voters from paying any taxes at all is the cheapest form of demagoguery.

The worst phase of it is the way it is being attempted—that is, by a trick of legislative procedure which seeks to tie the President's hands so that, if he wishes to veto the proposal, he will also have to veto the continuance of the corporate taxes at the present rate of 52 percent. The Treasury needs the \$1,750,000,000 in revenue which would be lost if the corporation taxes are automatically reduced to the 47-percent rate.

LOSS TO TREASURY

Also imbedded in the tax law expiring on April 1 next—unless extension is voted now—are certain excise taxes which, if not continued, would cost the Treasury another billion dollars. This is all wrapped up in the same package, which the Democrats assume the President would not dare to veto.

But the proposal to cut off \$20 from everybody's taxes would mean a loss to the Treasury of about \$2 billion. So, if the President vetoes the bill with the \$20 tax cut in it, the Treasury stands to lose about a billion dollars in excise-tax receipts because the Congress wouldn't care to let the corporation taxes go down to 47 percent. A bill to extend corporate taxes could be passed any time between April 1 and December 31, 1955, and still be made retroactive for the full calendar year.

Mr. Eisenhower, therefore, has no choice. He has to veto the \$20 vote bribe, which, because the taxpayers would not get it, the Democrats assume would create widespread resentment at the polls. As between a \$2 billion loss on that scheme, however, and a \$1 billion loss in excise taxes, it is preferable for the President to accept the excise-tax reduction.

There is no certainty, on the other hand, that Congress would refuse to pass a separate bill, after the veto, which would continue the excise taxes. Hence, the loss to the Treasury might not materialize at all. Then if business conditions are booming and tax receipts increase, it may be that in 1956 a general tax-reduction bill could be enacted in which all taxpayers are treated equitably.

The idea of letting any one who gets an income of \$3,000 a year become exempt from the payment of any Federal taxes at all, including the cost of national defense, is not one that will appeal to the sense of fair play of the electorate as a whole. Yet, if the wrecking crew have their way, it will mean that many persons in that very income group will be exempt from the payment of Federal taxes.

What may prove to be the most serious damage done by the "wreckocrats" on Capitol Hill, as someone now has dubbed them, may be in the effect on the purchasing power of the dollar. If inflation is to be the accepted policy of America for the years ahead—and that's what a continuance of the unbalanced budgets could mean—then the dollar will be driven steadily downward in terms of other currencies in the world.

GOOD NEWS TO KREMLIN

The Eisenhower administration since taking office has made a heroic effort to work toward a balanced budget. The promise has

been made that such a balance can be attained in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, or that it will be so close to a balance as to assure the dollar a sound position. But if the spenders are to take hold, then confidence will disintegrate. For if a \$20 for everybody doctrine is to be the political device to win elections, then there is nothing to stop the politicians from making it \$50 next time, and so on. It would be joyful news to the Kremlin, which hopes in one way or another to see the collapse of the private-enterprise system in America.

There are some Democrats in the Senate, like Senator HARRY BYRN, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who are opposed to the idea of any tax reductions until the budget is balanced. But the Virginia Senator will have a hard time blocking the \$20 bribe plan unless other Democratic Senators line up with him to conserve the dollar from the most violent attack that has ever been made upon it. The political conspiracy would have no chance of success if it were not assumed by the wrecking crew that the people can be and will be deceived.

No Time To Cut Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the editorial in today's Washington Evening Star with respect to the action of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee in voting a tax reduction of over \$2 billion at this time.

The editorial is as follows:

NO TIME TO CUT TAXES

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey has made a properly forceful protest against the Democratic move in the House to cut individual income taxes at this time. By his estimate, the proposal to give a \$20 tax credit to each taxpayer and dependent would cost the Government \$2.3 billion revenue for a full calendar year. Ways and Means Committee officials estimate the potential loss at \$2.1 billion and point out further that the proposed credit would result in removing about 7 million taxpayers from the income-tax rolls. Whichever estimate of loss is correct, approximately half of the drop in revenue would occur in fiscal 1956, in which the administration already foresees a budget deficit of about \$2.4 billion. Adding a substantial sum to this deficit would increase the inflationary pressures which the administration has succeeded over the past 2 years in bringing under reasonable control, a result which could be greatly damaging to the public interest.

Approximately \$7 billion in tax relief has been given during the past 2 years. In the same period, Government spending has been curtailed to bring closer the prospect of a balanced budget. The administration is recommending now that scheduled reductions in the corporation income-tax rates and in certain excises—involving an estimated \$3 billion in annual revenue—should be extended for 1 year at their present levels in the hope that another general, though moderate, tax-reduction program might be enacted in 1956.

It is unfortunate that political considerations are playing a large part in the maneuvering on tax legislation. For example, the Democratic proposal to reduce individual

taxes is attached to the administration plan to maintain current corporation and excise-tax rates, a maneuver obviously intended to minimize the danger of a Presidential veto if the combination bill should be passed. Clearly enough, the Government needs the revenue involved in this combination of proposals and it is an act of political irresponsibility to jeopardize it. The Democrats, especially those who are accusing the administration of spending too little on national defense, should not stoop to this kind of shabby politicking with tax revenues.

The Forgotten Program: Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Tuesday, February 22, 1955:

OUR DEFENSELESS CITIES

Val Peterson made a classic understatement in his television interview on Sunday when he remarked: "I do not believe the Congress or anyone else in this country has realized the need for a strong civil defense." There is an ironic inconsistency in the appropriation of hundreds of millions of dollars for early warning lines and Nike rings without any sort of determined followthrough to insure that citizens know how to protect themselves in nuclear attack. Perhaps members of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, which will begin hearings today on the problem of radioactive fallout, can dramatize for their colleagues and the country the sad plight of civil defense.

Despite Mr. Peterson's hard work as Civil Defense Administrator, it is plain to be seen that the administration has placed no very high priority on this kind of preparedness. The move of the Civil Defense Administration to Battle Creek, Mich., last year—a move apparently designed more as a political sop than as an effort to improve the effectiveness of the agency—has not helped to promote understanding of the problem. Congress, for its part, has shown little interest. It has repeatedly cut appropriations without insisting on a meaningful civil defense program that would justify the expenditures requested; legislators have been content in an attitude expressed by one House Member several years ago respecting a warning system for the District: "Let them ring church bells." The public apathy is merely a reflection of the apathy in the administration and Congress.

Yet there is every reason for confidence that Americans would respond to a civil-defense program that had the proper high-level attention and leadership. And the first thing to do to make the civil-defense program important is for the administration itself to show that it regards the program as important. The need is for concrete advance planning, for definite instructions to cities on what to expect for workable evacuation and shelter directions, for suggestions to private citizens on what they ought to be doing. The newly disclosed dangers from radioactive fallout—which now also has strategic implications—increase the urgency of realistic planning. Incidentally, the administration has had the facts on fallout for many months, and it is pertinent to ask why so little has been done.

If the Senate subcommittee can help focus some attention on the deficiencies of civil defense it will do a real service. Civil defense will not prevent a war; but adequate advance preparation will help prevent millions of needless casualties if war should come. Even in the hydrogen age civil defense is in no sense futile. What is futile is to kid ourselves that the present confusion constitutes adequate civil defense.

With Further Reference to the So-Called Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I hereby insert communications received from the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States with regard to H. R. 1.

SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED STATES,

New York, N. Y., February 17, 1955.

HON. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REED: In behalf of our association, I wish to express sincere appreciation for the sound and courageous expression of views of the minority in connection with the recent reporting of H. R. 1 by the Ways and Means Committee.

The views of you and your colleagues well state the importance of the synthetic organic chemical industry to national defense and the imperative need for an amendment of the law which will insure that our defense mobilization capacity will be protected from import injury. In this regard, we note in appendix B to the committee report an excerpt from the testimony of Charles P. Taft which we believe characterizes the position of our industry in a misleading manner. Your attention is invited to the enclosed letter which we addressed to the chairman of the committee following Mr. Taft's testimony on February 7. The purpose of the letter was to set the record straight with respect to the position of our industry on the national defense aspects of our foreign economic policy.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL LENHER,
President.

SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,

New York, N. Y., February 11, 1955.

The Honorable JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On February 7, 1955, Mr. Charles P. Taft, president, Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and in a statement apparently intended as a rebuttal to the opposition which had been expressed by various industries to H. R. 1, he made a number of statements regarding the organic chemical industry which are misleading. We, therefore, request that this letter be incorporated in the record following Mr. Taft's speech of February 7 in order to set the record straight.

Mr. Taft stated that, "One fragment of the chemical industry * * * told you that more tariff reductions will hurt our defense production facilities. But Secretary Dulles and Secretary Wilson, who worry about our defenses on a full-time basis, have said that we need H. R. 1 to keep our defenses strong." The synthetic organic chemical industry is the "fragment" of the chemical industry to which Mr. Taft apparently alludes. The industry's position on H. R. 1 was presented by this association. The position of our industry is not as described by Mr. Taft; rather as very plainly stated in my testimony before your committee, we called attention to the importance of establishing in the national interest "a positive policy and procedure under which tariffs could be reduced below a point which the Tariff Commission finds would threaten impairment of the domestic productive capacity declared by the Office of Defense Mobilization to be part of the mobilization base. An essential corollary of that policy and procedure would provide for the withdrawal of concessions which in whole or part have resulted in volumes of imports which threaten impairment of the domestic productive capacity programed by the Office of Defense Mobilization as part of the Nation's mobilization base."

In other words, looking to the future and calling attention to the Government's own policy of maintaining the mobilization base in a state of full readiness, we requested that a procedure be established which would insure that our mobilization base would not be hurt by increased imports under an extension of the trade-agreements program. We find it difficult to imagine that any thoughtful citizen, however enthusiastic for freer trade, would wish for the trade-agreements program to be used in such a manner that vicarious injury would be caused to our defense productive capacity.

Mr. Taft refers to the thinking of Secretary Dulles and Secretary Wilson on this subject. Significantly, Secretary Dulles, answering a question asked by Congressman SIMPSON, stated that the escape clause is needed not only to protect individual producers but also to protect the interests of the United States through the maintenance of the mobilization base, which he described as the minimum productive capacity and skills required to protect the Nation against the possibility of war.

As for Secretary Wilson, the importance he attaches to maintaining the mobilization base in a state of readiness is revealed in his statement before the House Armed Services Committee of January 26, 1955, in which he stated:

"We must also have ready reserve forces, an adequate mobilization base, appropriate reserves of ammunition and other equipment, and stockpiles of critical materials to meet the needs of an all-out war if such a situation should be forced upon us. This is the kind of defense structure that we must build and maintain to deal with the situation we face in the world today. At the same time we must carefully consider the force levels, composition, and the organization of our armed services. The services must be so organized as to permit the maximum utilization of our scientific, technological, and production abilities. In addition to the maximum utilization of modern technology we must plan and organize our forces so as to get maximum combat strength and at the same time minimize the number of men required on full time active duty."

Secretary Wilson quoted in his statement a letter which he had received from President Eisenhower setting forth the President's views. Excerpts from the President's letter pertinent to our national policy of maintaining our mobilization base in a state of maximum effectiveness are as follows:

"Second, true security for our country must be founded on a strong and expanding economy, readily convertible to the tasks of war.

"Our first objective must therefore be to maintain the capability to deter an enemy from attack and to blunt that attack if it comes—by a combination of effective retaliatory power and a continental defense system of steadily increasing effectiveness. These two tasks logically demand priority in all planning. Thus we will assure that our industry capacity can continue throughout a war to produce the gigantic amounts of equipment and supplies required.

"We can never be defeated so long as our relative superiority in productive capacity is sustained.

"In view of the practical considerations limiting the rapid deployment of large military forces from the continental United States immediately on outbreak of war, the numbers of active troops maintained for this purpose can be correspondingly tailored. For the remainder we may look primarily to our Reserves and our mobilization base, including our stockpile of critical materials.

"All these capabilities have a double value—they serve our aim in peacetime of preventing war through their deterrent effect; they form the foundation of effective defense if aggressors should strike."

Mr. Taft confesses his ignorance as to whether it is better policy to rely in time of war on plants located in the industrial areas of the United States or in plants scattered throughout the free world. Fortunately, the Government agencies responsible for our preparedness are not as confused as Mr. Taft on this subject. First, the Congress in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended and extended, has declared the Nation's determination to develop and maintain the military and economic strength required to oppose aggression and promote peace in the world. The Director of Defense Mobilization, who is charged with developing the policies to carry out the purposes of the act, has advised the President that to protect the security of the United States and the free world from Soviet aggression, our Nation must have a defense mobilization program of such magnitude that it is capable of deterring an aggressor or if we are attacked, to enable us to fight to win. He stated that the required program must include the industrial capacity to shift in the shortest possible period of time from partial to all-out mobilization. The Joint Committee on Defense Production in its fourth annual report very recently stated that "The all-important job facing both industry and Government is that of keeping our huge industrial empire in the state of maximum readiness for any emergency." The committee wisely observed that "The huge industrial expansions during the last 4 years have been aimed at overcoming shortages so vital to our defense economy. Adding new capacity can be futile, however, unless the mobilization base, built at great cost, is maintained in the maximum possible state of readiness."

The joint committee realizes, as Mr. Taft does not, that some of the production facilities which have been created to meet mobilization requirements are partially idle because the volume of production required for defense exceeds that normally needed for peacetime purposes. The committee's report refers to the fact that the maintenance of the mobilization base where such plants are involved is a substantial problem which requires the Government's assistance. As the Director of Defense Mobilization has stated in his annual report to the joint committee,

"The development of an adequate, secure mobilization base depends upon an understanding and conviction on the part of all levels and branches of the Government, and

of the people as a whole, that these things are necessary and that they offer the best assurance of surviving in what President Eisenhower has called 'an age of peril.'"

In this context, our association called the committee's attention to what we regard as the necessity of establishing procedures through amendment of the peril point and escape clause which will prevent our defense mobilization capacity as determined by the Office of Defense Mobilization from being injured by increased imports under the trade agreements program. We believe this recommendation is quite consistent with the emphasis which the Government itself has placed on maintaining the mobilization base in a state of maximum readiness. Far from opposing an extension of the trade agreements authority with the power to make the type of gradual, moderate, selective, and reciprocal concessions which the President described in his January 10 foreign trade message, our industry stated to your committee that it would not oppose a 3-year extension with authority in that period to reduce tariffs up to 5 percent a year so long as its exercise was subject to such procedures.

It is difficult for us to understand how there can be any disagreement with the principle of shaping Government action in the field of foreign trade policy in such a manner that the domestic productive capacity, which the Government itself finds to be essential to our national defense, will be safeguarded from import injury. On the basis of any fair examination of our statement as presented to your committee, it is ridiculous to say that we are taking the position that any further tariff reduction would destroy our industry. We have felt the urgent lash of war requirements in two world wars and have the right, we believe, to ask the Government to set up procedures for the future which as a minimum will insure that the capacity which the Government itself believes to be necessary for defense mobilization will be protected from impairment by increased imports stimulated by tariff reductions.

The type of reasoning which seems to be inherent in Mr. Taft's mischaracterization of our industry's position is that anyone who undertakes to present a different point of view from his own on the tariff issue must necessarily be someone who is speaking from an assumed state of shock or injury from import competition. He seemingly would deny to anyone holding a view adverse to his own foreign trade policy the right to make recommendations which would secure selectivity in our foreign trade program with respect to recognizable and legitimate national objectives. He says in effect that unless we are suffering a drastic loss of business from import competition at the present time, we have no right to make recommendations with respect to tariff policy for the future. Healthy industries, in his view, could not conceivably be healthy because of the existence of the tariff and must stand mute until progressive tariff reduction places them in a state of severe shock and injury. We think the Congress in the logical order has the right and duty to be concerned about sound tariff policies which will balance expansion of foreign trade with other national objectives such as the strength of our domestic economy and the unimpairment of our mobilization base. To these objectives we addressed ourselves.

Finally, we would like to set the record straight on a favorite error of Mr. Taft's which he persists in perpetuating. He refers to a colloquy which took place between Congressman Mills and me. The Congressman, referring to imports of coal-tar chemicals (which actually had a foreign invoice value of \$12,300,000 in 1953 according to United States Tariff Commission Report No.

194, 2d series, p. 168) and citing the total figure as \$10 million, asked me if these were not the imports which were competitive with the domestic industry's products. I did not undertake to verify of my own knowledge the accuracy of the figure cited by Mr. Mills but realizing that the Congressman's question was addressed to imports of coal-tar chemicals, I undertook to explain that these chemicals are dutiable under the American selling price and that the industry is prepared to live with the manner in which that provision is administered by the Bureau of Customs.

As this committee knows, organic chemicals consist not only of coal-tar products but also a host of non-coal-tar chemicals as well. Imports of coal-tar chemicals are dutiable under tariff paragraphs 27 and 28. The ad valorem or compound duties provided for under these paragraphs of the Tariff Act are based upon a value known as the American selling price. This value basis is applied where the imported item is found by the Bureau of Customs to be "competitive" with any similar domestic article. Organic chemical imports other than coal-tar products, on the other hand, are dutiable either under specific rates of duty or under ad valorem or compound rates which do not involve the American selling price feature. Consequently, the "competitive" determination made in assessing duty on coal-tar chemicals imports has nothing at all to do with the non-coal-tar organic chemical imports. It is a gross oversimplification and distortion, therefore, to imply, as Mr. Taft did before your committee and as he has repeatedly done in the past, that the imports of coal-tar chemicals assessed for duty under the American selling price are the only imports which as a matter of economic fact are "competitive" with the products of the American industry. Mr. Taft learns very slowly. We have called his apparent misunderstanding of the significance of the "competitive" determination with respect to coal-tar chemicals under paragraphs 27 and 28 to his attention on several occasions but he persists in the error. He once referred to the imports of coal-tar chemicals as the only really "sensitive" items among the organic chemical imports and claimed that the Tariff Commission was his authority for such a statement. The general counsel for the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association inquired of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission if there was any basis in the Commission's reports for such a statement. The exchange of letters with the Chairman of the Commission is set forth in full and shows that there is no justification for Mr. Taft's use of the term:

STEPHENS & JOHNSON,

Washington, D. C., May 12, 1954.

The Honorable EDGAR B. BROSSARD,
Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BROSSARD: Your attention is invited to the marked paragraph in the enclosed press release from the Committee for a National Trade Policy. You will note that the Tariff Commission is there quoted as the source for a statement to the effect that only \$9 million by value of organic chemical imports in 1952 were really sensitive items.

The Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, whom we represent as general counsel, intends to reply publicly to Mr. Taft's comments in order to correct a number of errors which it contains. We do not believe that the Tariff Commission has ever made any written statement upon which the marked paragraph could be based, and we cannot believe that any authorized representative of the Commission would have supplied any oral information upon which it could be based. Naturally before making any comment to this effect in the public statement we are preparing in response to Mr. Taft, we would wish to have

verification of this fact from the Tariff Commission.

May we, therefore, request you kindly to advise whether or not the Tariff Commission has ever published information upon which the marked paragraph could be based or whether any of your authorized representatives have supplied any oral information to that effect.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD O. LINCOLN.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1954.

Mr. DONALD O. LINCOLN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. LINCOLN: I have your letter of May 12 concerning a press release issued by the Committee for a National Trade Policy in which it states that Mr. Charles P. Taft in an address to the League of Women Voters, May 6, 1954, made the following comment: "According to the Tariff Commission, the only really sensitive items out of this \$15 million amount to \$9 million per year, or only a little over one-fifth of 1 percent of the organic chemical business."

You ask to be advised "whether or not the Tariff Commission has ever published information upon which the marked paragraph could be based or whether any of your authorized representatives have supplied any oral information to that effect."

The \$9 million mentioned in the paragraph of the release to which you make reference is a rounded figure representing the total foreign invoice value of imports in 1952 of coal-tar products imported under paragraphs 27 and 28 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The value of these imports, \$8,683,000, was given in the publication of the Commission, entitled *Imports of Coal-Tar Products, 1952*, issued by the Commission in July 1953, and in table 28, page 165, of the Commission's publication *Synthetic Organic Chemicals, United States Production and Sales, 1952*.

In further answer to your inquiry, the Commission has never indicated either in its publications or orally by any members of its staff that the imports of coal-tar products in 1952, to which the \$9 million relate, are the only really sensitive items among imports of all synthetic organic chemicals.

I trust this will answer your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR B. BROSSARD,
Chairman.

In the above correspondence, imports of coal-tar chemicals for 1952 are stated to be \$9 million based on foreign invoice value. (The dutiable value reported by the Bureau of Census is \$11,242,216.) In 1953, the year Congressman MILLS had in mind in asking his question, the foreign value of coal-tar chemicals imports was, as mentioned above, \$12,300,000. The dutiable value of these imports, according to Bureau of Census figures, in 1951 was \$18,569,698.

When we have had occasion to call attention to import and export figures for organic chemicals, we have done so in the interest of pointing to the differing trends involved. Imports of organic chemicals have increased steadily, from \$18 million in 1948 to nearly \$51 million in 1953, the latest year for which we have been able to secure information. Exports show a declining trend—from \$461 million in 1951 to about \$302 million in 1953. 1953's total was lower than any year since 1948 when exports were nearly \$310 million.

The significance of these trends is that the industry is using less of its capacity each year for the production of organic chemicals for export while the increasing imports reflected by the trend are steadily displacing capacity for the production of organic chemicals for domestic sale. We have not said, and do not now say, that the industry has been seriously injured as yet by these imports. What we have tried to call attention to is that at present tariff levels imports are steadily increasing while we are progressively losing

our export markets. In addition, we are producing for domestic consumption annually well below the capacity which would be required for us in the event of defense mobilization.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL LENHER,
President.

USDA Uses Unique Methods in Soybean Hearing at Memphis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a hearing at Memphis, Tenn., on February 14 when a crowd estimated at more than 300 people were present to listen to testimony in opposition to proposals of the United States Grain Standards Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture to make certain changes both in grades and classifications.

This was a rather unique hearing, Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the only persons in attendance at the meeting who appeared to favor the changes were Mr. Barr, chief inspector of the Grain Division, and the other representatives of the Department of Agriculture. Anyone attending the meeting had an opportunity to be heard, and several of us stated that we would like to know who was sponsoring the changes and that we would like to hear from anyone present who approved or endorsed the changes.

Mr. Barr was the only person who defended the position of the Department of Agriculture in proposing to make changes in standards and classifications which have been in effect and which apparently have been working very well since 1949. However, Mr. Barr was not only willing to indicate his support of these proposed changes in which he would naturally have a pride of authorship, but went so far at one time as to state that his division was convinced, and then immediately retracted this strong language to state that the Division was of the opinion that the changes might properly be considered.

This meeting or hearing was unique in another way, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the lack of notice which the farmer—the actual producer of soybeans—had. Actually, it was rather by accident and certainly indirectly that I learned about the hearing to be held in Memphis—one of a series of five.

When I inquired of the Department of Agriculture about the notice that had been given, I was told that the notice of the meeting had been sent to the Federal Register. Now, of course, some of my farmers do not read the Federal Register. I was told the notice was sent to most of the trade journals. Naturally, those subscription lists do not include any considerable number of farmers—the man who actually produces the soybeans and who would be vitally affected by any changes and who certainly should

have the opportunity to express himself before any changes are made.

I was particularly interested in whether or not the Commercial Appeal, the paper that most of the people in the Midsouth area read, was notified of this meeting. If they received a notice, it was not a notice that gained the attention of any editor, for there was absolutely no prior notice of this meeting in the Sunday or Monday morning issues prior to the meeting on Monday.

The crowd that did gather was recruited by some of the smaller elevator operators and through the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association. Naturally, the American Soybean Association had notice of the meeting and this notice was carried in its monthly magazine, but, again, this was not the notice that gets to the actual producer. As an indication of the lack of notice given throughout the section of the Midsouth where the soybean is a major crop, and where any reclassification will result in millions of dollars loss to the farmers of that area, I am, in another extension of the Record, having reproduced an article from the Republican, a newspaper of Caruthersville, Mo., as reported by Mr. Albert Cravens, a secretary-treasurer of the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked to have included with these remarks of mine a copy of a letter, written by the president of the above-named association, directed to the Director of the Grain Division in the USDA, setting forth the views of the Midsouth Soybean & Grain Shippers Association on the proposed revisions of the soybean standards, which is as follows:

MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN AND
GRAIN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION.

February 17, 1955.

DIRECTOR, GRAIN DIVISION, AMA,
United States Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

VIEWS OF THE MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN AND GRAIN
SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION ON THE PROPOSED REVISIONS
OF THE SOYBEAN STANDARDS

1. On the proposed revision that would reduce the maximum limits of foreign material 1 percent in each numerical grade. As country shippers we are in the middle on this question as we only buy on the grade that we have to sell but as the growers as presented by the American Soybean Association and the processors thought their present buying practices want 2 percent foreign material in No. 2 soybeans, we see no reason why the change cannot be made. We do, however, urge that a study be made to see if some simple method can be found to separate true foreign material from the small broken pieces of soybeans that fall through an $\frac{1}{16}$ -round-hole screen. Maybe the use of a smaller hole size such as a $\frac{1}{32}$ would let enough of the small-weed seed through and leave enough broken pieces on the screen to reduce the buildup of foreign material we now have in soybeans through handling. If such a method can be found we urge its use.

2. On the reduction of moisture we see no reason why the moisture in No. 1 soybeans cannot be reduced to 12 percent. However, we feel that no change need be made in the moisture of No. 2 soybeans as we have found that even in our humid climate 14-percent-moisture soybeans can be stored.

3. We can see no reason why the change in splits should not go through if you in the department feel that it would improve the soybean-grading system.

4. On the proposed special limits on heat damage in each numerical grade. We are against such limits as they would work a hardship on all shippers. Today inspectors are having enough trouble determining total damage or just how much total damage a sample contains. However, if the Department feels that such limits should be put into effect, then heat damage should be more clearly defined. We suggest that it means soybeans that have turned entirely black or brown from heat. The present methods of saying that a small brown spot in the middle of an otherwise sound soybean is heat damage leaves too much room for human error and judgment for such narrow limits of heat damage as have been proposed by the Department.

5. On the proposed reclassification of soybeans with green seed coats that are in cross section yellow from the yellow class to the green class. We cannot say too strongly that we are opposed to this change. We have many reasons for being against the change. Here are just a few of them: 80 percent or more of the Midsouth soybean production would be affected by this change. No evidence was present at Memphis to disprove our conclusion that if the proposed change went through that 90 percent of our Ogden type soybeans would grade as mixed. This was the case before the change in 1949. If they were classed as mixed in 1948 and before what new method has been developed to tell class by the variety predominate color and how could variety purity be proven? In other words how could an inspector tell the difference between a bleached Ogden and a pale S-100 to say that the sample was a mixture of green and yellow varieties or just a sample of Ogden type soybean and therefore are classed green and just happen to have 10 percent or more that just happen to be faded yellow?

We recognize the department's desire and the need to make a grade and class such that it will tell the buyer if he wants that certain quality or not. We agree that under the present standards for soybeans it is not always possible for the buyer to get just what he wants by buying a certain grade and class but as one of the speakers at Memphis pointed out No. 2 Hard wheat does not always describe just what type of No. 2 Hard wheat that a buyer wants. Therefore, a buyer will say that he wants Kansas or Texas No. 2 Hard wheat and not Illinois No. 2 Hard wheat. Today most buyers that need a yellow coated soybean for their special products have found that they can get what they want by saying that they want a No. 2 yellow soybean from Illinois points or maybe Ohio. We feel that since the buyers can get yellow coated soybeans by saying what he wants that it is not right to penalize the Midsouth that has no high yielding soybean that isn't mixed with green and yellow coats. We realize that you cannot sell a person for long something that he does not want so if it was not possible for a buyer to get yellow coated soybeans without changing the standards we would not be opposed but as he can get yellow coated soybeans leave the standards alone.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL C. HUGHES,
President.

Rural Library Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times:

RURAL LIBRARY SERVICE

"Over 26 million Americans, some 90 percent of whom live on farms or in small communities, are still without access to modern library services." That is the first sentence used by Senator HILL, of Alabama, in reintroducing the library services bill which barely failed of passage last year. It points up the fact that a good portion of the citizens of this country are still in a second-class status where access to useful information is concerned.

The library services bill as now constituted will enable State agencies to set up libraries in rural areas of 10,000 population or less, so that these people may have the same advantages that their fellow citizens enjoy in more densely populated and urban areas. The bill calls for the appropriation of \$7,500,000 a year for 5 years to this purpose, with guarantees that there will be no interference on the part of the Federal Government with or control over State or library agencies.

It is hoped that this session of Congress will finally get down to the serious business of making this type of service available to rural areas. The State agencies have programs lined up, but are temporarily strapped by lack of funds to get the initial program under way. The new bill will provide the necessary funds and make it possible to eliminate one more of the obstacles in the way of lifting the educational level of the American people.

Determination of the Filipinos To Stand Up and Be Counted for Democracy and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement made by the President of the Philippines, Hon. Ramon Magsaysay. The American people, with such a forthright statement, will once more realize that they have in the Filipino people a staunch friend and ally. During these days when there are those in Asia who are playing a game of appeasement it should fill our hearts as Americans to note that we have friends with the courage of their convictions such as the Filipinos.

President Magsaysay is a leader who deserves the gratitude, admiration, and respect of the American people and I insert his statement in the RECORD as an expression of American gratitude for another token of the Filipinos' determination to stand up and be counted for democracy and freedom.

President Magsaysay, February 3, 1955, issued the following official statement welcoming the United States position with respect to Formosa:

WELCOME UNITED STATES-FORMOSA STAND

Responsibility for the defense of Formosa has been undertaken primarily by Armed Forces of the United States which, under our mutual defense treaty with America, also constitutes our main bulwark against external attack. Formosa and the Philippines fig-

ure importantly in the defense pattern against aggression in this part of the world. The two countries, by virtue of their geographic proximity and respective defense commitments, have a vital stake in the resolute maintenance of this defense pattern.

We cannot therefore be indifferent to the events that are transpiring in that area nor be unconcerned with the ultimate fate of that island. Our interest extends to the measures that have been taken to defend it against aggression. Formosa is vital to our national security. It must remain free and in friendly hands.

For these reasons, I welcome the decision of the United States Government clarifying its stand on the Formosa question. I trust that this policy of firmness will achieve its avowed purpose of deterring further acts of Communist aggression in this area. We stand squarely behind the United States in its determination to achieve this purpose.

Wheat Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress has enacted legislation allowing additional acreage for durum wheat, consideration should be given to permit growers of high-protein wheat, which is in equally scarce supply, to get an additional acreage allotment. A good deal of this high-quality wheat is grown in the State of Montana and the House of Representatives of the Montana Legislature has passed the following memorial:

House Memorial 4

Memorial to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, Montana's congressional delegation, and members of the United States House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, seeking an adjustment in the Federal farm program as it relates to the grower of quality wheat

Whereas all wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas are meant to control surpluses, but there is no surplus of the kind of wheat raised in Montana; and

Whereas millers are pleading for more high milling quality wheat of which Montana is the principal producer; and

Whereas Montana growers are now subject to the same restrictions as are growers of soft low-quality wheats, which are in huge surplus; and

Whereas some adjusted acreage allotments for our small operators will tend to redress a balance which is badly needed and the present pressure on all operators is curtailing too much production of high-protein wheat: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Montana House of Representatives in its 1955 session assembled, That all responsible officialdom noted above be asked to see that revisions are made in the Federal farm program to permit increased production in areas which grow wheat of high milling quality determined to be in short supply.

LEO C. GRAYHILL,
Speaker of the House.

The reason for increased acreage allotments of high protein wheat are summarized in a recent editorial from the Montana Farmer-Stockman. The editorial follows:

NO SURPLUS OF MONTANA WHEAT

The national wheat acreage allotment and marketing quota program are designed to control surpluses, of course. But there is no surplus of the kind of wheat raised in Montana. Millers are crying for more high milling quality wheat and Montana is the principal producer of that type.

Why then should Montana growers be subject to the same restrictions as are the growers of the softer, lower quality wheats which are in vast surplus? Surely some plan can be worked out to permit the Montana grower to meet the need for his quality wheat.

It is the working out of such a plan that the Montana Advisory Committee to the USDA is assuming as its major responsibility. When the committee was first formed in response to the invitation extended by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson at the time of his visit to Montana, it had as its purpose the working out of specific proposals for five Montana farm problems: 1. Protection of markets for Montana mustard. 2. Protection of acreage for Montana sugar beets. 3. Modification of wheat acreage allotments with regard to smaller operators. 4. Establishment of a bushel rather than acre allotment control program. 5. Recognition of Montana's quality wheat.

So far the committee has had two meetings. At its first, in Helena, it quickly agreed on recommendations for Montana mustard and beets but found that it required more study to make proposals for the other problems.

At its second meeting, in Great Falls, it encountered divergent opinions on the subjects of bushel vs. acre allotments and consideration of the small farmer. A bushel method of control for wheat seemed to meet the needs of dryland farmers who might have a large crop one year and a small one the next. But what about the irrigation farmer who has more control of his production and can, conceivably, make one acre produce what two produced before? He'd rather have the limitation on acres.

And as for the small farmer—who is a small farmer? Can his basic problem be solved by giving him a few more acres of allotment? If so, where will those acres come from? Must they not, inevitably, come from the large operator, and what share can the large operator reasonably be expected to give?

Exchange Student From New Zealand Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States makes a notable contribution to the democratic way of life each year by sponsoring a contest for high school students who write on the subject, I Speak for Democracy. Freedom in America has been so secure that most of us take it for granted to the extent that we seldom think about it or question its origin or fundamental idea. These annual contests dramatize for thousands of young people the basic idea of democracy and freedom and in setting forth their own thoughts they become better citizens, more deeply dedicated to the ideal of freedom.

I am proud that 1 of the 4 cowinners of the national contest is presently a resident of my district in Minnesota. She is an exchange student from New Zealand, spending time in America to become better acquainted with our way of life so that she may become a more enlightened and better citizen of her own country. Miss Catherine Styles develops a most important point for all of us to ponder in this day when the freedom of man throughout the world is being seriously challenged—namely, that freedom and democracy are ideas that inspire all men and in the longing for freedom and self-government by other peoples we find kinship and herein lies our greatest strength in combatting the Communist philosophy which would destroy all freedom. Miss Styles' essay follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Catherine Styles)

I am not an American. My people are not American. And yet, I, too, speak for democracy.

Not much over a hundred years ago, the race that founded America began to found another nation. Surrounded by the vastness of the Pacific Ocean, a new land had been discovered. The brown-skinned people who already lived there called it Aotearoa, the land of the long white cloud. Today, we call it New Zealand. It is a young country, a virile and growing country. It is a country of sea and sunshine, of snow on the mountains, of trout lakes, and primitive fern forest; of weird pools where the boiling mud leaps and bubbles, cracks in the rocks where the steam comes white from the insides of the earth. . . .

The people who live there are a people who love freedom.

The people who live there are my people, and when I speak for democracy, I speak for them.

I have seen something of America. I have watched the crowds on the streets at night, seeing the advertisement signs flashing on the saw-edge of the horizon, saying: Buy my products; no, buy mine; mine is finer yet. I have seen, back home in the early morning, the man with his horse and his dogs, driving sheep. I remember the jostle and pattering rush of the delicate forefeet, and the clean smell of the bracken, and the sharp barking of the dogs. I remember this, and I know that those crowds with their faces colored by the glow of the advertisements, and that man out early with his flock, although they are 7,000 miles apart, are people with the same ideals and beliefs, the same love of individual freedom. And I am glad that I can say this, and I speak with all the sincerity in my power. I know that people, these people, all people, are the most terribly important thing in the world. I know that to make as many people as possible as happy as possible is the greatest ideal in the world. And I know that this is the ideal of democracy.

You people of America do not stand alone. Democracy extends further than America. Two thousand years ago the Christian doctrine proclaimed the equality of man. Belief in the equality of man means acceptance of all races, all creeds. Belief in democracy means belief in the equality of man. It means respecting the individuality of every human being.

At home, in the summer evenings, near the time of Christmas, I would sit on the low veranda steps, and hear the baby owls calling in the darkness, and the cows coughing and stamping in the paddock, and see the white bobs of the rabbits scuttle in the half light. And by the gate I would hear the voices of a couple murmuring together, the young man and woman. And I would

think: This is good; this is good, this life, this land, this people. All this is good, the best that ever was.

I still believe it is good, but I know now it was no single nation I was believing in, but the truth of free people everywhere. And I know that the most wonderful thing in the world is the freedom of the individual; in my country, in your country, and in every country.

Not as an American, not as a New Zealander, but as a free citizen of the world in which I have faith, I am speaking to you now. I am not remembering that you are American and I am British. I am not remembering that our voices are different, and our manners, and the cut of our clothes. I only remember that, together, we believe in the individual freedom and right.

I only remember that, together, we speak for democracy.

The United States Information Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the advertising profession I have been actively interested in the program and accomplishments of the United States Information Agency, under the able direction of Theodore C. Streibert, an experienced radio executive.

I am convinced that the USIA must greatly enlarge its scope and activity in order to effectively meet the challenge of anti-United States and anticapitalist propaganda being pumped into the neutral and satellite countries of the world by the Kremlin today.

We must be willing to enlarge USIA appropriations and give this agency the support and encouragement it will need in order to meet and stem the flood of Communist propaganda throughout the world.

Encouraging support of the USIA and its objectives has come recently from the advertising profession, members of which are best able, in my opinion, to evaluate the effectiveness of propaganda effort of every kind.

The Advertising Association of the West, a pioneer organization representing the leaders of advertising in the 11 Western States, recently adopted a resolution on the subject of selling America to the rest of the world. The resolution was adopted at the AAW midwinter conference in Los Angeles, Calif., on January 30, 1955.

Under unanimous consent, I include the resolution as a portion of my remarks:

This association is mindful of the immensity of the stakes in the continuing cold-war competition with the ungodly and militant forces of world communism which threatens the very survival of the free world.

We are painfully aware of the viciously distorted version of our country being spread throughout the world by the ruthless and tellingly effective propaganda of the Communists.

We are conscious of the transcendent need for combating this force by portraying to the world more extensively, aggressively, and

effectively the true story of America and our Nation's peaceful and constructive desires.

This association therefore faces our responsibilities as good citizens and as the organized voice of advertising in the West by declaring our policy as follows:

1. We endorse the necessity and objectives of the United States Information Agency and related programs, and deplore the relative inadequacy of appropriations for this vital activity.

2. We pledge the active interest of this association, and urge organized advertising to lend its knowledge, counsel, techniques, and proven skills toward helping sell America as effectively as advertising has proved its ability to sell goods and services.

3. We call on our Government to expand this activity and to utilize more fully the abilities and usefulness of the advertising profession and industry toward this objective, and also to rely on those possessing the proven skills in these techniques and crafts.

4. We recommend appointment of a committee of this association to establish such liaison with the appropriate agencies and organizations, both public and private, as appears practicable. The committee further will explore the problem and make recommendations to this association regarding the value, desirability, and means of doing our part in helping tell America's story abroad honestly and effectively for the welfare of our country and cause.

Narcotics Addicts Have Been Hospitalized by the District Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as you may remember legislation was enacted during the 83d Congress which provides compulsory hospitalization, by court order, of drug addicts in the District of Columbia. During the hearings on my bill, it was pointed out that there were approximately 2,500 known drug users in our Nation's Capital.

During the past month the first 2 addicts have been compulsorily hospitalized under the new law. The first was a young man of 20 years who was committed last Friday. Monday, a 30-year-old woman, who admitted using up to 8 caps of heroin a day, became the second to be sent to the United States Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky.

In the latter case, the new law proves its effectiveness in helping to eliminate crime in the District. An assistant United States attorney testified that the woman told police she had supported her expensive habit by prostitution.

On the other hand, 22 men and women drug users have voluntarily begun hospitalization under a special provision of the act since it went into effect last year. Of these, 1 man has been cured and has returned to the District. He was hospitalized approximately 5 months.

The law directs the court to commit drug addicts to the Public Health Service hospital until they are cured. After

they are released, the patient must make periodic reports to authorities to insure that the person has not returned to the habit.

I believe it is only proper to point out that these persons are not considered as criminals under the provisions of the act but rather as patients. Still, the law provides no haven for those who have committed a crime under some other existing law.

A Political Program To Prevent World War III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD my address entitled "A Political Program To Prevent World War III," delivered before the annual Conference on Freedom and Peace Through Liberation, at its luncheon meeting held at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 22.

The address follows:

Mr. chairman and members of the conference, I am very happy to be able to join with you on this Washington's Birthday anniversary to discuss how we may attain the goals of peace and freedom through liberation. I want first of all to congratulate you on choosing such an excellent name for the conference because it connotes a positive goal. Equally important, it leaves no doubt that it is not a "me too" organ of Kennanism, containment, and surrender.

On this occasion when we commemorate the anniversary of the birth of the father of our country, soldier, statesman, and patriot, it is appropriate that we ask ourselves the question:—What should we be doing to advance the cause of human freedom at home and throughout the world?

George Washington and the men who joined hands with him in preparing and signing the Declaration of Independence never stopped thinking about individual liberty and the basic human freedoms. We must never forget that the American patriots, though but a handful of men, gave birth to political concepts soundly based in morality and alive to the basic dignity of man which fired the imagination of all mankind. So appealing was the cause they represented that other fearless souls from the four corners of the earth came to the shores of America to offer their personal fortunes and their very lives in support of that cause.

After the independence of the United States of America was won, the cause of national independence, as represented by that victory, was not seriously challenged in the world political arena until 1918. It might be said that the concept of nation and the cause of national independence held an unchallenged hold on the loyalties of mankind for a period of 140 years.

Today we see the cause which the American patriots gave to the world challenged by a new type of imperialism which seeks to turn back the pages of history by thousands of years and to make of mankind some sort of robot, completely devoid of all human feelings. That challenge is a vigorous and dangerous one as attested to by the fact that in the short course of 37 years, Russian

Communist imperialism has enslaved over 30 nations, in excess of 800 million human beings, and now occupies almost one-third of the earth's surface.

The so-called Russian experts have offered us a number of catch phrases to symbolize the courses of action open to us in our struggle to survive as a national entity. One of these slogans is peaceful coexistence, which, by the way, is a slogan coined by Lenin, and which has but recently been resurrected by Khrushchev the latest czar of the Russian Communist empire. The promoters of this slogan claim loudly that unless we are willing to engage in peaceful coexistence with the empire of communism, all mankind will be doomed because war will surely result. These same advocates maintain that if war breaks out, most of mankind will be wiped from the face of the earth because of the tremendous destructive power of the hydrogen weapons possessed by the free world and by the mad men of the Kremlin. These messengers of doom and despair are telling us that we must accept the realities of communism, that we must learn to accommodate ourselves to it, else we shall surely perish from the earth.

There is only one reward for those who make the fatal error of attempting to make any accommodation with the conspiracy of communism, and that reward is death or slavery. This is the irrefutable, unquestioned record established by communism during the course of its 37 years of tyrannical existence. There is not the slightest evidence at hand which indicates there has been a change in Communist doctrine or objectives. The events of the past 37 years remain as the only reliable index of what happens to nations and people who seek to work out a *modus vivendi* with Moscow.

Another slogan has been coined to describe what these experts claim as the only other course of action open to us, and that slogan is "preventive war." The creators of this slogan maintain that if the United States takes positive and overt action against the Communist conspiracy, a new world war will surely result. The creators of this slogan also maintain that anyone who advocates positive and overt action against the Russian Communists is *per se* advocating war of a preventive type. The promoters of this slogan, like those promoters of the slogan of peaceful coexistence, really maintain there is no other course open to us but to submit to the strangling embrace of the Russian bear. When you cut away all their fancy language and tortured reasons you arrive at no other conclusions.

It is my considered judgment the American people are being subjected to a series of brain washing through the constant repetition of these slogans—"Peaceful coexistence and preventive war." These series of treatments which automatically exclude consideration of any other course of action, are calculated to break the American spirit, to destroy our creative initiative as freemen, and to paralyze action of any type that would challenge the right of way of world communism.

Recent events which have taken place in Moscow leave no doubt in my mind that the empire of communism is threatened by powerful internal forces generated by the enslaved non-Russian nations and people. These forces, in my judgment, are so powerful that their impact upon the Russian central authority located in the Kremlin, is such as to make it impossible for the Red imperialists to conduct a successful war against the free world. In the event of open war, these captive nations and people would rise up against their alien oppressor. While this is true today, I am not certain this will be the case for all time to come. I am certain it is true today, and that is a fact we must act upon while we still have time.

The long-winded oration given by Molotov on the occasion of Khrushchev being

crowned the Czar should have been entitled "Fear of Freedom." The windy, almost childish, boasting, and bullying of the supposedly suave international diplomat, Molotov, must be regarded as a reliable index of the turbulent storms which now best the masters of the Red colonial empire. All of us recall the story of the little boy who, while walking by the graveyard in the dark of night, whistled loudly in the hope that he could drive away the evil spirit. To say that Mr. Molotov was whistling in the dark would be an understatement. More accurately stated he was shrieking in a hurricane.

Recently this practical appraisal of the situation was made by a committee of Congress:

"That the time was never more opportune or the world situation more demanding for a bold positive political offensive by the United States and the entire free world; this is the only course which gives reasonable hope for avoiding all-out war."

This is a quotation from the published Summary Report of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, dated December 31, 1954. This estimate, as you will note, was made before the recent turn of events in Moscow. I believe that this conclusion has even stronger foundation in fact today than it had then, back in December, and I, as a member of that committee, was absolutely convinced, based on irrefutable evidence in possession of the committee, that this conclusion was conservative. Now the question before us is, What should make up that bold, positive, political offensive? Of one thing we may be certain, slogans, catchwords, and speeches do not mean action. What is needed is the launching of concrete steps calculated to return the initiative in the struggle for the minds and loyalties of all mankind to the cause of human freedom, as represented by the United States of America. I would like to offer you some concrete steps which I believe we must take as soon as possible and which are, without doubt, well within our capabilities. I take pleasure in recalling to your attention the 13 recommendations made by the House Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression as the concrete, starting steps in such a bold, positive, political offensive. Those recommendations are:

1. The committee again recommends that the President of the United States take the initiative in convening an international conference of all free non-Communist nations for the following purposes:

A. To express formal recognition of the fact that the Communist governments, which now control over 800 million human beings, are not representative of the will of the people.

B. To seek agreement whereby the free non-Communist nations acting in concert will withdraw diplomatic recognition from all Moscow-controlled Communist governments.

C. To reaffirm the friendship and solidarity of the people of the free world with the people and nations enslaved by communism.

D. To develop a program for the rapid and complete termination of all commercial treaties and trade with Communist governments and the initiation of a program of trade among all non-Communist nations which will strengthen the security of the free world.

E. To develop an overall, dynamic program for the defeat of the international Communist conspiracy.

2. That Congress establish a joint committee on all United States overseas information programs in order that maximum results may be assured in bringing the full force of truth to all the people of the free world and increased hope to the millions of people enslaved by communism.

3. That Congress by appropriate action reiterate and make clear that the eventual

liberation of all the nations enslaved within the Communist empire, together with unqualified support for the principle of national self-determination through free elections and the secret ballot, are firm and unchanging parts of our national policy.

4. That in the advancement of the American program for world peace and freedom all efforts therein be measured against the criteria of whether they assist the captive peoples to hasten the day when they may achieve their liberation, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected.

5. That the spirit of resistance to Communist tyranny behind the Iron Curtain be encouraged and supported through the judicious use of funds already authorized by Congress for such purpose.

6. That the appropriate agencies of the Government concerned with the threat of world communism give maximum opportunity to those private American organizations, groups, and individuals that have a natural bond with the enslaved nations and people, to play a major role in the restoration of freedom in the lands of their ancestry.

7. That, as a demonstration of our genuine sympathy for the enslaved nations and peoples, and to weaken the will of the armies under Communist rule to fight and support the Kremlin's plan for world conquest, the President immediately direct the establishment of the national military units formed from escapees from the enslaved nations as authorized by section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, thus providing a concrete symbol of a genuine coexistence and unity between the nations and peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

8. That Congress at the next session enact H. R. 8000, known as the Political Asylum Act of 1954, to provide for the rapid and effective reestablishment of selected escapees from communism and to encourage the defection and escape of others.

9. That the Congress give the United States Information Agency full support not only by way of an increase in funds but also by strengthening its role in our Government's political offensive. Similarly, foundations, private organizations, and individual citizens are urged to continue and increase their support to the Committee for Free Europe (Radio Free Europe).

10. That an International Juridical Commission be established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so that Communist crimes perpetrated against humanity may be fully recorded and officially noted for prosecution.

11. That the Department of State transmit copies of this report, together with all other reports of the committee to each member nation of the United Nations.

12. That the Department of State formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions and recommendations of this report, branding the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against all the nations enslaved by communism and that the United States delegation to the United Nations be instructed to take immediate steps to place this resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

13. That the work of this committee be continued in order to complete the investigation of all phases and techniques of Communist aggression in areas of the world not already covered by the committee, together with further inquiry into conditions of life within the Communist empire; a program that lack of time has thus far prevented.

I leave to your judgment whether or not this 13-point program will advance the cause of freedom and peace throughout the world. I believe that we, as a Nation, must initiate such a program because unless we do so, we must face up to the inevitability of all-out war or the alternative of abject surrender

to a life of slavery now threatened by the Communist conspirators. We, the inheritors of this sacred heritage of individual liberty, government under law, and dependence upon divine providence, must not fail in the historic mission the enslaved nations and suffering peoples of the world have called upon us to fulfill. Remaining true and firm in the support of our great American ideals, we cannot fail in this historic mission.

Twentieth Triennial Congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September last, at Plymouth, Mass., the 20th triennial congress of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants was held. The attendance of officers and delegates from the forty-odd State societies of the Mayflower descendants, making up the Congress, was the largest in the history of the general society, founded in 1927. There were many interesting features involved in the 3 days of the congress, one of which was the customary Pilgrims' progress, a procession made up of men and women dressed in the costumes of Plymouth Colony days. This picturesque group, headed by a drummer boy, and followed by impersonated Pilgrims: Elder William Brewster, the role assumed by Rev. Cecil Plumb, of Salem, N. Y., elder general of the general society; Governor Carver, John Howland, John Alden, Priscilla Mullins, Captain Miles Standish, Governor Bradford, and others, marched up to Burial Hill, where some of the earliest Pilgrims repose. The procession stopped at the site of the Old Fort of Pilgrim days, and there Elder General Plumb delivered a very fine and appropriate address to the assemblage present, made up of Mayflower descendants, and others.

At the congress, the following officers were elected for the next ensuing 3 years: Governor General Col. Waldo M. Allen, Lake Forrest, Ill.; treasurer general, Merriam Davis, Hartford, Conn.; counselor general, Maurice H. Thatcher, Washington, D. C.; historian general, Mrs. John Kermott Allen, Boston, Mass.; elder general, Rev. Cecil Plumb, Salem, N. Y.; captain general, Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Hudson, Wis.; and surgeon general, Dr. Jay S. Ruldophy, Wayne, Pa.

The new counselor general, Maurice H. Thatcher, was formerly Representative in Congress from the Louisville, Ky., district. He was also chairman of the committee on resolutions at the recent Plymouth Congress, and had served in the like capacity at the 19th triennial congress of the general society in 1951. In addition, he was the author of a proposed amendment to the constitution of the general society on the questions of eligibility and subversives; which proposal was adopted at the recent Congress.

Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States and deputy governor general for Nebraska to the general society, delivered before the 20th triennial congress a fine, informative address on the subject of communism, and narrated the steps being taken by the Congress of the United States and the Federal executive departments in dealing with this grave menace.

Also, the recent congress at Plymouth adopted as the theme song of the general society the composition, *Our Mayflower*, of Mrs. Marie Rich Rockwood, well-known composer, of Massachusetts, herself a descendant of Gov. William Bradford, of Plymouth Colony fame.

A unique and interesting feature of the program of the congress was the rendition by Harry B. Sherman, of Rhode Island—impersonating Elder Brewster—of the famous fancied speech ascribed by Daniel Webster, at the Pilgrim Festival in New York in 1950, to the spiritual leader of the Plymouth Colony.

The 20th triennial congress, agreeably to long-established custom, was held in the First Parish Church, at Plymouth—an edifice which may be said to be a lineal descendant—the fifth—of the 1st church of the Pilgrims in the Plymouth Colony, which is considered to have been the first Congregational church in the new world.

Under leave accorded, I am very glad to include as a part of these remarks the indicated address of the elder general.

The address of Elder General Cecil Plumb follows:

This representation of Pilgrims who survived the dreadful winter of 1620 is an attempt to honor the memory of the entire company of those immortals whom we hail today. Their endeavors to serve God had large influence in shaping the frame and substance of the America we love. History should make sharper distinction between the fairly tolerant Pilgrim and his more self-righteous Puritan brother.

The object of their pilgrimage was to build a better material living in order to glorify God, preserve ideals, and propagate the redemptive Gospel of Jesus Christ. It was their share of performance in what they regarded as the whole duty of humanity to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. They who earlier had covenanted in a spiritual society to seek God's will and to obey it so far as they saw it, arriving at these ungoverned shores compacted to also form a political society. Through it they planned to choose officers with responsibility to promote the common good. This compact was the earliest written document of constitutional government known to the world. It was an important factor in the establishment of the United States of America, the world's earliest national example of government by and for the people.

Pilgrims departing from Plymouth, England, received a letter from their beloved pastor, John Robinson, in Holland. His advice was most practical. Because of their plan for a civil community, he said, they would find certain things necessary which he urged they never neglect. These were, first, brotherly forbearance; second, placement of the general good above personal advantage; and, third, choosing officers who love and promote the general good, yielding them honor and obedience.

The loftiness of their ideal, the completeness of their investment, the persevering devotion to their calling, the penalty of their sacrifice, the success of their enterprise, the present challenge of its dream is unmatched

in the traditional or written annals of mankind.

Our world today is in a sorry state. But we face no greater evil, we have no lesser God, than they knew. Each generation must redeem its liberty, make its own pilgrimage. No discouragement is ours that was not theirs. No resource was theirs that is not ours. Need we be reminded that many times the fortunes of this Plymouth were as like to ebb away as the waves of yonder tide? Here is Bradford's estimate of the considered judgment of his fellows: "The dangers were many, but not desperate; the difficulties were many, but not invincible—all of them through the help of God, by fortitude and patience, might either be borne or overcome."

What a place is this for enlistment of modern Pilgrims. What a time is this for the practice of a Pilgrim's progress in godly faith. Shall we not this day join ourselves to these people of the past whose faith, labors, and memory have enshrined this Plymouth in the hearts of America and the hopes of the world? Shall we not this day join ourselves in spirit with all people who love truth, seek virtue, treasure liberty, and in lowliness of spirit are willing to be led and taught by God their Maker?

This is not a world of chance. This should not be a day of darkness or despair. Men and women who receive God are not victims of circumstances, but children of providence. The righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith, from generation to generation. The just shall live by faith.

Opposition to H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article published by the American Tariff League, Inc.:

UNITED STATES PRODUCERS PROTEST WIDE POWERS OF H. R. 1

The administration's all-out attempt to obtain early congressional enactment of its United States tariff-cutting program has run into strong opposition from major segments of United States industry, agriculture, mining, and labor, whose representatives have been voicing their apprehensions at congressional hearings on H. R. 1, the bill to renew and broaden the President's powers under the trade agreements program.

H. R. 1, an administration-sponsored bill that carries some of the proposals of the Randall Commission, was introduced January 5 by Representative JERE COOPER (D., Tenn.), chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee which started hearings on the bill January 17. It incorporates the tariff proposals submitted to Congress in the President's special message on foreign trade of January 10. Other nontariff recommendations in the presidential message, including the request for further customs simplification, are reportedly being drafted for early submission to Congress.

Efforts to demonstrate administration solidarity behind its freer trade policies highlighted the start of the House hearings as a parade of Cabinet witnesses testified in support of H. R. 1. Members of the President's official family included Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, Secretary of Defense

Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, and Foreign Operations Administration Director Harold E. Stassen.

Witnesses testifying in opposition to H. R. 1 far outnumbered the proponents of the trade-extension bill and represented a comprehensive cross-section of the United States domestic economy, including some of the largest, as well as the smallest industries, and agricultural producers.

League Executive Secretary Richard H. Anthony, in presenting ATL's views on H. R. 1, declared that the broad and unprecedented powers given the executive branch under the bill presaged "a mopping-up operation . . . on our tariff structure." He warned that they appeared to permit the President to enter into executive agreements, such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), "which would become law without being referred to Congress for ratification, and to permit the President to cut tariffs on his own regardless of any trade agreement—an entirely new grant of power."

Representatives of the American chemical industry told the committee that further reductions in United States tariffs on chemical imports would weaken our national security program. Industry spokesmen referred to the rapid recovery of the foreign chemical industries since the last war and the inability of United States chemical producers to compete with efficient foreign producers paying labor one-tenth to one-fourth of our wage rates. They further urged adequate tariff safeguards to help meet the great disparity between United States producers' costs and those of foreign competitors.

Representing the United States chemical industry at the House hearings and testifying their opposition to the tariff-cutting features of H. R. 1 were Edgar M. Queeny, chairman of the board, Monsanto Chemical Co.; Samuel Lenher, president, Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association; Sidney C. Moody, vice president, American Cyanamid Co.; Calvin Campbell, vice president and general counsel, Dow Chemical Co.; Fred G. Singer, for the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc.; and D. G. Rogers, president, national aniline division, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.

Appearing on behalf of the United States electrical equipment manufacturing industry: Gwilym A. Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp., testified that United States producers were unable to bridge the price gap existing between them and foreign makers of such heavy-duty items as motors, transformers, control apparatus, turbines and generators. Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., expressed concern over increasing Government procurement of foreign-produced electric power equipment and urged that proposed tariff changes should be preceded by a consideration of the probable impact of the proposed change upon our national security and defense program.

The maintenance of an adequate manpower reserve of trained personnel and skills as vital to the Nation's strategic defense industries marked the testimony of L. B. McKinley, vice president, Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., representing the domestic scientific equipment industry.

Wool, cotton, rayon and synthetic fiber processors and manufacturers united to oppose H. R. 1. Commenting upon the heavy textile representation appearing before the House hearings on H. R. 1, the New York Daily News Record on January 31 reported that opposition to the administration's tariff-cutting program "has for the first time in history drawn the entire textile industry into unified action, with 25 trade associations joining forces." Industry representatives,

the New York Herald Tribune reported on the same date, criticized the adoption of a foreign economic program without adequate deliberation as jeopardizing the livelihood of employees and the savings of investors in textile and allied enterprises.

A heavy contingent of witnesses representing a cross-section of the United States domestic independent oil producing industry voiced a strong protest against the impact of increased oil imports and urged Congress to provide adequate safeguards to maintain vital United States natural resources. Industry spokesmen noted that 25 percent of domestic producing oil capacity was now shut-in for lack of market demand.

H. R. 1 PROVISIONS ANALYZED

Although the President, in his Congressional message on January 10, stated that the additional authority requested to negotiate new tariff reductions would be carried out on a gradual, selective and reciprocal basis, an analysis of the provisions of H. R. 1 indicate that substantial, across-the-board tariff cuts are possible on every single United States tariff rate, whether or not it has been reduced in prior United States tariff negotiations under GATT or in separate bilateral pre-GATT tariff pacts.

H. R. 1 extends the President's authority to enter into new trade agreement negotiations to June 30, 1958, and provides for major revisions in the basic trade agreements act. The bill would empower the President to (1) incorporate into newly negotiated trade pacts general provisions related to international trade provided they were not inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States; (2) further reduce United States tariffs in annual stages over the next 3 years by 3 alternative methods, 1 of which would permit the President to lower tariffs on his own authority without relation to a trade agreement, a new concept of delegated tariffmaking power; and (3) follow a new trade agreement negotiating principle in the contemplated United States-Japanese pact, by granting United States concessions on items of interest to third countries in return for which those third countries would reduce their tariffs on items of interest to Japan.

H. R. 1 would authorize the President to include in trade agreements provisions with respect to international trade, including provisions relating to tariffs, to most-favored-nation standards and other standards of non-discriminatory treatment affecting such trade, to quantitative import and export restrictions, to customs formalities, and to other matters relating to such trade designed to promote the purpose of this (act) *Provided, That no such provision shall be given effect in a manner inconsistent with existing legislation of the United States.*

This section of H. R. 1 would appear to permit the President to enter into such an overall agreement as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) without the necessity of referring it to Congress for ratification.

The language of this section of H. R. 1 is descriptive of the commercial policy sections or substantive provisions, of GATT which are being revised at the current GATT review session in Geneva. In his March 30, 1954, message to Congress, the President had urged a revision of the substantive sections in GATT, but failed to mention that they would be submitted to Congress, adding that the "organizational provisions" thereof would be sent to the Congress for its approval. In his January 10 message of this year, the President again stated that when the "revision of the organizational provisions are satisfactorily completed, the results will be submitted to the Congress for its approval."

GATT, originally negotiated in 1947 and signed provisionally for the United States

under the alleged authority of the Trade Agreements Act, has never been submitted to Congress. Congress, moreover, in recent trade extension laws has incorporated therein a GATT caveat stating that Congress by their enactment, did not express approval or disapproval of GATT.

H. R. 1 does not change the peril point and escape clause provisions of the present trade agreements law. The President would continue to have discretionary authority to negotiate duty cuts below the peril points set by the United States Tariff Commission, provided they kept within the maximums set by the law, and to proclaim or reject Commission recommendations for escape clause remedy to domestic producers injured by increased low-wage imports.

NEW TARIFF—CUTTING AUTHORITY PROVIDED

H. R. 1 stipulates that on or after June 12, 1955, the President may proclaim United States tariff reductions according to the following three alternative methods:

Method 1 provides for decreases, in three annual stages of 5 percent, of duties to a maximum of 15 percent below those existing on July 1, 1955.

Method 2 provides for decreases to a rate 50 percent below the one existing on January 1, 1945 in the case of "any article which the President determines, at the time the foreign trade agreement is entered into, is not being imported into the United States or is being imported into the United States in negligible quantities."

While method 2 may be applied to implement a trade agreement entered into after June 12, 1955, H. R. 1 specifically allows the President to proclaim duty reductions thereunder on his own determination if he finds that the general purposes of the Trade Agreements Act as amended by H. R. 1 are promoted thereby. This latter authorization constitutes a new type of tariff-reducing power not previously granted under the trade agreements program. The bill, however, stipulates that unilateral duty cuts made under method 2 by the President can be proclaimed only after the statutory safeguards, including the peril point investigations, are followed.

Method 3 provides for decreases to 50 percent of any rate above that level, "during a period determined by the President to be a representative period." President proclamations thereunder are to be based on the current valuation provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930. Last year, the United States Tariff Commission was instructed by the Senate Finance Committee to undertake a special investigation on all United States imports subject to duties equal to 50 percent ad valorem or higher and to report its findings to the Congress by December 1, 1954. Portions of this study covering items subject to peril point investigation by the Commission in preparation for the contemplated negotiations with and for the benefit of Japan have been withheld by agreement with the Finance Committee. The committee has received the rest of the study, but is keeping it confidential for the time being.

H. R. 1 AND UNITED STATES-JAPANESE NEGOTIATIONS

H. R. 1 expressly provides that Presidential proclamations of duty cuts negotiated in the projected United States agreement with Japan and certain GATT countries, if concluded on or after June 12, 1955, shall be subject to present limits of a 50 percent reduction of rates existing on January 1, 1945, if the President determines "that such decreases is necessary in order to provide expanding export markets for Japan (including such markets in third countries)."

In the tariff-cut negotiations with Japan and third countries, the United States has made known its intentions to grant United States concessions to third countries in re-

turn for their concessions to Japan, rather than to the United States. H. R. 1 thus appears to expressly authorize the President to employ a new principle of reciprocity. In agreements to date United States concessions to other countries have been made for the avowed purpose of obtaining concessions for the direct benefit of the United States.

GATT REVIEW CONTINUES

Basic agreement on two of the controversial agenda items which have beset the ninth GATT session since the start of its deliberation on a revised GATT is reported in press articles from Geneva. On January 29, the New York Times reported that the GATT meeting had informally agreed to extend for a 3-year period beyond the present expiration date of July 1, 1955, an amended version of the GATT article XXVIII provision which prevents wholesale withdrawal of tariff concessions made by GATT member nations, including the United States. Geneva press reports also stated that agreement had been reached on the type of permanent organization which would be set up to supervise GATT. Tentative titles for the new body were the Organization for Trade Cooperation or the International Organization for Trade Cooperation.

GATT studies of persistent capital movements from foreign countries with the United States were reported in a recent Geneva dispatch to the New York Times. The startling policy implications of these GATT studies were termed highly controversial by the Times Geneva correspondent, who then added: "Indeed, they contain so much dynamite that it is highly unlikely the study will ever be published as an official paper."

The GATT reports emphasize that the "very countries that assert the duty of the United States to help them with capital investments have been pouring hundreds of millions of dollars a year of their own investment funds into the politically secure United States capital market." The Times report continued: "The studies also throw considerable doubt on the thesis that lowering the American tariff is essential to the establishment of better balance in world trade."

Pointing out that if the flow of foreign capital into the United States was the major cause for dollar shortages, the Times report went on to say that it "could easily be made out as the villain responsible for the economic disorder by those interested in maintaining or increasing barriers to competitive imports."

Soybean Producers Face Gigantic Loss if United States Department of Agriculture Carries Out Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the proposal, if not the announced intention, of the Grain Standards Division of the Department of Agriculture to make certain changes in the soybean standards, I have gone on record as opposing these changes for a number of reasons.

Naturally, one of the most compelling reasons for opposing these changes is the fact that any such change would immediately and without question result in

a financial loss of many millions of dollars, shared by practically every producer of soybeans throughout a large area of the South and the Midwest.

Furthermore, any change at this time, and without giving the farmers of my area, as well as those of many other States, an opportunity to make a change in their plans for planting, would be doing them the greatest disservice. If such a plan as a representative of the Department of Agriculture said they were convinced was in order, and which he indicated would be put into effect this year, is permitted to go into effect, it would cause confusion and penalize thousands of southern farmers at a time when they have already suffered an irreparable damage due to droughts of the past 3 years.

If such a change is to be made, it should not be made until after our farmers have had adequate notice and an opportunity to adjust their planting plans. It should, in my opinion, not be considered until sufficient notice has been given of the contemplated intentions of the Department to permit the development of a type of soybeans which will meet the requirements of the Department's so-called experts.

I would respectfully call to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture, as well as to those who have the responsibility of carrying out the regulations of his Department, that to make this arbitrary change, without due notice to all parties concerned, would be to take a most unfair advantage of the very persons whose interests they are supposed to be guarding.

Furthermore, I would respectfully point out that, at the recent hearing held at Memphis, Tenn., with approximately 300 persons in attendance, not one single person with the exception of the representatives of the Department of Agriculture, expressed themselves as favoring the proposed changes, and in fact all of those present, including farmer producers, elevator operators, and warehousemen, processors, operators of terminal facilities, exporters, and others, all went on record as strongly opposing the proposed change in classification of soybeans, and at this hearing there was no satisfactory answer to the question of Who wants this change?

In connection with these remarks, I am including herewith copy of an article which appeared in one of the newspapers of my district, The Republican, of Caruthersville, Mo., which sets forth a rather complete résumé of the hearing at Memphis, which calls attention to the damage which would be done by the adoption of the proposed change in classification, and furthermore sets forth rather clearly a substantiation of the charges which I have made that there was inadequate notice of this hearing and that the farmers of that area generally had no notice of the great importance of the contemplated change and therefore have not had sufficient opportunity to voice their great opposition to this change.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues, particularly those from the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi,

Kentucky, and Louisiana, will join with me in protesting this proposed change in the classifications as they would affect not less than 80 percent and possibly as much as 85 to 90 percent of the soybeans produced in their respective districts.

Herewith is a report of the Memphis hearing as reported by Mr. Albert Cravens, secretary-treasurer of the Mid-south Soybean & Grain Shippers Association, in the Thursday, February 17, 1955, issue of the Caruthersville (Mo.) Republican:

USDA RECLASSIFICATION OF OGDEN BEAN WOULD COST PEMISCOT FARMERS

Albert Cravens of the Missouri Soybean Co., of Caruthersville, which also has elevators at Hayti, and who is also secretary-treasurer of the Mid-south Soybean and Grain Shippers Association, was among some 300 Mid-south growers, buyers, and shippers who were in attendance at a United States Department of Agriculture meeting held Monday afternoon at the Hotel Peabody, Memphis, Tenn. A. O. "Cap" Acom of Wardell was also present.

The meeting was in charge of J. E. Barr, chief inspector, Grain Branch, USDA, who heard members of the group in testimony relative to a proposed change in classification of the Ogden soybean from a yellow to a green or mixed bean classification.

An interested witness at this meeting was Congressman PAUL C. JONES, of Kennett, the only Congressman from any of the six States present at this important meeting.

Since the soybean, along with cotton, forms the backbone of this area's agricultural economy, the proposed change in classification is of prime importance to farmers in Pemiscot County and throughout this six State area.

The Ogden soybean sometimes has a green seed coating over its yellow meat, making it appear to be a green instead of a yellow bean. The USDA proposes to change classification of the Ogden bean from yellow to green where it appears green. This actually would put the Ogden bean in the mixed classification, since some of the beans bleach out yellow while others retain their green coat at harvest time.

Mixed beans carry a 25-cent penalty when put in the loan and, it is feared here, this change in classification could lead to some discrimination against the bean in the American market.

At the conclusion of the meeting Mr. Barr gave the group little hope and said the USDA grading change, if made, may not be formulated before May 1, which would be well into the planting time in this county and area and would be too late for most farmers to make any adjustment in their planting schedules.

Mr. Barr told the group that "a lot of foreign buyers have complained on some green beans being certified yellow. We think it was a serious mistake when, in 1949, the Ogden was placed in the yellow classification."

In answer to the question of how many complaints had been made to the USDA by foreign buyers, Mr. Barr replied, "We think one is too many."

A representative of the port of New Orleans, who is also an exporter, told the meeting that this proposal is dangerous and will increase our problems tenfold. We think you will be faced with the never-ending problem of determining whether the bean is yellow or green or what.

A surprise visitor at the hearing was Congressman PAUL C. JONES, of Kennett, Representative from the 10th District of Missouri, of which Pemiscot County is part. Congressman JONES is a member of the Agricultural Committee, serving in the fats and oils division. He testified briefly and chided Mr.

Barr for not giving more publicity to the hearing.

That no publicity was given this important hearing was indicated by the fact that no press representatives were spotted in the large crowd and no Associated Press or United Press wire story was sent out from Memphis, nor was any mention of the meeting heard here over Memphis radio or television stations. No story was carried in Monday or Tuesday editions of The Commercial Appeal which were distributed here.

According to Cravens, Mr. Barr expressed surprise over the size of the crowd on hand and the outspoken manner which those who presented testimony participated in the meeting. "Reminds me of Texas," Barr said.

W. H. (Bill) Wyatt, who spoke for the Arkansas Bureau, pointed out that the mixed bean, in which classification the Ogden would fall, would draw a 25-cent per bushel penalty under the loan program.

"We believe," Mr. Wyatt told the meeting, "any foreign buyer can get strictly yellow beans from northern areas without hurting them and without totally wrecking our economy."

"A four- or five-million bushel crop in Mississippi County (Arkansas) alone in 1955, if the price dropped 20 cents, would mean a \$1 million loss."

"If the USDA can show us just cause why the bean should be changed, then time must be allowed to develop a comparable yielding yellow bean," he stated.

Most farm bureau groups planned to hold meeting when they returned home to state the situation and make plans to press for some action through their Congressmen.

Welcome to the Catholic Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, there has recently come off the press the first issue of a new professional publication entitled "The Catholic Lawyer." It is published quarterly by the St. Thomas More Institute for Legal Research of St. John's University School of Law, in Brooklyn, N. Y., under the editorship of Rev. Joseph T. Tinnelly, C. M., dean of the law school.

The statement of policy in the first issue contains the following:

The average attorney is a leader in his community. His opinion is respected, his advice valued, not only in purely professional problems but in a wide variety of subjects having some relation, however tenuous, to law. In consequence, no matter how sound his general and professional education may have been he still feels the need to widen and deepen his knowledge and experience. The success of the Practicing Law Institute, of graduate and post-admission courses in various law schools, and of institutes in taxation, insurance, labor law and other subjects under the auspices of bar associations, gives evidence of this widespread need.

The Catholic attorney has all the professional obligations of his non-Catholic colleagues. Indeed his conscience may be sharpened by the fact that his confessor will require him to make restitution for any harm which his culpable ignorance or lack of diligence may have caused a client.

The publication is intended to supply answers and information on problems of concern to lawyers by the promotion and publication of legal research in such subjects. It is dedicated to the principles of St. Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England under Henry VIII.

I know that the Members of the House, particularly the lawyer Members, will join me in welcoming this important contribution to the literature of the law, and wishing for it many years of success.

It is particularly appropriate that I should call this to your attention today, Washington's birthday, since this morning, St. John's University of Brooklyn was hailed at Valley Forge, Pa., by the Freedoms Foundation for its outstanding contribution to the American way of life during the year 1954.

A Plan To Torpedo REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD a portion of the National Farmers Union Washington Newsletter which points up a proposal by a "task force" of the Hoover Commission to abolish REA. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues who are vitally interested in REA.

As one who has probably the greatest percentage of REA members in any congressional district, I view this proposal by the Hoover Commission "task force" with considerable alarm. While the full Hoover Commission has not considered the "task force's" recommendation, I feel that friends of the REA should be alerted to prospects of legislation being introduced to torpedo REA.

The REA has done more than electrify rural America—thus improving the efficiency and productivity of our farms. REA has also raised the standard of living for farm people and brought to them some of the comforts of living heretofore enjoyed only by people living in urban, suburban and a few rural areas.

The National Farmers Union Washington Newsletter reads in part as follows:

HOOPER GROUP ASKS ABOLITION OF REA

A task force of the Hoover Commission on Governmental Reorganization is recommending that the Rural Electrification Administration be abolished and that REA co-ops be required to depend upon private financing for their future expansion.

Although not yet made public, the Hoover group's recommendations have been learned by the Farmers Union. They are also known to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and were discussed by NRECA leaders at their annual convention in Atlantic City, N. J., this week.

If approved by the full Hoover Commission and the President, legislation to accomplish the abolition of REA will be presented along with the Commission's report.

The Hoover plan calls for an immediate stop to Government loans to co-ops. In

place of REA, a Rural Electrification Corporation would be established through which the co-ops would borrow money needed for their future growth from private financial institutions.

The REC would sell debenture bonds in private money markets at rates of interest sufficient to attract private investors.

Interest rates to be paid by the co-ops would have to be increased sufficiently to cover the interest on REC's bonds, plus all administrative costs of the Corporation.

The Hoover plan would accomplish substantially what the Clardy bill proposed during the last Congress—to double the interest charge on REA co-op loans. It might well go much further.

Rural electric leaders at the convention estimated that interest rates would range between 4½ and 6 percent under the Hoover plan—from twice to three times as high as at present.

Higher rates for electric and telephone service are specifically recommended by the Hoover plan.

The task force recommendation would require co-ops to charge rates high enough "to enable them to pay (a) their own maintenance; (b) provide reserves for expansion; (c) make proportionate purchases of the Government stock in the Corporation (REC); and (d) pay interest and amortization on their loans."

This would place the co-ops at a serious competitive disadvantage. Profit utilities' rates cover only interest and profit on their capital and operating and maintenance costs. They never pay off their debt, nor do they finance their own expansion out of current rates.

Instead, the private utilities borrow the capital they need by selling bonds or common stock. Their debt is perpetual. Their very purpose for existing is to enable investors to obtain interest on their bonds and profits on their stocks. In contrast, the co-ops exist to furnish their owner-patrons with service at the lowest possible cost.

The Hoover plan would immediately "stretch out" the "yardstick" which co-ops have been setting in rural rates and service for the entire utility industry. By weakening the co-ops' competitive position, it would result in rising rates for all rural users of electricity and phone service.

A severe restriction on future expansion of the co-ops would also be put into effect by the Hoover plan, which would prohibit loans "for the construction of telephone or electric facilities which private utilities stand willing to build."

This provision would make "cream skimming" by the private utilities the law of the land, giving to the private utilities all the profitable territories.

It would also completely curtail the co-op generating and transmission projects, forcing the co-ops to depend upon private utilities for their wholesale power supplies.

Control by Congress over the rural electrification and telephone programs would be ended by the Hoover recommendations also.

The Rural Electrification Corporation proposed to replace the REA would be run by a board appointed by the President. Its policies and operations would not be subject to the close review by Congress which is now the case in respect to REA.

In the present situation, this change would immediately put the REA co-ops at the mercy of proutility administration forces which tried, during the past 2 years, to kill the REA program by starving it for loan funds. Farmers were able to go to Congress and get REA loan funds increased greatly above the amounts proposed by the President.

With an REC Board made up of people with points of view like other power officials whom President Eisenhower has appointed,

the co-ops would be put directly at the mercy of the private power lobby.

A "give-away" of the Government's equity in its present investments in REA co-ops is also involved in the Hoover recommendation.

Outstanding REA loans, which are secured by "first mortgage" obligations of the cooperatives, would be down-graded to "second mortgage" status in favor of the new loans from private investors.

This would mean that the Government would take practically any loss that might occur on any REA investment. The private investors would be paid off first in case of any loss, leaving the Government only what equity would be left over as security on its own original investment.

This feature, which would require a voluntary devaluation of the Government's \$2½ billion first mortgage security on its existing loan authorizations, is a tipoff on the lack of genuine concern on the part of the Hoover group for the Government's rights and financial interests.

The Hoover group's real motive is not to protect the taxpayers. It is instead to strangle the cooperative-electrification program as an effective source of competition with the private utilities, and to put the co-ops at the mercy of private financial institutions.

The REA co-ops in their convention declared the Hoover recommendation "would be utterly disastrous to the rural electric systems."

In a strongly worded resolution, the co-ops pointed out that the report's authors refused to hold public hearings. The report was prepared by Price, Waterhouse, the national power lobby's auditors, for the deliberate "purpose of scuttling the rural-electrification program and destroying competition in the electric industry," they stated.

NRECA demanded that Congress not only reject the Hoover recommendation, but also conduct a full investigation into the source of the plan to "expose the authors for what they are—tools of the money lenders and the power monopoly."

President's Plan To Aid School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial entitled "President's Plan To Aid School Construction," which appeared in the February 17, 1955, issue of the Durham (N. C.) Morning Herald. I am in agreement with the views expressed in this editorial.

The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO AID SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

It is necessary to examine rather closely, in the light of school needs, the President's message on Federal aid to school construction to determine whether his plan will really help the schools meet the building shortage.

In his message, President Eisenhower pointed out that over 300,000 classrooms are needed, largely as a result of curtailed construction during the war, and that an additional 50,000 classrooms must be provided annually to take care of the increasing enrollment. Classrooms which have become

unsafe or otherwise unsuited must be replaced. During the school year 1954-55, about 60,000 new classrooms are being built. He points out that while rate of construction is keeping pace with increasing enrollment, "it has only slightly reduced the total classroom deficit."

The President proposed Federal aid to meet construction needs as follows: Appropriation of \$750 million over a 3-year period to be used for purchase of school bonds by the Federal Government, the local school districts to pay a reasonable interest rate, which Press Secretary James C. Hagerty interpreted as a maximum of 3½ percent; the creation of special school-building agencies by the States, the States and the Federal Government to put up an initial reserve fund equal to 1 year's payment of interest and principal, the plan to provide \$6 billion during the next 3 years; an appropriation of \$200 million over a 3-year period to provide grants to school districts which can prove need and lack of local income; and \$5 million for State conferences (one-half the administrative cost) to plan sound long-term financing of the public schools free of obsolete restrictions.

If Mr. Hagerty's interpretation of the interest rate the Government will expect of the bonds it buys is correct, that proposal will hurt rather than help school districts. Durham County, for example, is paying 1.7358-percent interest on the 1948 issue of \$2 million for city schools and 2.3538 percent on the 1953 issue in the same amount. Both figures are substantially less than 3.125 percent. It would cost Durham more to sell bonds to the Government than it costs to sell them to investment bankers.

The requirements attached to the special agency proposal are such that the States could probably accomplish as much without Federal aid as with it under this proposal.

The appropriation for school districts which can prove need and lack of local income will help in hardship cases, but there are relatively few school districts which can benefit under that proposal.

The appropriation for State conferences to plan school financing sounds like throwing away that much money. State boards of education have no doubt explored such planning exhaustively.

Republican-Eisenhower Economic Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a revealing summary of the economic philosophy of the Republican-Eisenhower administration by William H. Stringer, Washington bureau chief of the Christian Science Monitor, appeared in that paper on February 19.

Mr. Stringer avers that things are going well on the Nation's economic front and lists the administration's steps of approach producing it. He raises a query as to whether the economy will tick along at its present fast pace if the prop of defense orders is discontinued.

I believe the answer is that it will, indeed. Not only will any decrease in defense spending allow us to divert spending toward long-delayed internal

improvements in the country, but more basically, our present-day economic philosophy is that which originally brought greatness and wealth to our country. It is a tried, tested, and successful philosophy that leads to ever higher standards of living for the average American whenever the dead hand of Government harassment is kept off his individual initiative and enterprise.

The article follows:

WASHINGTON.—The happy word along the Nation's economic front these days is that the United States business recovery is gaining momentum. The ancient recession has long since been skirted and auto production, construction, and steel output are booming.

This directs attention to the Eisenhower administration's basic business-economic philosophy, the philosophy which to some degree determines the economic climate of the Nation. At the moment business seems rather pleased with this economic climate. Has the Eisenhower administration happened upon a genuine "success formula"? Or is the "massive intervention" of continued heavy defense spending chiefly responsible for today's outlook?

Let us see how the administration authoritatively spells out its economic philosophy. What are the ingredients of this moderate conservatism which the President and his economic advisers have evolved? Fundamentally, a number of basic ideas enter the picture:

1. There is the doctrine not of equal shares for all but of equal opportunity for all; a doctrine not always practiced, but a primary objective.

2. There is the strong faith that incentives and rewards are vital to maintain an expanding economy; that if you tamper too much with the incentive verve it goes dead on you.

3. There is a rejection of the view that the economy must be stimulated by the pressure of steady inflation. The integrity of the dollar is to be preserved.

4. There is a strong belief in the essential role of private investment, the kind which moves ahead of immediate demand to anticipate and prepare for the needs of tomorrow.

(In the 1930's there was great pessimism, even in the schools of business, that the Nation's employment rate could never be adequately restored and kept expanding without massive governmental intervention. Now there is a real confidence in Washington that massive intervention won't be necessary; that business, given encouraged investment and upgraded living standards, can keep employment in a flourishing state.)

5. There is a strong, almost emotional, belief in the tradition of local effort—giving preference to undertakings by State and municipal governments instead of to the Federal Government (school aid, for instance). There is a feeling that private enterprise can do many of the things which the Federal Government was asked to do in the New Deal days (power generation, for instance). President Eisenhower gave his own argument for this view in a recent press conference when he said:

"I believe that the greatest amount of authority, which means comparable responsibility, must be retained in the localities in our country, or we are working steadily away from the system of government that has made this country great."

Local government, the administration contends, is closer to the people, and more responsive. It is admitted that at times a Federal program can be more decisive and efficient, but even so, the President contends, and he has felt this emotionally all through his career, local initiative must be encouraged.

6. Finally, there is a strong confidence in the value of international trade and a belief that markets should extend beyond national boundaries. Hence, the administration's ambitious foreign-trade program, which it feels will produce greater prosperity all around.

Thus reads the administration's economic credo. But it should also be said that there are things which the administration, being avowedly liberal where individuals are concerned and realistic in world affairs, does not believe in—points where, in effect, it tempers the orthodox business philosophy. For instance:

1. It doesn't believe the budget should be balanced at all costs. Budget policy must provide for adequate national defense at whatever price. Budget balancing would have to give way to higher spending if a depression should come along.

2. It holds that the capitalist system has its vicissitudes, which Government must ameliorate. Such as temporary unemployment, and the cares of old age. Thus the Eisenhower administration embraces most of the 1930 social-security reforms without question, including unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and farm price-support legislation.

3. The administration visualizes a distinct role of Government in developing the Nation's resources. In the main this would mean encouraging development within certain safeguards. Again, it prefers local to Federal initiative. Here the administration runs into its greatest clash with the Democrats and many conservationists.

4. It believes Government must foster a dynamic economic life. This means enforcement of the antitrust laws. It demands Federal funds for research and development. It means resisting attempts to rigidify the economy, such as the use of the tariff to force industry to use coal. Channels for the entry of new businesses into the market must be kept open.

These are among the basic ideals of the Eisenhower regime. Many of them are fairly obvious. Not always do they work out in practice. But their partial implementation has produced one of the most favorable economic pictures in years. That is provided the prop of defense orders continues. Whether this economic philosophy would keep the economy ticking along satisfactorily if war tensions melted and the Nation embarked on a genuine peacetime economy is another question.

What the administration especially feels is that the Nation is moving encouragingly away from the idea, prevalent in the 1930's that we have used up our capacity to grow. There are plenty of new horizons business-wise. When popular wants are being constantly upgraded, no saturation point is likely. And when one's own standard of living is going up, one is not worrying about whether the other guy is getting more than his equal share. At least, this is how the Eisenhower administration expounds its philosophy of plenty in this rosy year of 1955.

Address by the Honorable Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of this body an address by the Honorable Charles S.

Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, on the 160th anniversary of the United States Naval Supply Corps, which was delivered in New York on February 17, 1955.

Secretary Thomas in his speech has presented an excellent review of the Navy's defense program and the role of the Supply Corps in providing logistic support. Our Nation is indeed fortunate to have a man of the background and experience of Mr. Thomas serving in this vital position.

The address follows:

Mr. Jack, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you, Mr. Murrow. That introduction, I trust, shows that I am a Supply Corps man at heart. I hope you will accept me here tonight as one of you.

Six days hence, as most of us know, the Navy's Supply Corps will be 160 years old. An organization doesn't attain that venerable age unless it has survived the old-age tests of service, farsightedness, and progressiveness. This birthday has been achieved by a steady performance which has always been outstanding in the area of military supply. The Nation and the Navy are better and stronger because of its contributions.

For those who may not be acquainted with the Navy's Supply Corps and its far-reaching activities, let me say that it is the Navy's business organization. Its officers are the business experts of the Navy. They manage a huge and complex organization which is responsible for getting the Navy what it needs, where it needs it, and when it needs it. Though complex and vast, the Supply Corps' mission is simply summarized in a single phrase: "Service to the fleet."

As you all know, the Navy has just completed a very delicate and potentially dangerous task in the Formosan Straits. That task has been performed expeditiously and in a most outstanding manner of which every American can be proud. I will hazard the opinion that there will be no immediate war in the Formosan Straits, and my reason for saying so is quite simple. Whenever the Communists are confronted by strength, resolve, and courage but without provocation, they halt. For the first time in this cold-war siege, they came face to face with the harsh realities of seapower at the coastline of the Formosan Straits' 100 miles of open sea. To be an aggressor here required more than an order to violate a frontier—they had to have the ability to control and cross that 100-mile strip of water. And that they cannot do.

Parenthetically, I might point out that our Seventh Fleet couldn't have accomplished this task had there not been an effective supply organization behind it. The food, the oil, the gasoline, the spare parts, the thousands of items which keep that fleet operating 7,000 miles from home—and in this case kept it on the line for many days—is an excellent example of the unseen and often unsung work of the Supply Corps.

Right now, Formosa is current business for us all, and I am afraid we haven't seen the last of it because in relation to the global scene, Formosa appears to be but a part of a pattern for conquest. A year ago, the pressure area was Indochina. Before that it was Korea. Before that it was Iran. Before that it was Berlin. The locale of the tensions are constantly shifting, but the pattern for conquest appears to remain the same.

We all know that the country and our President want a real and lasting peace and are working diligently for that objective. However, until the Communists show some tangible evidence of a like desire, we have no alternative but to keep ourselves in a constant state of readiness.

Therefore, I thought it would be both appropriate and timely tonight to speak about

our Navy's defense program for the future and the vital part which the Supply Corps plays in it.

Let us begin by reducing the problem to its basic essentials.

What is the threat which confronts the free world today? It appears to be a very patient and long-range program for world domination. And what is the nature of this threat? There are many answers to this question—the threat is spiritual, it is economic, it is psychological, and it is military. It is a spiritual contest between those who believe in the worth and dignity of the individual and who have faith in God and those who consider man only as an advanced but soulless type of animal. It is a contest of systems—free enterprise versus regimentation. It is a contest of philosophies between those who cherish freedom and those who practice tyranny. And lastly, it is a contest of military strengths. The military threat can be varied and complicated—a cold war or a hot war; a little war or a big war; a nuclear or a nonnuclear war.

Now in analyzing this threat and its danger, we must answer the question:

Is the threat immediate or is it one of extended tension? If the answer is that we anticipate an attack in the immediate future, we obviously should go all out on our expenditures for military defense and get ready to protect ourselves in every possible way.

To do so would cost us over \$100 billion every year. But if we miscalculate, spend \$100 billion and more 3 or 4 times, and we are not attacked, we would find ourselves in serious economic trouble. We might discover we have exhausted ourselves and allowed Communists to win by default.

On the other hand, if we decide that the danger is one of extended tension—one to test our patience, destroy our economy, and yet one which gives us time and opportunity to work for a real and lasting peace—I submit that the following elements are essential for a period of extended tension:

First. We must have a retaliation capability not only to deter war but to overwhelm an enemy if he strikes.

Second. We must have a hard core of land, sea, and air forces which can be used in a variety of situations and in a variety of places. These forces must be able to handle localized emergencies yet strong enough to withstand the initial onslaught of a major conflict.

Third. We must have sea supremacy.

Fourth. We must have a continental defense program.

Fifth. We must have a potent Reserve system organized for rapid expansion.

Sixth. We must have an industrial mobilization base also designed for rapid expansion.

And lastly. We must continue a strong research and development program to maintain our scientific lead.

In years past our defense program was either feast or famine. The past 20 years are typical of this accordion process. In 1935 our entire military defense budget was slightly more than a half-billion dollars. Then, during World War II, we spent approximately \$300 billion. By 1949 our defense budget had fallen back to only \$13 billion annually. Then, during the Korean war, we mushroomed again and spent almost \$200 billion.

The economy of the United States—or for that matter any nation's economy—cannot stand such violent changes very long. It is elementary that the process of rapidly building up and closing up is wasteful and unsound. It hurts labor because it is a series of hirings and layoffs; it hurts industry because there can be no advanced planning; it hurts the military because the Armed Forces are sharply expanded 1 year, seriously reduced the next.

If this process of sharp peaks and valleys in our military expenditures had been per-

mitted to continue, it alone could have defeated us.

To reach his decision President Eisenhower considered all the factors. After the most careful analysis with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, as he said, after "prayerful study," he concluded that our military defense program must cover an indefinite period of extended tension, be adequate and strong, and yet one which the American taxpayer's pocketbook can support indefinitely. I know of no American better qualified to make that decision than President Eisenhower.

I would now like to examine with you this program of the President's in relation to the Navy. It is concisely summarized in his state of the Union message and can be divided into four major areas.

STRATEGY, AIRPOWER, PROGRESS; AND ADMINISTRATION

Let us take these areas one by one.

The President had this to say about strategy:

"Undue reliance on one weapon or preparation for only one kind of warfare simply invites an enemy to resort to another . . . we must therefore keep in our Armed Forces balance and flexibility adequate to our needs."

This statement is in sharp contrast to pre-Korean days when our military strategy was drifting toward a one-weapon strategy and to preparation for a single type of warfare. Korea proved this strategy vulnerable and fallacious.

Since our national policy rejects preventive war, a potential enemy can choose the time, the type, the size, the scope, and the location of war. Our defenses, therefore, must be sufficiently balanced and flexible to meet a variety of threats, any one of which could defeat us.

Our offenses too, must be balanced and flexible. By having several systems or methods of retaliation instead of one, we force an aggressor to anticipate retaliation by every one of those methods or systems. By so doing, we accomplish three things:

We force him to increase his defense-offense ratio. In other words, he must translate more of his capacity to strike to self-defense.

We make him dilute his defenses. Instead of defending only one corridor, area, or avenue, he must anticipate reprisal from every direction and every frontier. And we add a heavier burden to his relatively poorer industrial machine.

Having several balanced and flexible offensive systems is a corollary aid in that it increases our chances of being able to deter a war.

The Navy is tailored to provide sea forces embodying these fundamental principles of balance and flexibility. It makes the soundest, safest military sense.

Next airpower.

"The forthcoming military budget," said the President, "emphasizes modern airpower in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps."

How does the Navy feel about this? Well, the Navy agrees solidly. Within the Navy itself, because it is a big contributor to national airpower, the importance of airpower is thoroughly recognized and appreciated. Airpower over the seas, and emphasis upon it, is growing constantly.

For example, the fleet now has airplanes of very great striking potential of many types and sizes which are fully capable of carrying weapons of rapid and destructive striking power. They can deliver atomic weapons to targets 1,000 miles away.

And we have just recently launched the first of a new class of carriers on which these planes are based. We are also developing a new family of jet seaplanes which can use the 70 percent of the surface of the world as 10,000 mile long runways.

These examples certainly highlight the growth of airpower in the Navy.

Third, progress.

"Our military planners," said the President, "must be flexible enough to use new weapons and new techniques."

The numbers of new weapons in the Navy is quite surprising, even since the end of the Korean war. In the subsurface field, we have launched the atomic-powered submarine, *Nautilus*, which has exceeded our expectations. Three more atomic submarines are to be built. We have developed killer submarines to search for and destroy enemy submarines in their own element. We have troop-carrying submarines, tanker submarines, and guided-missile submarines.

On the surface of the sea, the Navy is changing mightily. In addition to the mobile seabases of the *Forrestal* class, two guided-missile cruisers are joining the fleet this year. Three types of guided missiles are now operational in the fleet—an air-to-air missile called Sparrow; a surface-to-air missile called Terrier; and a surface-to-surface missile called Regulus. We anticipate that the guided-missile field will change the Navy quite as much as did the change from wooden ships to metal ships.

In the air, the Navy is developing the helicopter to perform two offensive tasks—to hunt submarines and to transport Marines in an amphibious assault—as well as to perform a host of auxiliary roles. The Navy is also developing vertical-takeoff aircraft, jet seaplanes, bombers, and fighters, all of which we are now testing.

So in the matter of new weapons, the Navy is right in the forefront of progress.

In the matter of new techniques, we feel we are equally progressive. I will mention two new techniques briefly.

To complement our fixed land bases, the Navy is emphasizing a new concept of mobile seabases—carriers, jet seaplanes, and guided-missile ships. These moving bases will be able to prowl an aggressor's coastline. Their use will raise no problem of sovereignty. They will be able to change location at speeds up to 40 miles an hour to any area of the world's oceans and seas where their presence is required. Their locations will be unknown and unpredictable. They will be less vulnerable than fixed bases. These moving seabases will give our reprisal system the flexibility and dispersal it must have in these times when a sudden attack might overwhelm our fixed-land bases.

Secondly, atomic propulsion. Naval ships are ideally adapted for atomic propulsion, and we are moving in this field as fast as is practicable. The naval aviation field also offers a great potential for the atomic propulsion of aircraft. Atomic propulsion promises to change the Navy as much as did the shift from sail to steam.

Finally, the President has repeatedly emphasized efficient administration. At a press conference a few weeks ago he said that it is no crime to strive for efficiency and economy in the national-defense program. In the state of the Union message, he said:

"In administration of these costly programs we demand the utmost efficiency."

With 3 million people in the uniformed services, more than a million personnel in a supporting role, and spending approximately \$35 billion every year for an indefinite period, the armed services obviously must have the most modern, up-to-date supply systems for efficiently supervising volumes of this size.

As you gentlemen who represent American business know, good administration depends upon modern and efficient organization. It also requires experienced and efficient managers. It means good business methods and systems.

What sort of a business organization does the Navy have to handle its \$10 billion annual budget? In my opinion, the Navy's Supply Corps has developed the best and most efficient supply system in the history of any military organization.

First of all, it is composed of a group of officers and men who are specialists and experts in their field. That they are experts is no circumstance. Seventy percent of the corps' officers have undergraduate degrees. Twenty percent have graduate degrees in business administration. This educational process continues throughout their careers, supplemented by periodic 3-month assignments to civilian business.

In regard to organization, the Navy Supply Corps was the first service to adopt financial accounting. It was the first to use industrial stock funds. It developed a cataloging system to handle its 1,350,000 stock items which came to be a model for other organizations. It has adopted whenever practicable the best management systems of business and industry. It was the first to specialize and decentralize its procurement functions to 14 offices around the country. For example, all aviation materials are controlled through Philadelphia; all food is controlled through Washington; all clothing is controlled through Brooklyn; all ships' parts are controlled through Mechanicsburg, and so on. At each of these locations, three key experts sit side by side.

An inventory expert determines how much to buy and where to buy it; a technical expert determines what to buy from an engineering standpoint; and a procurement expert who does the actual buying. This marriage of administrative, logistic, and engineering know-how has given the Navy a sound and economical supply structure and, more important than that, it has made the Navy a more effective fighting force.

In this regard I might mention the Supply Corps' development of the modern supply ship and replenishment-at-sea techniques whereby fighting ships are rearmed, replenished, and refueled at sea. Admiral Nimitz referred to this development as the Navy's secret weapon in World War II. The best example of this is our 6th Fleet which has been in the Mediterranean now for the past 8 years without a supply base nearer than Norfolk—3,000 miles away.

Such things as these bespeak a sound and aggressive organization.

Few people today realize the importance of a modern and efficient supply system. Regardless of how able and well trained the military men, regardless of how fine their equipment, they are completely ineffective unless they can be rearmed and resupplied with all the vital things they need and at the time they need them.

The fine leadership and organization of the Supply Corps can insure, I am confident, that the President's demand for utmost efficiency will be carried out by the Navy.

Tonight I pay tribute to the Supply Corps and the wonderful group of men and women who make it successful. I know that its continued efficiency and performance will give increased strength to the Navy's and the country's defense program in the years to come.

Atoms for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial entitled "Atoms for Peace," which appeared in the *Nippon Times, Ltd.*, of Tokyo, Japan, on February 13, 1955. The editorial follows:

ATOMS FOR PEACE

A proposal of utmost importance to Japan is now before the United States House of Representatives. This is the resolution presented by Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, calling for the construction by the United States, with Japanese cooperation, of a nuclear power reactor in the city of Hiroshima.

That an atomic reactor "dedicated to the advancement of peace and progress through the production of power for industrial purposes" should be set up in Hiroshima would be highly significant. It would mark the return of the atom to that war-shattered city in a constructive role and would indicate the first concrete step toward the implementation of President Eisenhower's famed atoms-for-peace proposal made on December 8, last year.

It is gratifying to note that not only Mr. YATES but also Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, of the United States Atomic Energy Commission is strongly advocating that the Japanese people, who first felt the fury of the nuclear power as a weapon of war, should also be among the first to benefit from the use of atomic energy for peaceful, industrial purposes.

If any nation needs a constant source of abundant and cheap power to run its machines of industry, it is Japan. The promise which the harnessing of atomic power for constructive, not destructive, uses holds for all mankind would be a boon of immeasurable worth to this nation.

We are grateful to Mr. YATES and his colleagues who are exploring the possibilities of this humanitarian project. But we must admit at the same time that there are strong voices of opposition being raised here against the proposal.

Foremost among these are those who are still unable to distinguish between the atomic bomb and an atomic reactor. While this is understandable among a people with a first-hand experience with the horror of a nuclear explosion, we would do well to realize that atomic energy can and has been harnessed. The launching of the world's first atom propelled submarine, the *Nautilus*, is visible proof of the wonders nuclear power will be able to perform for mankind.

The Economic Counsel Board recently pointed out several technical difficulties, such as the signing of a Japan-United States bilateral agreement on security measures and the ability of Japanese atomic experts to handle the generation of electric power. It referred also to the national sentiment against the A-bomb. But these are not impossible obstacles.

As to be expected, Communists and other leftist elements are professing to look with horror at the proposal to build a nuclear power reactor in Japan. We take this to be one of the highest recommendations why this project should be carried through by all means. An abundant supply of atom power to fill our shortage of energy resources would mean a prosperous Japan—one which the Communists could not subjugate.

The need here is for a wider perspective. We must not forever be looking back at the destructive power unleashed on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. There are other uses for nuclear power than as a weapon of war. Scientists today have proved that the energy held within the atom can be used for peaceful and constructive purposes.

We are reminded of the fears and suspicions entertained when steam power and electric power were first introduced to a world unprepared for such magic.

We need not hesitate to usher in the atomic age of peace and progress in Japan. There is not reason why we should turn our backs to this great and humanitarian gesture of friendship and good will being extended to the Japanese people.

Anniversary of the Founding of Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last evening it was my pleasure and honor to address the Rotary Club of Muncie, Ind., on the occasion of the observance of the 50th anniversary of Rotary. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE ROTARY CLUB, MUNCIE, IND., FEBRUARY 22, 1955

When you asked me to be with you tonight to help commemorate the 50th anniversary of the founding of Rotary, I was both honored and surprised. Honored because my friends in Muncie would want me for this important occasion—surprised because you would risk the perfection of the program by exposing it to the usually dull and overextended verbiage associated with the office which I hold.

The feeling of honor, though, far outweighed that which bespoke of surprise and, being constantly aware of my debt to Muncie, I accepted. The source of that debt sits by my side tonight, as she has done constantly for the 21 years since she brightened the dull garden of my life by marrying me. The memories of her loving patience and high inspiration, her devotion to our children and her tolerance of the vicissitudes of being a politician's wife, make me look to the future with anticipation and with a knowledge that my debt to Muncie will forever remain an IOU, for it is not within either the material or the spiritual capacities of a man to repay to the full measure a debt of devotion such as the one I hold.

We are gathered here tonight to pay tribute to Rotary—not a tribute that would laud its many fine deeds, but a tribute to the lofty objectives of Rotary which have caused it to be what it is. We can pay homage, also, not so much to the men whose foresight patterned those objectives, but to that foresight itself; for today we, as never before, must draw upon the basic purposes or creeds of our lives for renewed strength and inspiration to meet the trials and challenges of the future.

Objectives or creeds are as much a part of our lives as is the sunshine, but, unfortunately for the ultimate good, too many of us treat them as casually as we do the warm rays of the sun, forgetting that only by storing the warmth of the sun do we stay warm during the cold of night. So must we store within us, by a proper adherence to them, the protection and strength of our creeds, so that, come the cold nighttime of trial, we will not be found wanting in the elemental power which their words bespeak.

You and I, as Americans, are not the only people who work and live under the writings of creeds. A constant reminder to a leader of communism in New York City is a placard across his desk that says "A world to win." This glaring creed tells that Communist that his aims are not bound by the corner drugstore or the next street, but that the world must be won. No job is too trivial, no time too long, no risk too great for him and his comrades as they pursue the dedicated task of the Communist, which is to win the world.

Why this devotion? They have been wise enough to their mad hatred of Christ to steal for their own foul purposes His command "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." They have taken this basic instruction and they are using it against the very ideal that gave it to us: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature."

When we do this, as Americans, then I suggest that peace will come. Yet, you might ask, "Where do I start? The world is a big place and I am but one." If that is your question, then it is only proper that we start with ourselves by making sure that we know the tune as well as the words of our objectives of life.

Words alone are not the fullness of the objectives; there is a tune of meaning behind them, so the tune alone will not suffice. The 2 must be 1 and, as we recite our objectives, our mottoes, our beliefs, or our creeds there must be in our hearts the full music of understanding and love and devotion to them, or else we say empty words and we lead neither ourselves nor our friends into belief and following.

The end result of a wordless belief is illustrated by the story of the Pied Piper of Hamelin, who, by playing a tune on his flute, lured all the rats of that city into the death that came with their plunge into the sea. They followed blindly, neither knowing nor caring why. It was a pretty tune, friends they knew were in the vanguard, so they joined in also, to their sad regret. The Pied Piper had no words or reason to offer, only his lilting flute, but he was successful, for they followed who only cared for the tune.

Let me burden you with another illustration. Mark Twain carried the doubtful reputation of being quite profane. His wife was greatly disturbed by this disagreeable leaning and tried in vain for years to cure her husband of it. She tried the pleasant approach and the harsh approach, both of which wives are masters of, but to no avail. Then one morning she put into operation the attack at which she had long worked—Mark had cut himself while shaving, and had gone into a long and garish dissertation, fully embellished by foul oaths, on the distastefulness of shaving. His wife entered the bathroom during the tirade, and when it had finished she looked him calmly in the eye and repeated in exact order every foul oath he had used. Mark smiled at her, at the completion of this approach, and said benignly, "Honey, you have all the words but you haven't got the tune."

To further answer the question "What can I do?" I will put a question to you first concerning this great organization to which you and I pay tribute tonight. Do you want to be a Rotarian? Not just a dues payer or one who attends meetings, but do you really want to be a Rotarian enough to live the meaning of Rotary? Are you willing to live your daily lives so that the people of the world will hear and understand the words and music of Rotary's great objective of service. Stated as the first of the six objectives of Rotary is "the ideal of service as the basis of all the worthy enterprises," and the word "service" appears in four of the remaining objectives of this club.

In fact, we call Rotary a service club, and not without reason. We look to you for service as a unit of our local and international society, but service as a unit or a club does not carry out your individual responsibilities to your accepted creed. To be only a part of it is not enough. It must also be a part of you, for service to man, service to Christianity, and service to your country are the words and music which you and I must preach to the world if free men, Christianity and our country are to survive and, in the survival, stamp out the evil alternative to these, which is communism.

True service is not for one's self. It becomes an unconscious acceptance of our responsibilities to one another and an automatic doing of those things which will be of service to our brothers. Service goes out to all, wherever we see it needed. Unlike the signal station attendant who saw a trainload of commuters stalled in deep snow and did nothing about it because, as he said, "It was not in my territory," it goes out without question or hesitation.

It is easy to lose sight of the true meaning of service and to live exclusively for ourselves and to be interested in service only when it serves us. This habit of forgetting that we are our brothers' keepers is one of the major wrongs of the world today. Shakespeare said something about it when he wrote: "That, sir, which serves and seeks for gain, and follows out for form, will act when it begins to rain, and leave thee in the storm."

We see in service, then, a fundamental creed that not only Rotarians, but all of us must accept if we are to approach our full obligations as Christian citizens of a free Republic. As one who is not a Rotarian, I salute your organization for making the words and the music of service available to so many thousands of men all over the world. Now, if they all really want to be Rotarians, and if those of us who are not want earnestly to emulate you in your decision, then all of us will, together, reap the blessings of this objective.

Having assumed a readiness for service and an understanding of its true unselfishness, we must now go two steps further for its full meaning. In addition to serving men by being our brother's keeper, there is also the responsibility of service to God. This does not mean just service to your church by attendance, or service to your church by donation of your time or money, but it means service to the teachings of God.

Here, again, I will counter your question, "What can I do?" with another question: "Do you really want to be a Christian? It isn't hard to be a good one. It merely requires a desire to live by the teachings of the Lord and to practice what we preach."

It's as simple as that, and when you and I have the words and the music of His teachings in our hearts, so that they are reflected in our daily lives, then we will be serving God in the truest sense. "Love thy neighbor as thyself," "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" is the creed or objective of Christian living, and it is a creed subscribed to by everyone. Unfortunately, however, it is one that is not practiced devoutly by each person as an individual. Do you want to be a Christian? The answer rests within you and your willingness to be of service to the Christian cause.

As I indicated earlier in my discussion with you, there are three questions that come to mind when we think of the word "service" in connection with our lives. These have not been developed tonight in their natural or normal order because, if they had, I would first have asked you, "Do you want to be a Christian?" Then I would have asked you the question that will come next, "Do you want to be an American?" and lastly I would have asked you, "Do you want to be a Rotarian?" Inasmuch, though, as the creed of Rotary brought the word "service" into tonight's discussion, I purposely started with the question concerning your willingness to assume all of its responsibilities.

I followed that with questions directed at your acceptance of the responsibilities involved in being of service to God, and my third, and final, question is directed at your willingness to assume the full responsibilities to being an American. If you live up fully to the responsibilities of being a Christian and being a Rotarian, then I suggest to you tonight that you will find it easy to live up to the full qualifications called for in an answer to the question "Do you want to be an American?"

Here, again, we must search for a basic objective or creed—we must find it out and understand it, so that we may know fully that which we pledge ourselves to serve. When one thinks of being an American one immediately thinks of the word freedom. One is constantly reminded of the blessings of this freedom: our ability to meet as we meet tonight and to discuss any issue that we care to discuss; our ability to print on the pages of our newspapers and in the chapters of our books words that we know might be disagreed with, but words that we know we will not be punished for printing. We associate freedom with our ability to go to the church of our choice. We associate freedom with our method of business, which we call the free enterprise system. We associate freedom with our ability to travel any place that we can or care to in this broad land of ours, and we associate freedom with our friends—our unrestricted ability to make them or to lose them according to our actions, and not the actions or choice of some dictator.

We associate freedom with all of those things, but do we stop often enough to ponder the source of that freedom, because in the recognition of the source of that freedom is the basic difference between our Republic and all of the governments of history that have come and gone before us. When people came to our shores from Europe, over 200 years ago, they did not come seeking wealth because they left wealth at home. They did not come seeking education because they came to a land devoid of schools from lands that were rich in educational institutions. Rather, they came seeking relief from the oppression of tyranny, and not long after they came they began to realize that the freedom which they sought was not to be obtained from the strength of material things, from the strength of armies and money, but instead, from the strength of something that had never been recognized.

We slowly began to feel the great strength of freedom, but here we differed from other people in history who struggled to their various victories, to their brief moments of freedom. We, through the strength our people had in their great belief in God and their willingness to serve God, realized that we would not become free because of arms or physical might, but that we would become free only when we knew and believed that our freedoms came from God and that we were the free children of God. When that realization came, our wise forefathers worked out on paper those ideals of government which they pledged themselves to serve and which they served so well. For the first time in the history of man's free search for government the answer was found by people who recognized the source of their freedom. Those men wrote in the Declaration of Independence "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

This, then, expresses the basic ideal or credo of our Government. On these wonderful words has been constructed this great Nation of free people. On the adherence to these ideals depends our future as free people. I might suggest, also, that on our adherence to these ideals and to the daily living of these ideals, depends the freedom of the world. Without them we become but another government waiting for the sands to run their sure course through the glass of time. With them we remain forever the only government in history to have found the real source of freedom. By living them we become the beacon light that will guide the oppressed of the Communist world to the freedoms of our life. We must show

them by our willingness to serve our ideal, by our belief in our ideals, and by our constant practice of them that we have a vision which they can share.

That, then, becomes your challenge as you answer the question "Do you want to be an American?" To put it simply, it means that you must be as convincingly and as constantly willing to serve our ideals of government as you are to serve the ideals wrapped up in your religion and in Rotary. We must, by our actions, show the darkened world that light and freedom still live. It is a rich challenge, one that man has never before been presented with, because never before has the concept of government been based on the idea that freedom springs from God. It is a thrilling challenge because, by accepting it, we can help change the world from a place of distrust and oppression to a place of trust and freedom. It is a dutiful challenge, for we owe it to our children to live by these ideals so that this which we have might be passed on to them in the clearness with which we received it.

When we talk of service in connection with our country we are too prone to associate that word only with serving the Nation in time of trouble, such as many of you men and women have done during the wars of this Nation. Yet, the kind of service that will maintain this free Republic, and cause it to grow to even greater heights in the years to come, is not confined just to the wearing of the uniform. It applies to our everyday responsibilities, to their perpetuation of our basic ideals of government.

Remember the Communist credo: "A world to win." Remember that communism does not recognize God, so that communism cannot recognize a government whose source of strength stems from the freedom of God. Remember that communism works 24 hours a day to destroy that which is yours and mine. So when we speak of service in connection with our Republic, we speak of service 24 hours a day—the dedicated task of being an American.

Still you say "What can I do? I am only one." Let me start to answer that question by reminding you of what has been said, "The greatest strength of those dedicated to evil lies in the indifference of those dedicated to good." While the good people have been taking care of themselves, the wrongdoers have been taking care of everyone else. We can just as truthfully say that bad politics are caused by good citizens who don't vote.

So, what can you do? Start now to see that in your next municipal or State or national election the dismal record of voter apathy is changed. Start with yourself by registering. Your party affiliation is not important because the majority of America has usually been right, but register yourself and encourage your friends and employees to do so as well.

During a hearing I recently sat through, a witness made what I think to be a very pertinent and timely remark. He said, in the course of the discussion, that he thought we had "been Americans too long." What he inferred by that, of course, was that we, as American citizens, accept all the pleasures and wondrous things that our freedom gives us, but we pay little attention to what can take that freedom from us. It is an amazing and frightening criticism of our bland acceptance of this freedom when we realize that we, as citizens, will fight and die for our Republic, we will pay taxes to keep it going, we will give our blood for our soldiers, but, when it comes down to the question of voting, the question of working at this business of being free, it actually takes a major catastrophe, a revolution, to arouse the American people to the point that they will exercise their franchise. Freedom has never been

something that was designed for lazy or indifferent people. It requires a constant dedication, a constant willingness to serve its basic principles if this freedom is to survive.

That, though, is only the first part of this challenge to you in seeking your willingness to serve your America. Voting is not enough. There are other things in the political fields that you can do to serve your country well, and American businessmen must recognize this and be willing to expand their fields of service to include them. There is the active arena of political life, where you engage, either at the precinct level, the district level, or the State level, as an active, working member of your party, or even go a step further and become a candidate for public office.

Remember, though, that in this area the enemies of our Republic not only want but seek the opportunity to serve their army of rottenness in any capacity for which that army calls them. There is an army of vigilance—ours must also be an army of vigilance. Our Army, however, will be vigilant in its dedication to the basic concepts of our freedom, while theirs cannot be dedicated to this same cause because their philosophy does not recognize the existence of God.

It is obvious that there is a relationship between these three fields of service which we have discussed tonight. The relationship is carried through by one concurrent recognition in all fields, and that is that to serve each well one must carry a faith in his God and a willingness to perform His work. In service in these three fields we find a great strength in a common song that has at the same time meaningful words and a purposeful tune.

It is good that this exists, because today as we sail this great ship of freedom through the dark and uncharted seas, we can be reminded of the cruise of Greek mythology that sailed the oceans of that day. You will recall that, as the ships came upon a certain part of the sea, they could hear strange and wonderful voices coming from the shoreline—voices of enticement, voices that spoke of great promise—and the ships would turn from their course and head toward these dark shores. They they would be wrecked upon the uncharted shoals and reefs from whence these voices of the sirens came, and it seemed that no ship's crew could forego the temptation to seek the source of these songs. One skipper plugged the ears of his sailors and then tied his hands to the mast, but he could hear the songs and he directed the ship to its sure course of destruction.

It remained, though, for one Greek skipper to solve this, Orpheus. He was a man possessed of a marvelous voice and he sang a strong and meaningful tune, and as he approached the dangerous part of these seas he began to sing, and he sang in such a loud and wondrous way that the voices of the sirens were drowned out and his ship passed that place safely and sailed on out into the broad seas.

We can liken that story of Greek mythology to our present day, when our ship, sailing as it is through the sea of life, is tempted to deviate from its true course of freedom to investigate the tunes of socialism and communism coming from the black shores that line this sea. If you and I know this great song of freedom, and if we are willing to serve man and to serve God and to serve our country by singing this song daily as we go through our lives, then I suggest to you that we can be as that one successful Greek ship, safe and secure in our passage through these trying times, and that we will emerge onto the great bright sea of freedom and move ahead in our journey through our free way of life.

South Carolina Day Address by Hon. Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on February 20, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] delivered a very interesting address at Valley Forge, in my State. I think his address should be generally read, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON SOUTH CAROLINA DAY AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL CHAPEL, VALLEY FORGE, PA., SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1955

Reverend Hart, ladies and gentlemen of the Washington Memorial Chapel, and friends, the invitation to participate with you in the South Carolina Day observance at this historic shrine so beloved by all Americans is both a pleasure and an honor. It is my lot to have been born near the site where the great Battle of Ninety-six was fought. The greater portion of my adult life has been lived almost within the shadow of Kings Mountain. Cowpens is only 10 miles away. Often from my window have I seen the monument to Gen. Daniel Morgan as the rays of the morning sun clothed it in splendor. These connections attach me by inheritance and sentiment to this place which we are privileged to honor today—Valley Forge.

The encampment here at Valley Forge 173 years ago has been, through the succeeding decades, of great and abiding significance to America. The example of personal sacrifice, privation, devotion, and fortitude of the men who weathered the storms here during the winter of 1777-78 is unparalleled in any other nation's struggle for freedom. The quality of men who were quartered in this valley tempered the mettle of the American Patriot. The zeal of the Patriot was here solidified into an unrelenting determination to proceed with the work at hand and persevere until victory should crown his efforts.

These Sunday commemorative services, assigned to each of our sovereign States, have a larger purpose than merely to recount the suffering and sacrifices of Washington and his Continental Army as they wintered in these surroundings: A review of Valley Forge also quickens within us a deeper sense of our personal obligations to God and country. By recalling the trials which were here met, and resolved by our forebears, we are inspired to a renewing of their high purposes. Except we approach these services in such a purposeful and dedicated attitude, we shall miss the sublime lessons of Valley Forge.

In his centennial address here, Dr. Henry Armit Brown reminded us that "a country is benefited by great actions only so long as her children are able to repeat them."

Not many years ago, the late Dr. Henry Nelson Snyder, president of my alma mater, Wofford College, in making reference to the Memorial Day services each year held at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery, repeated the same injunction in other words:

"Whenever a people forgets its worthy past, the day will come when it will not have a past worth remembering."

It is well, therefore, that we commune with the past, for we then may better appraise our heritage. As we revisit the springs which nourished our roots, we gird our loins for the present and fortify ourselves for the future.

It has been rather truthfully said that the American Revolution was won at Valley Forge. To this wooded and desolate winter retreat Washington gathered his half-defeated, half-naked, half-starved forces. It was fire-cake and water for breakfast, water and fire-cake for dinner. No battle was fought here. These valleys and hills were not the scene of any military triumph. What then are our special remembrances of this place? Not a military engagement involving technical skill, nor the valor and glory of men sacrificing their lives to cannon and bayonet. That was to come later. Valley Forge is etched indelibly in our memories because here it was that the spirit of the war for independence was rekindled and kept alive. Here the military skill of the army was developed to achieve the glorious victories ahead. Those who survived the encampment emerged as confident, well-drilled, and inspired soldiers—an army of intent, stouthearted, tenacious men with a will to win. And thus the clarion call to arms reverberated and reechoed throughout every colony. With clarity and unity of purpose, the American patriots redoubled their efforts. Moreover, it was here at Valley Forge that the adversity of want from within and evil conspiracies from without met their challenge. Here was born the steadfastness of purpose and will, during the darkest hours of the Revolution, in which the greatness of our Nation as a symbol of freedom was crystallized. At Valley Forge our brave men suffered, sacrificed, and endured that a newly born nation might live.

It is therefore appropriate that we set aside these days—these Sabbath days—for Representatives from our States to reflect in sober contemplation upon the participation of our fathers in the War for Independence. Ours is a great legacy, if we but pause to realize and revere it. Let us not be distracted by the glib tangents in some current writings whose authors lack a deeper appreciation of the significance of these surroundings and the history here made. No sacrifice is recorded in history comparable in magnitude to the trials and experiences at Valley Forge.

The soldiers were not given to much whining, but often glossed over their hardships, as did Richard Wheeler, who reassured his mother:

"We are very comfortable and are living on the fat of the land."

George Ewing modestly entered in his journal:

"Were I to describe the hardships and the difficulties we underwent, no person but those who were with us would credit my relation. Therefore, I choose to pass it over in silence."

Notwithstanding their heroic silence, the record is replete with accounts of the cruel suffering borne so valiantly by the American troops here. In a letter to Clinton of New York, General Washington said:

"Naked and starving as they are, we cannot admire enough the incomparable patience and fidelity of the soldiery."

Lafayette in writing to a friend, said: "The unfortunate soldiers were in want of everything: They had neither coats, hats, shirts, nor shoes. Their feet and legs froze till they had become almost black, and it was often necessary to amputate them. . . . The patient endurance of both soldiers and officers was a miracle which each moment served to renew."

Bitter indeed was the cup of which they drank at Valley Forge, but oh! how glorious the ideal which sustained and inspired them to ultimate victory! Dr. Brown stated the ideal thus:

"And here, in this place of sacrifice, in this vale of humiliation, in this valley of the shadow of death out of which the life of America rose regenerate and free, let us believe with an abiding faith that to them union will seem as dear and liberty as sweet and progress as glorious as they were to our fathers and are to you and me, and that the institutions which have made us happy, preserved by the virtue of our children, shall bless the remotest generation of time to come."

Let us, for a moment, get our historical setting in mind. Politically the Continental Congress began its meetings in Philadelphia in September of 1774. I shall refer to the Congress in more detail later. The tea-party episodes in Boston, Mass., and Charleston, S. C., had occurred in 1773. Militarily, the encampment followed Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, and the forced evacuation from Boston of General Howe. The attack on Charleston, S. C., on June 28, 1776, had been repulsed by Colonel Moultrie. John Adams referred to this event as the first real victory of our land and naval forces in the Revolution. South Carolinians glory in the fact that 5,000 pounds of ammunition seized by their militia aided Washington in his siege of Boston. Washington made his successful retreat from New England and New York with his victory at Trenton and Princeton during the Christmas season of 1776. Then, with singular magnitude, followed the occupation of Philadelphia by the British under General Howe during the fall of 1777. Congress moved to Lancaster, settling later at Yorktown (now York), Pennsylvania. The news of the capture of Philadelphia had a depressing effect on our fortunes abroad. Our enemies were rallied. Our friends were stunned. But the sage admonition of Franklin softened the blow:

"Howe," he said, "had not captured Philadelphia," rather, "Philadelphia has captured Howe."

Later events proved the truth of that sober reflection.

Having these events in proper focus, South Carolina is proud of her contribution to the dividends accruing from Valley Forge:

South Carolina was the first colony to organize and by formal act declare its freedom from Great Britain; in history little noted, representatives duly chosen from every district in South Carolina met in Charleston on January 11, 1775, and organized a provincial congress. On February 1, 1776, its delegates formalized a document declaring that South Carolina was no longer a province subject to the King of England, but "that she was now, by her own act, a free and independent State." At 4 o'clock in the afternoon of March 26, 1776, the members of the provincial congress declared themselves members of the General Assembly or Legislature of the State of South Carolina, with John Rutledge as president and Henry Laurens as vice president. The term "governor" came into official useage 3 years later.

Henry Laurens was born in Charleston, S. C., of Huguenot parents who theretofore proceeded from New York. He became a great leveling influence in the Continental Congress during the American Army's suffering at Valley Forge. Succeeding John Hancock as President of the Congress on December 1, 1777, he was a man of great Christian virtue and charity. He served without salary, working from 18 to 20 hours a day, though physically handicapped by a prolonged attack of gout and fever. He never complained, but rather compared his own physical discomforts as greatly less than those of the estimable leader and his men at Valley Forge. He once remarked that at least his sufferings were beside a fire, whereas the men and General Washington were on the cold ground with little straw and clothing to keep them warm. His son, John Laurens, as a colonel, became a valued and trusted aide to General Washington.

Through President Laurens' voluminous letters to his son, we find that Congress maintained the closest liaison with General Washington. When the conspiracy and intrigues of the day were bearing heavily on the cause of the Colonists, President Laurens, in writing to his son, said:

"In (Washington's ruin) would be involved the ruin of our cause. On the other hand, his magnanimity, his patience, will save his country and confound his enemies."

The estimate of President Laurens by John Adams is worthy of note. Adams makes reference also to the first great victory of the Revolution in Colonel Moultrie's preservation of Charleston. Having only a month's acquaintance with President Laurens, John Adams wrote his wife on August 19, 1777:

"I feel a strong affection for South Carolina for several reasons: (1) I think them as staunch patriots as any in America; (2) I think them as brave; (3) they are the only people in America who have maintained a post and defended a fort; (4) they have sent us a new Delegate whom I greatly admire, Mr. Laurens, their Lieutenant Governor, a gentleman of great fortune, great abilities, modesty, integrity, and great experience, too. If all the States would send us such men, it would be a pleasure to be here."

Daniel Roberdeau, of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, is credited with saying that President Laurens was a "worthy, sensible, and indefatigable gentleman."

Three great measures affecting the fortunes of the Colonies marked the contribution of South Carolina through the civil service of Henry Laurens as President of the Congress:

- (1) The Treaty of Alliance with France;
- (2) The conclusion of the proposals for the Articles of Confederation; and
- (3) The rejection of the Proffer of Peace with Great Britain in 1778. (Peace without freedom and independence was unacceptable to Laurens.)

The Continental Congress is worthy of a moment of favorable historical recollection. Congress through the years—Continental, under the Articles of Confederation, and under the Constitution—became the whipping boy for all our ills except, possibly, the sudden changes in the weather. Some of the writers of that day failed to realize its origin, its loose association, and the utter lack of constitutional power. That error has been perpetuated by subsequent historians and commentators because of their failure to recognize that the Continental Congress should be immediately differentiated from the constitutional Congresses that have succeeded them.

The colonial governments in 1774, 1775, and 1776 were houses divided against themselves, a condition naturally to be found in colonial governments aspiring to self-determination. The call for a convention of the Continental Congress lacked constitutional or sovereign authority. The British authorities had dissolved the colonial legislatures, and our States had not yet been organized. The selected representatives were not invested by their constituencies with sufficient power to execute either the will of their constituencies or even their own. The Congress ruled more by persuasion and patriotic fervor for a common cause than by any set rules of delegated authority. Therefore, to assess such an association with blame is to overlook its lack of delegated powers. The high resolves passed by the Congress on October 14, 1774, were instrumental in unifying and consolidating the thoughts and actions of the Colonies.

A great historian (Dr. David Duncan Wallace) under whom I had the privilege of studying put it this way in his life of Henry Laurens:

"Moreover, the situation of the Congress at the best was precarious and difficult.

Suddenly placed under the necessity of conducting a war, it was unsupplied with every power, authority, and resource for its task and could rely only on a steady sense of public duty in its constituents—a devotion which it was useless to expect. The war was conducted without any formal constitution, adequate authority, or orderly Government, and in the face of an apathetic or hostile party embracing probably a majority of the population. Yet, under difficulties almost beyond belief of a generation accustomed to well ordered institutions enjoying authority beyond derogation and supported by an ardent patriotism practically universal, the old Congress in one way or another kept the Government going and, with the aid of their great general and a handful of devoted patriots up and down the country, brought it to a successful termination and meanwhile performed a service for which they have received scant recognition in laying the permanent foundations of national administration which endure to this day. A Congressman had a difficult and thankless task, and those who performed it with ability and disinterested patriotism deserve a credit which they have not usually received. The earlier runners in a relay race have been forgotten in the shouts of acclamation for those of the later course who arrived bearing the torch of a completed constitutional system. The final runner could not take even his first step until the previous bearer of progress had arrived, and doubtless the first mile was as dusty and toilsome as the last."

In December of 1777, during the sojourn here at Valley Forge, the Congress consisted of only 14 Representatives. Eight Colonies had 1 representative each, 3 had 2, and 2 Colonies had none. Many of the able men of the day returned to their respective homes to strengthen their local governments. The First Congress met without an agenda. Their sessions were of necessity bound to secrecy. In the absence of constituted authority, a chief executive and departmental heads, it is a remarkable tribute to their common sense, ardent patriotism, and unity of purpose that the Continental Congress was able to carry on foreign affairs, raise an army, conduct a war, and bring it to a successful conclusion. Hence, I deprecate the rather general and unfounded criticism, often gratuitously and never rightfully heaped upon the achievements of the Continental Congress. Let us ever remember that the Congress then was and now is the only spokesman and the last resort in expressing the will of our people. Without such an elected, representative body, we drift aimlessly but certainly into the despotism of a one-man government or an oligarchy of tyrants. The meaning of Valley Forge becomes depreciated if we minimize the real worth of the representatives of the people of that day.

Slowly but in orderly succession the fruits of the sacrifices at Valley Forge appeared upon the American scene. Out of the darkness and despair of the suffering here, victory in time emerged.

From this crucible of hardship General Green was enabled to prepare the artillery and gather necessary supplies. General Von Steuben brought a knowledge of military science and tactics to our determined but untrained Continentals. The lesson of warfare learned and practiced here are reflected in the great result that followed. The first effects of such training appeared at Monmouth. After Savannah and Charleston had been taken by the enemy, important events followed closely in my native State. The strongholds of the enemy had been reduced to New York, Camden, and Charleston. Generals Green and Morgan were deployed to the South because it was there that the British hoped to divide our colonies and later conquer Washington's forces. The battles of Camden, Kings Mountain, Cow-

pens, and Guilford Court House forced Cornwallis to retire to Wilmington. This led Cornwallis to Yorktown, Va., and the surrender there on October 19, 1781, followed by the signing of the peace on November 30, 1782.

Incidents and events—small and large—form significant links in our chain of recollections of Valley Forge and contemporary happenings:

Henry Laurens fathered for a time the wounded Lafayette. He made him a personal loan of \$6,000. Many years thereafter (1825) Lafayette laid the cornerstone of the monument to De Kalb at Camden, S. C.

Col. John Laurens in defense of the honor of his chief, challenged and wounded Gen. Charles Lee because of the latter's disregard of General Washington.

We recollect the capture of Henry Laurens by the British while he was en route to Holland as our ambassador. Laurens' value to our cause was illustrated in his exchange by the British for Lord Cornwallis, and confirmed by his appointment as one of our peace commissioners along with Franklin, Jay, Adams, and Jefferson. Edmund Burke commented in Parliament on the coincidence that Lord Cornwallis upon his surrender at Yorktown was held as prisoner in America by Colonel Laurens while the latter's father was imprisoned in the Tower of London, over which Lord Cornwallis held authority as constable.

History likens Col. John Laurens, the able son of Henry Laurens, to Alexander Hamilton. Being detached from Washington's headquarters and because of his fluent use of the French language he was made Special Minister to France to secure and expedite loans, ships, men and supplies. The several ships filled with supplies, money, men, and sinews of war were testimonials to his ability, zeal, and accomplishments. It will be of particular interest to you to recall that from the funds he brought back, \$250,000 was used by Robert Morris, who with his associates added \$150,000, to establish and capitalize the Bank of America at Philadelphia. The early and untimely death of Colonel Laurens, on August 27, 1782, on a completely unnecessary battlefield in South Carolina, was the occasion of much grief and a fine expression of regard from General Washington. The English poet, Day, in an epitaph for young Laurens, wrote:

"Beyond the rage of time or fortune's power, remain, cold stones, remain and mark the hour when youthful Laurens yielded up his breath and sealed his country's liberties in death. For injured rights he fell and equal laws the noble victim of a noble cause. Oh! May that country which he fought to save shed sacred tears upon his early grave."

Valley Forge had a great bearing on subsequent events in South Carolina. After Lord Cornwallis and Admiral Parker captured Charleston, they began to overrun the State. They met great resistance at the hands of our militia. General Gates lost Camden to Cornwallis. The riflemen of the State under Moultrie, Sumter, Pickens, Harden, Thompson, Marion, Hampton, and others together with some forces from North Carolina and Virginia under Generals Green and Morgan began a wearing-down process of Cornwallis' forces. He was defeated at Kings Mountain on October 7, 1780; Tarleton's forces were defeated at Cowpens in January 1781. These battles and those in North Carolina forced Cornwallis to Wilmington, whence he left to Yorktown, Virginia, where, as I have said, he surrendered to Washington.

History records 137 battles—large and small—fought in South Carolina; 103 of these were fought by her own troops, and in 20 major engagements other South Carolinians participated.

Turning the pages of history it is easy to recall that great events and noble achievements often are born in moments of seeming

despair and periods of depression and hardship. Traditional history relates that the great Homer was blind when he gave the world his *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as was Milton when he wrote *Paradise Lost*. Dante, while suffering, produced his greatest works, and the music of Beethoven, much of which was written after he became completely deaf, will inspire the world as long as time lasts. Tennyson in the depth of his grief gave us the immortal *In Memoriam*. Historians credit Gen. Robert E. Lee with even greater stature achieved in his civil accomplishments following the War Between the States than for his brilliant exploits in battle. The French rose to their greatest heights at Verdun. Helen Keller has persevered despite deafness, blindness, and muteness to become a great crusader for others similarly afflicted. Dunkirk is too fresh in our minds for proper evaluation, but in all of these events we find that in periods of doubt and circumstances of greatest stress, men have arisen to their greatest stature. So it was with Washington, his brave generals, and the invincible soldiers at Valley Forge.

The feat of Sergeant Jasper at Charleston, S. C., had its sequel in the flag-raising at Iwo Jima. Such has been the history of the bravery, fortitude, and steadfastness of purpose of America and her fighting soldiers from the very beginning.

From the date of the Stamp Act Congress in 1765 in New York, of which John Rutledge, of South Carolina, was President, when the members were stirred by the plea of Christopher Gadsden, another South Carolinian, that "there ought to be no New Englanders, no New Yorkers known on the continent, but all of us Americans," and running through the services of those I have so briefly sketched, are found the indissoluble links that have bound our fate and fortune to Valley Forge. These events of such historic importance which you have given me the honor to relate today, happenings before and after the winter of 1777-78 and the events forged here, made possible the chain of successes that followed. We are the beneficiaries of the dividends from the despair of that fateful period in American history. May we never fail to recall them. Let us ever cherish them, teach our children to revere them. In a spirit of gratitude to a divine providence which has guided and multiplied our Nation's fortunes, let us all be thankful.

Shall the Tail Wag the Elephant?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently President Eisenhower summed up his program as being one of dynamic conservatism. Previously, he had characterized his thinking as progressively moderate. These two terms are typical of the Republican Party and its place in history. Historically, we have shunned extremes.

Mr. Kyle Palmer, political editor of the Los Angeles Times, writing in that newspaper on Sunday, February 20, 1955, has some interesting observations to make concerning the Republican Party. His comments should be required reading for all Republicans. His analysis of the leadership of the late Senator Taft as a statesman of moderate ideas rather

than an extremist is something we should keep in mind today.

Senator Taft was a man who possessed the unerring ability to keep his eyes on the major goals and refused to be diverted by the day-to-day actions of the extreme right or left. Such is our job today to move ahead with President Eisenhower and moderation and pay no heed to extremists who would divide us. After all, there is only 1 America and 1 Republican Party.

The article follows:

SHALL THE TAIL WAG THE ELEPHANT?

(By Kyle Palmer)

If we are to judge from some recent unpleasanties between Republican leaders of differing views and intents, a fight is brewing for control of the Grand Old Party.

It is somewhat ironical that the party's family quarrel should be brought into the open in connection with various celebrations of the natal day of the GOP's generally acknowledged saint, Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln's birthday has become a traditional occasion for Republicans to point with pride at their own virtues while viewing the iniquities of the opposition with suitable alarm, just as the Democrats utilize the birth date of Andrew Jackson for a reverse process.

This year many dissident Republicans took occasion to depart from usage and turned the thunders of their wrath upon elements in their own party which they condemn for this or that departing from party regularity.

As one who generally finds himself disinclined to follow any leadership that swings to extremes—whatever the direction—I am disposed to feel that all this talk of recapturing the Republican Party is not a healthy thing.

The theory that absolute conformity to fixed political doctrine must be acknowledged if one is to remain respectably orthodox is an unsound surmise. First, because orthodoxy isn't necessarily consistently commendable, and, second, while we may recognize fixed truths and eternal verities, we can never be sure who holds or exemplifies them.

Not entirely.

Politics itself is not a fixed science, and it is in essence an application of influences that seek the greatest good for the greatest number. Which entails compromise between extremes and even, at times, between issues that may have virtually equal worth.

Thus, who is going to recapture the Republican Party from whom?

Political parties offer opportunities for the widest differences of opinion and conviction, but in the main have a central core of philosophy that binds the minds of men and women to a common purpose—not absolute, not inelastic, not always in complete harmony, but yet sufficiently cohesive to become propulsive and effective.

There are many interpretations of what is meant by Republican or Democrat, and an even broader category of those who make the interpretations.

Governor J. Bracken Lee of Utah and Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY of Wisconsin were two of the Lincoln Day speakers who voiced a desire to "recapture" the Republican Party, each disclaiming any intention of leading or joining in a third-party movement.

But could anyone acquainted with the respective careers of Lee and McCARTHY have confidence that they could agree for any length of time on what to recapture? Their first recapturing adventure would scarcely end before they'd become engaged in recapturing from each other.

Governor Lee is, without question, an excellent governor. He has firm ideas on government, most of them sound, but he is in no better position than JOE McCARTHY to set himself up as one competent to set a fixed Republican pattern.

There is no such pattern. And a good thing there isn't.

For once a political party become hide-bound, once its ideals and inspirations are static, the people will discard it.

Evolution rather than revolution is most likely to keep a political party robust, responsive to public ideals, and capable of carrying out the popular will.

Dwight Eisenhower, who is not a professional politician, and who has learned much of the game of politics—especially as it represents party politics—on a day-to-day basis, has not always struck just the right political note nor has he escaped making some of the blunders of a man who deals with those more adept in the profession than himself.

He has backed sometimes when he should have filled and filed when he might have been wise to back, but he has profited from his experiences, and his better understanding is and will be reflected in a stronger Republican Party if—and a very large "if"—he is not frustrated and thwarted by extreme GOP elements.

It is of course true that Mr. Eisenhower's power in politics is not menaced solely from the political right; he faces a like jeopardy from another extreme which, at all cost, would kick the so-called rightists out of the party and, in its turn, "recapture" what it regards as the true Republican spirit.

Neither side to that argument has any exclusive claim upon the Republican Party or Republicanism, and either, were it suddenly to become the arbiter of all that is Republican, would carry the party into the political ditch.

Torn between two such elements, the best attitude for Mr. Eisenhower to assume is that of Mercutio, who learned the folly of extreme partisanship the very hard way with a sword thrust in his gizzard and who, as he expired, invoked "a plague on both your houses."

It is revealing of the ineffectual position of both Republican extremes that the one continues to present its case as a prolongation of the leadership of Robert A. Taft while the other essays to condemn its opposite from the standpoint of a purely imagined and fictitious portrait of the late Ohio Senator. Neither is correct in its assumption.

Taft was never an extremist, had his convictions firmly rooted but never rootbound. He was capable of compromise without surrender, could see merit in an opponent's contention, never considered himself immune to miscalculation or mistakes.

By common consent he was known as "Mr. Republican." And this was not because of his assertion of infallibility but because of his readiness to reach sound and equitable adjustments.

He was much more moderate than many who gathered under the banner of his leadership. In the supreme test of his patriotism and statesmanship—which came after his convention defeat by Eisenhower and the later need by Eisenhower for his counsel and support—Taft set out neither to capture nor be captured. His purpose was to serve as best he could, and both in the interests of his country and his party he channeled his services through the mediums that offered or could be developed.

Taft's brand of Republicanism is now what the party most needs. No political leader in contemporary history tried harder than Taft to promote his ideas and his personal political fortunes, and none either in victory or defeat has demonstrated a greater readiness to place public welfare ahead of personal advantage.

Hence if there is to be any effort at recapture of the Republican spirit by those now displeased with what they perceive, some effort directed to the possibility of emulating the example of the great Ohioan could prove most salutary.

George Washington and the \$20 Income Tax Reduction Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today this House heard an excellent reading of the Farewell Address of our first President, George Washington, by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. KRAMER]. I congratulate him.

This is a traditional honor we pay to the founder of our country on the anniversary of his birth.

But it amounts to more than that. What George Washington said in that address amounts to a lot of good common sense on how to run a country. We rear a lot of foolishness in this chamber from time to time and I presume whoever thought up this custom of reading the Farewell Address each year had in mind that such an annual air conditioning would do us some good.

Certainly, this year it could not have come at a better time considering the fact that we are shortly to commence debate on the politically frank and obvious \$20 income tax scheme measure.

Now I ask you, my colleagues, isn't it pretty clear what George Washington would say about the thing if he were here today?

Listening to his beautifully worded Farewell Address leaves little doubt he'd go out after it like a mongoose after a cobra.

My only question is what kind of language would he use. It's my guess it would be a lot less formal than the style he used for the Address.

But he isn't here so we have to look to the Farewell Address.

This is what Washington says about the politics involved in this scheme by the Democratic Party to woo millions of votes by putting an extra \$20 bill in each of their pockets:

The common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it. It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration.

As I read the foregoing in light of the \$20 scheme, Washington would regard the partisan political purpose behind it as a mischief which sidetracks the Congress from its duty of providing good government for the people of the United States. It would, in fact, weaken the Government of the United States. Further, according to Washington, the people of this country in their wisdom ought to discourage such goings on.

Next, let us take a look at what the Father of our Country has to say about the finances involved:

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remem-

bering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing on posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.

The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind that toward the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant.

As I read the foregoing in light of the \$20 scheme, Washington would abhor it. He says to have a regard for the amount of our public debt. Sure, spend money to meet emergencies, but when the emergency is over, get rid of the debt; do not saddle it on your children and your children's children. And do not forget, unpleasant as they are, taxes are the only way of paying for the expenditures of government.

There, my colleagues, you have the wisdom on this subject of a man much more versed in the intricacies of government than most of us.

But even George Washington was somewhat dubious as to whether or not you would heed it. In the closing portions of his Farewell Address he had this to say:

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our Nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit * * * this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

As I read the foregoing in light of the \$20 scheme, even though Washington mentions the expectation that his advice "may be productive of some partial benefit," I think in this instance he would expect us to do more than cut it down to \$10. I think he would expect us, in this situation where there is a choice between doing what is right for a political party and doing what is right for our country, to have the wherewithal to choose to do what is right for our country.

Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] has reported to his constitu-

ents on the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the gentleman's statement which is short, lucid, and points up the real facts surrounding this issue which has become the subject of unnecessary controversy.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

I am impelled to make a few simple remarks about the Dixon-Yates contract because it is being used by some as a symbol of evil. It is the bone of contention in the fight of the Socialists to destroy private enterprise. They use it as the offsetting answer to everything that is good. You make the casual remark that inflation has been stopped, and the cost of living is down. The reply is, "Yes, but how about Dixon-Yates?" You continue, "The national income is going up and taxes are coming down." Again the reply is, "Yes, but how about Dixon-Yates?" That reply has become so universal that if you were talking to Chou En-Lai and said, "It is a violation of the Korean Armistice for you to hold our prisoners," he would say, "Yes, but how about Dixon-Yates?"

POWER REQUIREMENTS

Some background is necessary in order to understand how the contract came into existence. The Atomic Energy Commission is the largest single user of electric energy in the United States, and by far the largest customer of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The TVA came to Congress a few years ago and said that by 1957 they would be short of power by some five or six hundred thousand kilowatt-hours. The AEC has first call on energy, and private users would have to be rationed. They asked for \$100 million of Federal money to build a steam plant at Fulton, 25 miles north of Memphis, which is nearly 100 miles outside of the Tennessee Valley watershed. Three times Congress refused to appropriate this money as the locale was not within the jurisdiction of TVA.

The Director of the Budget suggested that it might be feasible to find some private industry to supply this anticipated shortage. TVA has long been unable to supply the AEC with needed energy at the Paducah atomic-energy plant, as witness the fact that the Commission under the Truman administration negotiated two contracts for private supplies, three times in excess of the current subject contract. These contracts were negotiated without any of the sound and fury which accompanies the Dixon-Yates negotiations, even though the energy charge was slightly higher than the one now contemplated.

NO GIVEAWAY

The Government can cancel these contracts on 3 years' notice, and the private companies would then have to find a market for the surplus energy so canceled out. This in itself would be no small task. Due to the possibility of cancellation, it was felt that it would not be feasible to concentrate additional power around Paducah, which could not be absorbed by other customers, but that any additional energy should be generated at a point which, if cancellation should come, the supplier could find a reasonable ready market for the energy.

It was felt that a plant located near Memphis could be built, and the energy exchanged with TVA to cover its growing shortage. The AEC would exchange kilowatt for kilowatt with TVA. The contract provides that the Government can buy the Dixon-Yates plant at any time, or can cancel at any time. Here I should say that Dixon and Yates are just names. Each is the head of a large going public utility in the area, and the two companies formed the Mississippi Generating Co. to finance the project which has an estimated cost of \$107 million. One hundred

million would come from bonds and notes, and the balance would be the risk capital supplied by the two parent companies.

The contract provides a ceiling on what they can earn, but no floor. There is no guaranteed income. The ceiling is less than the national average for public utilities. The energy charge will be less than TVA now charges the AEC at its Oak Ridge plant, if you eliminate the tax factor. And speaking of taxes, it should be noted that the taxes paid by private electric utilities for local, State, and Federal taxes in the United States average 44 percent of the gross income from sale of energy, and while TVA claims to pay taxes, they amount to only 4 percent of their gross income from energy sales.

SOCIALISM OR FREE ENTERPRISE

The question arises: Are the people of this country going to support the Government, or is the Government going to support the people? The attack on the Dixon-Yates contract is not based upon facts, it is a diversionary action, while the real attack is against private enterprise. The Socialist plan is for government ownership of all capital. Public power is the spearhead of this drive, and because it is the easiest segment of industry to nationalize, the Socialists cannot afford to let the Dixon-Yates contract go unchallenged, even though it would supply the shortage of energy, encourage private industry, and save the Government from borrowing another \$100 million.

I am glad that the President is standing firm on the issue in spite of the attacks. The opponents have done a potent job of obscuring the provisions and purposes of the contract and we who support private enterprise should be just as effective in presenting the facts in their true light.

The United States Army and Army Installations in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the 21st of January of this year Hon. Frank H. Higgins, Assistant Secretary of the Army, delivered a most interesting and informative address before the State Press Association of Alabama, which was meeting in its annual convention at Huntsville, Ala. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK H. HIGGINS
BEFORE THE STATE PRESS ASSOCIATION OF
ALABAMA, HUNTSVILLE, ALA., JANUARY 21,
1955

Ladies and gentlemen, I am indeed happy to be here tonight and am very grateful for the opportunity to speak to you as a group—a group that is such an important segment of one of our great democratic institutions—the American press.

I want to talk to you tonight about your Army and your Army in Alabama. However, before I do, I would like to make an observation which I feel is particularly appropriate.

In the British Parliament, you often hear the expression, "Her Majesty's loyal opposition." The last two words of this expression can be applied to the description of the

relationship of the press and the Army. Those of us, all down the line, that are charged with the management of your Army are human and, therefore, are not infallible. Yes; we've made some mistakes, and we'll probably make others.

It is not expected that you will be in agreement with us on every detail of every subject—nor would we want it that way. When the press praises us, we feel good about it. We are concerned when we are criticized; but this is good, and that's the way it should be, for the probing finger of the press sometimes points to an error or a wrong which, of course, we all are anxious to set right. Let me add that there may have been times when the Army has been unjustly criticized, and naturally we don't like that.

But—and this is the point I want to make—if you begin with the assumption that your Army and its management are sound, although not infallible, we can reach a point in our dealings—and I believe we have reached this point—where we can refer to the American press as our loyal opposition. This, to me, expresses the real value and strength of our relationship, from which stems the great power of the press.

Since I went to Washington, I have been particularly impressed by those many things that the Army does, in peacetime, which result in many benefits to all of us and to our Nation. Many of us look upon the Army as a highly specialized fighting machine, costly to maintain, and useful only to fight wars. We overlook, or perhaps have not been given an opportunity to look on the other side, so to speak, of the Army; those things that the Army is doing and has done for our Nation besides defend it.

American history is replete with examples of such activities which have contributed to the continuing growth and expansion of our great Nation. But, before I talk of those contributions made by the Army from which all of us as a Nation have benefited, let's take a very specific look at the Army in Alabama today.

Located in Alabama, from Theodore in the south to Huntsville in the north, the Army has 7 installations, comprising more than 170 thousand acres, at a real property cost of over \$291 million.

These seven installations are Fort McClellan, Camp Rucker, Anniston Ordnance Depot, Theodore Ammunition Loading Terminal, Alabama Ordnance Works, Phosphate Development Works and, here in Huntsville, Redstone Arsenal.

In Army installations and activities in Alabama there are over 13,000 civilian personnel employed, and over 9,100 military personnel, with a payroll of \$85 million a year. So the importance of Alabama in the Army's plan is pretty obvious.

Now that I have given you a brief rundown of what the Army has in Alabama today, let us examine a few of these installations more closely, and see just what they are.

Let us take Camp Rucker first. Camp Rucker was a World War II training camp. It was the home of the 66th Infantry Division, and trained thousands of infantry replacements during World War II. It also trained many nondivisional, battalion-sized units of engineers, tank destroyers, 42 chemical mortars, and heavy artillery. After the war, it became the home of the 47th Infantry Division.

Last year the time had come to find a new home for the Army Aviation School then located at Fort Sill, Okla. Because of economy measures, our choice was limited to already existing Army installations. We had to meet all of the many basic requirements for operating an aviation school, and at the same time find a place where we would have to make minimum changes and additions in construction; and where manpower and operating fund requirements would be at a minimum. We considered every feasible in-

stallation, and we chose Camp Rucker because it met, to the greatest degree, all of the varied requirements.

The move of the Army Aviation School to Camp Rucker has not been completed, but we plan to finish it by June 30. You see, it is very difficult to move the school in toto and still meet our training requirements; but as rapidly as present classes are graduated, and requirements on equipment and personnel decrease at Fort Sill, the move to Camp Rucker will be completed. We expect that all elements of the school now at Sill will be at Rucker to start the new training year beginning in July of this year.

At Camp Rucker we anticipate that the number of military and civilian personnel, including the aviation school faculty and students, will total approximately 5,000 people during fiscal year 1956. In addition to the Army Aviation School, plans are now being made to station other types of units at Camp Rucker, so as to use the installation and its facilities to the maximum. There is little doubt as to the importance of the economic benefits that will accrue to the surrounding community as a result of the activities at Camp Rucker.

Another historic military installation in Alabama is Fort McClellan, just outside of Anniston. Alabama's sons in World War I and World War II were trained there. It stands today as the home of two major Army activities: the Chemical Corps School and the Women's Army Corps Center.

Since June 30, 1949, the Army has completed construction of almost \$9 million worth of facilities at Fort McClellan; and, in addition, there are more than \$10 million worth of facilities now under construction. There are over 5,400 military personnel, both men and women, stationed at Fort McClellan, with over 900 civilian personnel working on the post.

At Childersburg we have the Alabama Ordnance Works, which produces smokeless powder, TNT, tetryl, and other explosives for the Army. A portion of this plant is being rehabilitated, and the investment will be approximately \$46 million. Construction, we hope, will begin sometime in April.

Somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,000 people will be employed there. This will mean considerable benefit to the economy of the local area.

Now let me tell you a little bit about the Redstone Arsenal. Redstone was a Chemical Corps manufacturing arsenal during World War II. Now it is the heart of the Army's guided missile and rocket research and development program. This arsenal is responsible for research, development, and procurement for manufacturing in the field of guided missiles and rockets for the Army—a highly important installation.

Although its principal business is the research and development of rockets and guided missiles, Redstone has other activities. It is the home of the Ordnance Corps Guided Missile School, which is charged with the troop training for all guided missile organizations. The production lines of Redstone's ammunition division are now in operation for the loading and assembling of components into a finished round of conventional ammunition.

The Army has spent \$7½ million on expansion and rehabilitation projects at Redstone. Expenditures for projects currently underway total \$27 million. And within the bounds of its 10 by 12 mile area, more than 7,100 people, civilians and military, are employed.

I have discussed briefly with you, in a statistical sort of way, some of the Army's activities in Alabama. Before I leave the subject, I feel I should quote two more very important figures, and these are in addition to all the things which we have been discussing so far: From July 1952 through September 1954, the Army placed 934 pro-

curement actions in the State of Alabama, for a dollar value of \$172.6 million.

So far tonight, I have been talking primarily in terms of the economic benefits that stem directly from your Army's activities now, during peacetime. These are the "extra dividends," in the sense that we have the defensive strength that our Army provides—and of course we cannot have that without paying for it. But some of that investment comes back to us in the economic benefits I have just mentioned. This is a part of the "other side" of the Army.

Now I would like to go back in history a little, and cite a few other examples of these "extra dividends" we get from our Army in peacetime that benefits our whole Nation. The benefit to you or me may be felt only indirectly in the raising of our standard of living and making our way of life so much better, but they are still important examples of the tremendous contribution your Army makes to the everlasting greatness of this country.

One of the earliest of these examples occurred in 1803, when an expedition of Army volunteers, under Captains Lewis and Clarke, conducted explorations which were later to bring American civilization to the great Northwest. For the next half century, the Army assisted our forefathers in their westward expansion. It conducted nearly all of the preliminary explorations. The Army constructed roads and trails to the West. It built bridges and canals. It conducted surveys and prepared maps.

The need of our new Nation for engineers became acute. There were no schools to train them. The first technical school established in America was the Military Academy at West Point; which, at that time, was created to train engineers. Early West Point graduates were called upon to do many jobs for our expanding Nation—mineral exploration, railroad construction, surveying, and the development of our waterways.

The civil works program of the Army engineers is a tremendous, never-ending mission: In Washington, the engineers had charge of building the Capitol, the Library of Congress, the Post Office Building, the Government Printing Office, the Washington Monument, the Department of Agriculture Building, and the Pentagon—the largest office building in the world.

So far, Army engineers have opened up, or improved, 27 thousand miles of inland and intracoastal waterways. Dams constructed under the supervision of the Army engineers now protect over 4½ million people, and 28 million acres of farmland, from devastating floods. And 2½ million kilowatts of power are now being generated by these dams.

The building of the Erie Canal; the cutting of the Panama Canal; the development of Ohio River navigation stand high among the accomplishments of the Army engineers. And as many of you know, the engineers have now been called upon to assist in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Another quite different service to which our daily lives and fortunes are geared, had its beginning in the Army. In 1870, Congress directed the Army to organize the first weather bureau. The Army was required to take meteorological observations throughout the country, and warn the Great Lakes and coast sections of the approach of storms. This first organization of a weather service on a national scale was handled by the Army's Signal Corps.

Upper-air sounding devices, recently developed by the Army, have contributed in a major way to improved weather forecasting. But perhaps the greatest military assistance to civilian weather knowledge is in the area of severe storm and hurricane warnings. Military weather reconnaissance missions assist the civilian forecasting services in following and forecasting these storms and hurricanes.

Now a joint group, with military and Weather Bureau participation, has been established to study the characteristics of severe storms and hurricanes; and to find out how to pool our knowledge more effectively, so that the forecasting of hurricanes can be improved.

In the field of medicine, the Army has made many outstanding contributions. The accomplishments of Maj. Walter Reed and Maj. William Gorgas, of the Army Medical Corps, top an impressive list of these notable contributions. The first typhoid vaccine in the United States was made by the Army Medical School. Smallpox vaccination was introduced in this country by an Army medical officer. The first apparatus using chlorine gas in the purification of water was developed by another Army medical officer. And now, to defeat one of man's oldest enemies, the Army Medical Corps has developed primaquine—to cure malaria.

The Army's vital need for lightweight metals of great tensile strength—for equipment used in airborne operations, for example, provided stimulus to the development of metals which are strong, lightweight, corrosion-resistant, such as magnesium, aluminum, and titanium alloys now used in commercial products.

Many other benefits, difficult to visualize, accrue to all of us in the metal products we use daily—they are made better, with better materials, and they last longer, because of the contributions made in the field of metallurgical techniques by the Army Ordnance Corps.

Our transportation industry is watching very closely a development project of the Army's Transportation Corps. This project is called containerization. Army materiel is placed in steel cargo containers, which move intact through the transportation system from originating depot in the United States to using depot overseas. These standard steel containers measure roughly 7 feet on a side, and can be used over and over again. The adoption of this containerization program on a broadening scale by the military will effect economies by simplifying documentation; the reduction of loss, damage, and pilferage; and, in the case of overseas shipping, the elimination of expensive export packing.

The Army Quartermaster Corps has always been high among the organizations contributing extra bonuses to our country. Gen. Nathaniel Greene, the Quartermaster General during the Revolutionary War, started this trend. He set up a system of Army warehouses which was the forerunner of modern warehousing methods. Our entire complex economy depends upon the efficient system of distribution that started then.

In the Seminole Indian War, the Army needed a waterproofed outer garment. The Quartermaster Corps impregnated a light cotton coat with gaita percha—and that was the first raincoat.

Until the war between the States, practically all clothing was either tailored-to-order or made in the home. But during that war the Army Quartermaster Corps set up the first system of mass-producing ready-made clothing. We all know the importance of the multi-million-dollar industry—which was created then.

I hope you have noticed a very significant factor in the things I have been telling you about our Army. In the early days of our history, the Army performed a variety of civilian-type functions for our Government and for our people. But as our dynamic American way of life evolved and developed, all of those civilian-type functions were shifted elsewhere—out of the military. Our Army has concentrated on the tasks that relate specifically to the accomplishment of its military mission.

All of the civilian-type "dividends" we are now receiving from the Army are by-products of work that is being carried on for purely

military purposes, with one exception: that exception, of course, is the civil-works program handled by the Army Engineers. Here, direct work for primarily civilian purposes goes on. But in this case, the Nation draws significant military strength from the arrangement, and this makes the exception worthwhile.

In peacetime, our military construction program is very minor. Yet when mobilization comes, one of the very first things we need is a large and effective organization for carrying on urgent military construction. By having the Army engineers handle our civil-works program in peacetime, when war comes we already have an extensive construction organization in being, which is fully integrated with the Army, and which can be instantly switched from the execution and supervision of public works programs to the execution and supervision of military construction programs. This was a lifesaver in World War II, and if a third world war should come, it is impossible to calculate its importance.

Now, most of the "extra dividends" I have been talking about tonight are fairly tangible and material. But before I sign off here, I want to mention one more dividend we civilian Americans get from the military Americans in this Army of ours.

Often, in our home communities, we have spoken about some young man to the effect that—"He should join the Army. It would be good for him. It would make a man of him." Like most of our folk sayings, this is based on something sound.

Naturally our sons, and brothers, and our daughters' husbands, will gripe while they are in the service—and try to impress us with how tough things are. That's only human. But when you sit down and talk seriously with them, they will tell you that their stint in the Army broadened their horizons, and matured them, and made much more responsible citizens of them than they would have been without it.

The Army chaplains and our character guidance programs, and our information and education activities help, of course. But when the chips are down, what the young man is made of—will show through.

Some of the young people who have been through the toughest circumstances in their military service will tell you that—if a person is made of the right stuff—he will benefit from living with other people, and shouldering new problems, and adjusting himself to the different phases of Army life.

So this is the final "extra dividend" I wanted to mention tonight. This is the one that we can never measure in dollars and cents. But it is a "dividend" which contributes importantly to the strength and maturity of our Nation.

I hope that you have found this look at the Army's "other side" interesting. And I hope that the next time you pay your taxes, you will find comfort—not only in the knowledge that some of your money is being invested in the building of a strong Army to defend your home, your family, and your freedom—but also in the knowledge of these other ways in which the Army serves you in time of peace, with the same dedication that it serves you in time of war.

And I want you to remember too, that the things I have been talking about tonight are extra dividends. We receive regular dividends from the Army—not only when it is actively engaged in winning wars, so that we may retain our freedom and our way of life—but every day of our lives, simply through the sense of security which we enjoy because we have the Army.

Try to imagine, just for a moment, what it would be like if we had no Army. Try to imagine that the professional soldiers who have dedicated their lives to the defense of the Nation have vanished; and that we have lost, along with them, all their military skills and knowledge. Our military equipment is

gone, and our supplies and facilities have vanished. There isn't an American soldier anywhere in the world. Then remember the news as you printed it in your papers today, as you saw it on television, as you heard it over the radio.

Now, if you will give that imaginary picture just a moment to sink in, I think you will be inclined to agree with me—that we have never made, and never will make, a better dividend-paying investment than when we pay our share toward the maintenance of our Army.

Thank you.

Lincoln Day Address by Governor of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a Lincoln Day address delivered by the Governor of Idaho at Pocatello, Idaho, on February 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. ROBERT E. SMYLYE, OF IDAHO, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE SOUTHEASTERN IDAHO LINCOLN DAY ASSOCIATION, POCATELLO, IDAHO, FEBRUARY 9, 1955

Seven years in the history of a great State is a comparatively short period of time. To me on this night it seems even shorter than usual. For tonight marks an anniversary of sorts. Seven years ago, almost to the very hour, I had the honor of addressing this association on the occasion of your 1948 commemoration of the birthday of the great Lincoln. Then I had served you as attorney general for the brief period of 2½ months. Your invitation then was my first opportunity to make a public speech to a large audience. For that reason it was fitting that I should return this year as your Chief Executive and I hasten to say to you that I am honored that you invited me.

There is an obscure quotation from Mr. Lincoln's papers that somehow seems appropriate to this time and place and to this minor anniversary of my own. In 1864, just as they departed to join the Army of Northern Virginia, then commencing its campaign through the wilderness, Lincoln said to the 184th Ohio Infantry on the lawn of the President's house in Washington:

"I happen temporarily to occupy this big White House. I am a living witness that anyone of your children may look to come here, as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free Government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance . . . that the struggle upon which we are engaged should be maintained."

That simple statement is to me a challenge and an inspiration. Drawn from the deep springs of Lincoln's humility and his communion with the spirit of our Nation's greatness, it is a beacon that anyone of us can follow. It speaks the ancient command that we must so honor our freedom that no act of ours shall ever leave that heritage less secure than it was when we received it from our fathers.

Some of you may remember that night 7 years ago when first you honored me with your invitation to come here. I had occasion then to say that it was fitting that we honor

Lincoln here "in the heart of this burgeoning new industrial empire in southeast Idaho." Just because that 7 years have been so brilliant, and our accomplishments so many, let me take you back in memory along the path that we have traveled.

Seven years ago the Westvaco plant was not yet built on the western approaches to this city. Monsanto had not been heard of in Soda Springs. The Atomic Energy Commission's development in the Arco desert and at Idaho Falls was the secret of some classified drawing board. The Jefferson Lake plant in Bear Lake County was not even a dream. Jack Simplot's plant was only about half its present capacity, and the Garrett terminal on Poleline Road did not exist.

But our development has not all been industrial. We have faced the challenge of the growing years in other fields as well. Count the number of new schoolhouses that dot this southeast Idaho landscape. Add up the support that those schools now have that wasn't there in 1948. Measure the miles of new and improved highways that move our pleasure and commercial traffic to and through our State. Remember that Idaho State College was then in the first year of its life as a 4-year degree-granting college, and that 20 years of sterile conflict on that score were behind us. And ponder the fact that only this week, with the signing of House bill No. 30 your college really reached maturity with the privilege of offering graduate work and granting graduate degrees. With that act, when it is properly implemented, southeastern Idaho will have come of age in the field of higher education.

And then as good Republicans, remember that these 7 years were Republican years, and let that be an answer to the prophets of gloom and doom who would have you believe that there is no future and that we must always be someone's colony.

They have been a brilliant 7 years, studded with the accomplishments of a free people, born to persevere and prosper. They have been the accomplishments of men and women true to the heritage of liberty and enterprise bequeathed to us by the great Lincoln. And the future that lies ahead can be just as bright, and brighter. We face great challenges, but the history of this mountain country is the story of difficulties met and mastered. We have the vision, the courage, the ideals and the spirit with which to face these bright tomorrows and to make them our years of historic growth and development.

I am happy that I can report to you tonight that your 33d legislature is writing a brilliant record of accomplishment. With devotion to the welfare of our State, without regard for partisan advantage, they have worked untiringly toward the solution of some of the most difficult legislative problems to confront a legislature in many years. As your chief executive I have insisted that we must put our financial house in order, and that that task must be the first order of business. The members of both parties in the house and senate have bent to that task unparingly and we are solving our financial problems without recourse to partisan bitterness with all its wasting effects on our future. The spirit and commonsense with which this legislature is facing its work is historic. It makes it possible to view the great future of our State with calm confidence that we can master this challenge that history has given us to build, and then sustain, an economic landmark in the Mountain West.

But I trespass overlong in a discussion of those things that lie closest to my heart these days—those problems of our young and vigorous and growing Idaho.

We are met tonight to honor the memory of the first President which our Republican Party installed in the White House. It is

true that Abraham Lincoln belongs to the ages—to the brilliant history of a free world whose concept of liberty is encrusted with Lincoln's devotion to the Christian dignity of the individual human being. But history will understand in this hour of commemoration on the anniversary of our party's birth, if we remember with glad hearts that peculiarly and historically, the great Lincoln belongs to us—to the Republican Party whose first principles he enunciated and whose feet he first set firmly on the path that led to power. And in this hour of dedication and commemoration, it is fitting that we look to the greatness of his spirit for guidance and for inspiration.

In the Book of Ecclesiastes there is a somber passage about the "time of little hope," which is described as the day when the clouds return after the rain. In some ways it fits this time of international stress all too well. The immediate, deadly danger from the storm is long over. Yet the clouds return and instead of the sunshine of enduring peace in which we hoped to bask after 1945 we have lived under gray overcast.

It was in just such a period that Abraham Lincoln came to the White House almost 100 years ago. The storm had not burst, but the clouds hung low and were growing thicker and blacker. The hearts of brave men faltered when they tried to look into the future; and cowards were already whimpering and whining on street corner and rostrum and editorial tripod. The analogy with our own time needs no stressing.

Yet, had the Nation but known it, on March 4, 1861, the Nation was already saved, for the man had arrived. It took a long time for people to realize it, long years of blood and fire and anguish; and longer years for the dust of battle and the clouds of passion to drift away. But when we could see clearly again, the truth was plain—from the moment that Lincoln took the oath of office as President, the Union was saved.

I draw the parallel no further. I dare not. Men of Lincoln's stature are God's gifts to a nation, bestowed when and as His wisdom, not our wishes, may determine. He may not grant us another in the present crisis; or, perchance, He may have already sent us one whom we have not yet recognized any more than in 1861 men recognized the gaunt rail-splitter as the Nation's savior.

But this we do know—in times when the road ahead is shrouded in mist, it is the spirit of Lincoln that this Nation needs above all else, and it is the gift of that spirit for which it should pray. I am no theologian, but I understand well enough the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican in the temple. Prayer is not enough. The man, or the nation, that goes down from the temple justified is the one that prayed for the right thing. I doubt that it is right to pray for another Lincoln; but I am no more firmly convinced of my own existence than I am that it is right to pray for the light that glowed from the mind and heart of Lincoln.

Carl Sandburg has published as a little book the preface that he wrote for his great life of Lincoln but later for some reason discarded. In it he has a description of Lincoln that may strike you at first as merely curious, but which, when you study it, I think you will admit is great. Sandburg said, "He was not only a genius in the science of neighborly human relationships and an artist in the personal handling of life from day to day, but a strange friend and a friendly stranger to all forms of life that he met."

Translate that into national terms and see what a lordly thing you get. Imagine, not a man, but a Nation infused with the spirit of that man—a genius in the science of neighborly human relationships. How soon the worst of its diplomatic problems would dissolve and vanish. Imagine the United States an artist in the personal handling of

life from day to day—how magically our public life would be transformed, how quickly the screaming and vituperation would die away, how rapidly we would suppress the merchants of hate, how we would scorn the sowers of suspicion and prejudice. Imagine us as strange friends and friendly strangers to all forms of life—the Samaritan among the nations, never identified with any, never inseparably bound to any, always a stranger but always a friend.

Somewhere in that picture I believe you will find every good thing that the United States has done in this blasted and twisted century, the bloodiest in human annals, in which good deeds, God help us, are few and far between. A great deal more is in the picture—it includes every good deed we might have done, but didn't. Take such splendid moments as we have had, such fragments of nobility as we have managed to achieve and fit them together, discarding the weaknesses and villainies, and you will have a portrayal of the grandeur of Lincoln's spirit.

Then add the lost opportunities—the times when we didn't quite understand, or didn't quite dare, or weren't quite generous enough to do the great thing we really wished to do—and you will have the sorrow that brooded over his spirit.

In 1861 it was Lincoln's wish to purchase the slaves and set them free at the expense of the whole country, not at the expense of the Southern States alone. But he was not permitted to do it. Passion was running too high, misunderstanding was too thick on both sides for calm reason to obtain a hearing; so, while the evil was eliminated, it was at the cost of fearful agony and loss on both sides.

In 1955 we are facing the same old evil. It has a new name, but that doesn't matter. They call it totalitarian dictatorship now, but in essence it is slavery. It must be and it will be eliminated; but I believe, as Lincoln believed, that there are better ways of eliminating it than by fire and sword. Where Lincoln said "this Nation," we must say "this world," but the rest we may quote verbatim—this world "under God, shall have a new birth of freedom." The best and wisest among us know that there are better ways of eradicating the evil that must go.

So while I dare not claim that there is a Lincoln among us, I have faith to believe that some men among our leaders are imbued with the spirit of Lincoln to the extent that they will not accept war as the solution of our problem until the last alternative has been exhausted.

You will find such men in both parties, but conspicuous among them is the President of the United States. Under intense provocation at home and abroad, he has yet to utter one inflammatory speech, on the one hand, or, on the other, to yield 1 inch to the communist doctrinaires. With firmness in the right as God gives him to see the right, he is yet convinced that hatred and suspicion, to say nothing of the wild passions of war, are poor instrumentalities to advance the right. He knows that there is a better way and, like Lincoln, he is seeking desperately to find it and then persuade his countrymen to follow it.

It is no partisan appeal to call upon all men of all parties to sustain him in this endeavor. Disagree with him on everything else, if you please, but follow him in his effort to make reason the rule and charity toward all, the spirit of our foreign relations; for this is the spirit in which Lincoln acted, and, so acting, rose above all parties, all sections, all economic interests. In that spirit there is neither Democrat nor Republican, no North, no South, no East, no West, only Americanism.

It was in so acting that Lincoln acquired the piercing vision before which the mists of passion, the dust and smoke of battle

that blinded other men, became the thinnest of transparent veils through which he could see that Nation that was to be—that vision without which the people perish.

These days in Idaho we can be prayerful that a little of this vision of Lincoln's—the divine inspiration that marked out his path—will be given to us at this crossroad. There is now marked out the pathway that will put behind us all of our old and sterile controversies, all our regional jealousy and distrust, if we have the courage and foresight to follow it. And once those areas of mistrust are liquidated, and we all approach our problems without the rancor of partisanship and beyond the dictates of regional pride, then we will truly have turned the pages into the bright history that will be tomorrow.

In the century since the Lord took Lincoln from among us we have learned to know that his real genius was his oneness with his people. Sprung from the most humble among us, born to suffering and privation, touched with an inspiration that had its source in divinity and took its strength from our whole concept of individual freedom and dignity, Lincoln lives in history as the one really great example of the brilliance of the American way. He had the enduring patience to live with a problem until it could, would be solved, and he knew that no issue, no question, would long be mistakenly decided if it was submitted to the patient wisdom and the ultimate justice of the people themselves.

It is fitting then that we should come here to do honor to this greatest of all great Americans and that the brooding and somber spirit of the Emancipator can look down upon us to see if we remember his sacrifice and if the love of liberty and human freedom still burns in our hearts. Look down, Lincoln, look down up us. This is more than an anniversary—it is a rendezvous with your spirit—an occasion for reporting that for another year we have kept the faith.

May God preserve the memory of this great and gallant American. May God preserve the land and the principles for which he lived and died. May God bless our Nation, and give to each of us the strength to answer whenever duty calls, and to say by deeds, as well as words, "Lincoln, we are here, and we remember."

President's Highway Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's highway program repeats his now familiar process of coolly surveying a national problem and advancing a sound means by which the problem can be attacked and steps taken toward eventual solution.

No responsible person can deny that our Nation is facing eventual strangulation on the highways. For half a century it has been a nip and tuck battle to keep highway construction ahead of automotive progress. We must move ahead with this bold plan in order to expedite the flow of goods and people from place to place. Whether in war or in peace, our highways are vital to the national economy and welfare. If we can

reduce the annual carnage caused by traffic accidents, this alone will make our efforts worthwhile.

I am particularly pleased with the fiscal aspects of the President's scheme. Here again, the planning is based on our anticipated revenues over a specific period of time. The improved highway system will be paid for out of the funds received from increased gas tax revenues as America grows and is not a mortgage on the earning capacity of future generations as has been the case with other half-baked schemes of past years.

This is a blueprint for action which we as legislators should get behind and support.

Contributions by American Indians for the Welfare of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Thomas Dixon, national commander of the United American Veterans, delivered over the facilities of WPIK, at Washington, D. C., on February 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Patriotic Americans, in my broadcast last Saturday I brought to you the good news about the building of an Indian temple here in Washington. I want to refresh your memory on the many contributions made by American Indians for the welfare of the United States of America.

Now I will bring your memory back to the year 1492 when Columbus discovered America. To his surprise, Columbus found Indians here on this continent; they were friendly people and brought many gifts to express welcome to Columbus and his crew.

When the Pilgrims landed here, broke and hungry, it was again the American Indians who came to the assistance of these poor and destitute people.

The first Thanksgiving Day was based on the native Indian custom of celebrating their harvest season. The pale-faced Pilgrims carried on this thanksgiving custom with many kinds of food which the Indians brought them.

During the long, bitterly cold winters there was terrible suffering among the early pioneers. They were at the point of starvation for many years—until they could plant and harvest their simple food needs. During these very trying times, it was the American Indians who gave the Pilgrims wild fowl, drinking water, fish, corn, and other provisions. You may be sure that the Pilgrims were grateful for this blessed understanding and help on the part of the American Indians.

The Pilgrims realized in those early days that the Indians were deeply moved by a spiritual influence. The Indians called it the Great Spirit. We call it God.

The American Indians taught the Pilgrims how to take certain roots and make it into a bread, and how to use the wild herbs as food,

and how to make a kind of tea out of small roots.

The Pilgrims were moved to see how devoted the Indians were to their spiritual rituals. Even in those early days the Indians had many skills which made their survival possible; just to cite a few: The Indians showed the Pilgrims how to make fire from two rocks, and how to make cutting implements from rocks.

Next in line was the great Pocahontas, the daughter of Chief Powhatan of the Powhatan Tribes of Delaware. Although Capt. John Smith committed a breach of trust with the Indians and was condemned to die by the Powhatan Indians, it was then that the famous Pocahontas saw a religious duty to be performed, and she went against the wishes of her own father and did her duty by saving the life of Capt. John Smith, because she did not want the hands of her tribe stained with the blood of a human being. I have been told that there are some direct descendants of the great Pocahontas living today, and that they are very proud of their Indian lineage.

Every American has heard of the great Chief Sequoia, whose American name was George Guess. He was the first Indian to make an alphabet of the Indian dialect.

Every American of today knows of former Vice President Charles Curtis, who rose from a lawyer in Kansas to the United States Senate, and then to the Vice Presidency of the United States. Mr. Curtis was exceedingly proud of his Indian heritage, and his sister, Mrs. Dolly Gann, was the leading woman in the society life of Washington for many years.

And everyone knows about Will Rogers, who boasted rightfully, that he never had an enemy. His statue stands in the Hall of Fame in the Capitol Building. He was also of Indian descent.

There was also Senator Robert L. Owens, from Oklahoma, himself an Indian. It was he who brought about the enactment of law which recognized the five civilized tribes as American citizens. Senator Owens was very proud of his Indian lineage.

And every sports writer remembers old Jim Thorpe, who was classed as the greatest all around athlete in the world.

And the aviation world remembers Wiley Post, another Indian, who was the first to fly a solo flight around the world.

Also in the sports world, they all know of Soxolexis, also of Indian parentage. He was a great ball player, and for many years headlined the Cleveland ball team; his name has made baseball history, and today the Cleveland ball team is called the Indians.

And every American knows of the heroes who raised the American flag over Iwo Jima. Well, one of those heroes was an Indian soldier from Arizona.

The American Indians have given outstandingly good accounting of themselves in every war in which this country has been involved, either as individual soldiers, or in regiments of Indian infantrymen and artillerymen. They are unexcelled in military scouting.

The Indians are a proud and patriotic part of our citizenship. They deserve to have their early history and their present treasured heritages recognized in a substantial way as a spiritual force in the establishing of a sacred shrine to be known as The Temple dedicated to the Great Spirit.

This temple will be located in Washington, the seat of our Government, where divine services can be held in the native languages and dialects of the many tribal groups all over the country.

One of my listeners wanted to know why an Indian shrine should be built in Washington. Is it possible that an American can be so shortsighted as not to realize the moral and historical value of such a shrine? We think nothing of tossing billions of dol-

lars into foreign countries. We have spent millions of dollars building monuments to Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson. But when it comes to a just debt of gratitude to the original owners of this country, the American Indians, why, that has been completely overlooked.

Right at this very minute, our political and religious leaders are rightfully doing everything possible to arouse the people all over the world to the necessity of moral rearmament. I ask you, what better moral rearmament could we have here in America than the building of a shrine to the American Indians?

I would be very ungrateful if I did not say a word in appreciation of the sponsor of this broadcast, Mr. Collis Ormsby Redd, founder of the Crusaders for the Forgotten Man. Mr. Redd has dedicated his life to the task of awakening the political leaders all over the world to the necessity of getting back to God. Mr. Redd spends his own money in financing these broadcasts, he realizes the moral value of this great cause on behalf of the American Indians.

I thank you.

Washington's Birthday Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered last night at the Washington's Birthday banquet of the Sons of the Revolution at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the Sons of the Revolution of the State of New York, I am greatly honored to be called upon to respond to the toast to General George Washington.

As the leader of the Army of the Revolution he was first in war and his courage and ability played a major part in the winning of our independence.

After this great service to the new Nation, he felt he was entitled to retire, but we consider him first in peace because he presided over the Constitutional Convention which gave us the basic framework of our Government and then later became the first President under the Constitution.

In the period of our national life since then, he has been truly first in the hearts of his countrymen.

While we are here to pay tribute to George Washington and the service he rendered to our Nation, it is also fitting and proper that we review some of the current problems and the effect they may have upon the institutions he did so much to help create and to preserve.

The world balance of power has been so upset that no prudent person can ignore the realities of the situation. Not only the future of this Republic but the hope for a free world of free men largely depends upon the policies that we follow and the firmness with which we and the free nations deal with future communist aggression or threat of aggression.

In the past 10-year period international communism has increased its power, its area,

and its population. Ten years ago at this time there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today over 800 million people live under the most ruthless, godless tyranny the world has ever known.

Recognizing the inherent danger in further Communist conquest, the Government of the United States has undertaken a series of commitments under the North Atlantic Alliance, the ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States) Mutual Defense Pact and mutual defense pacts with the Republic of the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Japan, southeast Asia, and the Republic of China.

The last two treaties were overwhelmingly ratified by the Senate this month.

In a display of national unity that should have encouraged our friends abroad, given courage to the neutrals and opened the eyes of the would-be aggressor, the House of Representatives passed the resolution by a vote of 409 to 3 and the Senate by a vote of 85 to 3.

This action had no sooner been taken and the two treaties ratified than diplomatic moves started on the part of certain Asian and European powers to bend the line of defense in the Pacific and lay the groundwork for a conference which would have all the unfortunate results of a Munich, a Yalta or a Geneva wherein the aggressor gains his objectives at the conference table.

Unfortunately, the history of these conferences has been that it is always the free world that gives up territory and surrenders human beings to the control of the Communists. It is never the other way around, wherein the enslaved people gain their freedom. We must not permit Gulliver to be tied down by the Lilliputians. There are those, at home and abroad, who seek to advance the cause of world government. Until now it has not been a major threat to our Constitution or our sovereignty. The development of the atomic and hydrogen weapon has caused some persons at home and abroad to believe that world peace and security depend upon some form of world state. This is a fallacy that could cost us our freedom.

This country cannot join its political system with the other nations of the world, including Communist or other dictatorships, without diluting our constitutional guarantees. How can a Communist dictatorship, or any other kind, have an equal voice with this free Nation without compromising our constitutional structure of government and the rights of free men? How can a Socialist or Communist economic system be tied to ours without first compromising and then destroying the free economic system, the rights of private capital, and the unregimented life of our people? How can we join our productive capacity and resources to the unproductive who lack resources without destroying the living standards of our people whose enterprise and thrift helped them accumulate property and capital for new industry? This has been the great incentive that has advanced us from a small colony of 3 million to a great Nation of 165 million people, the most productive the world has ever known.

It is one thing for the American people by deliberate choice, after thorough debate, to amend our Constitution to meet changing conditions. To allow it to happen by default would be a betrayal of our responsibilities.

We must not permit court decisions of Executive agreements to raise such to the status of treaties. Nor will we long preserve our Constitution, drafted at Philadelphia under the chairmanship of George Washington, if we fail to challenge any effort to amend our Constitution by use of a loophole which may provide a treaty or Executive agreement short-cut to what was intended to be a difficult process.

Let us examine the record of the United Nations as an agency for effective collective security as envisioned by some or as a basis

for a world government as contemplated by others.

World War II had not yet terminated in 1945 when the United Nations Conference was held in San Francisco. The people of the world did not know that we were on the threshold of the atomic age though those high in Government had reason to believe a vast new power that ultimately could be used for destructive or constructive purposes was soon to be unveiled.

Hopes were high everywhere that the Soviet Union, though a dictatorship, had learned the folly of aggression and of war and because of the vast help given by the free world to them they would be willing to help establish a system of international law and order to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

Unfortunately both during the San Francisco conference and in the 10 years that have followed a vast propaganda effort has taken place to build the United Nations into something which its charter provisions could not or did not permit it to become. In the United Nations different people envisioned different things.

Some envisioned it as a mighty force of collective security that would rally most of the nations of the world to resist aggression and preserve the peace. In moments of oratorical fancy some even suggested that the fact the United Nations was in being would warrant free nations to scrap most, if not all, of their armed forces and place their reliance upon the "police power" of the United Nations and the collective moral persuasion of that organization. On June 25, 1950, this concept was shattered shortly after it appeared to be confirmed.

When the Communist forces crossed the 38th parallel, the United Nations Security Council promptly acted and first called upon the Communist aggressor to cease the aggression. The Communists, of course, forthwith showed they were not impressed by a United Nations resolution or the adverse moral reaction of that organization. The Security Council next called on the 60 members of that organization to give aid and support to the victim of the aggression, the Republic of Korea.

What is the record on this? After 3 years of the Korean war, of the 60 members of the United Nations only 17 contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression. Outside of the United States of America, the other 16 contributed armed forces in the amount of 45,000. The United States of America alone contributed more than 450,000, and we rotated more than 1 million men through the Korean theater of war. The little Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, supplied over 600,000.

This means that of the United Nations members the United States of America supplied more than 90 percent of the manpower and better than 90 percent of the resources.

When the forces of the Republic of Korea, not being a member of the United Nations (having been kept out by a Soviet veto), are added to those of the United States, it means that our two nations alone supplied better than 95 percent of the manpower.

Does this indicate that the United Nations is an effective instrument of collective security? The answer must come back in the negative.

Our associates in the United Nations so tied us down that a stalemate was all that could be gained after 3 years of struggle in Korea.

We were denied the right of hot pursuit and the enemy was protected in his sanctuary across the Yalu.

With that example are you prepared to risk the future of our Nation and the safety of our people upon the collective ability of the United Nations to function in the event of aggression? The answer likewise must be in the negative.

Has the time not come for a realistic appraisal of just what part the United Nations is qualified to play and to stop kidding ourselves into believing it is something it is not and, in my judgment, cannot be.

There are some who have envisioned the United Nations as a world state to which openly or clandestinely, individual nations would surrender their sovereignty. Some of the more enthusiastic proponents of this type of super state compared the San Francisco meeting with that of our own Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. Of course, the two gatherings are not comparable when one considers the building of a government upon which man might depend for the protection of his life and his religious, economic, and intellectual freedom.

In the first place, those who met at Philadelphia spoke a common language and had a common heritage. True, they had come from different areas of the world, but they or their predecessors had come seeking a new way of life, freedom from Old World tyranny or a desire to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

They had fought a common battle against the mightiest empire of that time. They had carried over from the old country the background of the Magna Carta and of representative government. They had had experience as an independent nation, much of it unsatisfactory, under the Articles of Confederation.

With that background, under what I believe was divine inspiration, drafted the greatest document produced by the mind and hand of man for his self-government and protection of his natural rights.

A little more realistic understanding of the history of the nations gathered in San Francisco should have made it clear that such an organization could not be and should not be considered a basis for world government.

There is no common language or common heritage. Nations which have had no experience with representative constitutional government sit on equal terms with those that have had long experience. Nations of less than 1 million have equal representation with those of over 300 million. The Soviet Union, which is perhaps the most tyrannical government since western civilization entered the modern era, sits as an equal partner with nations with long-established constitutions of law, order, and a respect of the rights of man.

Now, there are those who urge the admission of Communist China which was the aggressor in the Korean war. This, together with the other Communist states, would give that system of tyranny over 800 million people that they claim to speak for.

As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guarantees of freedom under our Constitution being diluted or modified directly or indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions.

Let us be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late wherein we have been taken. I believe that every candidate for public office—executive, legislative or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue. It is later than you think.

The United Nations, if it does not destroy its moral position by actions which I shall mention, does have a function it could perform. It could be a forum wherein the views of the free world and the Communist world might be aired provided that there was assurance the debates in the General Assembly or the Security Council were receiving as widespread coverage behind the Iron Curtain as they do in the free nations.

Otherwise, it becomes a vast propaganda forum for the Communists wherein the point

of view of the West does not have the equal opportunity to get to the people in the Soviet Union and its satellites because of the strict censorship those governments exercise.

Even in regard to its position of moral leadership the United Nations has allowed itself to become seriously compromised.

Following the intervention of Communist China into the Korean war the United Nations, after great hesitation, declared Communist China the aggressor. There had been no such hesitation when the small aggressor Communist Korea, crossed the 38th parallel in June of 1950.

To close observers this seemed to indicate that there would be alacrity to pass a resolution and to act against a small aggressor but there would be procrastination and delay in acting against a large aggressor. This seemed to be an abandonment of principle for expediency.

Later, when the evidence was conclusive that the Soviet Union was not only giving moral support to Communist aggression in Korea but was supplying MIG planes, tanks, artillery, ammunition, and other weapons in clear violation of the United Nations resolution and the charter of the organization, no steps were taken to expel the Soviet Union from the United Nations.

Later on, the official representative of the Soviet Union baldly and boldly admitted the fact that such support had been given and in effect defied the United Nations to do anything about it. They did nothing and by inaction underscored their futility when dealing with Soviet charter violations.

Every member of the United Nations knows that the terms of the Korean armistice have been violated on numerous occasions. The neutral nations commission is not allowed to function in Communist North Korea as it was intended though they have complete freedom in the area of the free Republic of Korea. In violation of the terms of the armistice, the Communists have brought in equipment and built military airfields. No effective steps have been taken to require respect for the terms of the armistice.

The most flagrant violation has been the admitted holding of 15 members of the American Air Force, 11 of whom have been sentenced to prison terms of from 4 to 10 years. Under the terms of the armistice it was required that all prisoners of war who wanted to be returned should be allowed to do so.

There is strong reason to believe that there are at least several hundred additional United Nations and United States prisoners of war being held in violation of the terms of the armistice.

The United Nations passed a resolution expressing its concern in this matter. The Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, made a special trip to Peking. He returned without the release of the prisoners and without any date upon which they might be expected to be returned in the future. It is apparent that they are being held for the purposes of international blackmail on the part of the Chinese Communists.

Impotent and paralyzed, the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly have taken no effective steps to enforce the release of our airmen in accordance with terms of the Korean armistice. Again I ask: "What effective steps, if any, does the United Nations intend to take?"

In the matter of the Chinese Communist aggression against the Republic of China which is a charter member of the United Nations, that organization invited the Chinese Communists to come to New York to discuss a cease-fire.

Arrogantly, the Chinese Communists laid down terms that a victor would be expected to lay down to the vanquished—namely that the Republic of China should be removed from the Security Council and that the Soviet Union resolution condemning the United

States should be made the order of business rather than the New Zealand resolution relative to a cease-fire.

When this message was received the United Nations again demonstrated its ineffectiveness by postponing the whole situation, while some of the neutralist friends of the Soviet Union and Red China are trying, through diplomatic channels, to provide for a Far Eastern Munich whereby the Chinese Communists will be given the key coastal islands of Quemoy and Matsu and membership in the United Nations. This, of course, would be another defeat for the free world and throughout all of Asia looked upon as another victory for the Communists, comparable to that growing out of the Geneva Conference, wherein the Communists gained control of Northern Vietnam and 15 million more human beings.

I am strongly opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

If, as part of a Far Eastern Munich, the appeasers force Red China in I shall devote the balance of my life to taking the United States out.

These are not pleasant facts, and there are many in this country and elsewhere who, because of the vast amount of publicity and propaganda, have gotten a distorted view of the capabilities of the United Nations Organization.

Certainly, in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapon, a nation can no more return to isolationism than an adult can return to childhood.

It is important that we have a system of effective collective security and to demonstrate to the Communist world that there will be no further retreats or the abandonment of free people into Communist hands.

This Nation will live up to all of its treaty obligations, and we have the right to expect that our allies will do likewise.

I have a deep conviction that the American people and those throughout the free world who understand the dangers facing us will never again pay the price of another Yalta or another Geneva in order to buy a temporary respite from the insatiable appetite of international Communists to destroy human freedom.

If we as a free people will show the same courage and common sense that motivated Washington and the others who under divine inspiration gave us our Constitution there are none of our great domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need fear.

Twenty-Dollar Tax Cut: Will It Do Something for the Average Person, or to Him?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am including below an article from yesterday's Christian Science Monitor documenting the political nature of the proposal for a \$20 reduction in personal income taxes for each taxpayer and each of his dependents. The article also sets forth the purposes and plans of the Democratic Party for further and additional maneuvers with political "sex appeal."

In it the distinguished majority leader is quoted as saying that whenever "anything is done for the average person, the

Republicans oppose it and cry politics." With such statement I heartily disagree.

I believe a more accurate summation would be this: "Whenever anything is proposed that will do something good for the average American, the Republicans support it wholeheartedly; but whenever anything is proposed because it is politically attractive, but in the end will do bad for the average person, the Republicans have the courage to oppose it."

The \$20-reduction scheme is a case in point. By dint of real political courage, vision and foresight during 1953 and 1954, the Republican-Eisenhower administration came to grips with the problem of spiraling inflation in this country.

In 1939 the cost of living index was at 59.4. By 1954 it had skyrocketed to 114.4. In these 15 years under previous administrations the average person had more than half of his savings wiped out by the indirect taxation of inflation, the security in social security was taken away because benefits of the program no longer were enough even to buy necessities at inflated prices, and there was no end in sight for similar hardships on the average person.

Were these previous administrations doing something for the average person? More accurately, they were doing something to him, because they failed to get the public debt in hand and thus stop the spiral of inflation.

Then along comes the Republican-Eisenhower administration and after 2 years the cost of living index at the end of 1954 is at 114.6, with two-tenths of 1 percent of what it was when that administration took over.

Now comes 1955 and a Democratic-controlled House and Senate. Within 7 weeks there is proposed the \$20 tax reduction political scheme to upset the economic appletart. It would result in cutting the Government's revenue, increasing the debt, and thus start the vicious inflation spiral all over again. It will cost the average person in increased prices far more than the \$20 it saves him in taxes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I propose this honest question: Are those behind this scheme going to do something for the average person, or something to him?

The Monitor article above referred to follows:

DEMOCRATS TRY TO OUTDO GOP?

WASHINGTON.—That proposal for a \$20 reduction in personal income taxes—which the Democrats are seeking to rush through Congress this week—is the opening gun in a frankly political drive to win voter support for 1956.

The Democrats are preparing to outbid the Eisenhower administration—on taxes, on schools, on highways, on whatever else looks feasible.

In a reversal of the usual conservative-liberal sequence, the Democrats are preparing to say: "We can do what the Republicans propose, but we can do it better."

The Eisenhower administration has held out the hope of an income-tax reduction in 1956. The Democrats propose to vote it through now—a \$20-a-year cut in personal income taxes, with an additional \$20 cut for each dependent, effective next January.

DEMOCRATIC TACTICS

The Eisenhower administration is sending its \$101 billion highways program to Congress February 22. A Democratic-con-

trolled Senate Public Works Subcommittee has started hearings 1 day earlier on a bill introduced by Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee, authorizing annual Federal appropriations of \$1,600,000,000 a year for the next 5 years for highway construction.

President Eisenhower has proposed a \$7 billion school-construction program, designed to build schools through local option, private lending and construction and very small increments of direct Federal aid. The Democratic National Committee has circulated a confidential memorandum to all Democrats in Congress saying this program would produce no new schools for 2 or 3 years.

Democratic Members of the Senate Labor Committee, conducting hearings on the schoolroom shortage, look with favor on a bill by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama, proposing big direct Federal appropriations for school aid.

This is the new Democratic strategy—to outdo and outbid the Republicans. Democrats have been complaining that President Eisenhower has moved so far in adopting humanitarian, liberal legislation that he has seized the Democrats' best issues before the voting public.

POLITICAL MANEUVER

Democrats have been wondering how on earth they could defeat President Eisenhower if he stands for reelection in 1956. They find it dangerous and unwise to attack him directly. But perhaps he and his party can be outmaneuvered; the income-tax cut suddenly exploded in the House by able veteran Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, is the first tactical move in this direction.

House leaders, formally introducing the income-tax cut in the House Ways and Means Committee, February 21, want to achieve House passage by this weekend. The measure then would go to the Senate where most Democratic leaders have thus far remained noncommittal, although influential Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, who is a member of the Senate Finance Committee, said the House leadership, led by Speaker RAYBURN, had drafted the measure without consulting Senators.

Quite naturally, Republican leaders in Congress have denounced the surprise Democratic plan as an irresponsible move intended to embarrass Mr. Eisenhower. They have protested that it is improper and disgraceful for the Democrats to try to ram through the proposal in a week without regular hearings. The income-tax cut is proposed as a rider to the administration bill to extend present corporation and excise taxes, due to end April 1, for another year.

M'CORMACK RETORTS

Because of the administration's desire to extend these taxes, to prevent the budget from falling further out of balance, President Eisenhower hardly will want to veto the main bill to kill off the rider. Here is where an item veto would be helpful to the Chief Executive.

The House majority leader, Representative JOHN W. M'CORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, has retorted to the Republican outcries that whenever "anything is done for the average person, the Republicans oppose it and cry politics."

Mr. Eisenhower has said the Government cannot afford the revenue loss of an income-tax cut so soon because of the estimated \$2,400,000,000 deficit in the fiscal year starting July 1. The President is likely to have one powerful Democratic supporter in the Senate, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, but he would hardly be able to stop the proposal in committee.

Tax reduction always has heavy political overtones. Political scientists and economists make the point that in these days when tax policy has such far-reaching impact on the national economy, partisan con-

siderations should be subdued, and tax policy should, in effect, become as bipartisan as foreign policy.

The vital immediate tax issue before the Nation is whether the 52-percent corporation excise taxes (which under present law fall to 47 percent in April) and the special excise taxes on autos, tobacco, liquor, and gasoline shall continue for another year.

It is really too early now, in the opinion of economists, to know whether it would be wise to cut individual income taxes next year. But to the strategists of the Democratic National Committee and the Democratic House, it is politically wise to resuscitate some vote-getting issues well before 1956.

Investigation of November 1952 Election in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the United States grand jury for the Federal district of New Mexico on the contest growing out of the general election held in New Mexico on November 4, 1952, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO—IN THE
MATTER OF THE GRAND JURY REGULARLY
CONVENED AND EMpaneled AT ALBUQUERQUE,
N. MEX., ON SEPTEMBER 13, 1954—No. 3685,
MISCELLANEOUS

REPORT OF THE GRAND JURY

To the Honorable CARL A. HATCH,
United States District Judge:

We, the grand jury, having been duly empaneled, sworn, and instructed by the court, having performed our duties in accordance with the instructions of the court, and having completed all business now before us, beg leave to submit the following report of our actions:

We were empaneled and began our deliberations at Albuquerque at 9:30 a. m. on September 13, 1954, and have been in session until the time of this report at 4:30 p. m. on September 24, 1954.

We have investigated 82 matters presented to us by the United States attorney, said investigations involving 99 defendants.

We have examined 110 witnesses, and herewith return into open court 65 true bills and 16 no bills. In certain cases investigated by the grand jury, the persons investigated were not bound over to await the action of this court and the grand jury found no basis for indictments. In accordance with the instructions of the court, no bills are not being formally returned into court in such cases. This accounts for the discrepancy between the number of cases considered and the number of true bills and no bills returned.

The grand jury expresses its sincere thanks to the court for permitting it to use Judge Hatch's library to hold its session. The grand jury further takes notice that during the time the grand jury was in session Judge Rogers was conducting jury trials in the only courtroom in the Federal Building in Albuquerque, and that his jury was forced

to use the room that was normally used by the grand jury which, by the way, is too small for the use of the grand jury. The grand jury further notes that during its session at the same time that Judge Rogers was using the courtroom Judge Hatch had to conduct trials in his private office, both Federal judges having business at the same time.

The grand jury wishes to take this opportunity to stress that in its opinion the courtroom facilities and grand jury room facilities in the Federal Building in Albuquerque, N. Mex., are completely inadequate now that there are 2 Federal judges, so much so, to the point that 1 of the judges has had to use his personal office to conduct trials coming before him officially. The grand jury considers it against the public interest in the conduct of the business before the Federal courts in New Mexico that one of the judges, namely, Judge Hatch in this instance, had to release the room where he has the court's library, it being the only library in the United States District Court for the use of the grand jury, to the detriment of the court and the attorneys who were participating in the trials before Judge Rogers inasmuch as they had no access to the library during the time that the grand jury was in session.

Certain evidence was heard by this grand jury at its last meeting which ended on the 31st day of March 1954, indicating that there were possible violations of Federal laws in connection with the general election held in this State on the 4th day of November 1952. As a result thereof and in the interest of the people of the State of New Mexico, this grand jury requested that a full and complete investigation of said election be had in order to determine whether there was any fraud or whether there was a violation of the civil rights of any individuals. We expressed the desire that this investigation be conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

We wish to report that pursuant to that request by this grand jury, the court ordered all the ballots concerned impounded. The Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted a wide, thorough and complete investigation of all of the allegations made. We have spent more than 3 days during the last 2 weeks in which this grand jury has been sitting, listening to a very complete, detailed and thorough report concerning every aspect of the investigation conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation on 39 separate allegations made by several persons concerning the 1952 general election, each 1 of said 39 allegations branching out into numerous suballegations.

We wish to report to the court that the great majority of the allegations which were made concerning violations of Federal laws were completely irresponsible and without basis in fact. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, upon instructions from this grand jury, spent a tremendous number of man-hours investigating each phase of those allegations so that this grand jury could once and for all determine what the alleged violations were and, if there were any violations, who was responsible therefor. From the very thorough investigation that has been made and the evidence that has been presented to us, we feel that the great majority of those allegations should never have been made in the first place as they had absolutely no basis in fact. Most of those allegations seem to have been motivated for purely political purposes without any investigation having been made concerning the facts, by the people who made the allegations.

We wish to highly commend the Federal Bureau of Investigation and especially the agents who worked on this case, as well as the staff of the United States attorney for the district of New Mexico, on the thoroughness and diligence of their work in this matter. They carried out the wishes of this grand jury in a most excellent manner.

The evidence produced before this grand jury showed that out of 105,000 ballots, which were involved in the several allegations of this case, only an infinitesimal number were found to contain any evidence of irregularities at all, including cases where there was strong doubt as to whether there were irregularities. In our opinion it is doubtful that in any election of this type held anywhere, fewer voting irregularities would be found.

We wish to report to the court that no evidence of a conspiracy to violate the civil rights of any individuals was found during this investigation. There was some evidence of technical violations through ignorance of the law on the part of some individual election officials and voters. The grand jury is of the opinion that in those cases there is not sufficient evidence of willfulness to warrant the return of an indictment as the persons involved were acting in good faith. In matters which disclosed technical violations or other violations of State laws, we find that such evidence was turned over to the State authorities. We find that many of the allegations which were eventually investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation turned out to be based purely on hearsay stories which came out in the newspapers after the general election of 1952, and had no basis in fact.

We wish to state that this grand jury is composed of representative people of the State of New Mexico and that it is our opinion that the laws concerning elections in the State should be enforced, but that in doing so the people involved in making accusations of violations of such laws should be more careful in investigating for themselves the facts before such allegations are made public and turned over to the investigative agencies of the Government. It is perhaps appropriate to point out that in our opinion any laxness in the conduct of the elections is due in a large measure to the lack of interest of the general public in the State in lending themselves to help at the polls. It is our opinion, after listening to all of the evidence in this case, that the great majority of the election officials, who sacrificed their time and efforts in the 1952 general election in carrying out their duties, did a most meritorious job. Nothing more could be asked of them. There were a few instances where some election officials were perhaps negligent. In this respect we feel the blame lies not only with those election officials but with the attitude of the general public in not taking a more active part in the election processes which are such vital functions in our republican form of government.

Paper Is Not Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Paper Is Not Money," written by Philip M. McKenna, and published in the American Mercury magazine of March 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What is money? "Congress shall have the power—to coin money and regulate the value

thereof—" says the Constitution. By regulation was meant to establish the weight of the coin and the grains of precious metal in it.

The framers of the Constitution did not have any idea that they should presume to say how many bushels of potatoes, or bales of cotton, or pounds of iron, or yards of cloth should be exchanged for a dollar. Nor were they pursuing that will-o'-the-wisp of some of our modern economists who propose that the standard of value of our dollar be a list of commodities that would have the same value indefinitely.

They were to provide the people with coins in dollar denominations, of monetary metal. Nor did they intend, by coining money, to mean printing paper. They were providing a convenient unit of value by which free men might exchange goods and use money as a store of value.

In fact, they were so opposed to paper money experiments that the Constitution further forbids any State of the Union to make anything other than gold or silver a legal tender for payment of debt. That's the law today. Only a devious course of legalistic rationalization has permitted denial of that plain intent.

What's wrong with paper currency and checkbooks? They are fine and dandy when we have an ultimate standard into which paper currency and checkbook dollars can be converted on demand.

But, wittingly or unwittingly, in 1933, the people were taken down the communistic path, Lenin having been reported as saying that the best way to take over a country for communism was first to debase the currency. We proceeded to lay the groundwork for debauching the currency of the American people just after we had elected Franklin D. Roosevelt on his campaign statement that a sound currency is to be maintained at all hazards.

Roosevelt, in his campaign speeches in 1932, had given no inkling of his later course. In fact, he had referred to the magnificent speech of Carter Glass at that time, who had denounced the immorality of any government which would break its covenant with the people by issuing promises, in the sale of bonds which they did not intend to pay back in the same standard of value in which the borrowing was made. Foreign economists advocated the abandonment of specie payments to American citizens to further the interests of their own countries.

There was no valid reason for the action on March 6, 1933, taking us off the gold standard. There was more gold in the United States Treasury January 1, 1933, than there had been in September 1929 when a very great amount of credit existed, in fact, too much. It was described by the then Secretary of the Treasury Woodin as "a suspension of specie payments, for the time being, to meet an emergency." Since then, apparently we've had nothing but emergencies.

We continue, under the laws hastily enacted by a rubber-stamp Congress April 6, 1933, to deny to the American citizen the right to redeem currency in our standard of value, gold at \$35 per ounce, while making good, any business day in the week, to foreign central banks, shipping gold from our Treasury at \$35 per ounce in exchange for dollar credits they may present for redemption. During the week of November 15, 1954, foreign interests drew out \$50 million in gold. During 1953, and down to June 1954, \$1,247,000,000 of gold was transferred to foreign interests from our Treasury. Foreigners own it now. That amount is about 5 percent of our total stock of gold.

To remedy that discrimination against the United States citizen by his own Treasury in favor of foreign central bankers, the Senate

this spring in its Committee on Banking and Currency heard the witnesses who testified regarding the Gold Redemption Act of 1954 and other bills which would take off the deadly hand of government from the people's money by requiring that currency be redeemed in gold coin on demand when wanted by any holder of it.

Testimony showed that there is in the United States Treasury sufficient coverage to meet any expected demand from United States citizens, provided the Government's actions meet with general approval as to their fiscal soundness. Foreign interests can take out gold now, so that the Treasury would be exposed to no more hazard from them than it is today. Students of the facts about redemptions know that gold tends to flow to countries where there is no doubt about the currency being redeemable.

When already swimming, the danger of a shower making you wet is not worth considering. We now have in our Treasury about 10 percent of gold reserves to all currency outstanding, plus all demand bank deposits (your checking accounts and everybody else's) in the United States of America. That's more than was found necessary in 1926, for example, when it was 8.4 percent and nobody thought it dangerous. It averaged 8.6 percent from 1915 to 1932.

Why, then, all this fuss about a redeemable currency? Because of the threat that an irredeemable currency implies to every holder of life insurance, savings accounts, bonds, and pensions payable in dollars, and because government has the power to deteriorate still further the value of the dollar by issuance of bonds and notes which it doesn't promise to pay back in anything better than irredeemable currency.

Such mere threats cause people to do queer things, wasteful to the country as a whole. Testimony showed that since 1940 the dollar has lost on the average 5 percent of its remaining value every year. As people become aware of that fact, they seek what they call hedges against inflation. Lacking a sound currency, people resort to barter instead of money. That is the beginning of the road which, once taken, leads to financial disorder by rapid deterioration of the dollar.

The burden falls on the trustful holder of dollar obligations; the thrifty citizen; the endowment fund of the college; the trust fund of the widow and the children; the savings of the rank and file citizens whether in bonds, savings account or pension fund. Slowly and unobtrusively the value of his savings is taken away by the sly process of monetary inflation.

He thus becomes an easy prey to the claims of any leader who says that he will correct all by rent fixing, by controls, and by a managed economy in which the government will take over his affairs. That's the essence of communism.

One government official said that now is not the time for resumption of specie payments—the dollar would not stand the test. Another testified that, in his opinion, the dollar was very strong, that not until confidence in the dollar got a great deal worse would it be necessary to restore faith in it by making it redeemable to the United States citizen. Like the Arkansas settler who couldn't fix the leak in the roof now because it was raining, and when it wasn't raining the roof didn't need fixing, there is a tendency to procrastinate on the matter of the immediate restoration of the gold standard for the United States citizen. It can and should be done—without devaluation, and without delay.

Remember that Lenin, founder of communism, told J. M. Keynes that the best way to soften a country for communism was first to debase the currency.

A Fighting Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Fighting Secretary of Labor," which appeared in the January 1955 issue of the Carpenter, the official publication of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. This article includes the text of the address which Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell delivered before the 27th general convention of the brotherhood, and I wish to commend it to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVENTS ARE PROVING JIM MITCHELL TO BE A FIGHTING SECRETARY OF LABOR

As the months roll by, it is becoming increasingly evident that the Department of Labor is in militant hands. There is evidence that under the leadership of Secretary James P. Mitchell the Department is going to do the things it was set up to do—namely look after the interests of working people.

In a hard-hitting address to the 27th general convention in Cincinnati last November, Mr. Mitchell outlined the things which the Department already is doing, and the new measures it plans to adopt, to protect the rights and interests of men working on projects financed in whole or in part by Federal funds.

By decentralizing responsibility for policing wages and working conditions, chiseling has been made a good deal more dangerous for unscrupulous employers. By coordinating enforcement efforts of all Government agencies, buck-passing has been reduced to a minimum.

Shortly the Department will issue a poster outlining legal wages and working conditions for each job financed by Government funds. These posters are to be displayed in a prominent place on the job site so each worker can tell exactly what he is entitled to. The poster will also tell the worker where to file a complaint in case of a violation.

Since addressing our convention Secretary Mitchell made another major policy speech in which he placed himself on record as being categorically opposed to right-to-work laws. Naturally, he has incurred the displeasure of those who want to see unions placed in a legal straitjacket.

Because it contains a good deal of pertinent information, a major part of Secretary Mitchell's address to our convention is herewith reprinted:

"I know you share my conviction that Federal money spent in connection with construction projects should not be used to depress the prevailing local wage rates. Neither you nor I want unfair contractors to be able to underbid fair contractors by chiseling on established wage rates.

"I am in favor of vigorous law enforcement. I believe that Federal construction work should go only to fair contractors. These contractors, who, I am glad to say, are greatly in the majority, do business according to the rules laid down by Congress in the Davis-Bacon Act and in the other statutes containing prevailing-wage provisions.

"For many years, as you know, enforcement of these laws by the contracting agencies of the Government was not uniform, and sometimes it was lax. To correct this situation, in 1950, the Secretary of Labor was given responsibility of coordinating enforcement of these prevailing-wage requirements by the responsible Federal agencies. The Secretary of Labor was given authority to issue standards and regulations to be observed by these agencies in their environment. The Secretary can make investigations to obtain compliance.

"Real progress has been made in the past year. Liaison with the other agencies involved and enforcement have definitely improved. Serious violations continue to be found, however, and there is still lack of knowledge or lack of interest by some local project officers of the procurement agencies. Some agencies continue to conclude that violations do not merit blacklisting where the facts appear to us to warrant it.

"While these trouble areas exist, the Labor Department's enforcement activities are steadily increasing. There is clear evidence that due to efforts of the Labor Department and the contracting agencies a new climate of responsibility is building up among both contractors and the Government agencies involved.

"We like to think that our efforts in the Department of Labor have played some part in these achievements. Still, we have not had this enforcement function too long, and time is needed for working out procedures with the Federal agencies having contract responsibilities. And, more importantly, with your help, money is needed from Congress to help us work out these enforcement functions of the Department of Labor, and I hope that in cooperation with the American Federation of Labor legislative group we can persuade Congress to give us more money to enforce the laws that Congress has passed.

"Let me give you a few examples of how our improved-enforcement program is working. The Department of Labor received what appeared to be a rather minor complaint regarding violations at an armed services base in Georgia. This matter was referred to the contracting agency, one of the armed services. When no immediate action was taken, we sent an investigator. As a result of what he found, Department of Labor investigators have been in there since the spring of 1953. Instead of just 1 firm being investigated, about 30 firms working on the same base are now under investigation and it is estimated that restitution of over \$200,000 is due employees.

"In another case a painting contractor in the Pacific Northwest was under investigation. He moved several times and each time used a different gimmick to get around paying the required prevailing wages. He came up with a new one I never heard of before. He listed his employees as subcontractors, and he kept no payroll records. We finally caught up with him, and he is now on the ineligible list.

"In Texas—and you see these examples are in the South and Southwest—a very large contractor was found using a great number of workers to perform journeymen's work and improperly paying them as helpers, such as carpenters' helpers—and, mind you, he came up with a new gimmick. He called some of them 'junior helpers.' At the Labor Department's request, the contracting agency stopped any further payments under the contract and ordered the practice to be discontinued. We have started a full-scale investigation on this job to determine the amount of back wages due to the workers.

"In another case we found a contractor in New Mexico violating the Fair Labor Standards Act in work at an airbase. The men were working seven 8-hour days, 56 hours a week, without overtime compensation. With-

in a week after we discovered these violations we asked the Federal court to order these practices stopped. In addition, an investigation for Davis-Bacon Act violations was started.

"At another base in New Mexico we found a case of fraudulent payrolls. The contractor was very accommodating in this case. He gave each employee a slip of paper with his paycheck showing just how the juggling was done.

"We were very fortunate and it was very easy to catch it.

"We are now developing the case for criminal prosecution and blacklisting.

"As a result of our vigorous enforcement of these laws, a larger number of contractors are ineligible to receive Government contracts for 3 years, because of violations of the law. This is a stiff punishment because it prevents a firm from participating in a substantial portion of all the construction in this country. During the last fiscal year—from June of 1953 to July of 1954—20 firms were blacklisted as against only 4 during the 17 years from 1935 to 1952. I am sure any objective person would agree with me that this shows vigorous enforcement.

"Now I don't want to leave the wrong impression. Most of the contractors who do business with the Government carefully observed the law. But there are those who would break down hard-earned labor standards, cheat their own workers, and place fair bidders at a competitive disadvantage. While the blacklisting penalty is not one that should be used lightly, the law has been and will be enforced, and where willful violations of the law are found, the blacklist penalty will be used and used and used by the Department of Labor.

To do an even better job of enforcing the law, we have given more responsibility to our regional offices. Our attorneys and investigators are now closer to the job sites from which these complaints come. There are now 10 offices instead of 1 responsible for the coordination of the enforcement function. This decentralization should improve enforcement and the handling of complaints of violations.

"In order that workers on the job will be aware of their rights under the prevailing wage laws, and so that they may recognize violations of the law, and how and where to file complaints, we have issued and distributed a poster prepared by the Department, to be placed by contracting agencies or project sponsors on job sites.

"This poster says, in effect, you are entitled to be paid not less than the hourly rate for the particular classification of work which you perform, as set forth in the attached schedule. Apprentices rates apply only to apprentices properly registered under approved Federal or State apprenticeship programs, and it shows where they may file their complaints at the local offices. This will be the poster, and below it will be the wage rates which should determine under the Davis-Bacon Act, and we hope that with the widespread use of these posters more employees and more workers on the job will become better aware of their rights.

"There will also be published soon a pocket-size pamphlet explaining the various laws and regulations for the benefit and protection of construction and other workers. This pamphlet will be available to workers, unions, and contractors throughout the country. And I hope that with this pamphlet your membership and the members and employees of contractors who are not your members will be better able to understand their rights and their benefits under the Federal law.

"Finally, I want to refer to the 8-hour laws which require the payment on Government construction contracts of overtime compensation of time and one-half for hours worked each day in excess of 8. Dur-

ing the past months I became aware of a serious gap in these laws. Apparently, under their provisions, there is nothing to prevent a contractor from working his employees seven 8-hour days, or a total of 56 hours in a week, without the payment of overtime compensation. Of course, some construction activities are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act which requires the payment of overtime compensation for hours worked in excess of 40 per week, but this is not true of most construction. This is a problem that needs attention and should have legislative remedies in the next session of Congress.

"If we are to enforce strictly the laws for which the Department of Labor is responsible, we need your help in at least two ways. First, we need you to tell us when you see violations of these laws so that we may take action. Violations should be reported to the contracting agencies, or to the regional offices of the Department of Labor, or directly to me. Secondly, it is important that the complaints we receive be sound ones. When we receive complaints of violations of prevailing wage laws, we call them to the attention of the appropriate contracting agency—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or some other agency. If the agencies investigate and find them justified, they have confidence in us and will act quickly and cooperatively when we call violations to their attention. If, however, the allegations do not stand up when they are investigated (or are too trivial and picaresque to be worth noting), this hampers our effectiveness with the contracting agencies. It is then natural for them to tend to act more slowly and with less interest when we call alleged violations to their attention. It is the old story of crying 'wolf' too often.

"For example, we received a complaint from a business agent that laborers were operating certain pieces of equipment on a construction project. We referred the complaint to the contracting agency, which made the investigation and informed us that no such equipment had been used on the job. We then wrote to the union and so informed them, and they still made the same charge and gave us the name of the person responsible. The agency again investigated, and then the Department of Labor had a qualified person to check the matter, not a person in the agency, but from the Department of Labor, who found that the whole complaint was wrong and that the union had the wrong job. You can see what kind of a spot that puts us in in enforcing our will with the contracting agency. What I am saying here, of course, does not apply to the Carpenters Union. I just felt it was worth mentioning to give you the full story about our work in this field.

"With your cooperation and with that of the contracting agencies and contractors, these laws can be enforced vigorously and fairly. That is our objective, and I think you will agree we are well on our way to realizing it. If you can suggest any way we can be of better service to you, I hope you will let us know.

"This enforcement of the Davis-Bacon Act which I dwelled on at great length because of your special interest in it is just one example of President Eisenhower's dedication to good government and to the enforcement of law. I know that throughout the country in many States union organization is becoming more and more difficult. I know that in many States of the Union you have a deliberate and direct attempt to undermine the standards which your union and other unions have built up. But I want to assure you that the Department of Labor, within the legal means given to us by Congress, will see to it that the laws that are on the statute books that apply to labor standards are going to be strictly, vigorously, and continually enforced."

Personal Income-Tax Exemption of \$800**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, about this time of year some 60 million taxpayers are struggling over the preparation of their income-tax returns. This mental struggle, coupled with the painful duty of paying the taxes, is not restricted to persons of large or even moderate incomes. It extends to persons of very low income as well. It is my conviction that the law is exacting tribute from millions of persons living far below what we like to think of as a fair standard. I believe that equity and economics both demand that the level of personal exemptions be raised to at least \$800.

The tax on income has long been recognized as potentially the fairest tax in the whole lexicon of public finance. It is the one tax which lends itself to manageable progressivity, and measures out its burdens according to the financial capacity of those upon whom its burdens fall. But the Congress has pushed the application of the tax too far. The law now lays a heavy hand on the poor and economically depressed. Reason protests this anomaly. Here we have in the income tax the most perfect tool for distributing burdens according to ability to pay, yet, as it were, we take billions of dollars out of the hides of millions who lack any real taxpaying ability. When personal exemptions under an income tax are so low that the burden of the tax falls on persons whose incomes are below a level capable of supporting a minimum standard of living, then the tax ceases to be levied in accordance with ability to pay.

Economists and sociologists have figured out what is the minimum that any individual or family can receive and still maintain a reasonable living standard compatible with American concepts. These minimums give recognition to the requirements of health, education, decent housing, clean living, an opportunity to share in a minimum of the good things of life. Certainly the Congress, even if it does not guarantee such a minimum, should not deliberately lower the standard of those who already are sub-par. Yet that is exactly what the Congress does when it exacts a toll from the person whose income barely exceeds \$600.

The Congress has not always been so niggardly. Except for a single year, Federal personal-income-tax exemptions, measured in terms of buying power, are lower today than they have ever been in the past. When the income tax was first enacted in 1913, a family of 4 was entitled to an exemption of \$4,000. In terms of the buying power of depreciated 1955 dollars, that was the equivalent of about \$11,000. But actually today, a family of 4 enjoys an exemption of only \$2,400. In 1931, the legal exemption was \$4,300. This had a purchasing power of around \$7,600. Even

in 1944, when World War II was at its height, the exemption had a purchasing power in excess of 3,000 of our 1955 dollars. But today, as I said, the exemption is only \$2,400. This is at least 50 percent and more below what is held out as being necessary to provide a minimum American standard of living. And every dollar exacted in income tax from persons below that minimum drives them one rung farther down on the economic ladder. My point is: If we cannot help to raise up these poor, the least we can do is to refrain from pushing them farther down.

If we raise the exemption to \$800, we will reduce the tax of everybody, and at the same time—and this is the most important thing—abolish the tax on 13.2 million taxpayers with very low incomes. This will give relief not only to these taxpayers, but also it will reduce the tax compliance burdens of thousands of employers who now have to withhold for these low-income taxpayers. Removing some 13 million taxpayers from the rolls will also greatly reduce the administrative burdens and costs of the Internal Revenue Service and permit that agency to apply its personnel in much more constructive and revenue-producing work.

There are those who support tax relief for the wealthy but oppose tax relief for those at lower levels. They protest against removing anyone from the tax rolls. Everybody should pay their fair share, they say. Nobody should be exempt. Happily there are those who read statistics differently, and have a different concept of what is fair. I cannot understand how ordinarily intelligent well-thinking men can argue the justice of all levels of government in the United States taking in taxes more than one-fourth of the income of families with incomes below \$1,000, \$2,000, \$3,000, or even \$4,000. Yet that is what the statistics show. To repeat so there will not be any misunderstanding, the combined Federal, State, and local tax burdens on families with incomes of \$1,000, \$2,000, \$3,000, or \$4,000 exceed 25 percent of their income. To be sure, much of this burden comes from excise and property taxes, but the Federal Government in taxing their incomes also adds to the burden. It is at least this added burden that I insist should be removed.

I consider all that I have just said to be of great importance, but I have not yet reached what to me is one of the most important economic consequences of increasing personal exemptions. Increasing the personal exemption by \$200 will reduce the tax burden of persons in the lowest bracket by a maximum of \$160 for a family of four. With taxes reduced, take-home pay will be increased. But much more important is the fact that the tax savings of all these taxpayers will add about \$4.5 billion in purchasing power, principally of persons in the low-income brackets. They will spend this money for clothing, better housing, more adequate food, refrigerators, automobiles, and the thousand and one items and services that consumers buy. But the net effect on the Nation's economy will be much greater than simply an increase in retail sales by \$4.5 billion. This increased spending will re-

sult in higher business profits, higher tax revenues for the Federal Treasury, and greater employment for all. Recognized economists in the country estimate that increased purchasing power of \$4.5 billion could raise aggregate income by perhaps double that amount when secondary or induced effects are taken into account.

We should remember that many workers are being displaced each year through technological improvements. We cannot and should not try to fight this. Hundreds of thousands of new workers are also moving into the labor market each year. We certainly cannot fight this. But we must ever be on guard to prevent developing unemployment. I caution that 3 million unemployed—the approximate figure today—is not to be viewed with complete disinterest and unconcern. I point out, too, that the average period of unemployment toward the end of last year was nearly 13 weeks. We can only view this with the greatest seriousness.

There are those in the United States who seem to think that the way to promote prosperity is to maintain an economic system and policy which favors business, the great corporation, the wealthy stockholder. Their thought is that some of the benefits accruing to these groups will trickle down to the mass of workers and consumers. It is thinking such as this which dominated the enactment of the 1954 tax law. It seems to me to be far more logical to assure a continued prosperity by increasing consumer purchasing power. With increased purchasing power will come increased demand. Investment, production, and sales will rise, and these in turn will promote more investment, more jobs, continued prosperity. Congress should be ever alert to do all that is necessary to prevent economic depression. But the Congress must also realize that one consequence of concentrating incomes in a relatively few hands is a reduction of consumer buying power. Depressions have been born and will continue to be born so long as the mass of the population have a purchasing power inadequate to buy our potential tremendous industrial output. The Congress must realize that failure to give some relief to consumers from heavy tax burdens is depression creating. The 84th Congress has an opportunity to enact an economically sound, and equitably just, tax measure. An increase in personal exemptions to \$800 is just such a measure, and I call upon the Congress to act favorably and speedily thereon.

Utilization of Congressional Record by Educators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the Record an article by Mr. Glenn A. McLain, director of eastern Kentucky center of international relations of the Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond, Ky., which was published in Social Studies, a periodical devoted to subjects of interest to teachers and administrators. As is indicated by the title of this article, "The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as Source Material for Social Studies Classes," Mr. McLain has pointed out some illuminating and useful ways in which the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been utilized by teachers and other educators of our schools across the country, which I think will be of interest to the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as SOURCE MATERIAL for SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSES

(By Glenn A. McLain, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond, Ky.)

Social studies instructors in both the conventional and general educational course often find difficulty in selecting current materials for lecture or discussion purposes. The difficulty often arises because of the mass of material available, not because of the lack of material. It is usual to find many different types of newspapers, magazines, and special pamphlets at hand for either illustrative purposes in the survey course or as a prime basis for panels in the general educational course. Through the use of the Readers Guide to Periodicals and other reference books in the library there is seldom any lack of material, but selectivity is another problem entirely. Although social studies instructors point out the merits or the weaknesses of such periodicals as Harpers, Atlantic Monthly, Reporter, Freeman, and the many others, one source of material is frequently overlooked. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an often criticized, but seldom read publication, can provide necessary historical background and authoritative source material. It is especially necessary in the social studies problems course to help the student find out the issues of our age. These issues are spelled out for the student daily in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is the publication of the House and Senate. It is published at the close of each daily session before the next day. In Washington, the RECORD is used as a current bible of legislative happenings. Senators, Congressmen, and the President of the United States read the daily RECORD, as the play-by-play report of the most complex governmental operation in the world.

Most Americans are familiar with the general purpose of the RECORD, to provide a verbatim account of the speeches and debates of our elected representatives. Few Americans are familiar with the other but not less important functions of the RECORD. Each Senator and Member of the House is privileged to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD any material which will benefit the work of the Congress. Our legislators are the sole judges of what type of material will benefit the work of the Congress. Such material may include a recipe for chocolate cake from the legislator's hometown newspaper. It may be the official program of the administration or the opposition party for a new social-security system. Frequently our Representatives have articles printed from the

leading publications of the world. During the first session of the 83d Congress over 2,000 articles from newspapers, magazines, and periodicals were placed in the RECORD. There are few libraries in the world which could boast of such a collection of material on world problems, past and present. Important speeches aside from congressional efforts are included. Resolutions, treaties, and international documents of interest are also printed in great numbers.

It is customary to consider the instructor's teaching aids from a strictly pedagogical point of view. If the instructor makes it his practice to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he will benefit as much as his students. Instructors today are confronted with the task of keeping abreast of current material pouring from the presses of America. Few instructors faced with heavy teaching schedules can do more than read the specialized journals available in 2 or 3 fields. A daily reading of the RECORD will provide a good cross section of the type of reading material which directly influences our lawmakers. The solving of current problems can be shown to be a matter of sectional opinion induced by historical influences of the past. The instructor can use past issues of the RECORD to build this historical perspective so needed in the problems course concerned mainly with current issues. A careful check by the instructor of the daily flow of publications in special fields being authorized for reprinting by the Congress will provide the most authoritative material available. Such issues as foreign military aid, the United Nations, farm prices, the national debt, or the search for subversives in government can be quickly reviewed and studied by the class.

The instructor will find he can receive the RECORD at no cost to himself. This should be a welcome thought in these days of skyrocketing prices for all publications. An annual subscription to the RECORD will be, in most cases, gladly supplied by the instructor's Congressman or Senator. A privately paid subscription costs \$18 a year. Each Congressman is supplied with 68 copies and each Senator with 100 for distribution to their constituents. Educators are always considered first in the makeup of the legislative mailing lists for the RECORD.

The direct advantages of using the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a source for discussion and problem-centered courses are several. A daily reading of the RECORD will show the student exactly how our Government operates from a legislative point of view. Too many times the problems discussed in the social studies class are analyzed in the abstract, without taking into consideration the background of their origin. Both current and past historical background will be highlighted by the use of the RECORD. The class will have the benefit of using authoritative reports as soon as they are printed for the use of the Congress. Otherwise, much valuable material is often sidetracked after congressional studies have been completed until the United States Superintendent of Documents catalogs it for distribution through Government channels. Frequently, the class and the instructor will get the benefit of articles published in newspapers, magazines, or journals which are not accessible in their own libraries. The Appendix of the RECORD is a veritable gold mine in this respect.

By regular usage of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, both the instructor and the student will appreciate more readily the vitality and complexity of our governmental and social institutions. New insights can be gained which will improve the content and method of teaching in the social studies course.

Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Underpaid Public Servants: They're Not All in Congress," which was published in the Detroit Free Press of February 18, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERPAID PUBLIC SERVANTS: THEY'RE NOT ALL IN CONGRESS

In voting to hike their present \$15,000 salaries to \$25,000—a 66-percent increase—Members of the House of Representatives took an action for which reasonable-minded citizens will not criticize them.

The pay increase, which applies to Senators also, but which still waits Senate action, is realistic in the light of what has happened to living costs in the past few years. The last time Congress got a pay raise was in 1946, and any housewife or any wage earner knows what has happened since then.

It should not be the policy of the United States, the strongest and richest nation in the world, to expect its public servants to be paid a wage which is not in keeping with the demands and dignity of office.

If we insist upon paying Members of Congress, Federal judges, and other officials (the latter also are provided for in the House bill) salaries below the standards of business, industry, and the professions, we can expect a caliber of men and women who are themselves below those standards.

About one-third of the House Members voted against the pay increase, but we suspect that most of those who did so actually voted against their convictions. We doubt there are many Members of Congress who don't really think they are entitled to more than they are getting now and would be glad to receive more. The votes against the increase, we imagine, were mostly political, and were cast with attention to what some of the less favored folks back home might say.

And what about those folks back home?

We know of one man in Detroit with reason to feel rather bitter about his Congressman voting himself a \$10,000-a-year raise.

That citizen happens to be a veteran Detroit postal clerk with 29 years' service behind him.

He appeared in Federal court Wednesday to plead guilty to stealing \$231.

Stealing postal funds cannot be condoned. But this employee, on the job for 29 years, with 5 children, all under 12 years, to support, has a wage of \$84 a week.

Can the richest and strongest nation in the world be any more complacent about overlooking the dignity of a humble Federal worker than in taking care of the financial needs of our Congressmen, Senators, and judges?

We can't plead surprise. Postal employees have made their plight known to Congress and the people.

Congressmen are undoubtedly entitled to more money. But before they adjust their own pay levels they might first take a good look at some of the inequities in other categories of the Federal service.

Or does the old principle of noblesse oblige exist only in the pages of the romantic novels of the days of chivalry?

Opposition of Electric Cooperatives to the Missouri Basin Interstate Compact Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the February 1955 issue of the South Dakota Rural Electric Cooperative paper, the High Liner. This article reports the opposition of the electric cooperatives to the passage of the so-called Missouri Basin interstate compact bill.

The electric cooperatives foresee only interminable delay if attempt is made to deal with the Missouri Basin development through compact procedures.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAST RIVER DIRECTORS OPPOSE COMPACT PLAN TO MANAGE BASIN

East River Electric Power Cooperative directors here February 1 opposed passage of a compact between the 10 Missouri Basin States as an organization for directing the development of the water resources of the basin, such as is proposed by the bill recently introduced in the Senate by Senator Karl E. Mundt, Senator Francis Case, and 10 other colleagues.

The directors said that the South Dakota Rural Electric Association had previously gone on record against such a plan and questioned that the compact plan is really what the people of this State and basin want. "Certainly, if the people understand these plans," a spokesman said, "they would choose a commission type, such as is proposed by the Hennings bill, which was proposed in the last session of Congress."

A resolution against the compact form was passed by the directors. Motion to pass this resolution was made by Sam K. Ulrikson, Canton. It was seconded by Ralph Dennis, Canova. The resolution:

"Whereas the orderly development of the resources of the Missouri Basin demand that control of these resources be placed in the hands of a commission with fixed authority and fixed responsibility;

"And whereas the need for such a commission is immediate because of the threat of a water shortage during 1955;

"And whereas the attempt to negotiate a compact between the 10 basin States of the Missouri Basin will take unlimited time and will inevitably end in failure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we record our opposition to the compact approach to basin management and urge Congress to create a responsible agency on the Federal level."

A compact plan, the directors said, would just add confusion to the situation. It could have no authority and control, would just become another buck-passing organization to further confuse development of the resources of the basin.

Report of Dr. Daniel A. Poling on His Visit to Korea, Japan, and Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and informative report on the situation in respect to Formosa, made by Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald magazine. Dr. Poling has recently concluded a personal visitation there.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Poling's report was based upon his visit to orphanages and military installations in Korea, Japan and Formosa. Christian Herald operates 8 children's homes or orphanages in these areas and 1 in Hong Kong. Dr. Poling returned to New York today, after 1 month's absence.)

Dr. Poling said: "It is the glory of the Army of the United States that it has been and is an army of compassion. From his pay, the young American in uniform in all the services has contributed not less than \$4 million to feed, clothe and house the orphans of Korea, Japan, Germany, and the islands. Today more than 50,000 of these children and babies are in Korea alone."

Dr. Poling stated the following as his conclusions from his visit:

"1. Today Moscow and Peiping are joined in a gigantic conspiracy to blackmail the world into surrendering freedom. A 'cease fire' could become a worse disaster than Munich.

"2. The loss of small islands off the mainland may be, from the military standpoint, inconsequential, but with them would go a loss of face that could become a major setback to the United States and the United Nations.

"3. As to American prestige in Asia, the repudiation and recall of Douglas MacArthur was a catastrophe. Followed by the failure of the United Nations to win the Korean War, there had resulted a weakening of the will to resist communism that has become a creeping paralysis throughout the East.

"4. The strong message of President Eisenhower and the practically unanimous support of Congress, have revived hope and gone a long way to restore faith throughout Asia. A week ago nationalist flags flew everywhere over the refugee areas of Hong Kong, where more than 2 million Chinese suffer and wait for the liberation of their homeland. In Japan the growing propaganda for closer ties with Moscow and Peiping was definitely halted by the action in Washington.

"5. I have talked with the representative leaders in every area and level of life in Japan, Korea, Formosa, and Hong Kong—generals, ambassadors, missionaries, prisoners-of-war who refused to return to their homes and chose Formosa, businessmen, refugees, social workers, and recent escapees. Among these men and women there is almost complete agreement as follows:

"(a) More than 90 percent of mainland Chinese hate their Communist masters. Millions have died hopelessly. As to the total number liquidated, such men as Bishop Quentin K. Y. Huang and correspondent John C. Caldwell vary, but the high figure is 43 million. The living wait only for outside help and a leader to rise in revolution

from Canton to the Yellow River. Those with whom I sat in conference are convinced that, given an air umbrella of strength and Gen. Claire Chennault's formula for invasion, Chiang Kai-shek could establish a bridgehead, hold it, and then steadily advance. These same competent observers, many of whom have spent from 20 to 40 years in China insist that American ground troops would not be required.

"(b) We lost the Korean war because we listened to the wrong men, who steadily hindered or reversed our military leaders. For the first time in our history we fought a war, with all its sacrifices and losses, in which we committed ourselves, deliberately and unnecessarily, to less than victory. For this, pressure from abroad was largely responsible.

"(c) Today time runs out—fast. But there is still time enough if, following President Eisenhower's message and leadership and the action of Congress, we listen to such men as Judd and Knowland and give to Admiral Radford and Generals Hull, Taylor, and Chase full responsibility for military action as required."

Move to Town?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead of February 5, 1955:

MOVE TO TOWN?—YOUNG FARM WIFE WONDERS ABOUT QUITTING THE FARM

Here is a letter from a young Iowa farm woman. Her husband is a renter. Read it and see if you think she has the right bear by the tail:

"To the Editor:

"This is the first letter I have ever written to any magazine or newspaper, but I just have to let off steam some place.

"I get so tired of all these writeups worrying about how the young folks are leaving the farm. Look at us. We're staying—so far.

"We are a young couple with four children. We've lived on the farm 6 years, since our marriage. My husband has always lived on the farm. I came from a nearby town.

"We have never given a thought to any life but the farm, but now we are wondering.

"We live moderately and have managed to obtain the necessary machinery, but we cannot seem to get ahead of expense enough to save for that farm of our own we hope to have some day.

"How does the little farmer ever get ahead?

"Right now, the easy way to have a place of our own is to sell out and buy a place in town. Anyone can get a job in town, but my husband is a born farmer and a good one.

"I used to think a man farmed when he couldn't do anything else. I know now that it takes more knowledge and ability than any job a city fellow holds.

"Why, then, can't it be made easier for us to be independent?

"Yes, I know the Government has a plan where you can buy through FHA. But the land has to be cheap and falling apart before loans of this type will be granted.

"Yet there must be a way. I look around me and see so many who are still renting

after 30 years or more. Yes, they were good farmers too, but could never make the step to ownership. I shudder to think that is what will happen to us.

"Perhaps the easy way—moving to town—is the best way? I'm wondering.

"YOUNG IOWA FARM WIFE."

How would our readers answer this? Say that town jobs aren't so easy to get now and that some renters get a better living than some owners? Or what?

Wallaces' Farmer and Iowa Homestead agrees that young people who started in the high time have a special problem. We'll run a series of articles soon about the difficulties of the young farmer. But in the meantime, we'll appreciate comment from our readers. If you want to write to Young Iowa Farm Wife, we'll forward the letters.

Postal Clerk Steals: Judge Is Sympathetic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a matter which will soon come up for their consideration: The question of postal pay raises. At the conclusion of my remarks I insert a news item from the Detroit Free Press, dated Thursday, February 17, 1955, and a copy of my letter to Federal Judge Theodore Levin. The news story tells of a veteran post office clerk with five children making \$84 per week and pleading guilty in Federal court of stealing \$231 of postal funds. Further, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my letter to Federal Judge Theodore Levin assuring him that my remarks are in no way intended to influence his duties as a jurist.

In his remarks from the bench Judge Levin states that "Something should be done about it." The implications contained in his statement, I feel, are directed to this body. When a jurist decries the inequities of a socio-economic situation which places beyond his scope of authority a means of applying a remedy I am of the opinion that those in a position to take action should not falter or hesitate. The remedy must be shaped here in the form of adequate postal pay legislation capable of answering not merely the needs of bare existence, but sufficient in scope to make the public servants of our postal system shareholders of a standard of living for which we can be justly proud.

I feel that the President's message on postal pay increases falls short of the mark in supplying the needed solution for this problem. The administration's salary plan, now before committee, calls for a 5 percent increase in basic salary rates. What would this mean to the postal clerk that is responsible for nourishing five children along with himself and his wife? Not enough to pay one-half the milk bill if he is supplying these tots with the recommended minimum of 1 quart per child per day. Since when has this great legislative body considered

the basic welfare of its citizens secondary to a dream of making the postal service a self-supporting, going business concern? I do not say this to slur any efforts to make more efficient the operations of our Government agencies, but when human values are being equated with the cold statistics of fiscal policy, I, for one, shall never abide by any resultant that sacrifices humaneness for business expediency. Our responsibility is to the many—as well as the few.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I earnestly request my colleagues to join me in support of a 10-percent increase in the basic salary rates; retroactive to the date of the President's disapproval of H. R. 7774 of the 83d Congress.

POSTAL CLERK STEALS: JUDGE IS SYMPATHETIC
(By Charles Manos)

A veteran postoffice clerk who makes \$84 a week pleaded guilty Wednesday in Federal court to stealing \$231.

Charged with misapplication of postal funds collected by him on cash-on-delivery packages was Clem Hall, 49, of 1866 Kenmore, Grosse Pointe Woods. He has five children—all under 12 years of age.

Hall's plea immediately drew from Judge Theodore Levin a sympathetic comment apparently aimed at pay scales for postal workers.

"It's a shame a good man like you should be a victim of circumstances," Judge Levin said. "Something should be done about it."

Hall, a clerk in the Grosse Pointe branch, has worked for the postoffice for 29 years.

Judge Levin released Hall, who will forfeit his job and possibly his pension rights, on personal bond pending sentencing.

FEBRUARY 23, 1955.

HON. THEODORE LEVIN,
Judge, Federal District Court,
Eastern District of Michigan,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR JUDGE LEVIN: I am enclosing with this letter a copy of some remarks I made this week on the floor of the House of Representatives. I sincerely hope that I have not taken any privileges in my interpretation of your comment in regards to this matter.

Since this individual is a member of my constituency I felt duty-bound to make public mention of the matter with the hope that adequate legislation would evolve therefrom. In no way do I intend my comments to influence you in your duties of administering the justice that our laws require.

I would be most interested to hear whatever further views you might have about the general problem.

Cordially,

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Member of Congress.

Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of the House I voted on the matter of extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in some form or other on six separate occasions. In looking through the record of those occasions I find that on four of them I voted in favor of the legislation. On two occasions I voted against.

When this matter was before us in the 79th Congress, it contained no provision to safeguard the American producer and workman against unwise reductions of duties. There was no provision for escape clauses and no provision providing for a finding by the Tariff Commission as to the limit to which a modification or binding of duties and other import restrictions may be made without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic producers. I voted against this legislation.

In the 80th Congress, with a Republican majority, we were successful in writing into the law a provision requiring escape clauses in trade agreements and also the provision providing for a finding by the Tariff Commission of the points below which it would be perilous to our domestic economy to go in reducing tariffs. With these provisions in the bill, I voted for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

Then came the 81st Congress. The control of the Congress had shifted to the Democrats and one of their first acts was to repeal the provisions adopted by the 80th Congress. The escape-clause and the peril-point provisions were completely eliminated. I voted against this bill.

In providing for the extension of the Trade Agreements Act in the 82d Congress, the Congress reinserted the escape-clause and peril-point provisions over the vehement objections of the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and President Truman. With these protective provisions in the bill, I voted for the legislation.

The matter of extending the Trade Agreements Act was before us on two occasions during the 83d Congress. It must be said to the credit of the present administration that they did not then, as they do not now, request the elimination of the escape-clause and peril-point provisions. I voted for both extensions.

Mr. Chairman, this brief history of the recent actions of Congress in connection with the Trade Agreements Act shows that the question at issue has not been so much the matter of authorizing the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries, but rather the extent to which the position of our domestic producers would be recognized and the extent to which they would be protected against unfair competition in international trade.

We all agree, I believe, that our prosperity is tied up with the exchange of goods and services. The greater the velocity and volume of this exchange, the greater is our prosperity. That is true whether applied to domestic trade or to international trade. The more goods you can move back and forth between people, the more prosperous everybody is going

to be. We must, therefore, have some machinery, some mechanism, some authority, to make possible the elimination of unnecessary restrictions and burdens on that exchange of goods. The President must have the authority to enter into agreements with other countries which will eliminate unnecessary restrictions. The basic purpose of the Trade Agreements Act is to provide this authority. I support this basic purpose.

Please note that I used the word "unnecessary" in referring to the restrictions and burdens which we should attempt to eliminate. I use the word "unnecessary" because I think we must recognize that circumstances can and do exist which require a nation to place certain restrictions on the goods or services entering into that country. I think we are most unrealistic and make a serious mistake when we criticize either our Government or a foreign government for imposing a restriction on the flow of goods into that country in order to meet some conditions then existing in that country.

The proponents of free trade speak loud and eloquently about the virtues of open unfettered competition. We have heard some of their speeches today. Given their way, we would completely repeal the Tariff Act of 1930, and any of our other laws which regulate the flow of goods into this country.

I, too, believe in competition. I would remind my colleagues, however, that what we in this country have always strived for is fair competition. We have many laws written on our statute books to assure that our domestic commerce will be based on fair competition. With respect to our domestic economy, we recognize that Government has an obligation to assure an environment which encourages fair competition. In 1914 we established the Federal Trade Commission. Look at its basic objectives. Let me quote briefly from the United States Government Manual of 1954-55 concerning the duties and purpose of this Commission:

Although the duties of the Commission are many and varied under the statutes, the foundation of public policy underlying all these duties is essentially the same: to prevent the free-enterprise system from being stifled or fettered by monopoly or corrupted by unfair or deceptive trade practices. In brief, the Commission is charged with keeping competition both free and fair.

Yes, that is our governmental policy in the field of domestic commerce—to keep competition both free and fair. The question I would ask my friends who advocate free trade is, "Should we have any less concern about assuring fair competition in the area of foreign commerce and foreign trade, particularly when that competition arises from foreign producers who are outside of the scope and application of our other domestic laws?" In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, we should be more alert to assure fair competition when the threat is from foreign producers outside of the jurisdiction of our basic laws.

Let it always be remembered that we, as a Government, impose burdens on our domestic producers which we do not and cannot make applicable to foreign producers. Let me call your attention to

just a few of them. I have already mentioned the Federal Trade Commission Act. In addition, there is the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Labor-Management Relations Act, and, of course, the various States' fair-trade laws. In addition, there are the various Federal and State taxes imposed on domestic producers. There is also the social-security law, the Unemployment Compensation Act, and the various States' workmen's compensation acts. Those are just some of the burdens which we have placed on our domestic producers by law which do not apply to foreign producers of similar commodities.

I am certainly not suggesting that these laws should be repealed. I do say that we must, however, be fair to our domestic producers and recognize that these laws can place them at a distinct disadvantage in competing with foreign producers.

There is no question but what we would all be horrified if anyone were to suggest that the minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act should apply to only a small section of the country, such as New England, and that the rest of the country would not be subject to this law. There is no one who would not recognize that this would place the New England producers at a decided disadvantage in any effort to compete with producers in other sections of the country. We would hurl all of the derogatory adjectives in the book at such a proposal. Yet, if it would be unfair and unreasonable to discriminate between domestic producers, is it not just as unfair and unreasonable when we require a domestic producer to comply with such laws and at the same time require him to compete in our domestic market with foreign producers whom our laws do not reach. Certainly the answer must be "Yes," unless we provide some other compensating device to protect against the unfairness. Our tariff laws and import regulations must perform that function.

I have emphasized the need to protect our domestic producers from unfair competition because I am very fearful that there have been times when this fact has not been recognized in negotiations and agreements entered into under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act. I share the concern of many in this House that those who administer the act under Presidential directive are sometimes overly anxious and overly enthusiastic about befriending some foreign country and, in their enthusiasm, lose sight of their fundamental obligation to be fair and honest with our own people. That is why I have long been an advocate of the escape-clause and peril-point provisions of the act. That is why I also feel that there is a need for strengthening the present escape-clause provisions.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this extension. I voted to report this bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means and I will vote for its passage today. If I could vote to give the authority referred by this bill to a Democrat administration, as I did in 1948 and in 1951, I

certainly can vote to give it to the present administration.

Because I believe we must take every precaution to assure protection for our domestic producers against unfair competition from foreign producers, I intend to vote for the motion to recommit, which has as its objective the strengthening of the escape-clause procedure.

Toynbee Answers 10 Basic Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the magazine section of the New York Times of February 20, 1955, there appears an article entitled "Toynbee Answers 10 Basic Questions." The subtitle of the article is "The Noted Historian-Philosopher Expresses Optimism on Some of the Great Issues of War and Peace That May Determine the Future of Western Civilization."

These questions and Professor Toynbee's answers are so illuminating that I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

Let me call the attention of my colleagues to the 10th question, which is: "Do you think that communism is the wave of the future?" An outstanding statement in his answer is the following, which can be characterized as the key to the entire article:

The wave of the future is, not communism, but religion of the kind that does give the individual human being effective spiritual help in leading his personal life.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOYNBEE ANSWERS 10 BASIC QUESTIONS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writings and speeches of Arnold J. Toynbee, author of the monumental *A Study of History*, have produced a good deal of controversy. What follows are 10 basic questions put to Professor Toynbee and his answers to them.)

1. Are you an optimist or a pessimist about the future of Western civilization? Why?

I am an optimist in two senses: (a) I do not believe that Western civilization is fated to decline and fall. (I do not believe, either, that it is bound automatically to survive and prosper.) (b) I believe we Westerners have it in our power to save our civilization by our own exertions. No doubt, we may fail to do the things necessary for our salvation, but this is not what I expect. My expectation is that the challenges presented to Western civilization in our time are going to arouse us to repent, to reform, and to lead a new life.

2. Do you believe that history repeats itself?

Repeats itself is ambiguous. It may mean "is bound to repeat itself" through the working of some inexorable law of nature which cannot be broken by the action of human minds and wills; or it may mean "has sometimes repeated itself in the past," and therefore can repeat itself, without there being any evidence that it is bound to repeat itself.

I believe that history repeats itself in the second of these two alternative senses, but not in the first. I am not a determinist.

3. Isn't our present period distinguished by new factors which make it unique—the atom bomb, the rise of Communist states, etc.? Can it, therefore, be said to be repeating any other period?

The atom bomb is not the first new weapon, of greater destructiveness than any weapon known before, that mankind has added to its armory; the atom bomb is in the same series as the airplane, gunpowder, the crossbow. The present Communist states, again, are not the first states that have been dedicated by their rulers to the militant propagation of some particular ideology or religion. There have been militant Protestant Christian, Catholic Christian, Islamic, and Jewish states in the past. So there is a sense in which neither of the new factors mentioned in this question makes our present period unique.

At the same time, a difference in degree, when it is very great, can become a difference in kind; and I do think that the difference, produced by the invention of atomic weapons, in the degree of the destructiveness of war is a difference that has produced a change in the nature of the institution of war as known and practiced hitherto.

In the past, war has seemed to "make sense" because it has seemed reasonable to make two assumptions: (a) That the soldier, by risking and, if need be, sacrificing, his life at the front has at least a chance of being able, at this price, to defend something behind the front effectively; (b) that it is better to win a war than to lose it. But the invention of atomic weapons looks as if it may have obliterated the formerly valid distinctions between soldier and civilian, front and rear, victor and vanquished. If so, then our present period would be unique in seeing the historic institution of war turn into something new and different: mass suicide. We have already coined a new word, "genocide," to describe this new possibility.

A second difference in degree that has perhaps become a difference in kind is the improvement of means of communication to a degree at which we have come near to "annihilating distance." With atomic weapons in our hands, we are now within pointblank range of one another. We can use this "annihilating of distance" to destroy ourselves. Alternatively, we can use it to make the world a common home for mankind to live in as one family. Both these alternatives have become possibilities in our present period for the first time in history.

A third difference in degree that has perhaps become a difference in kind in our present period is the acceleration of the pace of social change. The revolution through which we are living is not the greatest in human history up to date. It cannot be as great as the revolution through which our pre-human ancestors passed when they were becoming human. But that earliest revolution must have been spread over so many successive lifetimes that no single individual will ever have been aware of the mutation that he was undergoing.

By contrast, in our time the pace of change has become so fast that the individual is now conscious of being kept on the run in trying to keep up with it. This, too, is something new, but it is also not quite without precedent; for something like this bottleneck acceleration of the spread of change has sometimes overtaken human beings in the past when people with widely different ways of life have suddenly run into one another.

Conclusion: Our present period is in some sense unique, and this in important ways. But it is not unique in being unique. Other periods, too, have been unique in ways of their own.

4. If history repeats itself, does that mean world war III is inevitable?

Yes, if "repeat" means "must repeat" (which I do not believe); no, if "repeat" means "has sometimes repeated" (which I do believe).

5. You stress the importance of reviving religion. How would you define true religion?

I would define true religion as being right belief and right feeling taking effect in right action. Without right action, right feeling, and right belief have no virtue in them. By right belief I mean recognizing that (a) we human beings understand and control only a tiny fraction of the universe, and (b) that there is a presence in the universe which is spiritually greater than we are and which is absolute reality. By right feeling I mean awe in face of the mystery of the universe and humility in the presence of absolute reality. By right action I mean trying to bring one's self-centered self into conformity with this spiritual presence behind the phenomena.

I have tried to put my definition in terms that hold good for the religions of the Indian family (Buddhism and Hinduism), as well as for those of the Palestinian family (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam), with which we in the West are better acquainted so far.

6. If there is no religious revival, how will that affect the West?

If there were to be no religious revival, the outlook for the West, as I see it, would be unpromising. I believe our modern western way of life is the expression of a belief in the sacredness of the personality of the individual. This high valuation of the individual personality in the West is being challenged today by communism and other totalitarian ideologies which deify the human community and maintain that the individual human being exists for the sake of the community, as the ant exists for the sake of the ant heap and the bee for the sake of the beehive.

If this totalitarian exaltation of the community were to prevail over our liberal western belief in the sacredness of the personality, that would, I should say, be the death of the distinctive ideal for which the West stands. If our western ideal is to hold its own against the challenging totalitarian ideal, it must stand on sure foundations. Its original foundations were religious. The historical origin of our western belief in the sacredness of the human personality is the Jewish and Christian belief that human souls have an absolute value in the sight of God; and, though, in the modern age, this religious basis of our western belief has been forgotten or even repudiated, I cannot see any other foundation on which our belief can stand.

For this reason, I think the outlook for the West would be unpromising if there were to be no religious revival. In looking forward to a religious revival, I do not expect to see us return to our ancestral religions in the traditional forms into which they had set in the age before the beginning of the modern western scientific movement.

7. One of your critics writes: He comes to the strange conclusion that the Russian reaction to the technical power of the West is analogous to Christianity's reaction to Roman imperialism." Is his a fair statement of your point of view?

No; it turns my point of view upside down and the conclusion attributed to me would be strange indeed, if it had ever really been reached by me or by anybody else. My critic has mixed up two quite separate points of mine, and he has misstated each of them. I have never compared the Russian reaction to the technical power of the West with Christianity's reaction to Roman imperialism. I have made the quite different point that the Russians, since Peter the Great, have reacted to the technical power of the West by mastering western technology and using

it as a means of holding their own. Christianity does not come into the picture here.

On the other hand, in another context, I have compared Russian communism, not with Christianity, but with Roman imperialism, on the ground that communism and Caesar worship are like one another in being glorifications of collective human power at the expense of the sacredness of the individual human personality. In this connection I pointed out that, in the Roman Empire, Caesar worship, which had seemed to have overwhelming material force at its command, was defeated by oriental religions which were not forms of man worship, as Caesar worship was, and which had neither the will nor the power to use material force; and I suggested that, in our world, communism might be defeated by oriental religions, as Caesar worship once was.

I was thinking here of four living oriental religions: Judaism, Hinduism, Islam, and Christianity. In contrast to Christianity, which started in Palestine and reached the West from there, communism is not oriental in origin. It is a western product, a western export. It was manufactured by a Rhinelander in the reading room of the British Museum, London, England, Western Christendom, and it was exported to Russia from here.

8. Is coexistence possible?

Yes, on the evidence of past experience. For instance, in the world in which we are living at this moment, Protestants are coexisting with Catholics, and Moslems with Christians. In the 17th century there were Protestants and Catholics who believed that existence would be impossible for them if the other party were not eliminated, while in the age of the Crusades and the jihads, there were Moslems and Christians who believed that the liquidation of the enemy religion was a necessity if they themselves were to survive. Yet centuries have passed; the parties are still coexisting; and they have not, after all, found it impossible to go on living side by side. These precedents are encouraging. I think of them when I hear western contemporaries of mine saying that coexistence with communism is impossible. In the light of history, I do not take this state of mind tragically.

Coexistence will, though, be uncomfortable and unsafe so long as both sides are simply putting up with it as a state of affairs which they dislike and to which they are submitting only sulkily, out of sheer necessity. If we manage, as I believe we shall, to stave off a third world war, we must make positive use of the time that we buy. We must use it for trying to understand one another and to acquire some confidence in one another. Our long-distance aim ought to be to prepare the way for worldwide cooperation in dealing with the major problems that face the world today on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

The alternative to coexistence is not the continuation of our own existence, with the other party conveniently eliminated, while we live happily ever after by ourselves. The alternative to coexistence is more likely to be nonexistence for both parties, because the alternative is a third world war, and a third world war means mass-suicide in the atomic age.

9. What are the major problems facing the world today, as you see them?

First, the problem of staving off a third world war as a first step toward reaching a relation with one another of sufficient mutual confidence to reduce the fear of war to the vanishing point.

If we manage to solve the problem of keeping, and then insuring, the peace, the next major problem may be that of limiting the world's population. If atomic weapons do not destroy all life, preventive medicine applied by public health authorities will allow the numbers of the human race to

multiply up to starvation point and beyond it, unless we can bring ourselves quickly to change our habits, and our traditional attitudes, in regard to the procreation of children.

In this inner sanctum of family life, habits cannot be changed easily. It will be hard, indeed, for wives and husbands to reconcile themselves to the necessary new idea that the number of children they are to have is not exclusively their own private affair but is something in which the world, too, has a say, since it is the world that will have to provide the food ration for the children if these are born into a world on the brink of starvation.

If the world manages to keep the peace and also to keep its population within limits by other means than the inhuman traditional means (war, famine, and pestilence), I think the greatest problem of all will be the revival of religion. I believe man cannot live without freedom; his spiritual life is the sphere in which he needs freedom most of all; and religion may be the only field left for freedom of any kind in the world into which we are now moving.

I see at least three forces at work which are all militating against freedom and telling in favor of totalitarianism. These three forces are the pressure of population, the dangerousness of the high-powered tools with which we have now equipped ourselves and the demand for social justice. All three forces are driving us toward the regulation and regimentation of life. In the fields of economics and politics, the opportunities for freedom, therefore, seem likely to diminish. If freedom is not preserved in religion, which is its spiritual citadel, it may be altogether lost; and, without freedom, man would no longer be human. This is the nightmare of "1984."

10. Do you think that communism is "the wave of the future"?

No, I do not. In the long run, I believe that communism will fail to captivate mankind, because, as I see it, communism has very little spiritual help or guidance to offer to men and women in the personal trials and troubles of their individual lives. I know of no religion or ideology that has captivated people in the past without having proved itself to be a very present help in trouble of the personal kind. I therefore believe that "the wave of the future" is, not communism, but religion of the kind that does give the individual human being effective spiritual help in leading his personal life.

Religion of this kind is represented in the world today by half a dozen living religious faiths: Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, the Hinayana Buddhism of southeast Asia, and the Mahayana Buddhism of eastern Asia. "The wave of the future," as I foresee it, is the resurgence of these living religions. I should expect to see them revive in new forms that might be startling, and even shocking, to people who have remained faithful to them in their traditional forms. I should also expect, in a world in which distance has been annihilated, to see them come into a much more intimate contact with one another than ever before, and to learn a great deal from one another.

At the same time, I should not expect to see them coalesce into a single world religion. I should expect to see each maintain its own historic identity; and, for most people, for a long time to come, their ancestral religion will probably be the one in which they will find themselves most at home—though, as the world grows into a single family, more and more people are likely to choose their religion for themselves when they are grown up, instead of automatically remaining members of the local church in which they happen to have been brought up.

Though I do not think that communism is the wave of the future, I do think that it is a formidable movement, and that we cannot afford to sit back and wait passively until mankind becomes disillusioned with it.

It is formidable because it makes a powerful appeal to at least three different publics. It appeals (a) to weaklings who long for clear-cut and authoritative answers to all questions, both on matters of fact and on issues of conduct; (b) to idealists who long to devote themselves to some great suprapersonal public cause which will take them out of themselves; (c) to natives who long to find a shortcut to catching up with the West in material efficiency and power. Of these three publics, (b) is influential out of all proportion to its numbers; (a) and (c), which overlap, include, between them, the great majority of the human race.

If the mission field for communism is as favorable as this, the propagation of our own faith will call for the utmost spiritual exertions from us. We are free to make these exertions if we choose; neither communism nor anything else can prevent us. And we can be confident that, if we do exert ourselves, our faith will win in the struggle for the conversion of souls. We believe that our faith is the true one, and that the truth is mighty and will prevail.

Problems of Aged Persons in the United States Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Care Inadequate for the Sick Aged," published in the New York Times of Tuesday, February 22, 1955. The article dramatizes the critical health problems confronting aged persons in the United States today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARE INADEQUATE FOR THE SICK AGED—MOST INSTITUTIONS ACCEPTING THEM WERE NOT DESIGNED FOR THAT PURPOSE—PROBLEM IS INTENSIFYING—INCREASED LONGEVITY ADDS TO BURDENS CAUSED BY SENILITY AND CHRONIC ILLNESS

(By Edith Evans Asbury)

Thousands of New York's aged already are mentally or physically ill and live in institutions. More than half of these ailing aged are supported at public expense.

Two city infirmaries, a city nursing home, 11 State mental hospitals and 100 commercially run nursing homes house and care for the aging ill from this area. Additional hundreds are being cared for in 91 homes for the aged operated by religious and philanthropic organizations. Nobody, including the city's commissioner of hospitals, knows how many chronically ill aged men and women languish in general and voluntary hospital beds, not because they need expensive care but because there is no place to send them.

Most of the havens in which these men and women have found refuge for their declining years were not designed to handle their problems.

Bird S. Coler Infirmary, a 1,920 bed institution on Welfare Island, is an exception. One of the most modern and best-equipped facilities in the Nation, it was planned to meet today's needs of the infirm aged. It was completed 2½ years ago, and already is filled nearly to capacity.

Creedmoor Hospital for the mentally ill, on the other hand, was designed to accommodate a higher proportion of younger and ambulatory patients than it now has. When it opened as a separate institution in 1935, only 28 percent of the patients in New York State mental hospitals were senile. Today this group constitutes 36 percent of the inmates of state hospitals.

Because most of Creedmoor's aging patients are bedfast or have limited mobility, they cannot, for instance, go to centrally located dining rooms in other buildings.

Replanning of food service for patients who cannot climb stairs, or even leave their beds—and some of the very old have to be spoon-fed like babies—is just one example of the adaptation required at Creedmoor.

HOMES FOR AGED EVOLVING

Similar changes, usually at great expense, have become necessary in homes for the aged. Originally planned as rest and retirement places for ambulatory, and sometimes healthy, oldsters, many of these homes are gradually evolving into infirmaries or hospitals.

There are two major reasons for the evolution. First, their original inhabitants lived for many years after entering, became chronically ill, and continued to survive for many more years. Secondly, men and women enter homes for the aged now at the aged of 75 or 80, usually for health reasons.

A generation ago, the average age at admission to a home for the aged was 60 or 65, and the reason was usually a need for shelter and food.

Nowadays, men and women in their sixties have the wherewithal to buy food and shelter in their own communities, thanks to social security, old-age assistance, pensions and the like. And they show an overwhelming preference for remaining independent, and outside an institution, as long as possible.

The old idea that retired men and women romp joyously into homes for aged, or sunny colonies in Florida to rest and relax after years of happy anticipation, has been disproved by recent surveys. They want to stay in their own homes in their own neighborhoods, near friends and relatives, regardless of the rigors of climate or penury.

Eventually, because of the increased life span, illness and enfeeblement overtake many of the aging, and they have to enter some kind of institution when they can no longer take care of themselves.

When aging men and women begin to deteriorate they are prey to a variety of diseases, and sometimes suffer from more than one at the same time.

THE DISEASE OF SENILITY

One of the most distressing illnesses to befall the aged and their families is senility. Medical science has not found its cause or cure. It can last for many years, during which the patient gradually grows increasingly feeble physically and mentally, requiring more and more care. The cost, over a period of years, of providing for a severely senile relative is utterly beyond the means of the average family.

Mildly senile persons can remain with relatives if there is someone to keep an eye on them. They cannot be left alone for long. They are forgetful, may wander away, may turn on the gas to make coffee and forget to put a match to the gas. At this stage their medical needs are likely to be few.

New York's small families, usually living in small apartments, often with husband and

wife both working, face a problem not to be underestimated even with mild senility. The situation is the more critical if teenagers in the family feel shamed by grandmother's behavior, or a daughter-in-law represents the burden of caring for her.

As the disease progresses, the senile person grows more forgetful, more vague, more childish. Physical and sanitation needs, as well as personality disturbances, become extremely difficult for the average family to cope with. At this point, some kind of custodial care elsewhere is usually necessary to keep the rest of the family from being blown apart.

Senility, while it affects the mind, has physical, not mental causes. In nontechnical language, it is the result of hardening of the arteries. The aging, thickening arteries permit less and less blood to flow to the brain, which becomes undernourished, starves and fails.

The disease can occur in any person, regardless of how satisfying his occupation, physical health, mental and emotional stability were during his active mature years.

ALL GROUPS AFFECTED

All income groups are struck. Wealthy families can hire companions or nurses, and keep the patient at home when the disease becomes severe, or they can obtain suitable institutionalization—at great expense.

If the family is supported by welfare funds, or demonstrably unable to pay for the care of the senile relative outside the home, public agencies will assume all or part of the burden.

The average, self-supporting, middle-income family, however, finds it virtually impossible in New York City to solve the problem of long-term custodial care for a senile relative in a way commensurate with its pride and self-respect.

In a nursing home—if one can be found that is willing to take a senile patient—fees will be at least \$150 a month, for bed, board, and nursing care alone. Medical treatment, when needed, will be billed separately.

Homes for the aged are extremely reluctant to accept senile patients, because of the more intensive, therefore more expensive, attention they require. Their financial resources are already strained to the breaking point by the unanticipated greater number of years their present population has survived, and by the resultant increase in chronic illness among them.

Another reason for the reluctance to accept a senile is that his childish behavior sometimes disturbs other patients.

By reducing their own standard of living some middle-income families, at great financial hardship, manage to maintain a senile parent or grandparent. But the senile can survive for years. Usually, as things are now, the senile from the middle and lower income family eventually goes to a tax-supported institution, despite his family's financial sacrifices and pride.

Usually that institution is a mental hospital, to the further demoralization of the family and drain on the taxpayer.

STATE HOSPITALS OPPOSED

Many students of the problems of the aged believe that the majority of the senile do not belong in State hospitals for the mentally ill. They believe the care there is more expensive than need be for this type of patient.

According to State law, senile psychotics must be committed to a hospital for the mentally ill. Many welfare workers believe the law is sometimes loosely interpreted in order to commit nonpsychotic senile men and women because there is no place else to put them.

In the opinion of this group, the law should be rephrased to distinguish between psychotic and nonpsychotic senility. They advocate separate institutions, more like

nursing homes than hospitals, for the senile.

If this were done, they argue, the senile's care would be less of a burden on the taxpayer, his last years could be spent more comfortably, and his descendants would be spared the stigma of mental illness.

Administrators of the State Department of Mental Hygiene are outraged by the latter argument. They declare that no more stigma is attached to illness of the brain than to bodily illness.

Dr. James A. Brussel, assistant commissioner, insists that no patient is in a State hospital for the mentally ill who is not mentally ill.

"Our mental hospitals are so overcrowded now that we are hard pressed for space," Dr. Brussel declares.

"Don't you think we would be delighted to empty our beds of older people if they were not mentally ill?" Dr. Brussel demands. "Then we could reduce overcrowding and concentrate our efforts and facilities on the younger person who would receive more benefit from treatment and perhaps be cured."

A spotlight was thrown on the situation last December, when Supreme Court Justice Benjamin Brenner declared that he was sick and tired of sending old people to mental institutions simply because there is no place else to put them.

Referring to four elderly persons appearing before him for commitment, Justice Brenner said: "Since denial of custodial care and hospitalization to these people would probably result in their death, I find myself compelled to certify them as mentally ill."

Miss Ollie Randall, national president of the Gerontology Society, applauded the jurist's outburst as a welcome shock. It underscored a problem that deserves a high, if not the highest priority in the community—planning for old age, Miss Randall said.

Commissioner Brussel's retort is that after a thorough clinical study—"and you can be sure it was thorough"—all four of the persons to whom the jurist referred were found to be "definitely very psychotic."

Miss Randall and scores of others, including physicians and psychiatrists as well as welfare workers, believe there is merit in drawing a sharper distinction between psychotic and nonpsychotic senility, and in providing separate facilities for them.

Even a distinct wing of a mental hospital, with a different name, which would appear on the death record handed down to his descendants, would be a humane step in the right direction, declares Justice Brenner. He also proposes that a new term "helpless aged," be used in commitment proceedings.

No layman is qualified to diagnose psychotics. Qualified psychiatrists themselves may vary in their judgment as to when the borderline has been crossed from emotional disturbance and neurosis into psychosis.

To the untrained observer, mere erratic behavior may be deemed psychotic, or outward calm of a true psychotic may be mistaken as proof of normality.

PSYCHOSIS IS DEFINED

Dr. S. Bernard Wortis, professor of psychiatry and neurology at New York University College of Medicine, and director of psychiatric and neurological services at University Hospital, New York University-Bellevue Medical Center, says there is no dispute about the exact definition of psychosis.

A psychotic, Dr. Wortis says, is an individual of normal intelligence in such a state of mind as to be unable to care for his own needs, unable to deal with the ordinary requirements of his normal environment, and devoid of insight into the consequences of his actions.

The city's psychiatrists base their decision on commitment recommendations on whether the senile person has reached this state, Dr. Wortis says. He denies that they take into

consideration any lack of other facilities for the patients' care outside a mental hospital.

The same definition, incidentally, almost applies to a baby. And, indeed, senile men and women revert to childishness as their disease progresses. As their memory fails, they forget acquired habits of self control. This means diapering, constant change of clothing and bed linen, and sometimes resistance to being bathed and fed.

One of the most tragic sights imaginable is the wasted, feeble 90-year-old, a great-grandmother, crying piteously in her bed for, Mama, I want my Mama.

Not all the aged become senile. The percentage is small. However, the numbers are large, and are bound to increase as our aged population increases. Unless some answer is found to the problems posed by their need for specialized care, its expense will continue to engulf an ever-growing number of families, and the taxpayer.

Some answers have been found to the question of how to care humanely and economically for the aged who develop other kinds of chronic illness. They will be discussed in tomorrow's article.

Fair Treatment for Mexico Under the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, there are in my district, many splendid United States citizens of Mexican descent. Through them and through my experience as a Member of Congress, I have come to admire and respect the Mexican people and our great good neighbor to the south, the Republic of Mexico.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to an urgent problem facing the Mexican people—the present plight of the Mexican sugar industry. That industry, the fourth largest in Mexico, is in danger of being frozen out of its fair place in the world sugar market. Regrettably, that result is being brought about in large part, through the operation of the United States Sugar Act.

In recent weeks there have been discussions, at the White House and the Department of Agriculture, with a view to recommending legislation to amend the Sugar Act so as to insure an equitable share of the United States sugar market for domestic sugar producers. I am heartily in accord with that objective. At the same time, however, if we are to amend the existing legislation at this time, we should certainly use the opportunity to adjust the grossly inequitable division of the remainder of the United States market among foreign producers, which exists under the present law.

Mr. Speaker, the requirements of the Mexican sugar industry are in no sense inconsistent with the promotion of a healthy, competitive sugar industry in the United States. Mexico has no quarrel with the objectives of the United States sugar producers or with their pro-

posals as set forth in recent official discussions. Mexico is merely seeking an equitable distribution among foreign countries, of the market which remains after domestic production is accounted for—a distribution which takes into account the economic facts of life in terms of trade balance with the United States, total sugar production and the impact of the United States sugar program upon the economy of the exporting countries.

In the recent discussions of the reciprocal trade bill we heard many fine sounding words about trade, not aid, and about the necessity for enabling our friends and allies to purchase our goods and services by purchasing from them what they can best produce. It is time to practice what we preach. I firmly believe in helping those who help the United States.

Mexico is the third largest purchaser of United States goods in the entire world, surpassed only by Canada and Japan. In the past 22 months, Mexican purchases from the United States totaled \$1,165,000,000. In the eight classifications of leading United States exports to Latin America published by the United States Department of Commerce for 1953, Mexico is the largest importer and occupies first place in 5, second place in 1 and third place in 2 of the classifications. In that year, Mexico imported from the United States \$156.2 million in industrial and electrical machinery, \$83.4 million in autos and trucks, \$70.5 million in chemicals, \$39.4 million in iron and steel mill products and \$294.9 million in other products. No other sugar exporting country came anywhere close to these figures.

At the same time, over the past 22 months, Mexico's balance of trade with the United States has been unfavorable to Mexico by \$532 million. For every dollar the United States spent in Mexico, Mexico spent \$1.84 in the United States—almost 2 for 1.

Even within the sugar industry itself, the balance of trade between the United States and Mexico is overwhelmingly unfavorable to Mexico. Every bit of sugar-processing machinery and spare parts used in Mexico has been purchased in the United States. During the past 5-year period the Mexican sugar industry imported \$38 million worth of United States manufactured equipment. During the same period, Mexico was permitted to sell to the United States only \$4½ million worth of Mexican sugar.

It is obvious, of course, that in the present dollar situation no nation can indefinitely sustain so great a trade imbalance without a serious deterioration of its imports from the United States. Mr. Speaker, one of the stated objectives of the Sugar Act is to promote the export trade of the United States. In view of this express language of the statute, one would certainly expect that the export quota allotted to Mexico by the administrators of the act would bear some reasonable relationship to the trade picture and take into account the crucial dollar gap problem of the Mexican people. That has not been done, however. In fact, the quota allotted to Mexico is so small as to be ridiculous.

In the face of the tremendous support afforded the United States economy by Mexican imports, Mexico has been allotted a quota of only 11,445 tons of sugar out of a total United States consumption of 8,200,000 tons. This represents only 1 percent of Mexican production and only fourteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total United States market. Moreover, it represents only thirty-one one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total export quotas allotted all foreign countries.

Contrast the position of other sugar exporting countries. Cuba, which imports from the United States only about two-thirds as much as Mexico, and whose trade balance with the United States is substantially favorable to Cuba, has a quota of 2,667,840 tons. This represents 47 percent of her production, 32.5 percent of the total United States market and 96 percent of foreign quotas, excluding the Philippines.

Peru, which purchases from the United States only about ½ as much as Mexico, has a quota of 51,922 tons—almost 5 times that of Mexico. The Peruvian quota represents approximately 8 percent of her production, 0.63 percent of the United States market and 1.4 percent of the total foreign quotas.

The Dominican Republic, which purchases from the United States only about one-fourteenth as much as Mexico, has a quota of 27,634 tons, more than twice that of Mexico. This represents 4 percent of Dominican Republic production, 0.34 percent of the total United States market and 0.74 percent of total foreign quotas.

How did this grossly inequitable situation come about? It came about because of the failure to formulate in the Sugar Act a realistic basis for the continuing establishment of foreign sugar quotas. As a result, the system has broken down and produces outlandish results. There is a crying need for a commonsense approach to the foreign sugar problem, related to the facts of present day life, and divorced from ancient patterns and prejudices. We must recognize the equities and exigencies of today, and we must be mindful of the impact of what we do upon the lives and well-being of our friends and neighbors.

Aside from the simple equities of the situation and the economic self interest of the United States, there are other reasons why a healthy Mexican sugar industry is in the best interests of the United States. Mexico is the only sugar producing country with a border contiguous to our own and the only one in a position to provide uninterrupted, overland supply in the event of an emergency. In time of war, this assured supply for United States industry is a matter of utmost importance to United States industry and the consuming public.

We all want our allies in the free world to be strong as a bulwark against Communist aggression. The economic well-being of our friends and allies is as much a part of our own national security as are arms and armies.

We must not underestimate the tragic effect which failure to correct the in-

equitable foreign sugar quotas will have upon the Mexican economy. The Mexican sugar industry is the fourth largest in that country. It supports well over half a million people. By dint of diligent and persistent effort, over the years, that industry has raised the standard of living of Mexican farm workers to a reasonable level. The operation of the quota system, as presently constituted, however, spells ruin for that great Mexican industry. With present export restrictions in the world sugar market, if the United States does not allow Mexico a more equitable share of its sugar imports, it can only mean ruinous surpluses in Mexico or crippling acreage restrictions, either of which would deprive thousands of Mexican workers of a livelihood. The social and economic impact of such an eventuality upon Mexico should be obvious. Mexico has already undergone a devaluation of its currency because of the unfavorable balance of its trade with the United States. Surely we should take reasonable measures to prevent additional economic dislocation and possible collapse of United States markets in that country.

Mr. Speaker, it is not as though these people were asking for an increase of millions of tons in their sugar quota. Cuba, which has a favorable balance of United States trade now has a quota equivalent to 32.5 percent of the United States market. A sugar quota for Mexico of only 2 percent of United States consumption would absorb that country's exportable surplus and give the industry the stability it so urgently requires. Such an adjustment would have a minimal effect upon the overall sugar picture. This is a case where so little on the part of the United States will mean so much to our Mexican friends.

Mr. Speaker, this is a situation which cries out for correction and I intend to make every effort to see that justice is done.

A Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from a constituent of mine, which I take the privilege of inserting in the RECORD under leave to extend my remarks, and which I believe shows quite adequately and fully some of the frustrations involved by some of our young men, who by their courageous actions attempt to enter a military career, but become faced with problems which perhaps many of us are not fully aware of.

I believe Joseph Zito's letter to me shows that frustration and disappointment which may be shared by so many other boys. The letter follows:

NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 20, 1955
 Hon. ALBERT W. CRETELLA,
 Congress of the United States,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CRETELLA: Up to now you have known me as the fellow who is looking for European employment, but now I would like to pass on a bit of information that may prove both interesting and amusing.

Last December, somewhat discouraged at the lack of results from employment seeking, I was attracted by one of those "The Army Needs You" posters. I had served in the Army twice, once as enlisted man and once as officer, and had been in the infantry, constabulary, and artillery. During that time I had had the finest training that the taxpayers' money could give, and an unblemished record. As an officer, though by no means brilliant, I was always dependable. With all this in consideration, after 7 months of civilian life I decided I could easily be the "you" part of the poster for an Army career. Next stop: the recruiting station.

I finished the comprehensive test 10 minutes ahead of the allotted time, missing only one question. My physical test produced a 1-1-1-1-1-1 profile. Next, I presented my engineering degree from Yale, my diploma from the battery officer course at the Fort Sill Artillery School, the diploma from the Artillery Survey School, and the Land Mine Warfare School. I threw in my fluent knowledge of Italian and German for good measure. In view of these qualifications, the local recruiting office forwarded my request for regular enlistment, recommending an E-7 master sergeant's rating. From there the papers went to First Army Headquarters, where they timidly stuck their neck out to recommend a lower E-6, sergeant first class rating, and forwarded them to Washington. Then came the coup de grace when some exalted shoe clerk sent them back authorizing an E-4 corporal's rating. Needless to say, all I got out of this is a good laugh. Just what the hell does one have to be to rate as a master sergeant? Especially at the present time when a great many of the officers and noncoms have only one good qualification—that of being there "fustest" and knowing when they are well off.

When you again hear that the Army wants good men, would you be so kind as to ask and inform me what "good" means? In closing, I would turn a skeptical ear to anyone who claims that it takes a higher pay scale to build a good army. Take it from one who got along on \$50 per month as well as \$320 per month, that not one of the men who turned down reenlistment in my battery gave finances as a reason, but we all resented the "sili-vilians" running the Army in such a wretched way.

Thank you for your time.
 Sincerely,

JOE ZITO.

Should the United Nations Review Conference Be Called This Year?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address entitled "Should the United Nations Review Conference Be Called This Year?" which was written by Mr. Harry Ganderson and delivered to the Guilford Battle Chapter of the Daughters of the

American Revolution at Starmount Forestry Country Club, Greensboro, N. C., February 10, 1955:

It is a real pleasure and honor to be your guest today, to discuss the United Nations Charter and the 1955 Review Conference. Because of the apparent growing belief that the proposed review conference is a must under article 109 of the charter, I have chosen to speak on the subject of Should the United Nations Review Conference Be Called This Year?

I understand that I was invited to address you on this subject as a result of my testimony given before the Subcommittee on United Nations Revision Conference, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which hearings were held in Greensboro under the chairmanship of Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin.

As you know, Senator WILEY, prior to Democratic control this session, was chairman of this important and powerful committee, and he is at this time the ranking Republican member of that committee. Recently, I had the occasion to write Senator WILEY about the proposed review conference, and in his reply, he remarked that as yet the subcommittee had not completed its hearings and study. I would gather from these remarks that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not yet decided if our country will support a call for a review conference, come September. Since that question is of foremost consideration, I would like to limit my remarks to this one issue. I know that you are already quite familiar with the basic theory of the United Nations, its structure, its weaknesses, its accomplishments, its failures, as well as the wide variety of amendments which have been proposed.

Your last two Continental Congresses adopted resolutions opposing any 1955 revision of the charter which might have the effect of superseding our Federal Constitution, or limiting our National and State liberties or freedoms, or which might attempt to bring about through the United Nations a world government or partial world government. Confronted as we are with the imminent threat to our American way of life, by the growing menace of world Communist dictatorship, the question of calling a review conference at this time should be a matter of great concern to the American people.

Your revolutionary forebears laid the foundation for our Government and made possible our great American way of life. Like the patriots of the American Revolution, who sacrificed their lives and fortunes for freedom and independence, we must be ever vigilant and zealous to preserve and protect our great heritage of life and liberty. Our country's unparalleled growth and development was made possible because, under our form of Government, we have a free and independent Nation, of free and independent citizens. In my humble opinion, we can ill afford in this critical period to lower our guard by diverting our energies, to urging and preparing for a review conference. There is no obligation under the charter to call a review conference, and I very much question the wisdom of calling it this year, or at any time in the near future.

Let's look briefly and quickly at the charter itself. Paragraph 1 of article 109 provides that a general conference to consider amendments to the charter may be held at any time upon a vote of two-thirds of the General Assembly and any seven members of the Security Council. Now, as for the much-discussed review conference, paragraph 3 of article 109 simply declares that if 10 years has elapsed and a general conference has not been called under paragraph 1, then the proposal to call a review conference must be placed on the assembly agenda, and only a majority vote is required for passage to call the review conference.

There appears to be too much emphasis on the proposed 1955 conference—in fact, to such an extent that many have forgotten, or have become unaware, that full opportunity is afforded for needed amendments to the charter at any time under article 108. Admittedly, such amendments would require the recommendation of two-thirds of the U. N. membership and the constitutional ratification of two-thirds of the member nations, just as would any amendments proposed at a full-dress review conference.

Already the charter has been subject to changes in a variety of ways, changes which one might call informal amendments. I would like to briefly cite a few illustrations.

1. The nonimplementation or nonapplication of fundamental provisions of the charter—like the failure to implement the disarmament provisions or to create an international police force under the Security Council, as specifically called for by the charter, to carry out the chief purpose of the U. N.—that is, the maintenance of permanent peace and security and the prevention of war.

2. Through the creation of specialized organizations and agencies—very worthy indeed, but which nevertheless have tended to minimize or rather subordinate the chief aims of the charter, at least in our time.

3. Through the interpretation of the charter by various organizations and members of the U. N.—like the perverted exercise of the veto, and the absences and abstentions by the Communist bloc.

4. Through the conclusion of supplementary treaties and agreements, such as the Headquarters Agreements of 1947, and the North Atlantic and other regional defense pacts. Actually, aren't we presently engaged in a civil war within the U. N.? On the outcome of this struggle may depend the very fate of the United Nations and civilization itself.

These illustrations clearly show that the U. N. has made changes in the charter, whether we choose to call these amendments or not. There are, nevertheless, adequate provisions in the charter for formal amendments to be made at any time.

To call a review conference simply to consider minor or technical matters would hardly be worth the effort which it would require. Furthermore, any effort to make fundamental changes in the structure of the U. N. might very well precipitate a struggle which would result in the very destruction of that organization. Of course, for those who are opposed to the existence of the U. N., a conference would furnish them an excellent opportunity to make lethal attacks upon it. That, however, is already taking place without a review conference. From some quarters the attack against the U. N. goes like this—the U. N. is obstructed by Russia and is not performing its chief aims, but rather, is devoting all of its time and our money to improving the impoverished nations. And then they make the point—that history shows it has been the advanced nations for the most part, and not the so-called backward countries, that have been the arch disturbers of world peace. They may have a point there—only time can tell.

Formulas for radical changes in machinery, elaborations of new procedures, plans for supergovernments, and the like, unfortunately rest on an unconscious assumption, that the more explicit the obligation, the more it is honored, and that the more parts the machinery has, the more smoothly it will run. Any of these proposals for collective security can be carried out under the present charter, when those obligated under that document perform their responsibilities.

The United Nations Charter described the foundation for permanent peace and security and the prevention of war, and it likewise describes the machinery to implement

those provisions. It is obvious, therefore, that the charter has not stood in the way of maintenance of peace. On the contrary, it is the failure of certain nations to do their part in implementing those provisions and living up to those obligations which they assumed when they became bound by the charter in 1945.

Twenty years ago we were trying to stop the piecemeal efforts of aggression by the Fascist rulers, who finally brought the holocaust of war misery upon mankind in their efforts to subjugate the democratic and Communist worlds. Today, we are faced with this same problem from the Communists, only on a broader scale, but dressed up in a different coat of armor. Without a shot, they have, since the creation of the U. N., enslaved close to one-fourth of the human race. They, too, led by the Communist despots, defy the charter. Another quarter of the human race is in the balance, while being snared into the iron jaw of the Kremlin. Mere reformulation of the obligations under the charter will not change the nature of either the revolt in the U. N. or the threat to the human race.

Although I would consider the veto question the principal issue which would come under consideration at a review conference, I do not consider that issue in itself as being decisive in effecting our position for or against calling the review conference. We should not forget that the United States no less than the other great powers, insisted upon the veto as a condition for the acceptance of the charter. The veto has not worked out like the U. N. founders had hoped, when the charter was forged under the crucible of wartime cooperation and allied victory, against the common enemy.

Modification of the veto power does not necessarily involve charter revision. During the past 8 years, the United States has participated unsuccessfully in efforts to reduce the use of the veto by agreement among the permanent members or by other methods which would not involve charter revision. Furthermore, several of the smaller nations have made attempts since 1945 to bring up proposals in the General Assembly to amend the veto. It was the dissatisfaction of the smaller nations with the charter's veto power at San Francisco which furnished much of the impetus for making provision for possible revision of the charter by a review conference.

The arguments are stronger today than during the San Francisco Conference for American protection of the veto power. Certainly, before Americans can take a position with regard to abolition of the veto, they must first decide if the best interests of the United States would be served by relinquishing the veto over U. N. use of American Armed Forces without our consent. They must also decide whether we should give up the veto with respect to U. N. membership, or as to who should represent China in the U. N. Would you dare relinquish the right of veto over international atomic control, even before a U. N. plan is devised acceptable to Russia? It would be utterly unthinkable to believe that Russia and its satellites would change their leopard skins at a review conference, except to perpetrate more frauds on the democratic world.

Admittedly, the Communist bloc has perverted the veto power and obstructed implementation of the primary functions of the charter. Nevertheless, conditions being as they are, the United States can ill afford to give up the veto. We are the principal defenders against the Communist aggressors and we must, therefore, protect our position and power to make our own decisions. We should not add to existing problems or increase the dangers to our own democratic institutions by calling a review conference at this time. Nor should we minimize the splendid opportunity such a conference

would offer subversive elements to strengthen their nefarious Communist network, both in our own country as well as the U. N.

Do you know that some of the formulas, like world federation, world government, and so on, which are suggested for charter revision, would necessitate amendments to our own Constitution also? It would, therefore, seem highly desirable to settle the American attitude regarding these proposals before talking about placing issues of such gravity into international debate. For example, it would be quite awkward for the American delegation to a charter review conference to be confronted with the support which the Communist delegations might give to such charter amendments which would alter our own sovereignty. It would be far better before deciding to call the review conference, for the twenty-odd Senators who want to explore an Atlantic Union and those who favor a world federation to publicly state their opposition to the proposed Bricker amendment which is clearly designed to make their proposals impossible.

These are just a few of the hard questions which should be answered before the American people decide whether or not to call for a charter review conference.

History teaches an important lesson—that in the development of new forms of government, certainly under democratic principles, society is ad hoc-minded and bit-minded. Let the charter evolve little by little, case by case. We must not be hasty or impetuous, or expect so much in so short a period of time.

The U. N. is a mere infant, disillusioned with false hopes, as compared with our Constitution, 167 years strong, blossoming in full manhood, and fulfilling the hopes of its founders. Experience, custom, usage, informal adoption and change, amendment, and judicial interpretation over the centuries have made our Constitution the greatest living document in governmental history. We have not had a review conference or convention to amend the Constitution since it was framed in 1787. No review conference was required for the Bill of Rights, or other amendments including the right of women to vote. I see nothing in the history of the world or in the development of the federal form of government of the United States which indicates that there will be any departure from that course of history as it relates to the United Nations. I do not think, therefore, that a charter review conference this year, or at any time in the near future, would serve the best interests of the United States, the United Nations, or the cause of world peace and security.

The world's population now is about 2½ billion, living in more than 120 large and small countries. Practically one-half of the human race are still underprivileged and impoverished. Most of the countries are inhabited by natives deeply rooted in a wide variety of mores and civilizations, and possessed of some radical concepts about human rights, quite foreign to ours. Under the charter, these conditions are branded as the causes of war.

Indeed the humanitarian aims of the charter are laudable objectives, but is the achievement of those aims the real cure for war? If so, will they be achieved in time to stem or stop the imminent drift toward world war III?

We know from experience in our own great land with only a handful of people compared to the world's population, that the concepts of people about their mores and human rights, the world over, cannot be changed overnight—not even by legislative or judicial fiat. While we may support and pray for the realization of the idealistic hopes of each generation, and now the United Nations, to bring peace to the world,

we must, nevertheless, be realistic in our practices.

In the meanwhile, therefore, we must keep our arsenal full, and our powder dry, and pray God this will deter and keep the horrors of war from our doorsteps.

Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, from the floor of the House on various occasions, many fine things have been said about the brave and courageous people of Poland, who are now suppressed behind the Iron Curtain. Many other statements have been contained in the Appendix to the Record at different times.

I can say with justifiable pride that I subscribe to all these statements and have associated myself with them in the past.

I incorporate herewith, under leave granted by you to extend my remarks, a resolution which was passed by the delegates of the lodges, belonging to Council 25 of the Polish National Alliance, in assembly gathered in Bridgeport, Conn., on January 23, 1955:

We, delegates of the lodges belonging to the Council 25, of the Polish National Alliance, whose president is Charles Rozmarek, gathered at the yearly meeting, on January 23, 1955, in Bridgeport, Conn., have resolved as follows:

We, Americans of Polish descent express our loyalty to the United States of America and to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as our solidarity with his struggle against communism which menaces our American freedoms. We urge the United States Government to strengthen the military power of our country. We do not believe in the policy of coexistence. The struggle between the communistic world and free world has been carried for years. This struggle will be ended with the victory of one side. We strongly hope that our beloved democratic country will be the victorious one. All free countries should get united in this struggle, and we should also look for our prospective allies among the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, who can bring us a great help in case of war. This was proved during the last war against Germany. This was proven by the Polish Underground Army which sabotaged German military effort, by cutting their communication lines and destroying war materials ready to be sent to the battlelines. If we want the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other countries to be on our side, they should be informed as to what they can expect after victory of the free world. They should know, in advance, that their territories will be not infringed.

We urge that the United States Government declare that the Oder and Neisse Line be a permanent frontier between Poland and Germany. No decision relating to the fate of Poland must be undertaken without the consent of Poles themselves. We state that the only legal representative of independent Polish policy in the world is the legal Polish Government in Exile, residing

in Great Britain. This Government has our unanimous endorsement and support.

We confirm, once again, our unflinching determination to undertake everything possible to carry on our fight for the final liberation of Poland and to persist in our fight until justice is done to Poland and independence is restored.

We extend our deep sympathy to the Polish nation, which, we believe, will endure, until the hour of final victory, the Soviet slavery into which it was sold by the secret agreements concluded at Yalta. We express our belief in the ideas of American democracy, which have put our country at the head of all free nations, and we believe that our free and democratic country will lead other countries to freedom and democracy. We are also of the opinion that everything should be done to free all Americans held by any communistic country.

Long live the United States of America.
Long live free and independent Poland.

HENRY BORONY,
CHESTER E. SZYMARE,
JOSEPH WISINSKI,
FRANCOSER LACHOWICZ,
Resolution Committee.

Thanks From the Outposts of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an editorial entitled "Thanks From the Outposts of Korea," which appeared in the Nutley Sun of February 17, 1955. I join in the salute to these fine women who have for so long unselfishly dedicated themselves to humanitarian pursuits—and who helped to make lighter the burdens of our boys who served in Korea:

THANKS FROM THE OUTPOSTS OF KOREA

The Nutley Committee for Servicemen in Korea disbanded this week, after having, for 4 years, sent packages and letters to Nutley soldiers, airmen, sailors and Marines in Korea. There will be no official recognition of the activities of the 10 women who, from their hearts and from their purses, paid a neighborly tribute to as many as 50 Nutley servicemen at a time, but the women will be amply repaid by the warm letters of appreciation which came to them from the Nutley boys in the field who received the writing paper and envelopes, the soap and shaving materials, the candy and other little extras which they could not find in the severe service rations in the Korean mountains.

Those boys were holding the outposts of civilization against communism. They were in the rugged highlands, often living in the open, in all sorts of weather, far from the niceties and comparative ease of the base ports where army exchanges would have catered to their wants.

Those 10 women saw to it that none of the Nutley boys lacked what they needed. Each package, each letter carried with it a breath of Nutley air, a word from home, an assurance that even though they were half way around the world those boys were not forgotten by their friends and neighbors in Nutley. Those women made our sons happy, they made them glad that they were from Nutley. Many wrote back to say that of all the towns in America, Nutley was the only

one to keep such friendly contact with its sons.

For the 10 women who conceived the idea, who took from their own purses to pay for the costs, who gave the many hours needed to gather, to wrap and to mail packages, Nutley can only say: Thanks for your generous gesture; thanks for those who no longer live to speak their gratitude. Thanks for all those boys whose service in the most deplorable conditions was made a little more bearable. Thanks for expressing, so beautifully, the true spirit of Nutley.

R. E. H.

1955 Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege during the period set aside for the observance of Lincoln's Birthday to deliver the following address to Lincoln Day dinners at Keene, N. H.; Indiana, Pa.; New Brighton, Pa.; and Huntington, Clarksburg, and Charleston, W. Va.:

LINCOLN DAY 1955

You have honored me by your invitation to join in this annual tribute to the memory of the immortal Lincoln, our first Republican President.

Lincoln, in all his greatness, was a common man with common attributes, yet by character and self-education he elevated himself to such a degree that world historians acclaim him as one of the six greatest personalities in the history of the human race.

Thus, as the Great Emancipator's soul took flight from his weary body, Edwin Stanton, Secretary of War, proved himself a prophet when he announced his death in these historic words: "Now he belongs to the ages."

Many times the question is asked, Why do we look to the philosophy of Abraham Lincoln for inspiration and guidance in the conduct of public affairs even though 90 years have elapsed since his passing?

The answer is that Lincoln was a common man whose words and deeds enshrined him forever in the hearts of mankind.

But this great Republican President did not reach the heights of world acclaim without experiencing heartaches and bitter disappointments.

A close study of his many reverses in life reveals that few men could have weathered such a series of trials and tribulations.

When you read of Lincoln's life, you are reminded of his statement in speaking of his lack of formal education when he said, "I do not know much—my schooling was limited to reading, writing, and ciphering to the rule of three."

This statement reveals the humility and sincerity of Lincoln, who was not ashamed of his early life and humble surroundings.

This humility of Abraham Lincoln was reflected in his first campaign for a political office when he was a candidate for the State Legislature in Illinois in 1832.

At that time, Lincoln said, "I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal-improvement system, and high protective tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles. . . ."

On clearly defined political principles Abraham Lincoln was content to place his future in the hands of the American people.

It took courage on his part to stand on his principles and to bypass the political magic of promising everybody everything in the hope of garnering a vote, a practice that became so popular with the New Dealers and Fair Dealers.

Lincoln, because of his courage and convictions, went down to defeat in 1832 as a candidate for the legislature.

He was defeated again in business in 1833 and lost everything of a material value.

In 1832, as candidate for speaker, he was again defeated.

In 1840, he lost as a candidate for elector. In 1843, he was defeated as a candidate for Commissioner of the General Land Office and also as a candidate for nomination to Congress.

In 1848, he lost in his campaign for reelection to Congress.

In 1855, he was the losing candidate for United States Senator.

In 1856, he was defeated as candidate for Vice President.

In 1858, he was defeated as a candidate for United States Senator.

But in 1860, he was elected as the first Republican President of the United States.

What a glowing tribute Lincoln's crowning victory was to his perseverance and to the truth of the old saying, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit!"

Abraham Lincoln refused to quit because he knew in his heart that the principles he espoused must be adhered to if this young Republic expected to become strong materially, morally, and spiritually.

He declined to surrender or compromise his principles with the result that his patience and perseverance have become a national symbol.

By comparison, the Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln can take a lesson from his determined and persistent attitude.

The Republican Party is still smarting over the reverses suffered in the November elections of 1954 when we lost control of Congress and met a similar fate in some State elections.

As members of the Party of Abraham Lincoln, we should honor his memory by abandoning our negative thinking and present a united and militant front behind the forward-looking program of our Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It has been a little more than 2 years since the American people repudiated 20 years of the New Deal-Fair Deal brand of political philosophy by entrusting the affairs of Government to a Republican President.

There is none who can deny that under President Eisenhower remarkable progress has been made in the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

At the same time, a more realistic and firm foreign policy has been formulated with the result that Uncle Sam is no longer being pushed around in the field of foreign affairs.

It is gratifying to realize that this new, firm foreign policy under President Eisenhower is responsible for the following accomplishments, namely:

- (a) Brought an end to the Korean war.
- (b) The Iranian oil situation has been ironed out.
- (c) The explosive problem of the Suez Canal which concerns the British and the Egyptians is being settled in a peaceable manner.
- (d) The troublesome problem of Trieste which has been a threat of war for years has been settled.
- (e) The Communist-inspired activities have been halted involving countries in Central America.
- (f) International relations are improving with respect to the arming of West Germany

as part of the defense against Communistic aggression, and finally

(g) In the Middle East, the real desire of the United States for peace and friendly relations is truly understood.

It should be remembered that President Eisenhower inherited the hopeless situation in French Indochina which had deteriorated to the point where it was beyond diplomatic solution.

Yet today in French Indochina, there is hope of saving at least a part of that area from the Iron Curtain.

In true Lincoln style, President Eisenhower redeemed his election pledge to the American people that he would consult Congress before sending United States Armed Forces into conflict.

Unlike his predecessor, Mr. Truman, who sent American troops to Korea on his own initiative, President Eisenhower asked and received from Congress the authority to employ United States Armed Forces in defense of Formosa, the Pescadores and related positions and territories in that area.

By consulting Congress regarding the Formosa situation, President Eisenhower clearly demonstrates his bipartisan foreign policy which is a vital factor in uniting the American people.

At the same time, President Eisenhower served unequivocal notice on the Chinese Reds that they will be at war with the United States if they attack the Formosan area.

This bold decision which results from the firm foreign policy on the Eisenhower administration is at the same time a blunt warning to Soviet Russia that its policy of wars by proxy or through its satellites will no longer be tolerated.

This courageous attitude on the part of President Eisenhower will restore not only our dignity as a nation but it also serves notice on Russia that we are sick and tired of her role as an enemy of world peace.

In backing up this bold and courageous decision of President Eisenhower, we have his assurance that every single order concerning the Formosan situation will have to clear his desk before it receives approval.

What a contrast this is to the conduct of the Korean war when the State Department headed by Dean Acheson tied the hands of General MacArthur by preventing American forces from pursuing and destroying the Chinese Reds north of the Yalu River in Korea.

It was this spineless and vacillating foreign policy that prolonged the Korean war, took the lives of 143,000 of the cream of American youth and left us with the irritating and troublesome problems we have now concerning the Chinese Reds.

The result of the futility of the Dean Acheson policy in Korea is demonstrated by the fact that it was America's first military defeat, not because our forces were wanting in valor, courage, or sacrifice, but only because it was a war rigged against victory from the very outset.

This statement is supported by every American field general who served in Korea.

For example, testimony given before a committee of the United States Senate reveals that General Stratemeyer, commander of the United States Air Force in the Far East, complained: "The enemy can hit me where I am based. I cannot hit them."

Gen. Edward M. Almond in answer to a question by a Member of the United States Senate as to how many opportunities did our side have to win the war, answered by saying: "Two . . . First, in November 1950, following the historic Ichon envelopment of the North Korean forces; and second, in June 1951, when some 50 Chinese divisions were trapped and routed clear across the Korean peninsula."

General Almond continued his testimony by saying: "At that point, 2 months after President Truman had fired General Mac-

Arthur, the whole American offensive was halted and abandoned on direct orders from Washington."

Gen. Mark Clark, in his testimony, said that Chiang Kai-shek on more than one occasion, had offered General Clark three of his best divisions with supporting air.

General Clark said, "I recommended it shortly after I got over to the Far East, but my recommendations were never answered."

Questioned as to whether he agreed with General MacArthur that the enemy should not have been allowed a sanctuary beyond the Yalu River, General Clark replied, "Yes, sir. I agreed at the time when the Chinese came in."

Continuing, General Clark said: "They came across the Yalu and killed our men."

"I think at that time we should have indicated that we were at war with Red China and should have retaliated with everything we had at our disposal."

General Clark was then asked, "Did you ever fight a war like this before and would you ever want to fight another one like it?"

General Clark replied with an emphatic, "No, sir."

These quotations from the testimony of three of America's great generals prove the oft-repeated assertion that officials in our State Department by their bungling tactics and with the consent of President Truman denied our American forces the opportunity to win the Korean war.

By contrast, President Eisenhower, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and fortified by his outstanding military experience on the field of battle, assures us that the folly in Korea will not be repeated.

We have the added assurance that America with an adequate national defense in this atomic-hydrogen age stands ready to give the American people the maximum of national security even if it requires using atomic and hydrogen weapons.

In support of this firm and realistic foreign policy on the homefront, the Eisenhower administration as the result of action by the Republican-controlled 83d Congress is meeting the problem of Communist infiltration.

This is made possible through a subversive-control program that is proving a mighty weapon to the Department of Justice and its FBI in the all-out effort to combat the Communist threat within our country and the worldwide menace of international communism.

This two-fold militant anti-Communist program is designed to stop playing patty-cake with the Communists here and abroad.

It permits the granting of immunity to witnesses who are willing to testify concerning subversive activities but who heretofore have invoked the fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

It provides the death penalty for peacetime spies.

It makes ball-jumping a serious crime.

It closes many loopholes in existing laws through which Judy Coplon and others of her kind escaped prosecution.

It provides for the loss of citizenship to persons who knowingly engage in Communist conspiracy.

It requires the registration of Communist-action and Communist-front printing equipment.

It increases the penalty for harboring or concealing a fugitive who is wanted on a felony charge or who has been convicted of any offense irrespective of whether it is a felony or a misdemeanor.

It denies Government pensions to convicted felons like Alger Hiss.

In addition, the Republican-controlled 83d Congress enacted a law which outlaws the Communist Party of the United States.

It likewise applies to any successor organization whose purpose is the overthrow of the Government of the United States or any

political subdivision therein by force or violence.

This subversive control law makes it a felony for any person to be a member of such an organization when he has knowledge of the revolutionary activities of such an organization.

In addition to this subversive-control program and our vigilant attitude in tracking down, exposing, and prosecuting Communists one of our mightiest weapons strong and solvent America.

For that reason, our domestic economy is of paramount significance because if we allow it to decay morally, spiritually, and financially, we become an easy and certain prey to world communism.

The Eisenhower administration's program designed to transfer the economy of our country from a wartime to a peacetime basis has been acclaimed by friend and foe as being in the best interests of the United States.

Unfortunately, the dove of peace brought with it serious economic dislocations in certain areas of the country where unemployment occurred when the manufacture of war materials was terminated.

In general, however, business is good and the savings and spending of the American people as a whole have increased.

The President's dynamic and progressive legislative program resulted in a revision of the tax structure that brought about one of the greatest tax reductions in the history of the Nation.

In addition, the Federal Government is now being operated at greater economy, with the result that it has been possible to lessen the tax burden on the people by many billions of dollars.

President Eisenhower's program in the field of health, social security, highways, housing, agriculture, and commerce has attracted bipartisan support which is indicative of its real merit.

Ladies and gentlemen, this dynamic Eisenhower program that is building a stronger America is a tribute to the genius and sincerity of our Republican President.

With less than 2 years remaining of his present term in the White House and confronted by a Democratic-controlled Congress, make no mistake that President Eisenhower's dynamic and progressive program is facing the acid test.

With the 1956 Presidential election in the offing, we Republicans cannot afford dissension in our ranks or sulking in our tents.

Therefore, it is incumbent upon us as disciples of Abraham Lincoln to close our ranks and present a united front in meeting Democratic attacks on our President and on the Republican Party.

May I warn you as a battle-scarred veteran of the political arena, that the Democratic Party will leave no stone unturned to lure us into political booby-traps in its effort to recapture the White House.

Frankly, we can expect a knock-down drag-out political fight with no holds barred in the 1956 campaign.

While we listen to loud protests about political smears, I predict that the campaign of 1956 will outsmear the despicable New Deal attack on President Hoover in 1932.

The campaigns of 1952 and 1954 will prove to have been "cream-puff" affairs in comparison to the 1956 campaign already underway and spearheaded by Chairman Butler of the National Democratic Committee.

Chairman Butler's attacks on Vice President Nixon reveal the pattern to be followed in next year's campaign.

These smear attacks make a mockery of the so-called Democratic pledge of bipartisan support of the Eisenhower program.

Fellow Republicans, time is running out on us.

This is February 1955 and already the Democratic campaign to recapture the White House and continue Democratic control of Congress is well underway.

Therefore, I say to you in all sincerity, it is time that we Republicans spring into action.

As I have said before, let us bury our party differences, close ranks and join hands on the firing line.

First, We should recruit more followers, especially among the younger generation.

Second, We should tell the American people of the forward-looking program of the Eisenhower administration and the success of its efforts to restore honesty and integrity to Government.

Third, We should refresh the memories of the American people of the 20 years of Roosevelt-Truman rule whose only means of providing employment was based on two wars with jobs and overtime at the expense of the flesh and blood of American fathers and mothers.

Fourth, We should convince the American people that as a Nation we are at peace and that the transition from a wartime economy cannot be accomplished overnight and without some economic dislocations.

Ladies and gentlemen, as Republicans we have nothing to hide in giving an account of the stewardship of the Eisenhower administration during its 2 years in office.

The Republican Party is leading this Nation out of the valley of destruction by providing real leadership in President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I repeat, we must bury all selfish desires and settle petty differences that if not compromised will divide our ranks and render us completely helpless.

Fellow Republicans, the task before us is to restore to Republican control our city halls, our courthouses, our State houses, and the Congress of the United States as well as to retain control of the White House in 1956.

As I have warned, the hour is getting late. This is no time for party bickering or weak-kneed Republicans who are timid about reshouldering the pack and moving into battle.

Let us never forget that, in 1952 after 20 long years of political exile, the American people gave the Republican Party control of Congress and the White House.

At this moment with the Democrats again in control of Congress, further defeats in 1956 could lose us the Presidency and the opportunity to recapture control of Congress.

Therefore, fellow Republicans, I beseech you to guard against any defeatist attitude by meditating on the long 20 year battle we had to regain the White House and Congress in 1952.

In addition, let us not lose sight of the fact that Abraham Lincoln after 10 crushing defeats from 1832 to 1858 finally achieved a glorious triumph in 1860 when he was elected as the first Republican President of the United States.

In commemoration of the 146th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, let us rededicate ourselves to the task before us—the preservation of our form of Government, keeping in mind as the great Emancipator did that, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit."

In 1952 with President Eisenhower as our standard bearer, we promised the American people who were weary of the New Deal-Fair Deal philosophies a new birth of freedom.

We are well on the road to redeeming that pledge under the brilliant and dynamic leadership of our beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Therefore, in the knowledge that our cause is just, let us reconsecrate ourselves to the task before us by presenting a united front.

At the same time, let us recall with pride and confidence that down through the years

the Republican Party has faithfully followed the sage advice of Abraham Lincoln.

As we gird ourselves for the 1956 campaign, let us adopt as our battle cry the ringing words of Abraham Lincoln uttered nearly 100 years ago when in 1856, during the formative years of the Republican Party, he said:

"Let us, in building our new party, plant ourselves on the rock of the Declaration of Independence and the gates of hell shall not be able to prevail against us."

Roslyn News Celebrates 75th Birthday— Second Oldest Weekly on Long Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join in congratulating the Roslyn News on its 75th birthday today. The American weekly newspaper, as I have stated previously, is as American as the Constitution of the United States and has contributed much to our progress since the birth of this great Nation. I am proud to claim the Roslyn News as one of my constituent newspapers and I am pleased to present its history.

February 23 marks the diamond jubilee for the Roslyn News of Roslyn, N. Y.

Three-quarters of a century of publication is a long time and in the space of those 75 years many changes have come to both the paper and the area it serves.

The first issue of the paper was published late in the nineteenth century by Pier Keeler and his brother in a small print shop on a winding country lane, now Main Street. They called their paper the Tablet, and since the town had but a handful of residents that, too, was the size of the paper's circulation.

One of the town's early visitors was George Washington, one of its best remembered sons, the poet, William Cullen Bryant. Through the years the sleepy village has changed to a smart and beautiful residential area on Long Island's famous North Shore, but it still houses famous artists, writers—Christopher Morley—television and theatrical celebrities.

A year after the Keelers started their paper, they sold it to William R. Burling who changed its name to the one it now bears. After him there were several other owners who struggled to make a small village weekly pay for itself. One of these was Maj. George M. Robertson, Roosevelt Raceway official and winner of the famous Vanderbilt Cup in 1903.

Today, instead of measuring its readers on the fingers of both hands, the Roslyn News can point with pride to a wide readership in an area that covers Roslyn, Roslyn Heights, Roslyn Harbor, Roslyn Estates, Greenvale, East Hills, Glen Head, Albertson, Williston, and Williston Park.

The Roslyn News is a part of the Griscom Publications, Inc., which consists of seven important Long Island weeklies.

In 1933, the Roslyn News, together with the Great Neck Record and the Oyster Bay Enterprise and Pilot were acquired by Bronson W. Griscom, of Syosset, and Barklie Henry, of Wheatley Hills, to form the Township Press. Two years later, in April 1936, the Township Press had grown to be a chain of nine papers and it then merged with the Woodyard Publications of New York—publishers of seven weekly papers—to form the Griscom-Woodyard Publications, Inc.

Later, Bronson W. Griscom formed the Griscom Publications, Inc., which has been responsible for the publication and growth as a community force of the Roslyn News.

In October 1954 the Roslyn News, under the editorial leadership of James J. Tuite, went into the tabloid format, a move which was hailed by local residents as giving the paper easier readability and a new freshness. Under Mr. Tuite's guidance, the Roslyn News has increased its circulation almost 50 percent.

In celebration of its anniversary, the Roslyn News is planning to move next month into modern and larger offices located at 45 Lincoln Avenue, Roslyn Heights.

The staff of the Roslyn News includes, in addition to editor, James J. Tuite; Harry V. Forgeron as advertising manager; Mrs. Esther T. Jacobs, associate editor; and Mrs. Anne Schlansky, circulation manager.

A Report of My Efforts To Relieve the Un- employment Situation in the Altoona, Pa., Area

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the acute unemployment situation in the Altoona, Pa., area has had my undivided attention for the past many months. Despite the fact that Altoona has been classified since 1949 as a labor-surplus area, the degree of unemployment has mounted during the past 16 months so that it is now classified by the United States Department of Labor as being in an area having a very substantial labor surplus.

It is encouraging to state that the unemployment situation in Altoona and vicinity has been attacked on all fronts with business and labor groups working collectively while the citizens of Altoona voluntarily contributed better than three-quarters of a million dollars in a "Jobs for Joes" campaign to finance the efforts being made to attract new industries to the Altoona area. This "Jobs for Joes" campaign supplements the program of the Altoona Enterprises, Inc., a subsidiary of the Altoona Chamber of Commerce, which raised in excess of

\$600,000 for the purpose of assuring continued employment. Already several new industries have been secured because of the splendid response to the appeal of Altoona Enterprises, Inc.

The unemployment situation in Altoona is the result of a sick coal industry which is reflected in a marked decrease in employment in the railroad and other related industries. Nearly 18 percent of the employables in the Altoona area are unemployed, or a total of 10,000 jobless persons, 6,000 of which are furloughed railroad employees. This unemployment situation is attributable to three factors: First, loss of coal markets because of the use of substitute fuels, chiefly foreign residual oil; second, dieselization of the Nation's railroads, which replaced steam locomotives; third, the general effect of unemployment in the coal and railroad industries, which is reflected in allied industries.

Recently I had occasion to write to Mr. Murray M. Gassman, national CIO representative in Altoona, Pa., on the subject of unemployment in the Altoona area outlining the efforts that have been and are being made to relieve the unemployment situation.

My letter to Mr. Gassman follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 19, 1955.

MR. MURRAY M. GASSMAN,

United Railroad Workers of America,

CIO, Local Union 2017, Altoona,

Pa.

DEAR MR. GASSMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of February 14, our telephone conversation of February 16 and my telegram to you of February 19 regarding my attendance at a mass membership meeting of your organization in Altoona, February 23, 1955.

As mentioned in my telegram of February 19, according to the legislative program announced by the House leadership early Friday evening, February 18, a busy legislative program is scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday, February 23 and February 24, 1955. In addition, committee meetings are scheduled for both morning and afternoon on these dates when matters affecting my congressional district will be discussed which require my presence.

Since there is no legislative business scheduled for Washington's birthday, February 22, as mentioned in our telephone conversation on February 16, I am committed to spend the entire day at the Pennsylvania State University, State College, Pa., which is in my congressional district. To keep this engagement at State College which concerns the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Penn State, I will travel by train in both directions because of weather conditions. Therefore, you will understand regardless of the legislative program on Wednesday and Thursday that it is a physical impossibility for me to be in Altoona on Wednesday evening, February 23, as I will not get back to Washington until Wednesday morning.

You stated in your letter of February 14 that the meeting on February 23 was called for the purpose of accelerating efforts in helping alleviate the unemployment crisis and to receive a report from the United States Representative from the 20th (not 23d) Congressional District regarding a program he may have to help the unemployed. Since it will be physically impossible for me to attend the meeting, the following report is presented which contains information which was furnished several weeks ago to the Altoona Community Welfare Council, copies being furnished to your associates of the

Blair County United Labor Council as well as to the Altoona newspapers. There is herewith enclosed copies of the information furnished which has been designated exhibits A, B, and C. Copies of the bills mentioned in these exhibits are also attached.

As you will note in my letter of January 7, 1955, to Charles A. Mentzer, executive director, Altoona Community Welfare Council marked as exhibit A, after exhausting all efforts to find legal authority on the part of the Federal Government to cope with the Altoona unemployment situation, the following program was developed as represented by the following bills I introduced on the first day of the 84th Congress, January 5, 1955, all of which are pending before appropriate committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in each bill.

H. R. 860 provides a program of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor and for other purposes.

H. R. 861 provides temporary unemployment benefits to unemployed railroaders whose benefits terminated after January 1, 1955, by extending the period of eligibility for railroad-unemployment insurance to July 1, 1955.

H. R. 862 amends the Social Security Act by prohibiting the several States from taking a lien against the real estate of the recipient of public assistance benefits as is being done under existing law in Pennsylvania.

H. R. 863 provides for the distribution of certain surplus food commodities by use of a food stamp plan.

Since introducing H. R. 863 and as a result of further consultations with the Department of Agriculture and representatives of labor organizations, H. R. 3144 and H. R. 3145 were introduced by me, copies of which are enclosed. Both of these bills place the cost of distribution of surplus food commodities in labor surplus and disaster areas on the Federal Government as well as authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to process these food commodities into a form suitable for home consumption such as wheat into flour, corn into meal, etc. I am informed that H. R. 3144 and H. R. 3145 provide a better approach than H. R. 863 providing for a food stamp plan.

As mentioned, all of these bills that I have introduced are pending before the House committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in them. Each committee chairman concerned has received a letter from me a few days after the bills were introduced requesting that he immediately secure a report from the Government agencies concerned on the bill or bills pending before his committee and upon receipt of such report that hearings be scheduled on the bill at the earliest possible date. In addition to writing each committee chairman, I have had a personal conference with each of them furnishing them full information about the Altoona unemployment problem and urging the earliest possible action on the legislation. In addition to my contacts with the committee chairmen, the White House, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the leadership of both parties in the House of Representatives, all agencies of Government concerned have been fully informed of the unemployment situation and of my program designed to alleviate it.

As you will observe from exhibit B which concerns H. R. 861, a bill designed to provide temporary extension of railroad unemployment insurance benefits, after many hours of research on my part, all available information concerning not only the Altoona unemployment situation but also the national picture was placed in the hands of the Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 22, 1955. Since that date I have had several conferences with Chairman Percy A. Priest

whose home town, by the way, is Nashville, Tenn., where there are 2,500 railroaders unemployed. I have also written a personal letter to every member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and furnished the same information I gave Chairman Priest.

In order to develop nonpartisan support of my legislative program, I wrote a personal letter to the Governor of Pennsylvania on January 22, 1955 and a similar letter to the legislative representatives of the CIO, the A. F. of L., the International Association of Machinists, the Railway Labor Executives Association and the Operating Railroad Brotherhoods. I have received replies from the legislative representatives of the organizations mentioned and in addition, I have been in personal contact with each of them. In each instance they have given me helpful suggestions and have agreed to work collectively with me in an effort to enact my legislative program.

With reference to H. R. 861 providing for the extension of railroad unemployment insurance benefits to July 1, 1955, it is only fair to tell you that there is a division of opinion as to the practicability of its provisions. First, because the bill may lead to Federal control over railroad unemployment insurance benefits; second, because of its effect on collective bargaining in the field of wage increases and third, the bill will establish a precedent for other unemployed groups covered by unemployment insurance as administered by the several States.

As you probably know, a new Congress such as the 84th Congress spends the first two months of the year organizing and being brought up-to-date by various agencies of the government with respect to their legislative requests to Congress which include appropriations. The result is that unavoidable delay is encountered in perfecting legislation since it has to run the gauntlet of the various congressional committees before reaching the floor. In the meantime, you can be certain that I am not leaving any opportunity pass to expedite early consideration of my legislative proposals.

In addition to the legislative program I have described, your attention is called to Exhibit C which concerns the government's efforts to provide employment opportunities to the unemployed in the Altoona area. This program results from my request which brought a governmental committee to Altoona for the purpose of inventorying the skills of those unemployed and seeking to obtain employment for them. As you know, this program is in full effect at this moment.

With respect to railroad unemployment insurance problems such as delays in certifying claims or the tardy receipt of checks, a complete review of the office procedure in handling these claims was made at my request with the result that through my Altoona office I have given 24-hour service and complaints have been reduced to an absolute minimum. In addition to the personnel of the Cleveland regional office of the Railroad Retirement Board being increased and authority given for overtime pay in processing unemployment insurance applications, at this moment the United States Treasury Department is setting up the machinery whereby authority is being delegated to the regional offices of the Railroad Retirement Board to write their own checks instead of the Treasury Department thus saving a whole day in issuing them. I have spent hours in contact with officials of the Railroad Retirement Board reviewing every procedure for the purpose of eliminating delays and I feel that we have gone the limit in cutting corners.

In an effort to alleviate the unemployment problem by bringing about a diversification of industry in the Altoona area, I have been active the past several years in cooperating with individuals and groups in Altoona and my entire congressional district

in furnishing information, running down leads, and otherwise aiding in trying to attract new industries. A useful information kit compiled by the United States Department of Commerce and containing material designed to assist local groups in organizing for the purpose of securing new industries has been sent to interested persons in this congressional district.

From your knowledge of Altoona, I think you will agree that the organized effort of Altoona Enterprises, Inc., is unequalled anywhere in the United States. This fact is confirmed by the United States Department of Commerce who has commended Altoona Enterprises, Inc., for its initiative and success in raising funds for the purpose of attracting new industries to the Altoona area. At frequent intervals, I have sent a list of industrial firms that the United States Department of Commerce reported as being interested in expanding their facilities mostly as a result of the Government's dispersal order under the civil defense program. This information has been furnished to all community groups in my congressional district where there is a committee organized for the purpose of seeking new industries. As you know, at my request representatives of several Government agencies visited Altoona about a month ago and conferred with officials of the Altoona group to make certain that everything possible was being done to utilize the aid of the Federal Government in diversifying industries in the Altoona area.

Over a period of weeks I have had lunch on numerous occasions with key officials of Government and labor organizations in an effort to coordinate my activities and to develop new approaches to solving the Altoona unemployment problem. In all fairness to those with whom I have talked, they have been unable to suggest any new approach. In fact, some of these Government and labor organization officials have commended me for the determined and energetic effort I have made the past many months in trying to alleviate the unemployment situation in my congressional district.

There is attached as exhibit D several pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 17 and February 18 which reveals an additional effort on my part to relieve the unemployment situation not only in Altoona but also in the central Pennsylvania area by my opposition to the unregulated flood of foreign residual oil from Venezuela that has captured the eastern seaboard coal market thus destroying the jobs of coal miners, railroads, and those in related industries.

In regard to the series of resolutions adopted by the county and city commissioners, there is no doubt that the unemployment problem is being attacked on all fronts; namely, at the local, county, State, and national levels. With such fine spirit of co-operation, I feel that our collective efforts cannot help but produce results. In view of the activities of so many persons and groups in helping to solve the unemployment situation in Altoona, I am sending a copy of this letter to interested persons.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1955.

CHARLES A. MENTZER,

Executive Director, Altoona Community Welfare Council, Altoona, Pa.

DEAR CHARLIE: For your information, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, furnished me the following information on January 4 relative to the designation of Altoona as a disaster area:

"This has further reference to your inquiry relative to the designation of Altoona as a

disaster area. The Surplus Manpower Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization has given very careful consideration to your proposal, and after consultation with the General Counsel of ODM, the Committee has found that the present Disaster Relief Act does not permit Federal assistance for the alleviation of unemployment.

"As you know, the Disaster Relief Act (42 U. S. C. 1855-1855g) authorizing Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters reflects the intent of Congress to alleviate suffering and damage resulting from major disasters, and to foster the development of such State and local organizations and plans to cope with major disasters as may be necessary. As defined in the act, the term 'major disaster' means any 'flood, drought, fire, hurricane, earthquake, storm, or other catastrophe' in any part of the United States."

With the ODM decision that the provisions of the Disaster Relief Act are not applicable to Altoona, I arranged a meeting with representatives of the Departments of Commerce, Labor, the Small Business Administration, and the Railroad Retirement Board, which was held in Washington this week. At this meeting Mr. Dewey Coates, former resident of Altoona, and community employment consultant, Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor, Washington, D. C., was named as the coordinator of the efforts the Federal Government will make to aid unemployed railroad workers in the Altoona area.

Already the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, as part of the Committee's program, has designated Mr. Merritt Robson, a Railroad Retirement Board representative from Chicago, to proceed to Altoona immediately for the purpose of determining the skills of those unemployed so that the United States Department of Labor and the Railroad Retirement Board may unite their efforts in securing employment for such persons.

Another step in the program will bring to Altoona representatives of the United States Department of Commerce and the Small Business Administration, who will make an inventory of the production potential of all industries other than the railroad to aid the Altoona Chamber of Commerce and Altoona Enterprises, Inc., in their efforts to secure new industries. This Committee will function in accordance with the Eisenhower administration's directive that areas like Altoona with a very substantial labor surplus shall be given every possible assistance in rehabilitating their economy.

In addition to the committee mentioned in the above paragraph, I introduced on January 5, 1955, H. R. 861, a copy of which is attached. This bill provides an extension of the payment of railroad unemployment insurance benefits to July 1, 1955 for the unemployed railroaders whose benefits terminated after January 1, 1955. The bill provides that the sum of \$10 million shall be appropriated from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States to cover the cost of all the benefits provided in the bill. Through the extension of railroad employment insurance benefits for the first 6 months of 1955, assistance will be rendered the unemployed while they await either recall to service or obtain employment elsewhere through the united efforts of the Railroad Retirement Board and the United States Department of Labor.

In addition to H. R. 861, I introduced H. R. 860 to provide for a program of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor. This bill which I had pending in the 83d Congress when it adjourned, also provides for an appropriation of \$3 billion to cover the cost of my proposed public works program.

To further assist the unemployed and their families, I introduced on January 5, 1955, H. R. 863, to provide for the distribu-

tion of certain surplus food commodities by use of a food stamp plan, and requested that the necessary expenses of administering the food stamp plan be borne by the Federal Government.

To protect the property of all those who may be called upon to depend on public assistance from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I introduced H. R. 862, which prohibits the several States from taking a lien against the real estate of the recipient as is being done under existing law.

The legislative program for the relief of the unemployed railroaders in my congressional district outlined in this letter has been called to the attention of the leadership of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress and the chairman of the congressional committees concerned urging immediate consideration of the legislation. In addition, I am personally contacting every Member of Congress and officials of organized labor including railroad brotherhoods, asking their assistance in securing early congressional action.

As you know, the 84th Congress convened this week and it will be the early part of February before the legislative machinery will begin to function. Meanwhile, you can be certain that I shall continue my determined efforts to provide relief for the unemployed by obtaining early action on my legislative proposals.

I am sending copies of this letter to interested persons in the Altoona area for their information.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 22, 1955.
Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PERCY: You will remember our recent conversation concerning my bill, H. R. 861, a copy of which is attached and which provides temporary extension to June 30, 1955, of railroad unemployment insurance benefits to those who have or will have exhausted their rights under existing laws.

There are 24 areas in the United States where a substantial number of railroad workers are unemployed because of a permanent or indefinite shutdown of railroad facilities. Starting early this month, many of these unemployed railroad workers exhausted their rights to railroad unemployment insurance with the result that there exists a most acute economic problem in these areas.

For an illustration, according to information furnished me by the Railroad Retirement Board, in Nashville, Tenn., 2,500 railroaders are unemployed and the survey reveals that the local industry other than the railroads will be able to absorb only a few of them. The result is that in your hometown of Nashville there are some 2,500 unemployed railroaders and their families who have lost or are about to lose their unemployment-insurance benefits which is their only source of income.

In my hometown of Altoona, Pa., there are 6,000 unemployed railroad workers whose unemployment-insurance benefits began to expire January 10, and in the matter of a few weeks some 4,500 will have exhausted their rights to unemployment-insurance benefits. Since Altoona's basic economy is the railroad industry, the only source of income left for these furloughed railroaders and their families is public assistance because local industries cannot provide employment for them. Therefore, my hometown has a similar acute economic problem to that of your hometown of Nashville.

At my request, the United States Department of Labor and the Railroad Retirement Board have made a survey of the Altoona

situation with the result that the skills of unemployed railroaders have been classified and every effort will be made to secure employment for them elsewhere. While this effort is being made to obtain employment for this group, my bill, H. R. 861, will extend their railroad unemployment insurance benefits to the end of the present fiscal year as if they had retained their eligibility. You will observe that I have requested an appropriation of \$10 million from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States so as to finance the cost of the extension and not disturb the solvency of the railroad unemployment insurance fund.

As I said in the beginning, there are 24 areas in the United States which include your hometown and my hometown that are faced with this acute economic problem resulting from unemployment in the railroad industry. I have delayed writing this letter to you so as to permit adequate time for perfecting the organization of your committee. Now that your committee is organized, it is my hope that you can give the subject of railroad unemployment top priority and arrange to discuss it at either a full committee meeting or assign it to a subcommittee so hearings can be held.

On behalf of the citizens of Altoona, I wish to inform you that everything possible is being done from a community standpoint to relieve the unemployment situation, and it is hoped that the extension of unemployment-insurance benefits will receive early consideration by your committee.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

Twenty-four areas where a substantial number of railroad workers are unemployed because of a permanent or indefinite shutdown of railroad facilities

Area	Number currently unemployed	Number estimated to obtain other employment in the community	Number estimated to remain unemployed
Albany, N. Y. ¹	1,884	28	1,826
Altoona, Pa. ²	6,000	0	6,000
Baltimore, Md.	1,336	0	0
Birmingham, Ala.	1,300	260	1,040
Buffalo, N. Y. ¹	486	100	385
Columbus, Ohio	1,107	400	707
Cumberland, Md.	600	100	500
DeSoto, Mo.	500	50	450
Duluth, Minn.	1,450	0	1,450
El Paso, Tex.	550	100	450
Harrisburg, Pa.	1,723	100	1,623
Indianapolis, Ind.	1,400	1,000	400
Huntingdon, W. Va.			
Ashland, Ky. ¹	1,465	225	1,240
Johnstown, Pa. ¹	400	200	200
Knoxville, Tenn. ¹	700	175	525
Las Vegas, Nev.	470	15	455
Nashville, Tenn.	2,500	very few	2,500
Philadelphia-Reading, Pa.-Wilmington, Del.			
Pittsburgh, Pa. (entire district)	2,000	1,000	1,000
Scranton, Pa. ¹	11,642	1,100	10,542
St. Louis, Mo. ¹	711	10	701
Terre Haute, Ind. ¹	1,100	80	1,020
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa. ¹	800	200	600
Williamsport-Northumberland, Pa.	508	10	498
	742	50	692

¹ Included in group IV-A areas of substantial labor surplus.

² Included in group IV-B areas of very substantial labor surplus.

³ Practically all.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 25, 1955.

To: Regional Directors, regions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

From: Director of unemployment and sickness insurance.

Subject: Railroad unemployment, Altoona, Pa.

Please refer to our memorandum of January 18, 1955, on the above subject. In that memorandum we mentioned that unemployment of railroad workers in Altoona, Pa., is attracting national attention and informed you that you would be requested to ask your field offices to develop orders for recruitment in Altoona as soon as information was available from the inventory of unemployed railroad workers then in progress.

Attached is a tabulation showing by age groups the number of unemployed railroad workers in Altoona (Blair County) in each occupation or occupational group listed. A majority of these claimants have already been paid the maximum amount of UI benefits to which they are entitled this benefit year. A high proportion do not have enough 1954 earnings to be qualified next year.

You are requested to forward this tabulation to each field office in your region and ask them to contact all railroad hiring officials who might possibly have need for the

services of employees in any of the occupations listed. Any orders developed are to be written up on form ES-113a and forwarded direct to the district manager at Altoona, Pa. All sections of form ES-113a should be carefully completed. Depending on the conditions of the order, particularly arrangements for transportation and physical examination requirements, the district manager at Altoona will either (1) refer applicants in person direct to the hiring official shown on the order, or (2) will forward to the hiring official an application form similar to exhibit A of FOM-III-4.

Please request your field offices to give top priority to this attempt to develop orders for recruitment in Altoona. It is requested that all hiring officials be contacted and all possible clearance orders obtained and forwarded to Altoona no later than February 4, 1955.

H. L. CARTER.

Active claimants, Jan. 1, 1955, Altoona, Pa. (Blair County)

Occupational groups	Age groups						Total
	Under 25	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 and over	
Group 1: Executives, professional men, telegraphers, and clerks.....	12	34	9	7	1	0	63
Group 2:							
Trainmen and engineers:							
Brakemen.....	13	57	20	2	1	0	93
Firemen.....	0	20	46	41	8	0	115
Switchmen.....	1	2	1	1	1	0	7
Group 3:							
Skilled trades journeymen:							
Blacksmith.....	0	3	12	2	2	0	19
Boilermaker.....	0	2	7	5	2	1	17
Carman.....	0	45	73	22	6	0	146
Electrician.....	1	18	49	14	1	0	83
Machinist.....	0	56	147	66	9	4	272
Molder.....	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
Mason.....	0	0	3	1	0	0	4
Painter and Painter B. & B.....	8	29	9	0	0	0	46
Pipefitter.....	0	15	41	11	0	0	67
Sheetmetal worker.....	1	3	22	9	4	0	39
Welder.....	3	11	31	8	1	0	54
Upholsterer.....	4	2	0	0	0	0	6
Group 4:							
Skilled trade helpers and apprentices:							
Blacksmith helper.....	1	23	19	11	5	3	62
Carman helper.....	3	157	172	67	9	0	408
Electrician helper and apprentice.....	13	52	52	13	0	1	136
Machinist helper and apprentice.....	15	43	134	50	10	0	252
Miscellaneous helpers and apprentices.....	9	45	54	30	8	5	151
Pipefitter helper and apprentices.....	0	14	33	10	3	0	60
Group 5: Laborers, baggage express and freight handlers.....	45	684	794	416	115	10	2,064
Group 6: Attendants, cooks, porters and waiters.....	2	4	6	13	6	0	31
Total.....	131	1,327	1,735	790	192	24	4,199

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 17, 1955]

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule because it will not permit amendments to H. R. 1 when it is read under the 5-minute rule.

This closed rule is a gag rule and denies me as a representative of some 300,000 people to offer amendments to the bill that will protect their interests as American wage earners.

We who live in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, have made every effort possible to obtain relief from the adverse effects of the unlimited and unrestricted importation of foreign residual oil which is one of the main factors in wrecking our economy. Unless those of us from coal-producing States are permitted to offer amendments to H. R. 1 curbing the flood of foreign residual oil, we have no other means of stopping it.

The unemployment in my congressional district is mounting daily and as of January 1, 1955, there were 18 percent of our employables unemployed. It is in the name of the unemployed in my district who are today living on public assistance and surplus

food commodities, that I ask that this closed rule be defeated.

I am sure that the membership of this House if given an opportunity to vote on an amendment providing for a 10 percent quota limitation on the importation of foreign residual oil that such an amendment will be approved overwhelmingly, since it will restore employment and also protect the jobs of those presently employed.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, 1955]

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the opposition expressed by a great many Members of this House to the gag rule now in effect on H. R. 1 reveals the feeling on the part of a great percentage of the American people that this legislation should be open for amendments.

I opposed the gag rule yesterday, and shall vote to recommit the bill. If the motion to recommit the bill fails, I shall vote against H. R. 1 on final passage because the interests of American wage earners are not protected.

After all, it is only through appropriate amendments that the jobs of American wage earners can be protected.

As the printed hearings on H. R. 1 will show, a long list of Members of Congress as well as spokesmen for numerous industries appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee pleading that H. R. 1 be amended in order that relief might be provided to many of our basic industries which have suffered because of the unfair competition resulting from a flood of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

Many Members of Congress who appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in protest against the damaging effects on the jobs of American wage earners resulting from reciprocal trade agreements have supported the principle of reciprocal trade in previous Congresses but to use their own words—they could not continue to do so any longer unless appropriate amendments were adopted.

When I first came to Congress in 1939 I opposed reciprocal trade agreements on the grounds that they were destroying the jobs of coal miners in my congressional district in Pennsylvania. At that time, imported Russian coal had captured some of the eastern seaboard coal markets from coal producers in my congressional district.

During the early part of World War II and before resigning my seat in Congress to return to military service, I supported the extension of reciprocal trade agreements in the 78th Congress because we were at war and the demand for coal revived our coal industry.

When I was elected to the 80th Congress I voted in favor of extending reciprocal trade agreements with the understanding that American industries would be protected from unfair competition resulting from a flood of cheaply manufactured foreign goods.

For example, in Pennsylvania residual oil from Venezuela was beginning to flood the eastern seaboard, thus destroying the market for Pennsylvania-mined coal.

During the 82d Congress I voted to extend reciprocal trade agreements because there was contained therein the so-called peril-point amendment which was designed to provide a checkrein on imports that could destroy the jobs of American wage earners.

During the 83d Congress I joined many of my colleagues in an effort to stop the uncontrolled flow of foreign goods. Many of you will recall that we were supporting the Simpson bill. My special interest was in regulating the flood of foreign residual oil by placing a quota limitation on the importation of such oil. As many of you will recall, the Simpson bill was returned to the committee.

During the early part of 1954 the so-called Randall committee was created and took testimony from spokesmen for industries adversely affected by the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign goods. I regret to state that the coal industry was denied the opportunity to present its side of the case. Consequently the Randall report ignored the increasingly serious situation existing in the coal-producing States of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, by my votes as a Member of Congress there is ample proof that I believe in the principles of reciprocal trade agreements and that I supported them until I found a wholesale disregard for protecting the jobs of American workmen.

It became evident that the so-called peril-point amendment was meaningless and that the Randall committee merely performed a window-dressing job and actually by their recommendations threw American wage earners to the wolves.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the extension of reciprocal trade agreements last year and I intend to continue to do so until the interest of the American working man is protected.

As a means of attaining the objective of protecting the jobs of American workmen,

I have 3 bills pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, namely: H. R. 345, H. R. 864, and H. R. 3019.

H. R. 345 is designed to provide a 5-percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil; while H. R. 3019 would increase the limitation to 10 percent.

H. R. 864 provides a permanent procedure for the adjustment of tariff rates on a selective basis and regulates the flow of imported articles on a basis of fair competition with domestic articles. H. R. 864 also contains a 5-percent quota limitation on imports of foreign residual oil.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. R. 1 because it will continue the disastrous effects on our economy by the reckless importation of foreign goods manufactured at a fraction of the wages paid American workmen.

For several weeks the House Ways and Means Committee has heard expert testimony from spokesmen for various industries regarding the adverse effects reciprocal trade agreements are having on our industrial economy. These experts produced facts showing that the employees of the industry affected not only lost their jobs but many of the manufacturing plants have been driven to financial distress, and in some instances were forced to close their doors.

Spokesmen for the coal industry told how the flood of foreign residual oil from Venezuela has destroyed the domestic coal markets of the miners in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia.

Back in 1939 when I first voiced my opposition to the importation of slave-mined Russian coal and other cheaply manufactured foreign products, I predicted that such a reckless policy would create ghost towns out of many communities in my congressional district and throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, my prediction of 1939 has become a reality. Practically all of our deep mines in central Pennsylvania are closed and thousands of miners have been out of work for several years. In fact, many mining towns have been abandoned and their empty and dilapidated rows of houses stand as a monument to the destructive effects of the importation of foreign residual oil. Because they have nowhere to go, there are only a few of the unemployed in the coal-fields of central Pennsylvania that have left the area. The result is that today, according to the United States Department of Labor, my congressional district is classified as a critical area because of the fact that nearly 18 percent of the civilian labor force is unemployed.

This unemployment is not confined to coal miners, but includes those employed in affected related industries such as the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, in my home city of Altoona, Pa., nearly 10,000 people are unemployed, 6,000 of whom are railroad employees with 4,100 of this number having exhausted their rights on January 10, 1955 to railroad unemployment insurance benefits. A similar condition exists among coal miners and others who have lost their right to unemployment compensation benefits from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, every community in my congressional district has an active committee engaged in trying to attract new industries and millions of dollars have been raised by voluntary subscription to finance this long-range program of rehabilitating the industrial economy of the area.

While this united community effort goes on, thousands of my constituents—all good Americans and victims of this reckless foreign-trade policy—are today dependent for their existence upon public assistance and surplus food commodities.

I regret that every member of this Committee is unable to talk to these unemployed Americans as they stand in line to

pick up their food coupons. If it were possible for you to talk to them, you would hear the pitiful story of their plight as citizens of a nation that boasts of its high standard of living.

As I mentioned a moment ago, communities affected by unemployment in cooperation with the State and Federal Government are endeavoring to rehabilitate their economy by attracting new industries. The unemployment situation, however, is getting worse as mines continue to close and more miners and railroaders are losing their jobs.

While this unfortunate situation prevails in the United States, residents of Venezuela, which is the chief exporter of residual oil, are enjoying unbridled prosperity.

Let me read you excerpts from Hal Boyle's syndicated column of January 24, 1955, titled "Venezuela Seen As the Texas of South America":

"So much money is being made here (Venezuela) that visiting Texans actually get an inferiority complex and the United States dollar feels like 50 cents. . . . The visitor has a dazed sensation he is caught in a mid-century Klondike gold rush. The atmosphere of quick money is overwhelming, and tales of riches made overnight are a bolivar a dozen. . . . Venezuela is bigger than Texas and Oklahoma combined and larger than any European country except Germany. . . . Its chief income is from oil—no land except the United States produces more. . . ."

"Although the nation has a population of only 5½ million, the Government spent half a billion dollars in 1954 on vast public-works projects and still ended up with \$80 million left in the till. . . . Foreign investors from the United States and Europe are pouring untold millions into the industrialization of the country. It has taken in more than 100,000 immigrants from Europe the last 10 years. . . ."

"Caracas, the 388-year-old capital, is now one of the world's greatest boom cities. Fifty years ago milkmen herded cows through its ancient streets. Today they are jammed by thousands of new high-priced motorcars. . . . Nearly a million people live in the metropolitan area, and so many new buildings are going up construction workers have no time to even take Sundays off to go to the bullfights.

"But the city has abysmal poverty as well as tremendous wealth. The shanties of the poor still crowd many of the raw red hills that stud Caracas. The Government has torn down thousands of these eyesores and replaced them with forty 15-story apartment buildings at a cost of \$24 million. Workmen can rent the apartments for \$6 to \$30 a month, own them after a period of 20 years.

"In 1955 the Government plans to tear down 6,500 more shacks and spend \$25 million more on apartment projects for low-income workers."

Mr. Chairman, what a contrast it is to compare living conditions in Venezuela with the coal fields of Pennsylvania.

May I add that the prosperity enjoyed in Venezuela is to a great extent at the expense of the misery and suffering of residents of the coal-producing States of our Nation and especially of my congressional district.

At this very minute a quarter of a million ton tanker ship is tied up at an east coast dock carrying disaster to the coal, railroad and related industries of this Nation, in much the same manner as rat-infested vessels brought disease into our port cities in years gone by.

This foreign tanker with its bunker space filled with residual oil is dumping it in violation of every American concept of fair competition. As a matter of fact, even if the miners of our Nation would work for nothing and the railroads transported the coal for practically nothing, the coal industry could not compete with this unfair com-

petition from foreign residual oil because its price is continually manipulated downward to capture the eastern seaboard coal market.

Mr. Chairman, it is being said in defense of residual oil that the oil companies have been requested to restrict voluntarily the amount of residual oil imported quarterly.

It has also been said that if any restrictions are placed on the importation of foreign residual oil that we will offend Venezuela.

Let me state, Mr. Chairman, that every time a coal miner loses his job because of the unfair competition from foreign residual oil a railroad has also been added to the list of the unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent coal-producing States recognize foreign residual oil as the archenemy of our industrial economy.

Therefore, I plead with you that H. R. 1 be returned to committee so that appropriate amendments can be adopted.

As far as I am concerned, it is about time we start adopting some of the policies foreign nations apply against us in protecting the jobs of their industrial workers.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1 without appropriate amendments will not correct the unemployment situation and afford the necessary relief to distressed industries and therefore I cannot conscientiously vote for it.

Meet Brooklyn, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was with great interest and I assure you with deep pride that I read in the Christian Science Monitor for February 18, 1955, the article entitled "Meet Brooklyn, U. S. A." By that title, proper tribute is rendered the community of Brooklyn which has contributed so very much to the greatest city, the greatest State, and the greatest Nation in the world. I include it here so that others will find pleasure and enlightenment in reading it:

MEET BROOKLYN, U. S. A.

(By H. A. Morris)

Most Americans know nothing of Brooklyn, N. Y., except what they read in the papers. Often these reports aren't flattering.

In reality, Brooklyn is one of the world's premier cities. In size it ranks third among the communities of the United States. As a voter's community it is second only to Cook County, Ill. The city also ranks third in the number of its industrial concerns, and fifth in the total value of its manufactured products.

Brooklyn, although only 1 of the 5 boroughs that comprise Greater New York, is separated from Manhattan by the East River and connected by 3 large bridges and a tunnel. It is made up of numerous sections, the best known of which are Flatbush, Williamsburg, Ridgewood, and Bay Ridge. Although governed by the Mayor of New York and the city council, Brooklyn has its own borough president and municipal officers and its own postmaster.

The history of Brooklyn began in 1660 when 134 hardy Dutch settlers occupied a strip of its shore. They were later joined by groups of English, Walloons, and French

Huguenots, and when the first United States census was taken in 1790 their numbers had grown to 5,000. The area was a small agricultural community for over 200 years, but a rapid development took place after the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge in 1883. In 1898 the separate city charter was given up and, through consolidation, Brooklyn became a part of New York City, as we now know it.

One of the first free schools was built in Brooklyn in the 1600's. The city was the first to free slaves under the Manumission Act of 1798. James Gordon Bennett and Horace Greeley, two of the greatest of newspaper editors, are buried there. Brooklyn manufactures 732 different articles, more than any other American community.

Brooklyn had the first heated horsecars in America. The borough ranks second as the coffee roasting center of the world. It is one of the Nation's leading centers for the manufacture of knit goods and food products, for fur dressing and for ship and boat building.

The *Monitor*, the ship that had the famous encounter with the *Merrimac*, and many of our great warships today were built at the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The Bush Terminal, which covers an area of 200 acres, is the largest single coordination of manufacture, storage and shipping in the world. Brooklyn high schools are among the finest and best equipped in existence. The St. George Hotel has over 2,000 rooms and a beautiful salt water swimming pool.

Brooklyn has 81 parks. The largest, Prospect Park, covers 526 acres. It lies on the ground where the historic battle of Long Island was fought and is said to be worth \$150 million.

Brooklyn has a wonderful children's museum, a beautiful botanic garden, an institute of arts and sciences, an academy of music, almost 60 hospitals, 4 major colleges and 201.5 miles of waterfront.

The borough is often called the "City of Churches" and it deserves the title. Starting with 3 churches in 1864, Brooklyn now has almost 800 places of worship. Church properties in the city have an estimated value of \$200 million.

Brooklyn boasts three of the world's largest playgrounds. Coney Island has 5 miles of bathing beach, and is internationally known. Manhattan and Brighton beaches are also large enough to attract thousands of bathers.

Novelist Betty Smith, Singer Phil Regan, Radio Comedian Bud Abbott, Playwright Irwin Shaw, Shep Fields and Vincent Lopez, the orchestra leaders; Phil Rizuto, Tommy Holmes, and Billy Loes, the ballplayers, all came from Brooklyn. So did the one and only Mickey Rooney and the biggest share of the boys of the 1st Infantry Division, the first American outfit to land in north Africa, Sicily, and Europe during World War II.

Brooklyn is truly a big city, with 50,000 retail stores and a population approaching three and a half million.

Despite its critics, Brooklyn is really in the U. S. A.

Freedom Message to People Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal aims of our post-World War II

foreign policy is to gain and hold the confidence of all freedom-loving peoples in our unrelenting struggle against totalitarianism. In this global battle in defense of our beliefs and ideals we need to have all believers in democracy closely united spiritually and morally to our cause. We and our friends and allies are convinced that the cause for which we are prepared to fight with all our might is the cause of humanity; it is the sacred cause of all free men. On that issue there is and should be no question in our mind. There can be no doubts or uncertainties. For when one is girding himself for a bloody battle, he must have no misgivings about the righteousness of his cause.

Today in our struggle against totalitarian communism, that fearsome and godless doctrine whose fanatical adherents have already enslaved almost one-third of the world's population, not only should we help all free peoples, but we should also seek ways of encouraging and inspiring those unfortunate millions in Communist-dominated countries who are being held in servitude against their will.

In this connection our principal task should be to keep alive the spirit of freedom in those peoples. Next to actual liberation, the best thing we can do, and I am sure we can do it effectively is, to inspire them with confidence and instill in them some hope, to show them some gleam of light, something indicating that they have friends and sympathizers in the free world who are seriously concerned with their fate. That is the purpose for which the Voice of America has been working, an endeavor which our taxpaying citizens are gladly supporting. The broadcasts sponsored by the free Europe group have similar ends in view. These broadcasts have done a good job in enlisting more friends for the cause of democracy. However, radio broadcasts have certain limitations. Many people in the Communist-dominated countries do not have radios, and furthermore radio broadcasts can be jammed. Consequently, alternative methods of reaching the people of Eastern Europe are required. One very effective method of dealing with the situation is by distributing leaflets with freedom messages to Iron Curtain countries by balloons. Of course, there is nothing novel in this suggestion. It has been tried on various occasions in the course of the past several years and has proved to be quite effective. In the resolution—House Joint Resolution 76—which I recently introduced, it is proposed to regularize this system, and thus make it more effective. This resolution also suggests an additional measure. It proposes that not only freedom messages but also food packages be dropped over Iron Curtain countries by balloons. This should prove far more effective than the leaflets alone. Our experience with distributing food parcels in Berlin has demonstrated that this type of psychological weapon has a powerful impact. If we should now use it in conjunction with freedom messages, it would not only give added force to those messages and help to convince the recipients of our

sincerity, but the food might also help save many victims of Communist tyranny from starvation.

In view of our past experience, this idea of sending our freedom messages and food packages to Iron Curtain countries by balloons is certainly worth trying. As has been stated in the proposed resolution, the food for this purpose is to come out of our surplus agricultural commodities. The administration of the whole scheme under the Secretary of State, would cost no more than \$2 million. It would be one of the cheapest and most effective methods of winning deserving and worthy friends behind the Iron Curtain for the cause of humanity and for free democracy. I sincerely suggest that we try it.

The Golden Anniversary of the United States Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in Appendix of the Record, I include the following excellent editorial by Don Saults, editor of the Missouri Conservationist, on the golden anniversary of the United States Forest Service which was established 50 years ago this month:

THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

It was just 50 years ago this month that the United States Forest Service was born. Its sire was Gifford Pinchot and its dam was intelligent planning; its godfather was Theodore Roosevelt and its godmother was Congress.

The Service has had a distinguished life since then, and it would appear to be in a state of vigorous maturity today. It was reared, nurtured and educated according to a basic precept enunciated by Godfather Teddy: "Forestry is the preservation of forests by wise use. And wisdom has been a pretty good guide to behavior even though men change the legends by which they live."

Gifford Pinchot became the first chief of the Forest Service; he was also the first native American to have professional training in forestry. And the Service has been run by professionals ever since. This seems a reasonably sound idea, too, in fields as widely separated as medicine and baseball.

Forest Service has a lot of children, now. Nearly all States have their agencies working in the field, just as Missouri has its forestry division in the conservation commission. Thirty universities and colleges, among them the University of Missouri, offer full instruction in forestry. (Pinchot had to go to Europe to learn.) Forty-five States—including Missouri—have extension programs in forestry conducted by the State agricultural colleges. And today, some 5,000 professional foresters are employed by private industry in the United States.

Back in the days of its callow youth, Forest Service wasn't quite socially acceptable and frequently got snubbed by local people. But at 50 years of age, Service has become not only respectable but even a romantic hero subject of movies, novels, and radio programs.

How times do change in 50 years. Too bad the men who dreamed the great dreams, who birthed the idea, aren't around to see people accept their scion as a distinguished citizen.

Just consider the matter of public forests, pretty much taken for granted today, although attacks are still being made on them by interests who have learned nothing and forgotten nothing since the turn of the century. Ever think what would have happened to our national forests if a protecting hand hadn't been laid on them a half century ago?

Those public forests—nearly 1,500,000 acres of them in Missouri—are big lumbering operations on the controlled-use principle, though our acreage here is only now developing into the harvest stage. Apart from sustained yield, they were visited by 35 million people last year, not just visited but used by those people for hunting, fishing, and outdoor recreation.

The Service is helping educate a lot of people, too. The most dramatic example of that is the development of Smokey Bear as symbol of cooperative forest-fire prevention, a program jointly conducted by the State foresters and the Service.

It has been a good 50 years, despite two world wars and an amazing growth in population and industry, which meant tremendous pressure against the Forest Service. But what will the future bring?

The Service doesn't know, any more than in 1905 it could foresee 1955. But it guesses there will be steady growth for forest recreation and for timber needs; that the forests' protective role on the watersheds will become even more important. Perhaps forestry research will develop new and better kinds of trees and other concepts of timber management.

Fifty years can be a long time to men, but it isn't much to a redwood or even to a Missouri white oak.

So the 18-year-old conservation commission of Missouri wishes the 50-year-old Forest Service of the United States a cheery golden anniversary and many, many happy returns of the day.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks by way of explanation of my vote against H. R. 1, I am concerned with the protection of America's industrial and agricultural production. During the past 20 years we have seen a tremendous reduction in our tariff barriers, and abnormal world conditions have been such as to make it difficult to assess the full effect of these changes in our tariff structure on our national economy. It is safe to say that the United States is no longer one of the high tariff nations. Our tariffs are now at their lowest point in history, and average only about 5.1 percent of the value of imports. In addition, it is to be considered that actually our tariffs affect less than one-third of our total imports.

There are many factors that affect free trade between the nations of the world. Import quotas, currency restrictions,

monopolies, government trading, cartels, and other devices are far tighter barriers to free trade than tariffs. The United States actually permits freer trade than any other industrialized country in the world, because, except with respect to quotas on agricultural products subject to price supports, it does not engage in these practices. The use of such devices by other nations has increased markedly during the past 20 years.

It is my feeling that a sound, stable, and prosperous economy in the United States is the world's greatest hope at this time. The theory that the United States should import those things that can be produced more cheaply abroad and emphasize production of those things which we ourselves can produce more cheaply is not true under present world conditions. We need a broad base of all industries for our Nation's economic strength, and some segments of our economy have to be protected to insure that condition.

Our Government is great because it is composed of a system of checks and balances and I believe that the escape-clause provisions should be strengthened and implemented toward that end. In addition, I feel that H. R. 1 was too great a departure from the time-proven basic American concept that we should have a Government of law and not a Government of men.

If Giveaways Are Sound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include an editorial from the Omaha World Herald entitled "If Giveaways Are Sound."

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has given away more than \$40 billion of American money since 1948 trying to save other nations and to buy some good will. This money was borrowed from the American taxpayer. It is a part of our debt structure. If you or I or any individual would proceed on the same theory that we should borrow money from the bank and go in debt so we could give it away, then surely someone, sooner or later, would suggest that we be examined by a psychiatrist.

It would seem that the money we have given away has bought more ill will than good will. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will this year examine with great care the money already available for the many foreign aid programs and the amount of money requested for additional programs. It is my humble opinion that we could well cut out all economic aid which would assist to balance our budget and perhaps even permit a small reduction in our taxes. I would suggest that military aid be made

available only to those countries who prove to be our friends and will fight when the chips are down.

The editorial follows:

IF GIVEAWAYS ARE SOUND

Last fall America's master of global giveaways, Harold Stassen, announced that his Foreign Aid Administration would buy 10 million tons of coal for distribution abroad.

Nothing was done about the coal until the other day when Kentucky Senator CLEMENTS asked Mr. Stassen if he could move Kentucky's share, 2 million tons, some time between now and October.

"Yes, if Kentucky wants it," said Mr. Stassen.

"Do they want it," said Senator CLEMENTS. "They want it as of yesterday."

"They," of course, are Kentucky coal interests. The idea is to relieve a depressed industry through Government purchases.

Now that foreign aid is in disrepute the country over, and almost everybody realizes the program won't buy allies or insure peace, the FOA is badly trying to buy allies here at home—allies who have a financial interest in continuing foreign aid.

If there's not enough demand for the high-priced coal that John L. Lewis' miners are digging, so goes this reasoning, then give it away, let the taxpayers foot the bill, but by all means keep the miners at work.

By the same token, if there's no market in America for the flood of price-supported farm crops, then dump the stuff on the world markets at cut-rate prices, or give it away as was done in the case of India.

There is a certain logic in this, once one accepts the premise that giveaways are a fine and sensible means of achieving desirable ends. For if it is a good idea to rescue foreigners in distress, it obviously is an even better idea to rescue depressed industries in America. Charity, after all, should begin at home.

But if this philosophy is accepted, why limit rescue operations to depressed industries only? Why not insure full employment, overtime, and everlasting prosperity simply by having the Government buy everything that can't be sold at home and give it away abroad?

Automobiles, for instance. They're streaming out of the factories at the rate of 8 million a year and the experts are shaking their heads, saying the boom can't last through the year. Why not keep the auto factories humming at full speed, why not give Reuther his guaranteed annual wage (because the industry would have guaranteed annual production and profits), and spread the shining product of Detroit as a free-for-nothing gift the world around?

Henry Wallace was a piker with his proposal of a quart of milk a day for the Hot-tentots. Why not throw in a new V-8, a 24-inch television set, and chicken every Sunday?

If a still, small voice should ask who's paying for all this, silence him quickly, for he is either a willful reactionary or an ignorant character who has not caught the vision. No true believer in the giveaway principle would ask such a foolish and unenlightened question.

The Late Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my apprecia-

tion of the life and services of the late Pete Jarman.

The untimely death of Hon. Pete Jarman, of Alabama, a former distinguished and very useful Member of this House, brought very great sadness to me, and my heart aches for his charming wife. Mr. Jarman was a Member of Congress and was serving with distinction on the Foreign Affairs Committee when I came in January of 1939. He continued to serve his constituents and the country as a whole for a number of years, gaining in stature each year. After his retirement from the House he was appointed Ambassador to the Commonwealth of Australia where he represented our Government at Canberra in this far-away, but relatively new country. In that capacity he gave his best efforts at all times, and he continued in this capacity until 1953.

In 1951 I was a member of a delegation sent by Congress to Australia to help in the observance of 50 years of free government in Australia, and it was my opportunity to learn at first hand about the outstanding service performed by Mr. Jarman. He was respected by the government officials of Australia and by the representatives of other nations at the Australian capital. Our country gained in prestige as a result of his constructive work.

Mr. Jarman died years too soon, but he left an indelible impression on our foreign service, and in all this his charming wife was an active and splendid participant.

Postal Decentralization Benefits Being Felt Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of Sunday, February 6, 1955, entitled, "Postal Decentralization Benefits Being Felt Here."

POSTAL DECENTRALIZATION BENEFITS BEING FELT HERE

Postmaster General Summerfield's program to decentralize the Nation's postal system has been felt all the way down to the rural postmaster.

St. Louis District Manager James E. Newton reported getting this comment from a fourth-class postmaster who had been invited to attend a meeting of postmasters from this area:

"There's something funny going on down there at St. Louis. I got a letter from some big shot who wanted me to attend a meeting clean down to St. Charles. I haven't been that far away for more than 10 years. It's almost 40 miles; besides the meeting was at 8 o'clock and I'm always in bed by 9 o'clock."

SIX-DAY REPLY

The "something funny going on" at St. Louis and nine similar regional offices throughout the United States, is an attempt

to streamline a Government department which until Summerfield took over in 1953 was still operating with horse-and-buggy methods.

Improvements in service are typified in this letter to the St. Louis district manager from a post office inspector relative to the extension of rural delivery service from Jackson, Mo.

"In the past it would take from 4 to 6 weeks to have a reply from the Department. In this case it took just 6 days."

The postmaster's request for an extension of service had been given prompt personal attention and several families received improved service without delay.

CLOSE TO HOME

Summerfield's decentralization plan also brings promotion and personnel decisions down to a level where they can be settled by supervisors who know the capabilities of their employees.

The Summerfield theory is that simple decisions that would have taken Washington offices weeks to handle can now be made close to home in a matter of days. Postmasters formerly petitioned Washington for such trivia as typewriter repairs.

Decisions on Missouri postal routes once made in Washington can now be made in district offices at St. Louis, Kansas City, or Springfield.

The St. Louis regional office, 111 North Fourth Street, directs postal service in Missouri, Iowa, and Arkansas. Regional manager James B. Tunny is a 45-year veteran of the postal service. His assistant is George J. Gross, a lawyer and former FBI agent.

OPENED IN SEPTEMBER

Tunny set up the Japan postal service after World War II and was in charge of the Cincinnati pilot office, the first of the regional offices to be activated.

Opened September 9, 1954, the St. Louis regional office supervises 3,434 post offices serving more than 8 million persons. Other regional offices are at Cincinnati, Chicago, Dallas, Minneapolis, Portland, Washington, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and New York City.

Regional offices are staffed by a public relations officer, an industrial engineer, and a management-employee relations officer. The engineer is charged with the elimination of duplication and the establishment of more efficient procedures.

The employee relations officer attempts to adjust grievances at the local level. Included in the Postmaster General's goal is a desire to place greater responsibility in the hand of the postmaster.

Summerfield's aim is to pare bureaucracy and operating costs and increase efficiency. At the same time the Postmaster General hopes to give the sprawling \$2 billion postal business some semblance of home rule.

Under the reorganization program, which began in November, 1953, the country will eventually have 15 regional postal offices.

The Post Office Department reports that between 1953 (when Summerfield took office) and 1954 the Department's operating cost deficit was cut from \$635 million to \$399 million.

Summerfield has not batted a thousand in attempting to pull the Department out of the red. His "junk mail" experiment was a notable failure. However, no one can accuse him of standing at the plate with the bat on his shoulder.

Another proposal for which he is pressing is an increase in postal rates.

Despite recent economies, the Post Office Department operates at a loss of between \$300 million and \$400 million a year. Proposed wage increases and fringe benefits will cost an estimated \$170 million annually for the Department's 540,000 employees.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania at Chicago, on the occasion of the 37th observance of the independence of Lithuania, Sunday, February 20, 1955, Lithuanian Auditorium, Rockford, Ill.:

The 37th anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania (February 16) and the 12th year of the occupation and domination of Lithuania by Soviet Russia, affords an opportunity to review the case of Lithuania; to bring out the falsehoods of its Soviet occupant; to ask the Soviets whether they made false representations at the time of signing the treaties of peace and nonaggression with Lithuania and the other Baltic states, or are they making false representations now in proposing "peaceful coexistence" with America and other countries; to assess the American policy of peace and liberation, and to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and liberation of Lithuania.

Soviet coexistence with other nations and respect for law and decency were manifested in the early treaties. The peace treaty with Lithuania (July 12, 1920), article I, declares: "Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent State with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and in a spirit of free and good will renounces all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her."

The nonaggression pact of September 28, 1926, provides:

"Art. 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other."

"Art. 3. Each of the two contracting parties undertakes to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party."

The Mutual Assistance Treaty of October 10, 1939 reaffirms the principles of the above two treaties and ostensibly speaks for coexistence between Lithuania and the Soviet Union. The preamble states:

"For the purpose of developing the friendly relations established by the peace treaty of July 12, 1920, and based on the recognition of an independent state existence and non-intervention in the internal affairs of the other party."

"Recognizing that the peace treaty of July 12, 1920, and the pact of nonaggression and peaceful settlement of conflicts of September 28, 1926, continue to form a firm basis of their mutual relations and undertakings."

The seventh article of the treaty provides: "Realization of this treaty should not affect in any way the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, in particular their State organization, economic and social system, military measures and generally the principle of nonintervention in internal affairs."

In addition to the above, shortly after the signing of this treaty Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs Molotov, in presenting the treaty to the Supreme Soviet of Soviet Russia for ratification, said:

"This treaty of mutual assistance in no way implies any interference of the Soviet Union in the affairs . . . of Lithuania, as some foreign newspapers are trying to infer. On the contrary, this treaty strictly stipulates the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states and the principle of non-interference in each other's affairs."

SUBJUGATION INSTEAD OF COEXISTENCE

The term of the treaty was 15 years. And yet, before 8 months had elapsed, it was flagrantly violated—Lithuania was seized by the Soviet Union in June 1940. Coexistence, law, and decency were superseded by aggression, destruction, and genocide.

After seizing Lithuania, Russia deposed Lithuania's legal government, replaced it with an illegal puppet regime. That puppet regime was and is illegal and without authority from the people or the constitution of Lithuania. It reigns by terror and through the Soviet armed forces. The people are deprived of human and property rights—they have been degraded to the level of horses or oxen.

NATIONAL DETERMINATION

Despite all this, the Lithuanian nation did not and will not approve the anti-Lithuanian and illegal acts of Russia and her puppets. Citizens of Lithuania and the entire Lithuanian nation have demanded and are demanding total independence for Lithuania—factual as well as juridical. The legal representatives of Lithuania, the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania, the underground, various Lithuanian immigrant organizations, about 3 million people in Lithuania and more than 1 million abroad—in fact all patriotic Lithuanians—denounced the Soviet occupation and spoliation of Lithuania, and are working for the freedom of Lithuania.

NONRECOGNITION AND LIBERATION

The United States Government and the American people have defended and are defending Lithuania in every way. The State Department made its forceful and noble declaration (of nonrecognition) the second day (July 23, 1940) after the treasonous and illegal vote of the so-called People's Diet to incorporate Lithuania in the Soviet Union. This declaration states:

"The devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small republics—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion."

Note that it clearly states that Lithuania's independence and territorial integrity are being annihilated by a neighbor—not by the Lithuanian nation, as the Soviets and their agents claim. The declaration states further:

"The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak."

In pursuance of this declaration, Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower, and their State Secretaries, have repeatedly reaffirmed the United States policy set forth therein. Both political parties, the Democratic and Republican, placed Lithuania and other Soviet occupied and dominated countries in their platforms of 1952, thereby making their independence part of the United States national policy. As a consequence thereof, the incumbent administration adopted and proclaimed the policy of liberation of the captive nations. The House of Representatives has unanimously adopted a resolution to appoint a select committee to investigate the seizure and incorporation of the Baltic states of Lithuania, Latvia, and

Estonia by and in the U. S. S. R. The committee made a thorough investigation and found that those states were forcibly seized by the Soviet Army and illegally incorporated by the Kremlin regime into the Soviet Union.

The committee concluded that the continued occupation of these nations by Soviet Communist power is the basic cause of the growing menace of war and stands as a threat to the security of the United States. This threat is increased in direct proportion to the time and opportunity afforded the Communists to digest and consolidate their gains and to use these gains as bases for further and greater aggressions. This threat is diminished in direct proportion as the Communist hold on the captive nations is weakened by a positive policy that promotes the forces of national independence behind the Iron Curtain.

The committee recommended that the United States Congress by appropriate action reiterate and make clear that the eventual liberation of all the nations enslaved by and within the Soviet empire, together with unqualified support for the principle of national self-determination through free elections and the secret ballot, are firm and unchanging parts of our national policy, and that the Department of State formulate a resolution based upon the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the committee's report, branding the U. S. S. R. as an aggressor against all the nations enslaved by the Soviets and that the United States delegation to the United Nations be instructed to take immediate steps to place this resolution on the agenda of the General Assembly for early action.

The Senate's Resolution 214 proclaims that the Soviet government has forcibly and aggressively incorporated the territory of the nations of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia into the Soviet Union.

"The Senate endorses the refusal of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower to recognize the seizures of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, and requests the President to use all available and appropriate means, through the United Nations, United States Information Agency, and otherwise, to keep the facts of the Soviet government's inhuman actions in these matters and its violations of solemn agreements before the attention of the world and to let the subject peoples know that they have not been forgotten."

In line with the foregoing thoughts, many Senators and Congressmen addressed the Congress on the occasion of the Independence Day of Lithuania; State Secretary John Foster Dulles made a statement in which he said: ". . . Through our contributions to the material and spiritual strength of the Free World, we seek to create conditions under which the right of the Baltic peoples to resume their place in the community of free nations will be universally respected. We are convinced that a world community in which the Baltic peoples are free to choose their own form of government and their political and economic institutions is likely to be one which will assure peace, with justice, for all nations, large and small."

The Lithuanians are ever grateful to the American Government for nonrecognition of the Kremlin's incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union and for using its good offices in supporting the efforts of the Lithuanian people to liberate Lithuania and to restore the sovereign rights and self-government to the Lithuanian people. They are also grateful to the American people for their sympathetic attitude and to the press and radio for their just and favorable treatment of the plight of Lithuania and its people. Lithuanians appeal to the United Nations and the people of the free world to support their cause in demanding that the Soviet Union implement

its catch-phrase of "coexistence" and abide by its treaties by withdrawing from Lithuania its troops, police, political agents and colonists, thereby restoring their sovereign rights and self-government to the people of Lithuania, and thus enable Lithuania to exist and coexist as a free and independent nation.

A Tribute to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a tribute to three fine young people from my district who have been honored by the Westinghouse Co. for outstanding achievement in the field of science.

All the people of Fairfield County, Conn., which comprises my district, are proud of the fact that one of 40 winners of the nationwide Science Talent Search, conducted by the Westinghouse Electric Corp., three of these gifted students are from the Fourth District.

This is the 12th year that Westinghouse has carried on this search for scientific ability, a program which has done and will do a large part in helping the United States to maintain its leadership in the field of research. Such a program is indeed both patriotic and beneficial not only for those immediately concerned but also for the security of the United States.

It is a distinct privilege therefore for me to pay tribute on behalf of the people of my district to Edward J. Foster, of Bethel, and Robert A. Buccino, of Stratford, both students of Fairfield Preparatory School and to Miss Alice K. Hartley, of Easton, a senior in Bassick High School, Bridgeport.

These three young people are coming here to Washington to compete for Westinghouse scholarships that may carry them on to even greater achievements in the scientific world.

Young Foster, who hopes to enter MIT, has constructed an oscilloscope, an instrument for showing visually on the face of a cathode ray tube the changes in varying electric current, an instrument he uses in his self-operated radio-TV repair business. Miss Hartley, who aims for Radcliffe College, has carried on unique experiments with vegetables to determine changes in color as the result of immersion in solutions of varying acidity. Young Buccino, who plans to begin his medical studies at Holy Cross College, has built and used a spectrophotometer, used to identify the different elements in a metallic compound by the light given off by their vapors when heated to incandescence.

Their selection among the 40 winners nationally is a tribute to the educational system in my State, especially the teaching of science as carried on by the good Jesuit fathers in Fairfield and by the Bridgeport high school system.

These three young people should be an inspiration to all of us because of their desire for greater knowledge and because of their ingenuity and demonstrated abilities. In the vision and determination of our young people, in their faithfulness to hard work, in their sense of responsibility, in these qualities lies the best hope of the free world. I shall be happy to greet these three young students and to wish them well at a crucial time in their lives. I express the fervent hope that they will continue to succeed in the fields for which they are so well qualified.

Independent Electricity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from a recent edition of the Commercial Appeal, a newspaper published in Memphis, Tenn., as follows:

INDEPENDENT ELECTRICITY

Hope of selling power from the proposed Dixon-Yates plant to the Memphis market is dead. It has been dead since early December, when Mayor Frank Tobey announced that the city of Memphis would build its own plant rather than buy from Dixon-Yates.

When the Dixon-Yates promoters went on through the motions of preparing to build by filing papers in Washington and Little Rock, Mayor Tobey considered it necessary to reaffirm his stand, which he did this week.

This time the Memphis plans were taken more seriously, perhaps because of the added significance of Memphis independence after weeks of working with other TVA customers who still hope to force Congress to return the policy of Federal money for more TVA generating plants.

Knowing how strongly the Memphis public has supported public ownership of the utility business at every opportunity, it should have been evident that the mayor was speaking in earnest the first time.

With Memphis ready to build a generating plant to supplement TVA power, the whole purpose of Dixon-Yates is gone. TVA will have enough power for the Atomic Energy Commission plant at Paducah without buying from Dixon-Yates.

Through many months of efforts by the AEC to get TVA to accept Dixon-Yates power, TVA officials have withstood efforts to get them to accept extra costs. Their hands are strengthened because Dixon-Yates power would be useless to TVA, with Memphis planning its own generating plant.

For Congress to approved \$6.6 million of Federal tax funds to build transmission lines from the middle of the Mississippi River into Memphis without a customer for the electricity is most unlikely.

There is a certain usefulness in Dixon-Yates to politicians. It is politically profitable for some to attack it and for others to support it. Perhaps it is too useful to both sides to be buried promptly.

There is usefulness for the West Memphis site to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. As Arkansas industries and population expand, more power will be needed, with water power

scarce and natural gas prices rising. Barged coal will be the logical fuel and a generating plant at West Memphis is likely to be built.

But sale of Dixon-Yates power to the AEC, which would sell it to TVA, which would sell it to Memphis, is something else. For lack of this market, it might even be necessary for the Dixon-Yates plant to be truly private enterprise.

Resolution Adopted at the Memorial Service and Rally Sponsored by the American Zionist Council of Los Angeles at Hollywood Temple Beth El, February 13, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at the memorial service and rally sponsored by the American Zionist Council of Los Angeles, at Hollywood Temple Beth El, Sunday, February 13, 1955:

We, the 1,000 citizens of Los Angeles assembled at Hollywood Temple Beth El on Sunday afternoon, February 13, for a memorial service, voice our shock and indignation at the brutal murder of 2 Jews by the Egyptian military dictatorship and the torture of 2 more, resulting in their death.

This action was taken in wanton disregard of the forceful representations for clemency made on the grounds of moderation and humanity by many governments, including our own.

Together with the entire civilized world, we express our sense of outrage at the inhuman trials and executions which are a mockery of justice. The Egyptian Government stands condemned in the eyes of all mankind for its brutal disregard for human decency. Events in that country in the past year have shown a striking resemblance to the bloody path by which other dictators have maintained power through a totalitarian regime.

Moreover, we are deeply disturbed by this evidence, pointing to an intensification of the bitter tensions existing between Egypt and the State of Israel. It must be feared that unless the conscience of the civilized world can be aroused to deter the criminal intent of the Arab rulers, they will be emboldened to intensify their attacks upon their own Jewish community and possibly to undertake a full scale attack against Israel.

This sacrifice of Jewish martyrs will not long appease a government which is intent upon diverting the peoples' attention from economic misery and social despotism at home. We shall hold the Egyptian Government eternally responsible for the blood bath which can ensue if scapegoats are to be the technique for appealing to mob passions and for maintaining in power a military dictatorship.

We do urge the continued vigilance of our Government in cooperation with the other governments which view with moral indignation and horror this tragic hanging, in order that the adherence to the principles of justice and respect for civil rights and international law be strengthened in Egypt and throughout the Arab world.

The John Day Project on the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM COON

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a joint memorial I have received from the Senate and House of Representatives of my home State of Oregon. This resolution, House Joint Memorial 2, memorializes Congress to provide the necessary funds for preliminary investigations and planning for the John Day project on the Columbia River, and then indicate its intention to build the John Day project promptly and solely with Federal funds by making the necessary appropriation to start construction immediately upon completing the preliminary planning or, in the alternative, enact without delay such enabling legislation as is required to permit local agencies to advance funds, under appropriate arrangements with the United States, so that construction of such project by the Federal Government can be initiated immediately.

This resolution is of great importance, Mr. Speaker, first because it sets forth the vital interest which the Oregon Legislature has in expediting construction of the great John Day Dam. And may I point out at this time that the Oregon State Legislature is representative of the thinking and wishes of the electorate of the State of Oregon. Therefore this memorial presents the wishes of that electorate. I make this point purposely in answer to certain public statements which were made concerning a "mandate" having been given by the voters of Oregon to their United States Representatives to prevent legislation in support of the administration's "partnership plan" from being passed.

The Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon are necessarily more closely representative of the people, and more sensitive to the views and feelings of the people of Oregon than any one Member of the United States Congress could possibly be. And now they urge that we go ahead with the John Day Dam—in this memorial they say:

Whereas the growth of the region requires over 500,000 kilowatts of new power capacity annually and such multipurpose projects as John Day must be started immediately in order to be completed and to avoid a serious power shortage by the early 1960's; and

Whereas various local public-utility agencies have offered to advance funds toward the preliminary engineering and planning costs of John Day, and have indicated a willingness to advance over one-half the estimated cost of the project to expedite its construction by the United States as a Federal project.

Opposition to new ideas in power development is quick to claim that the people share its prejudices. Those who oppose President Eisenhower's partnership

plan are more willing to try to confuse and propagandize the people than they are to lay the facts before the people and let them make up their own minds. They make the fatal mistake of underestimating the intelligence of the voter. The administration's program for construction of power projects shows both imagination and courage in proposing boldly new approaches, and this memorial which I proudly present to this body shows clearly that the people of Oregon, through their elected State representatives, support it.

The memorial follows:

House Joint Memorial 2

To the honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition, as follows:

Whereas the Federal Government, through its construction of multiple-purpose projects, has become a major supplier of electric power to the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the present and continuing growth of the region, including Oregon, requires the further and immediate development of its low-cost power potential in order to provide the energy base for industries, job opportunities, and the needs of its people; and

Whereas the John Day project on the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington is one of the major integral units in the overall plan of comprehensive development of the Columbia River and has already been authorized and approved as such by the Congress of the United States (81st Cong., 2d sess., H. Doc. No. 531); and

Whereas its construction will complete slack water navigation from the mouth of the Columbia River to Pasco, Wash., a distance of some 328 miles; and

Whereas it will provide approximately 500,000 acre-feet of storage for flood-control purposes and will also provide irrigation and recreational benefits; and

Whereas such project will produce in excess of 1,100,000 kilowatts of low-cost power, fully integrated with the Federal grid and the Northwest Power Pool and close to Oregon load centers; and

Whereas the growth of the region requires over 500,000 kilowatts of new power capacity annually and such multipurpose projects as John Day must be started immediately in order to be completed and to avoid a serious power shortage by the early 1960's; and

Whereas various local public utility agencies have offered to advance funds toward the preliminary engineering and planning costs of John Day and have indicated a willingness to advance over one-half the estimated cost of the project to expedite its construction by the United States as a Federal project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to (a) appropriate immediately the funds necessary to enable the Corps of Engineers to complete the preliminary investigations and planning for the John Day project; and (b) indicate its intention to build the John Day project promptly and solely with Federal funds by making the necessary appropriation to start construction immediately upon completing the preliminary planning or, in the alternative, enact without delay such enabling legislation as is required to permit local agencies to advance funds, under appropriate arrangements with the United States, so that construction of

such project by the Federal Government can be initiated immediately; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress. Adopted by house January 28, 1955.

E. A. GEARY,

Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate February 8, 1955.

ELMO E. SMITH,

President of Senate.

Filed: February 9, 1955.

EARL T. NEWBRY,

Secretary of State.

STATE OF OREGON,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Earl T. Newbry, Secretary of State of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the Seal of said State, do hereby certify:

That I have carefully compared the foregoing copy of House Joint Memorial No. 2 with the original thereof adopted by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 48th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the Secretary of State February 9, 1955, and that the same is a full, true and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all endorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the Seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Ore., this 10th day of February 1955.

[SEAL]

EARL T. NEWBRY,

Secretary of State.

Air Force Justice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I quote herewith an editorial which appeared in the February 17, 1955, issue of the Roanoke World-News, a newspaper published daily in the city of Roanoke, Va.:

TWO BRANDS OF AIR FORCE JUSTICE

Noting two items from Texas bases which appeared in the same newspaper Thursday, we are constrained to wonder once again where the Air Force gets its standards for justice.

At Carswell near Fort Worth, two enlisted men were sentenced to 5 years at hard labor by a court-martial. The charge: failure to salute an officer. They also got dishonorable discharges and forfeiture of pay.

The men claimed they were members of Jehovah's Witnesses and their religious beliefs prevented their saluting any person or object. The same sect objects to saluting the flag and to reciting the oath of allegiance.

We have no defense for anyone who cannot or will not assume the ordinary obligations of American citizens, but—

Over at Laredo on the same day another court martial was dealing with a colonel. He had sent an Air Force plane to Harrisburg, Pa., with men and tools to work on ma-

chinery he had purchased for his farm from war surplus.

En route he also had the plane stop at his home at Kokomo, Ind., and at Marion, Ind. This allegedly happened more than once. He admitted it.

So what punishment did he get? Forfeiture of \$150 pay per month for 1 year and a reprimand. No reduction in rank, no time in prison, no discharge—honorable or otherwise—just a fine.

That's what we call putrid justice. The enlisted men get skunked for something that cost nobody anything except damage to vanity and "prejudice to good discipline." The colonel gets slapped on the wrist for mulcting the taxpayers out of gosh knows how much money.

The Department of Defense and its various military boards ought to look this contrasting business over. If it doesn't, some interested Congressman ought to get up on the floor and say a few words on something worth while.

If we were the Air Force we'd go soak our head in a bucket.

National Fine Arts Advisory Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here an excerpt from a radio interview with Mr. Daniel Millsaps, who is interested in promoting an Art Department in the Federal Government. The excerpt is from the Patty Cavin Show of January 28, 1955, broadcast over station WRC—NBC:

EXCERPTS FROM A RADIO INTERVIEW WITH DANIEL MILLSAPS, THE PATTY CAVIN SHOW, JANUARY 28, 1955, NBC (WRC)

Miss CAVIN. Well, Dan, I know the President recently called for the establishment of an advisory commission for the arts, and I wonder if you would like to bring us up to date on this project since this is one of your special pet points.

Mr. MILLSAPS. Yes, we have worked for a long time to get at least a beginning of an art department in the Federal Government. We feel that eventually, there should be a secretary of the arts. The President has asked for an advisory commission in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. We do hope that eventually we can disassociate the arts from education or any of the other such aspects. Art can stand on its own and can itself contribute to the economy of the country.

Miss CAVIN. I see, you feel that they should have a very decided department all their own. Well, now, aren't there several bills now in the offing?

Mr. MILLSAPS. Congressman Thompson of New Jersey tells me that he has introduced 4 bills; 1 for the Civic Auditorium in Washington, 1 for grants-in-aid to the several States to help their art programs get started, and 2 others. We feel that some of these should get by this year; we came pretty close during the last session.

Miss CAVIN. Do you think if an advisory commission was actually set up that it would lead eventually to subsidized art training?

Mr. MILLSAPS. We do not want subsidization in the arts. We simply want recognition and a point of reference in the Federal Government, to give substance to all of the

arts, not just painting, sculpture and prints, but music, dancing and the whole gamut.

Miss CAVIN. From now on its up to Congress, right?

Mr. MILLSAPS. From now on it is up to Congress, and the people to voice their desires.

Miss CAVIN. Well we hope we've planted a seed of thought in our listeners' minds, and since watercolors are your specialty, here's a Capital By-Line salute to the opening of your one man showing tonight at the circulating gallery in Georgetown. It's the Malequanc version of Waltz in Watercolors.

President's School Proposal Falls Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the people in Alabama are concerned with the lack of classrooms for our school children. They are anxious for something to be done. On February 15 the Tuscaloosa (Ala.) News carried an editorial entitled "President's School Proposal Falls Short," which I commend to the House. The editorial follows:

PRESIDENT'S SCHOOL PROPOSAL FALLS SHORT

President Eisenhower probably is wondering what it takes to satisfy the public after proposing a \$7 billion school construction program to Congress that is now literally being ripped to pieces by both Members of Congress and school administrators.

The President had been criticized for failing to come forth with some Federal program designed to relieve the critical shortage of school classrooms over the Nation. The deficit in classroom space has grown to alarming proportions in the United States and all statistics on population show that the situation will get worse in the next 10 years unless something is done on a larger scale than has been taking place in the last few years.

Generally, criticism of the President's \$7 billion proposal is that it is inadequate to meet the pressing needs for school construction. The method proposed by the President to assist in school construction also has come in for criticism. For instance, Alabama Superintendent of Education Austin R. Meadows points out that bonds can be sold for school construction in Alabama at a lower rate of interest than that offered in the President's proposal.

The amount proposed for outright grants to States for new school buildings also is considered inadequate by those who administer school programs.

The President did not go into specific details on his proposed school-aid program in the message to Congress, and there are a number of questions that have developed as to how this program will work. Alabama's Senator HILL, who has been trying to get a school-aid bill through Congress similar to that which he sponsored for hospital construction, has posed these pertinent questions about the President's proposal.

1. How much concern is there for private lenders rather than for the needs of our children?

2. How can the programs possibly meet the needs for the immediate reduction in the present deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms?

3. How will it be possible for impoverished school districts to pay interest and amortize

Federal loans or pay rent without reducing the already inadequate funds for paying adequate salaries to teachers?

4. How long will it take to translate the revolving fund into schoolrooms?

5. How much delay, control, and interference is inherent with the setting up of State building authorities, with the necessary requirement that State constitutions and laws be changed to meet this Federal mandate?

6. How can the \$65 million annual direct aid build enough classrooms to meet pressing current needs?

The President has acted in response to numerous pleas to do something about the educational crisis. He and his advisers, however, do not seem to have a clear insight into the magnitude of the problem nor the method for a workable, fast-moving solution. The result is likely to be another year of debate and wrangle in Congress without definite action and appropriations forthcoming.

Security: Our Common Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that what we are seeing in the spectacle of recanting witnesses, and in the sudden frenzy of certain professional liars to rush forward to confess their duplicity, is the manifestation of the insidious menace of communism as it tries by devious methods to save its minions as they are brought to trial.

The Republican Party certainly cannot be charged with creating a Communist bogeyman in the face of the FBI investigations and confidential reports antedating the disclosures which led to the conviction of Alger Hiss and the suicide of Harry Dexter White. And there is no one in his right mind who would even insinuate that the overwhelming majority of loyal Democrats had anything whatsoever to do with such traitorous conduct or liked the situation any more than the rest of us.

What we should realize is that national security is the responsibility of every patriotic citizen and, as the following editorial which appeared in the January 29 issue of the Saturday Evening Post so forcibly emphasizes, it must not become a partisan issue:

OUR SECURITY MUST NOT BECOME A PARTISAN ISSUE

The people of the United States and their political leaders are about to be subjected to tests of their courage, tenacity, and powers of discernment as severe as any they have undergone for many generations. It is difficult to remain "at the ready" when the Nation is being challenged, bullied, and kicked in the teeth by a contemptuous enemy. To keep up the guard under the more persuasive attack described as peaceful coexistence may prove almost impossible. We are offered the outward and visible sign of something all of us want, peace. Few dare even to appear to reject so desirable a boon. And, as time passes, fewer and fewer critics arise to mention the probability that the Kremlin's idea of peaceful coexistence is that we should exist peacefully in the Red orbit. The Communist dove of

peace is a decoy, wired to blow up in our faces.

Simultaneously with the peaceful-coexistence symphony from abroad, the left wingers in our midst plan another campaign equally insidious. Relying on the general distaste for McCarthyism, they hope not only to discredit the results of past congressional investigations but to amend the rules governing such committees drastically enough to make it impossible to probe deeply into the operation of the Red conspiracy. If we can be led to believe that there never was an Alger Hiss, that Harry Dexter White was a victim of a climate of fear, and that thought control has been established in America, then the movement to render Congress impotent to expose Communist penetration may well succeed.

On another sector of the battle, leftwingers attack the security system governing the hiring and firing of Federal jobholders. The gimmick here is that a man accused of being a "security risk" or a "loyalty risk" should have the right to confront his accusers. In 1 case that found its way to the Supreme Court, 4 Justices voted that a suspected employee should have this right, although it has been often pointed out that, when the FBI is the informant, the identification of the agent supplying the information would end the usefulness of the FBI in this field. This, of course, is a blow which the Communists and their fellow-traveling allies could endure without great pain. The proper response to the "right-to-confront-accuser" argument is that a Federal job is not a right. Nor do admitted past injustices in security matters constitute a valid argument for making it impossible to remove a dubious employee without going through proceedings as loud, protracted, and frustrating as the trial of New York's 11 Communists 5 years ago.

The answer to the question: "How far will this softening-up process get in Congress?" lies with the Democratic leaders. It will be tempting to some to treat the subject as a party matter. Many Democrats feel that their whole party membership stands accused of virtual treason by certain GOP campaign orators, and it is natural that this should rankle. However, no responsible Republican leader has made any such charge, although many have rightly pointed out that, during the 20 years of Roosevelt and Truman, it was frequently difficult to move against the Red conspirators.

Either Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Truman could have prevented communism from becoming a party matter by the simple device of saying to the congressional investigators: "Nobody wants to throw out these scum, if there are any in the Government, any more earnestly than we do. Come in and get 'em." Instead, Roosevelt sent word to Whittaker Chambers that he could "jump in the lake" (inexact quotation), and Mr. Truman mumbled sourly that the whole thing was a red herring. Adlai Stevenson seemed unable to untrack himself from this generally unhelpful attitude, and that is one reason why Mr. Eisenhower is now President.

Anyway, all recrimination to one side, the Democrats in Congress have an opportunity to take the Red issue away from the Republicans and hand it to all patriotic Americans. They can do this simply by refusing to weaken the investigating apparatus of Congress and by continuing it with improvements, especially now that the public is in serious danger of being lulled to sleep by the peaceful coexistence myth. Senator McCLELLAN, who succeeds Senator MCCARTHY as chairman of the Permanent Investigations Committee, has already given assurance that the probes into communism will continue. There is no reason why the security and existence of the United States should ever have been a party issue at all.

District of Columbia Fine Arts Auditorium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the House District Committee, Wednesday, February 23, 1955, on H. R. 630, District of Columbia Fine Arts Auditorium:

Progress in a democracy has many and varied faces. Sometimes it has a swift look about it which carries action forward by leaps and bounds. Sometimes it has a stubborn look and great effort is required to relax its hold. At other times it has an indifferent look, and endless patience and resolution must be applied before interest can be sparked in it. It is one of our great strengths as a democracy that will and determination are demanded, required and permitted, so that the strides we make are our own and belong inevitably to us all.

These thoughts have been turning around in my mind as I look at the bill we have before us, H. R. 630, to create a Federal Commission to formulate plans for the construction of a civic auditorium in the District of Columbia. This bill is part of a larger program to encourage the growth and development of the fine arts throughout the Nation, which has been the concern of many Members of Congress for the past 20 years. It is only a small part, but a most vital one. And as I consider its provisions, I think of the many times in the past that I have been called upon to speak on the importance of such a program, and the many times I have asked permission to do so. But the patience I spoke about earlier that is demanded of us in a democracy, and the grace that that patience is permitted us, gives me great courage that we are indeed on our way.

We are often spoken of by our many friends from abroad as the country of experts. Give us a material thing and we will plumb the depths of its capacity, and when we have reached those depths we will search even further and our resourcefulness will find greater depths than man could have envisioned. Our friends from abroad respect our known capacity for such imagination and creativity, but in their hearts, and yes, even on their tongues, they belittle our culture and refer to us as crass materialists. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Of course, we have unlimited vision in our industry. Of course, we believe in a high standard of living for all, and of course, we will continue to use our inventiveness to the full in that direction. But we as a Nation love culture. We have respected it since our Founding Fathers wrote the Declaration of Independence in words which ring out forever not only in faith but in beauty as well.

Apparently, we have not had the time as a country to solidify this love of culture into a thing for all to see. But as a people we have demonstrated time and time again that it is deep within our hearts. Our songs are sung all over the world. Our books are read all over the world. But our art, our theater, our opera, our music have not yet found their full rein. They have not as yet become the integral part of our lives which our industrial prowess has already defined. As a Nation so far developed, so great a power on this earth, so responsible to the hope of

peace on earth, we cannot afford to dally any longer on our cultural front. It is not only because we need it for our own happiness and fulfillment, but also because we need it to combat forces in our world today which abuse every lack and feed on it like vultures, deadening hope and spirit wherever they can.

It has been said that democracy is difficult to define to peoples who have not lived under it. The arts, however, have an international language of their own. They speak a universal language which all who live on this earth can understand. They speak to the spirit of man—to his hope and his faith and his longing. They can reach out and spark the hearts, where things cannot even touch them.

Let us begin in the Capital of our great Nation, and build a center for all to see. I have traveled all over the world and have found beautiful cities in beautiful climes. When I return to Washington, I feel great pleasure in the physical beauty which meets my eye, and I am proud that it is often called the capital of the world. But if we wish to be a nation which can speak to the hearts of mankind, we must bring together and plant the fruits of our genius, talent and ability in the fine arts, and let them flourish in our Capital.

H. R. 630, and all the other similar bills which are being discussed at this hearing, is a modest one indeed. It asks for an appropriation not to exceed \$25,000, for a purpose which can do much toward making this city one of the cultural centers of the world. We can afford this sum. Those of us who have spoken repeatedly of building a national theater, of creating a Fine Arts Commission, and other projects to encourage and develop the fine arts in our land, look to this measure as a significant beginning of a great hope.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by a well-known reporter and commentator, John O'Donnell, in the New York Daily News of yesterday, February 22, 1955, concerning proposed reform in the method of selecting Presidents:

(By John O'Donnell)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—A hundred years have passed since we Americans changed the method by which we elect our Presidents and Vice Presidents. Vigorous efforts—particularly in the last decade—have been made to get rid of the out-of-date electoral-college system by which all the Presidential electoral votes of each State go to the winning candidate, regardless of the smallness of his plurality.

But all have failed. Now, in this session, there is a better than even chance that Congress will pass a constitutional amendment for submission to the sovereign States. The amendment is designed to credit a candidate with the proportion of votes he receives in each State even if he doesn't win a majority.

In the recent past, these efforts have been killed off on the Hill for a variety of reasons: Uncertainty among the party leaders about who would benefit by the change; personal jealousy among the sponsors; and, of course,

the deep-seated unwillingness of the Nation to tamper with the Constitution.

Back in 1950, the Senate gave a rousing 64-27 vote in favor of the amendment introduced by then Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and Representative Ed Gossett, of Texas, which would prorate a State's electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote cast for the various presidential candidates. An interesting angle of this vote is the fact that the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, led the opposition. Taft was opposed to changing the Constitution for one thing and, as Mr. Republican, also wanted the electoral votes of such important normally Republican States as Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, etc., to continue to go in a block to the presidential candidate who carried the State.

Despite the surprising Senate victory, the amendment met the same fate in the House that its many predecessors had suffered before. Speaker SAM RAYBURN, like Taft, was opposed to any changes in the Constitution. On the Republican side, many Republicans figured that the Democrats under the proposed pro rata system would pick up more electoral votes in the big Republican States of the North than the Republicans would south of the Mason-Dixon line. That, of course, was back in 1950, before Eisenhower had cracked the solid South in the 1952 elections. Now the thinking has changed.

COUDERT BILL ANSWERS CRITICISM

Meanwhile, New York's Representative FREDERICK COUDERT introduced a substitute bill which answered criticisms that proportional representation does not work and encourages the formation of splinter parties. The COUDERT amendment provides that in a presidential election each State be divided into electoral districts with the same boundaries as congressional districts.

Here is how the COUDERT system would work out: the voters in each of these electoral districts would elect a single presidential and vice presidential elector and the entire voting population of the State would select two others at large. In a presidential election in New York, for example, instead of the winning candidate scooping up all of the State's 45 electoral votes it could be figured on the basis of the present House delegation that the GOP candidate would get 26 electoral votes, the Democrat 17. The two electors at large (corresponding to the two United States Senators) would of course go to the vote of the majority.

Now new life has been breathed into the effort to reform the presidential election system. Senator PRICE DANIEL, the famous 1952 Eisenhower Democrat, is pushing a new bill based on the old Lodge-Gossett proportional formula. (Of course, some of the Coudert ideas may be taken over in committee hearings.)

The Texan already has lined up more than 20 senatorial cosponsors which include not only a group of fellow southerners but such Democratic liberals as HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; HILL, of Alabama; and KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, along with such strangely assorted Republicans as the nationalist JENNER, of Indiana, and DIRKSEN, of Illinois, plus IVES, of New York, WILEY, of Wisconsin, and WILLIAMS, of Delaware.

WHY SOUTHERNERS ARE INTERESTED

Each group among the backers has its particular and different reason for backing the amendment. The southern rebels frankly state that they think the amendment would let the South play a more direct part in the outcome of the presidential election and—importantly—in the nominating convention. They are sick and tired of minority pressure groups throwing their weight around under the threat of tipping the election scales in such absolutely pivotal States as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, etc. They figure that should the power of the minority groups to determine the course of entire blocks of

State electoral votes be destroyed it would be possible to nominate a more conservative Democrat than at present—possible even to nominate a candidate from south of the Mason-Dixon line, such as General RUSSELL, of Georgia, for example.

On the other hand, such liberals as Democrat HUMPHREY and Republican IVES, of New York, are backing the amendment on the basis of a more representative election.

Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, has introduced his bill calling for the election of the President on a straight popular vote without the States figuring in the picture at all. This has no chance. But there is a good chance for the old Lodge-Gossett proposal after the committees have worked it over with the Mundt-Dirksen-Coudert offerings of the last Congress.

Important to note is that Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, is chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee which will handle the bill. He was an ardent supporter of the Lodge-Gossett amendment in 1950 and has promised to hold hearings on the new Price Daniel resolution.

But again, as in 1950, regardless of how the resolution fares in the Senate, it may again meet heavy going in the House.

A Long Way To Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is seldom that a public works project evokes support from Members of Congress as non-partisan as that which has prevailed in the case of the Calumet-Sag Waterways development. Last year a memorial was presented at the White House testifying to this support, which was signed by all of the 25 Congressmen who represented the State of Illinois at that time.

It is encouraging and gratifying to have the favorable reaction of the Chicago Daily News, one of the newspapers which serves the territory traversed by the Calumet-Sag Channel. A recent editorial of the Chicago Daily News follows:

A Long Way To Go

A pardonable outburst of rosy statements followed the President's recommendation in his budget message of a \$4 million appropriation for a start on the long-deferred Calumet-Sag Channel improvement project.

Typical was the reaction of Hjalmar W. Johnson, Inland Steel executive and chairman of the Inland Waterway Coordinating Committee, who hailed it as the first step toward an industrial boom for the Chicago-Calumet area, all the Great Lakes, and the broad Mississippi Valley.

There is sound reason to believe that such an era of expansion is on the way.

The Cal-Sag victory comes on the heels of two other highly important projects with which it is intimately linked—the building of the St. Lawrence seaway, expected to be finished by 1958, and the plans of the Chicago Regional Port District to float a \$25 million revenue bond issue as a first step toward building port terminal facilities on Lake Calumet.

As the Cal-Sag Waterways Development Committee has often pointed out, either the seaway or a Chicago world port is only half a project unless the 16.2-mile bottleneck

section of the Cal-Sag Channel is made deep and wider.

The President's recommendation of funds is only a first step toward getting construction underway. It is not a total victory until the Congress has approved and the \$4 million is actually available.

There will be a long way to go on Cal-Sag, which eventually will cost an estimated \$132 million. The initial fund will thus provide only a bare start on the neglected waterway.

The Cal-Sag development committee can rightfully take a major share of credit for progress so far in Washington. It sponsored the Cal-Sag memorial presented at the White House last year and signed by all Illinois Congressmen.

It is working now with these leaders to forestall the inevitable attempts of Cal-Sag foes—chiefly the railroads—to head off the recommended funds. The effort must not be relaxed.

Remarks of Carroll Reece, National Press Club Luncheon, February 23, 1955, Made in Reply to Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me at the National Press Club luncheon, February 23, 1955, in reply to Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins:

I

Four weeks ago, many of us gathered here today were honored by the presence of Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, one of the Nation's most publicized educators—now the president of a large tax-exempt foundation.

As this man of wisdom spoke, I was somehow reminded of Elbert Hubbard's definition of egotism. He defined egotism as "the anesthetic that nature gives to deaden the pain of being a damn fool."

As he moved into his address, his evaluation of me became quite evident, but, after my 34 years in public life, I do not feel that either my patriotism or intellectual integrity are diluted by Dr. Hutchins disassociating himself from me.

We seem to have only one thing in common: Once, he was heralded as the "Boy Wonder." Once, after obtaining leave of absence from New York University to run for Congress, I was heralded as "The Boy Congressman." Now I am no longer a boy, neither is he any longer a boy or a wonder.

As this great and dedicated man rose to address us, an aura of academic distinction radiated from his person, an aura reinforced by the soft effulgence which radiates from the wealth and power which support him.

Indeed, it seemed to me that there stood before us a knight in golden armor whose high purpose well might be to save a spotless maiden from a foul and fire breathing monster.

II

Alas, our knight in golden armor chose not to draw the 2 edged sword of truth and facts, but rather, in anger and acrimony, brought forward the mace of demagoguery, studded with spikes of vituperation.

We were treated to the horrors of a political abattoir in which personality, character, and integrity are destroyed. It seemed a strange cacophony.

Why should he regale us with obiter dicta—if not in an effort to use you to bolster his case in the press of the Nation? Why stoop to public obfuscation when facts and reason are available.

Testimony and facts developed under oath by a duly constituted committee of Congress cannot be set aside by ridiculing their source or content.

Such factual testimony deserves full consideration and objective analysis.

This point of view was emphasized by Mr. Justice Frankfurter when he said in an opinion in the Rumley case:

"Our Republic will have lost its vitality when the people are no longer permitted to hear the information developed by their legislators. And our scholars, our intellectuals, our great educators hardly justify the confidence reposed in their integrity when they resort to ad hominem arguments and obiter dicta to suppress and discredit information of which they personally disapprove."

Again Woodrow Wilson said, "The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

What a great shock, a distinguished academician turning politician, before our very eyes. His utterances appear as endless rewrites of a central theme of the professional intellectuals found in the foundations. The artful propagandists, dressed in the attire of an intellectualist, rides again.

III

As a rather reluctant dragon, I come before you today through the courtesy and aid and spirit of fair play of the National Press Club—so characteristic of the members of the press and radio of our Nation.

It appeared to me that you, the purveyors of facts, might prefer me to answer in a more moderate and objective tone. Perhaps if an eminent scholar can turn politician for a day, you will permit me, a politician with some experience, to turn educator again for a day within the limits of my ability.

"Let me say that in advocating a return to reason I do not advocate abandonment of our interest in facts. I proclaim the value of observation and experiment. I would proclaim also the value of rational thought and would suggest that without it, facts may prove worthless, trivial and irrelevant—rational thought is the only basis for education," so said a great scholar.

In this spirit let us examine the speech of this knight in golden armor who came to slay, and to save the virtue of tax-exempt foundations.

Most psychologists, teachers, and advertising men know that repetition fixes an idea or symbol in the mind.

IV

Despite Dr. Hutchins' fervent disclaimer, in the title and first paragraph of his speech, Fund for the Republic is repeated four times, once more than the number of times the sponsor's product needs to be mentioned in a radio commercial.

This disclaimer hardly balances the impression, and, by the way, if he was speaking without even consulting his trustees, he reduces them to the level of impotent wind-dressing.

He avers, however, that the foundations have been doing a good deal of talking lately. Does he mean through their presidents and without consulting their trustees? Does this concerted activity indicate the overt evidence of a hitherto covert condition?

In view of his disclaimer, I wonder who paid for mimeographing his speech, who paid his expenses to Washington—and, you will recall, when a member of the club asked in one of the questions the amount of his salary he said he could not hear him. By

the power of subpoena, it would have been easy for us to have obtained his salary and that of all other foundation officials.

Since tax-exempt foundations are by nature public trusts, the public does have a right to know the salaries and expenses of officials but our committee was interested in getting more significant information. However, if Dr. Hutchins, due to the complexity of figures involved, should forget what his salary is, I shall be glad to inform him.

V

Parenthetically, I might say I received no extra compensation for my laborious assignment, nor did I charge any of my considerable expenses to the committee, except a very few telephone calls.

My efforts were purely a labor of love—if any. Although, I realize the difficulty Dr. Hutchins may have in agreeing that any Member of Congress with whom he may disagree is interested in doing a good job.

After 34 years of public service, what other purpose would he expect a man of my age to have.

Much of Dr. Hutchins' attack was directed at me personally, as though the whole investigation had been my personal plot against Foundations.

The fact is, as painful as it may be to him, the resolution directing the investigation was passed by the House of Representatives by a strong majority vote, both Republicans and Democrats voting for it.

There are some 7,000 foundations at the present time. Their aggregate funds amount to about \$7½ billion and they have annual income in excess of \$600 million.

The foundations of \$10 million capital, or over, comprise 7 percent of the foundations, but comprise 56 percent of the total endowment and 32 percent of the annual income.

The origin and nature of foundations, as well as their effect on our tax structure, gives the Congress ample basis for an investigation of them.

Due to the nature of our tax laws, the birthrate of foundations is increasing at an alarming rate. The possibility exists that a large part of American industry may eventually find its way into foundations.

VI

Because of the tax exemption granted them, foundations are public trusts and must be dedicated to public purposes. Through these tax exemptions an additional tax burden is put on the American taxpayer.

The rest of the people must pay heavier taxes, for example, because the Ford family was relieved of estate taxes upon the creation of the Ford Foundation, and because the foundation itself pays no income tax on 90 percent of the profits of the Ford Motor Co. it receives in dividends.

The duty follows, in Congress, to make certain funds thus provided are not diverted to either unlawful enterprises or any enterprise outside of tax exemption privileges.

Citizens with their own money may promote any cause, good or bad, not forbidden by law, but tax-exempt funds should not be used to propagandize for the theories of either Karl Marx or Mark Hannah.

For instance, the Fund for the Republic is now distributing a one-hour edition of Mr. Edward R. Murrow's teleshow with Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. This would be a perfectly legitimate thing for an individual to do with his own money, but it is not understandable how the tax-exempt foundation gets into it since it is obvious that Mr. Murrow's program was not designed to be an objective study, but an opportunity for Dr. Oppenheimer to make a defense of his conduct.

The directive of the enabling resolution setting up the committee was to "determine if any foundations or organizations are using their resources for purposes other than purposes for which they were created."

This language gives full faith and credit to the high purposes for which the foundations were organized.

The investigation was not directed against foundations as an institution in American life.

I feel honored to have been selected for the presidency of a foundation—now a small one, but which gives every promise of becoming an important one. This foundation, so long as I am connected with it, will always be open to inquiry.

VII

Dr. Hutchins' remarks were intended to convey the impression that the committee had concluded that foundations had contributed nothing of consequence to the public.

Either he had not read the report or he purposely suppressed the statement to be found on page 3 of the report and italicized for emphasis, reading as follows: "The committee was and is well aware of the many magnificent services which foundations have rendered to the people of the United States in many fields and areas, particularly in medicine, public health, and science. Nothing has occurred to change its initial conviction that the foundation as an institution is desirable and should be encouraged. If little time is spent in this report reciting the good which the foundations have done, it is not because this committee is unaware of it or in any way reluctant to acknowledge it. Rather, this committee considers that it is necessarily concerned with the evaluation of criticisms. A fair judgment of the work and the position of foundations in our society must obviously take into account the great measure of benefit for which they have been responsible. At the same time, the power of these foundations is so great that a proper evaluation must give great weight to the dangers which have appeared in their operations in certain areas of activity."

The report makes utterly clear it is not an attack upon foundations as such, and that it is, in general, in one broad area of activity that foundations have been widely criticized, that of the so-called social sciences.

In this area criticism comes from highly credible and qualified persons.

On the nature of these criticisms, Dr. Hutchins spent no time, satisfying himself to toss off the report with nasty personal insinuations and attack by epithet.

VIII

No reasonable man can accept Dr. Hutchins' unctuous suggestion that our inquiry at once brands the esteemed and highly placed directors of all the foundations as either fools or knaves. We all know as a matter of routine these operations are carried on by the paid administrative staffs.

The directors never presume to be in intimate daily touch with administrative decisions. I might say, primarily for Dr. Hutchins' benefit that the Ford Foundation trustees by resolution specifically relieved themselves of this responsibility by organizing in such a manner as to expressly exclude themselves from the detail of selection and then said: "The founders of at least two larger American foundations intended their trustees to devote a major part of their time to the actions and conduct of foundation affairs. Usually this arrangement has not proved practicable . . . for the program of a foundation may be determined more certainly by selection of its top officers than by any statement of policy or by any set of directions."

We cannot escape the conclusion that the trustees of this foundation abdicated their trust responsibility in assenting to this plan of operation under which everything except possibly the establishment of glittering generalities could be left to the employees.

Dr. Hutchins accused the committee of being guilty of fraud, absurd charges, scan-

dalous conduct, wild and squalid presentation, and in a climatic obiter dictum he said the Reece investigation in its inception and execution was a fraud.

These are phrases one hardly expects to hear uttered before such a discriminating audience. Such arrogance does not reflect credit upon academicians.

These blanket charges impugn the integrity of, not only a duly constituted committee and its members, but the integrity of the House of Representatives itself, and I am glad to address myself to these charges and give you an account of the work of the committee so far as time may permit.

IX

In a spirit of fairness, our committee began with what turned out to be a mistake in this instance: We decided to follow one of America's fundamental concepts of justice and procedure, namely, to make known the nature of the inquiry before the hearings began.

The evidence that had been gathered by the staff pointed to one simple underlying situation, namely, that the major foundations by subsidizing collectivistic-minded educators, had financed a socialist trend in American Government.

We informed the foundations in advance that our findings suggested that the foundations had for a long time been exercising powerful, although sometimes indirect political influence in both domestic and foreign policy, predominantly toward the left—to say nothing of the support by the foundations of the Institute of Pacific Relations which lead the movement to turn China over to the Communists and which was admittedly Communist dominated.

The doubts and reservations concerning the validity of the complaints against the large foundations were largely dispelled by the almost hysterical reaction of the foundations to the summary presented to the committee by the committee staff on the opening day of the hearings.

The excitement bordered on panic; as was observed by the demonstrations through the public relations channels of the large foundations and this convinced me, and others of the American public, judging from the letters received and which are still being received in my office, that the general picture which had taken shape, was not very far from the truth.

The foundations, being well aware of the nature of the duties and responsibilities of the committee, set up what might be termed a defensive barrage. This barrage was successful to a degree in smearing the committee and preventing the full facts from getting into the public press.

Concerning the difficulty of our task, John O'Donnell wrote in the New York Daily News:

"From the very start the special House committee created to investigate our Nation's multibillion tax-exempt foundations faced an almost impossible task. This was to tell the taxpayers that the incredible was, in fact, the truth.

"The incredible fact was that the huge fortunes piled up by such industrial giants as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford, etc., were today being used to discredit the free-enterprise system which gave them birth."

X

There is no doubt but that the large foundations and their satellites knew far better than did the committee where the bodies of their collectivism were buried, and as a result, their champion on the committee, the ranking minority member, could be thoroughly briefed on how to frustrate and discredit the various witnesses called before the committee.

The number of interruptions and the intensity of the vituperations heaped upon

these witnesses by the ranking minority member was without precedent in the history of congressional investigations.

And is it not astonishing that Dr. Hutchins, who poses as the great champion of civil liberties and whose fund for the republic was set up as a defender of witnesses before congressional committees, if not to investigate the investigatorial processes of Congress, has not offered one word of criticism of the conduct of Mr. Hays?

Contrast this silence with his slanderous personal attacks upon the committee majority.

On the contrary, Dr. Hutchins joined with Congressman Hays in slandering the critical witnesses, referring to them as "witnesses of dubious standing."

By dubious did he mean Professor Emeritus Briggs, of Columbia; Professor Hobbs, of Pennsylvania; Professor Rowe, of Yale; and Professor Colgrove, formerly of Northwestern?

Did he mean to include also Professors Sorokin and Zimmerman, of Harvard, and Boasard, of Pennsylvania, who gave highly critical testimony by letter?

I suppose the answer is that anyone who resists the foundations' intellectual straight-jacket is of dubious standing and should be publicly discredited.

When the pattern of the opposition tactics became obvious, I, as chairman, made up my mind that the only thing to do was to try to conquer discourtesy with courtesy, and throughout the hectic hearings I tried unsuccessfully to persuade Congressman Hays to a reasonable pattern of behavior.

Mr. Hays repeatedly vilified other members of the committee and questioned their good faith. He publicly, from the rostrum, accused the chairman of lying and being a coward, and accused the gentle Mr. Goodwin of duplicity and cowardice.

XI

The following excerpt which I, as chairman, had deleted from the printed record in an effort to maintain the dignity of the committee, is illustrative of the violent and abusive remarks, exceeding in impropriety, remarks for which a Senator was recently brought up on charges:

"The CHAIRMAN. Now, the gentleman from Ohio, I am sure, is not going to get anybody worked up or irritated here. If he has that in mind he might just as well subside, because the chairman for one has made up his mind that he is not going to let any byplay get him out of temper. That would impair the usefulness of this committee. . . .

"Mr. HAYS. I will say this to the gentleman, that out where I come from we have a saying that if a man doublecrosses you once, that is his fault; if he doublecrosses you twice, that is your fault. I just want you to know you won't get the second opportunity.

"The CHAIRMAN. Even that statement is not going to provoke the chairman, but there is no living man can justifiably say that this chairman—that this man who happens to be chairman at this time—has ever doublecrossed anybody or he had failed to keep his word.

"Mr. HAYS. I am saying both.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is all right.

"Mr. HAYS. Is that clear enough? There is no inference there is there?

"The CHAIRMAN. That does not disturb me a particle.

"Mr. HAYS. I know, you are pretty hard to disturb. I thought they had more guts in Tennessee.

"The CHAIRMAN. You are not going to provoke me. You need not worry; I have already made up my mind on that."

I am told that I demonstrated considerable forbearance, and I believe I did, although that was a difficult moment when Mr. Hays impugned not only my personal integrity but my physical courage.

I was tempted to compare military records with him, but that would not have been a very adult impulse to follow.

XII

By this time most of you gentlemen are probably familiar with the world's record which Mr. Hays has set for marathon interruptions of a witness.

In the case of one highly respected witness who was endeavoring to give the committee some information, Mr. Hays interrupted 246 times in 185 minutes.

And even though the committee passed a rule that a witness should be permitted to finish his presentation before being questioned and cross-questioned, Mr. Hays angrily declared in public session that he would interrupt whenever and wherever he pleased, and to say that he made good his word is an understatement.

Eminent professors among the witnesses were referred to publicly by Mr. Hays during the hearings as "crackpots" and as having been "dredged up by the committee staff," statements now echoed by Dr. Hutchins here.

An eminent Catholic scholar, Sister Margaret McCarran, was characterized by Mr. Hays as incompetent and as having secured her doctorate degree through political influence, presumably that of her father, the then senior Senator from Nevada.

The best answer to this remark which was manifestly made in an effort to discredit damaging testimony is a letter I received from Bishop Bryon J. McEntegart, rector of Catholic University, and which might be said was written with Cardinal Spellman's knowledge.

It is a long letter so I will quote only three sentences:

"It has come to my notice that at a hearing of your committee in early June, the assertion was made that a doctoral degree was granted at Catholic University of America as a result of pressure.

"On behalf of the University I wish to deny that allegation as completely false.

" . . . If the unwarranted assertion referred to above is included in the record of your hearings, may I ask that this letter be given equal prominence in your record."

XIII

Mr. Hays' technique of frustrating the testimony even included heckling the majority members of the committee during their questions and cross-examination.

It became apparent, therefore, that the appearances and testimony of the foundation representatives would be a farce because Mr. Hays would never permit cross-examination, and there was nothing I could do about it because as you gentlemen know, there is no force which governs the behavior of members of congressional committees, except that of self-control and common courtesy.

The majority members of the committee therefore, decided that further hearings would be fruitless.

To those of you who may have been given the erroneous impression by Dr. Hutchins and others, that this cancellation was not a unanimous majority action and that Congressman Goodwin did not concur, I refer you to page 945 of the committee hearings, which contains the following statement sent to me in writing, and I quote:

"I cannot be at the meeting on foundations tomorrow, and in the meantime I want you to know I think there should be an immediate cancellation of all public hearings. Signed, Angier L. Goodwin."

Obviously, the cancellation of the formal testimony of the large foundations and their satellites was all to their advantage from a public opinion standpoint because virtually none of the evidence against them had appeared in public print and the self-cleansing statements which took the place of their

testimony were printed verbatim plus favorable editorial comments in most of the important newspapers that came to my attention.

Dr. Hutchins' speech supports the false statement in Dean Griswold's fifth amendment to the effect that "After developing the case against the foundations, this committee closed its hearings without giving the foundations a chance to present their defense."

Now, here are copies of parts I and II of the hearings. In part I, pages 794 to 865 consist of foundation testimony and practically all of part II is foundations testimony.

In a single issue of the New York Times, July 25, the self-cleansing brief of the Ford Foundation was given 2 feature stories totaling about 4,000 words.

One story praised the Ford Foundation; the other smeared the committee.

I think you gentlemen will agree that that is thorough press coverage.

XIV

I now want to say a few words about America's large tax-exempt foundations—the ones who are at the center of this storm.

Dr. Hutchins, when he was here, ridiculed the committee opinion that these foundations were involved in an intellectual cartel and stated that the committee had indulged in "new wrinkles to the distortions that we have become accustomed to in congressional investigations."

This language of Dr. Hutchins is typical of the vituperation which has been poured on us by the professional operators of foundations.

Realizing the impossibility of controverting the massive evidence which we produced, they have resorted to smear and slander.

They cannot disprove the existence of the intellectual cartel which we so clearly disclosed—a cartel which, using public money, has so effectively influenced academic and public opinion both in the domestic and international fields.

Among many warnings concerning this cartel comes one from Prof. Carl O. Sauer, of the University of California:

"In American social science it has indeed become a dominant folkway to associate progress with putting the job inquiry into large-scale organizations, under formally prescribed methods, and with limited objectives. Having adopted the name 'science' we are impressed by the 'method of science' as inductive, quantitative, and experimental. We are even told that such is the only proper method."

Professor Sauer refers to the top social-science planners as "an elite, fashioning increasingly the direction and limits of our work" and says "a serious and delicate problem is posed by the growing role of the national research council and foundation, the last years having seen a continually increasing concentration of influence."

You know, these planners, of whom Dr. Hutchins is an outstanding example, have cleverly adopted a Communist tactic.

Communists charge that the rest of the world is aggressive.

Similarly, these planners accuse the Committee on Foundations of wishing to suppress freedom of thought.

The fact is that the intellectual cartel which they have created itself suppresses freedom of thought by expending vast millions of foundation money under their control to determine opinion, academic and public, in the leftist directions they favor. There is extensive testimony to this effect by most competent witnesses.

XV

The foundations have placed great stress upon the fact that the amount of money actually spent in the social sciences is not enough to finance an intellectual revolution.

But the fact remains that, working at the fountainhead, it does not take much money

to exercise virtual control over the relatively small number of people and institutions who in turn can control huge areas of policy and public opinion.

This power to impose brainwashing at the key points is against everything America stands for.

Evidence of this power comes from Prof. Charles E. Merriam, of the University of Chicago, one of the Nation's most notable educators.

Professor Merriam, himself inclined toward collectivism, was, at one time, an important dispenser of foundation funds.

In discussing his experience in this capacity, Professor Merriam said to one of his colleagues: "Money is power and for the last few years I have been dealing with more power than a professor should ever have in his hands."

As proof of the atmosphere of fear in which the conservative educator lives and works today, I would like to mention that the most pertinent information the committee received concerning the close-shop that apparently is being imposed on educators came from men who refuse to risk retaliatory action but were willing to give me off-the-record information.

One of them, who is a celebrated classical educator and known to all of you, said: "It is sad but true that it would be a waste of time for any graduate student of mine, however brilliant, to apply for a scholarship from the powers that be. They simply do not conform to the new collectivistic order of modern social science in America today."

Another internationally known professor and economist told us that in the large university where he teaches, no assistant professor would dream of not being a follower of the Keynes theory of deficit spending and the monetization of a public debt because only a supporter of Keynes could hope for promotion to a full professorship.

One of the most brilliant and most courageous social scientists in the country today, Dr. A. H. Hobbs of the University of Pennsylvania, is still merely an assistant professor.

He has been passed over for promotion, and the University authorities have made it utterly clear, ever since he began to point out the limitations of social science as a guide to social reform and began warning against the effect of such efforts upon the American way of life.

XVI

Regarding the question whether the foundations are supporting actual or potentially subversive projects, Dr. Hutchins virtually defeated his own case when he was attempting to point out how absurd these suspicions were.

He said in his speech before you that according to the Reece committee's definition, support of social planning by the foundations could be subversion.

This was said in derision because in Dr. Hutchins' opinion no rational man can take this statement seriously.

This shows the vast gulf between the rationality of Dr. Hutchins and that of the millions of Americans, Democrats as well as Republicans, who have come to realize that the planning of the social scientist reformers for their brave new world is actually or potentially subversive.

It is "subversive" because it seeks to introduce Fabian socialism into the United States.

The word "subversion" connotes a process of undermining; and these planners, these "social engineers" as they call themselves, who deem themselves entitled to lead us common people into better pastures, seek to undermine some of our most precious institutions, one being our unique system of enterprise of free management and free labor.

There is no need to doubt this.

They have been candid among themselves.

To some degree, they even have been candid with us common people.

They have set down their objectives as clearly as did Hitler in his *Mein Kampf*.

One of the documents which frankly discloses their plans is the *Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies*, a call to American educators to teach collectivism to our youth.

This project was financed by the Carnegie Foundation.

In his statement on behalf of the Carnegie Foundation filed with the committee, its president, Charles Dollard, sought to deny the socialist nature of this report which became an important influence in education.

He stated: "The worst that can be said is that the authors (of this report) not only reported this trend but appeared to accept it cheerfully. What they were accepting was not socialism—it was the New Deal."

But gentlemen, this was not the New Deal. My authority is none other than Prof. Howard J. Laski, the top philosopher of the British Socialist Party, who said of these conclusions and recommendations: "At bottom and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a socialist America."

Yet, after the *Conclusions and Recommendations* was published, the president of the Carnegie Corp. stated that the public owed its authors a vote of thanks.

XVII

Those of you who were here when Dr. Hutchins spoke will remember his eloquent closing words: "The Fund for the Republic is a sort of fund for the American dream. I do not think the fund can make the American dream come true, but perhaps it can help keep it alive and clear."

I would like to give you my impressions of the American dream that is now occupying the attention of the foundation-financed intellectual cartel.

Ever since the world began, well-meaning people, lacking faith in the common man to conduct his own affairs, have promoted the idea of government by an elite.

Plato wanted his perfect society run by all powerful, allwise and, of course, incorruptible philosophers.

Francis Bacon wanted his world run by a group of top scientists answering to the same specifications.

Robert Hutchins and the other members of this self-appointed professional intellectual aristocracy dream of an America governed by social scientists, guided by their benign infallibility under a system which frees the people from the responsibilities of freedom.

Mr. Pendleton Herring, of the Social Science Research Council, wrote in 1947 concerning this matter: "One of the greatest needs in the social sciences is for the development of skilled practitioners who can use social data for the cure of social ills as doctors use scientific data to cure bodily ills."

The degree to which this elite penetrated the Federal Government is indicated by the 1947 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education.

I would like to give you a few extracts from that report.

"It will take social science and social engineering to solve the problems of human relations. Our people must learn to respect the need for special knowledge and technical training in this field as they have come to defer to the expert in physics, chemistry, medicine and the other sciences."

I would like to mention that by no valid definition can sociology and economics identify themselves as true science.

Seven years before this report was issued, one of the members of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Horace M. Kallen, wrote a magazine article entitled, "Can We Be Served By Indoctrination?"

I would like to quote two short paragraphs from that article:

"I find within the babble of plans and plots against the evils of our time one only which does not merely repeat the past; this is the proposal that the country's pedagogues shall undertake to establish themselves as the country's saviors."

After some elaboration, Dr. Kallen concludes, "Having taken power, the teachers must use it to attain the central purpose of realizing the American dream. They must operate education as the instrument of social regeneration. This consists of inculcating right doctrine."

Change the word "American" to "Fabian" and you are pretty close to the truth.

Another phase of this American dream might be found in another document for professional pedagogues entitled, "Molders of the American Mind," by Prof. Normal Wolfel.

Here is one of his admonitions: "The younger generation is on its own, and the last thing that would interest modern youth is the salvaging of the Christian tradition. The environmental controls which technologists have achieved and the operations by means of which workers earn their livelihood need no aid or sanction from God nor any blessing from the church."

And he adds this final touch: "In the minds of the men who think experimentally, America is conceived as having a destiny which bursts the all too obvious limitations of Christian religious sanctions and of capitalistic profit economy."

XVIII

I am sure that this particular audience is peculiarly aware of the difficulty of putting into a small number of words any discussion of a subject of the magnitude of this one, particularly because only portions of the ground have been properly explored.

I also realize that many in the audience know more about some aspects of this subject than I do, because it is their business to follow political and sociological trends.

Among these journalists are a number of very fine people who honestly disagree with me concerning the danger of Fabian socialism, and they are entitled to their opinion.

But I do not think that any informed observer of public affairs would disagree with me as to the evidence of its encroachment upon the American economy.

For this reason, it is my opinion that the great majority of the working newspapermen of the United States, were they in possession of all of the evidence concerning the operation of the large foundations, would agree with me that foundation grants have knowingly given very substantial aid and comfort to Fabian socialism in the United States and unknowingly, or otherwise, given aid and comfort to causes which are subversive in a more literal sense.

Whether this is good or bad is, of course, a matter of personal conviction, but in either case, it is not a proper activity for philanthropic foundations.

What are these foundation funds which this intellectual elite presumes to use for their own political purposes?

They are public funds, dedicated to the public and necessarily so because they are the product of tax exemption.

I submit that those who expend these public trust funds should be subjected to the highest fiduciary duty.

For my part, I am not willing to see foundations given tax exemption to enable them to promote ideologies detrimental to the public welfare.

Even with its several faults, the report of the committee is a competent one, and in many ways an historic document.

Long after the pious protestations of its adversaries have been forgotten, this record will stand as the first determined effort to alert the Nation to the presence of a force which, if allowed to persist and grow, could become stronger than the Government itself.

The Man To See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial regarding a good friend, and a most distinguished constituent of mine, Bernard M. Shanley. I am sure many of my colleagues will join with me in extending to Mr. Shanley our very best wishes as he assumes his new and most important task as appointments secretary to President Eisenhower.

This editorial, which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Sunday News of February 20, 1955, follows:

THE MAN TO SEE

Bernard M. Shanley of Newark and Bernardsville has become one of the most potent officials in the Federal Government. As appointments secretary, succeeding Thomas E. Stephens, he will decide who, including Cabinet members, obtain private audience with the President.

It is 35 years since a Jerseyman stood in such close relationship to the President. Then it was Joseph P. Tumulty, the astute and engaging Jersey City lawyer who, as a young assemblyman, had attracted Woodrow Wilson's attention during the gubernatorial campaign of 1910. For the next 10 years, as governor and President, Mr. Wilson kept Mr. Tumulty at his side.

The presidential secretaryship assumed by Mr. Tumulty had changed little in the half-century since John G. Nicolay and John Hay, with a few clerks in a couple of offices over the East Room, comprised Abraham Lincoln's White House staff. Mr. Tumulty arranged appointments, gave out White House news, managed the clerical force and was the President's personal, political, and legal adviser.

These many responsibilities are now distributed among a dozen members of the President's staff, which was not reorganized to meet modern pressure on the President until Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. Then six administrative assistants with a "passion for anonymity" were authorized by Congress after a survey of the executive establishment.

Of all the burdens of the President none is more insistent or wearing than demands upon his time. A split-second schedule is needed if he is to do all that he is required to do and still have time left for the recreational interludes without which his office would destroy him.

It is the appointments secretary's job to keep this schedule in line and on time. This is a task requiring political experience and sound judgment, plus the ability to say yes with discretion and to say no with grace.

Interoceanic Canals Commission Recommended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a statement published in the February 2, 1955, edition of the American Daily—Diario Las Americas—a Spanish-English newspaper of Miami, Fla., with a large circulation in Latin-American nations, Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, former civil Governor of the Canal Zone during the construction era and sole surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, expressed his views concerning the Isthmian question.

The proposal for the creation of an Inter-oceanic Canals Commission to evolve and recommend a program for increased facilities of the Panama Canal and for future Isthmian waterway projects, as embodied in S. 766 and H. R. 3335 of the present Congress, was commended by him as being altogether wise and appropriate.

Because of Governor Thatcher's long association with the Panama Canal and constructive contributions—first in the Canal Zone Government and the Isthmian Canal Commission, and, later, as a Representative in the Congress from Kentucky, with continuing contacts with and studies of the Panama Canal and Isthmian problems—his opinions command due weight and consideration.

The subject news story follows:

NEW WATERWAY ACROSS THE ISTHMIAN SEEN NECESSARY—CANAL EXPERT FAVORS IMPROVEMENT OF PANAMA CANAL

WASHINGTON.—Maurice H. Thatcher, renowned specialist in interoceanic canals, said that it would be "wise and opportune" for the United States to study without delay the problems of how to improve the Panama Canal or construct a second waterway between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Thatcher, ex-Civil Governor of the Canal Zone, was a member of the Panama Canal Commission during the time of its construction. As representative from Kentucky he sponsored many laws relative to the Panama Canal.

In an interview with the United Press, Thatcher praised the bill presented last week in the Senate by Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, from Iowa, to create an interoceanic canal Commission which would be made up of 11 members to be appointed by the President.

The commission would study the possibilities relative to a canal at sea level across Panama, to improve the lock system of the canal or to build a completely new canal, in addition to the political questions relative to that work.

"The question of bettering the Panama Canal is of such importance and things change so rapidly in this atomic age, that I think the creation of a special commission would be wise and opportune," he said.

"In that way the whole matter could be studied, until reaching the recommendations which Congress and the President should consider before making decisions," he continued. "The moment will come, although I

don't know when, when another canal will be needed across the Isthmus, and we can well consider that the Isthmus extends from Mexico to Colombia.

"When the moment arrives, I think that a second route, in Panama or Nicaragua, will have to be considered, though, this is a matter that needs a great deal of study."

Thatcher said that a canal at sea level in Panama would necessitate tidal locks on the Pacific side, in addition to deep and costly excavations. He predicted a counterproject for the betterment of the present route of the canal, with 3 sets of locks in Miraflores and in Gatun, with a maximum level of 85 feet between the 2 sets. The locks would be widened to allow the passage of the largest ships.

When questioned as to why he mentioned Nicaragua as one of the possibilities, Thatcher answered:

"The route through Nicaragua has a long history. It has been considered for years. Previously it was almost chosen for the construction of the canal. There are some favorable geographic characteristics in Nicaragua. An elevation of 33 meters will be needed, but the lake makes a large stretch of water available."

Thatcher said that he doubted whether Mexico would be favorable toward construction by the United States of a canal across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec. He added that he thought a country as large as Mexico would insist on having complete control of any waterway within its territory.

He also said that the new canal across the Atrato route in Colombia is "feasible but very costly."

Thatcher insisted that the construction of a new canal, through whatever route, would be extremely costly and that, as a result, he thinks that the most economical solution would be to better the existing canal in Panama.

He made it clear that he was not expressing a conclusion about any route, apart from the fact that he thinks that a detailed study of the situation is an urgent matter.

Twenty Dollars a Head

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 23, 1955:

TWENTY DOLLARS A HEAD

Whenever anyone comes along and suggests cutting people's taxes he is going to get a pretty wistful reception. Taxes in this country have been so high for so long that many people can hardly remember when they were anything else, but everybody can dream.

So we suspect that Speaker RAYBURN struck a responsive chord in the voting public—and well thought he would—when he promised that the Democrats were going to get taxes down. On Monday the House Ways and Means Committee voted to carry out the promise, and the House itself is expected to consider it tomorrow.

But in view of how the taxes got up so high and what the Democrats propose to do about them, it seems to us that it was a pretty shabby promise.

The Democrats haven't said a thing about getting the Government's expenses down; the present administration has taken a bigger bite out of the Government's costs than any Democratic administration of the previous 20 years. And the Democrats aren't promising to distribute this tax largess on the basis of need, equity, or justice. They are simply going to hand every taxpayer a \$20 bill.

Well, there's going to be an election next year, and the Democrats are going to want a lot of votes from the taxpayers.

And as Mr. RAYBURN knows, the \$20 bill is the only piece of folding money the voter sees that carries the picture of a Democrat.

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest programs ever authorized by this Congress is that of vocational education. I could take a lot of time extolling the virtues of this great program, with particular reference to what it does for our great State. I am deeply interested in the appropriation for that work by this Congress. I hope the full amount which the agency needs can be appropriated.

I have just received the following letter from J. Marion Adams, assistant commissioner for vocational education for Arkansas, who is doing a grand job in Arkansas. This letter explains in some detail just what our problem is:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Little Rock, Ark., February 21, 1955.

HON. J. W. TRIMBLE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TRIMBLE: Since I wrote you last concerning the need for additional Federal funds for vocational education, we have made a careful study of our needs, keeping in mind practical limitations as to buildings, trained teachers, etc., and have made an estimate of the expansion we could make in the very near future if increased Federal funds can be made available.

We estimate that Arkansas local school districts could add right away 191 vocational teachers and an additional 200 lay teachers to offer courses to adult farmers (not regularly employed teachers, but teachers for short-unit classes only, paid about \$200 per class). Such expansion would cost approximately \$361,400. The additional teachers would be distributed in the various vocational fields as follows: agriculture, 21 plus 200 lay teachers; distributive, 20; home economics, 50; trade and industrial education, 70; and guidance, 30 counselors.

During the past year a committee of 25 citizens of Arkansas have worked vigorously studying the "needs, deficiencies and extent" of vocational education programs in Arkansas public schools. They established as Arkansas' ideal program of vocational education: appropriate courses in vocational education available to every person in Arkansas, whether in school or out of school.

Of the 425 school districts in the State of Arkansas 319 have at least one type of vocational course offered to high school students. A total of 107 local districts offer no courses

in vocational education. We feel that an outstanding program of vocational education for students in these schools (whether offered locally or on an area basis) would be a major asset to the social improvement, industrial development, and total economy of this State.

This year Arkansas is putting approximately \$1 million from State funds into its programs of vocational education and receiving \$601,431 in Federal funds. Local districts bear all costs of physical equipment, buildings, operational costs, and 50 percent of the salary of the local vocational teacher. You know, of course, that the need for additional funds for schools here at home is terrific. We do hope that Congress can provide increased funds for the vocational phase of our educational program.

Very truly yours,

J. MARION ADAMS,
Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education.

Then and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, many times during each session we are given many opportunities to hear our colleagues speak outside the Halls of Congress. We all receive many invitations, and, time permitting, we usually attend. I had the pleasure yesterday of hearing one of the finest such talks I have heard since coming to Congress. It was delivered by our very esteemed colleague from Ohio, Representative CLARENCE J. BROWN, I call this talk to your attention because it serves as a caution to all of us:

ADDRESS BY HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, OF OHIO,
BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SOCIETY,
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, FEBRUARY 22, 1955, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, when my good friend, Colonel Baxter, extended the invitation to me to be with you here today I broke a rule established some time ago not to make public appearances such as this while Congress is in session and promptly accepted. I did so, not only because of my high regard for the colonel, and my recognition of the Sons of the American Revolution as one of our greatest patriotic organizations, but also because I have reached the place where it has become virtually impossible for me to sit quietly on the floor of the United States House of Representatives while some Member goes through the mockery of reading George Washington's Farewell Address to a legislative body which, in recent years, has consistently failed or refused to heed, or to pay attention, to the advice and warnings given by the Father of our Country in that address.

So, on this 223d anniversary of the birth of the immortal Washington, I shall not devote my time to, or bore you with, repeating the usual tributes to the Father of our Country. Instead I have chosen the subject Then and Now, and shall attempt to give a rather condensed comparison of our beloved country and its Government, as it existed at the end of Washington's first term as President, and as it exists today.

Washington, as you will recall, took office as President, under our newly created sys-

tem of representative Government as defined by the Constitution, in April of 1789.

At the end of his first term, in 1793, the United States was made up of 15 States, 2 of which had been added to the original 13. They were—Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont, and Virginia. Of these only Kentucky lay west of the Alleghenies. Today, as you all well know, the Union consists of 48 States, embracing all of the land and territory between the Atlantic on the east, the Pacific on the west, Canada on the north, and Mexico on the south. But even now legislation is pending in the Congress to admit into the Union, two additional Territories as States—Hawaii and Alaska—neither of which is contiguous to any of the 48 States. And in addition, of course, Texas has the right, under the Annexation Agreement, to divide into five States any time that great empire may wish to do so.

The first United States census was taken in 1790, and fixed the population of the United States at 3,929,000. By the time the 1800 census was taken the fledgling Republic, had grown in population by 1,400,000—or by more than 34 percent—to a total of 5,308,000 people.

According to the first census and during Washington's Presidency, Virginia was the most populous State, having a population of 748,000, almost twice that of any other. Pennsylvania was next in population, having 434,000 persons within its borders. North Carolina was third, with 394,000, and New York—believe it or not—ranked only fourth, with a population of 340,000.

Back in Washington's time the Federal Government had its national headquarters in Philadelphia, the city of brotherly love, although the Father of our Country was even then planning the establishment of a new Federal City which was later to bear his name, in the District of Columbia—a 10-mile square area to be carved out of the States of Maryland and Virginia—along his beloved Potomac and near his home at Mount Vernon.

Under the Constitution, upon which the new system of government headed by Washington was established, and which, of course, is still in effect, each State has two Senators representing it in the United States Senate.

So, during Washington's administration the membership of the Senate totaled only 30, as compared to the present-day membership of 96. The House of Representatives consisted of 105 Members, based upon the census of 1790. Today, and for more than three decades past, the United States House of Representatives has had 435 Members, also apportioned on a population basis.

During Washington's first term the individual Member of Congress represented an average district population of about 40,000 people. Today each Member of Congress represents an average of nearly 400,000 persons—somewhere around 380,000 to be more accurate.

Back in the days when the new Republic was just getting underway, a Member of Congress did not have as many duties and responsibilities, or as much correspondence to handle, or messenger work to do for his constituents, as during the present time, but he certainly had a great deal more difficulty getting to his job at the Nation's Capital. It may be of interest to know that in journeying to Philadelphia for the meeting of the first Congress in 1790, 1 Member of Congress was shipwrecked, 2—and I quote, "were forced to land with considerable difficulty on Cape May and travel the remaining way to Philadelphia in a wagon"—end of quote; 2 Members suffered grave injuries when a stagecoach upset; and 1 reported he was—and again I quote, "forced

to travel by ship for 16 days through perpetual storms with serious and painful effect upon my digestive apparatus."

Those who served in the early Congresses of Washington's time did not need as much clerical help as we do today, for the only means of communication between Philadelphia and the various congressional districts of the United States, as well as the rest of the world, were: (1) The new and negligible postal service, (2) by special messenger, (3) quote, "any trustworthy person who happened to be traveling in the right direction," unquote, and, (4) masters of sailing vessels.

In fact, the postal service was, not only new, but most irregular, in those days. At the very best, according to the records, it took from 4 to 7 days to get a letter from Boston to New York, around 13 days for a letter mailed in Philadelphia to reach Georgia, and at least 20 days for a Kentucky Congressman to get a letter from Philadelphia back to his home district in the blue grass State. Such time schedules were kept, of course, only if everything went right, and quite often there were long and serious delays. For instance, a letter written by Governor Telfair of Georgia to Thomas Jefferson, posted January 2, 1791, did not reach its destination until March 4—61 days later.

Of course, foreign communication was even more difficult, for to complete an exchange of correspondence between America and Europe, back in those days, required an average of about 6 months. And difficulties often arose through capture, pirating or shipwreck, which resulted in the loss of much overseas mail.

While George Washington was President, Members of the House and Senate of the United States received the munificent salary or pay of \$6 a day for their services, as compared to the \$15,000 annual salary now paid Members of Congress, and to the \$25,000 salary provided in the new Federal pay legislation which cleared the House last week.

So, perhaps many of us who now serve on Capitol Hill should be grateful, not only for the difference in pay, but also for the difference in travel conditions, which now permit a Representative or Senator from California to leave his western home in the early morning and arrive in Washington in time for the opening of the Congressional session at 12, noon, of the same day.

But many present-day Members of Congress may be none too appreciative of the great improvement which has taken place in the Nation's postal service since the time of Washington. For instance, our modern postal service brings an average of 400 communications of different types to my office each day, all requiring the attention of myself and my secretarial staff. And believe it or not, there are times when my congressional mail reaches a grand total of 1,500 to 2,000 pieces in a single day.

During his first term as President, Washington had a cabinet consisting of 4 members, as compared to the 10 in the Eisenhower Cabinet. They were the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson; Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton; Secretary of War, Henry Knox; and Attorney General, Edmund Randolph. In addition, President Washington had a Postmaster General, Timothy Pickens, who was not a member of the Cabinet. Vice President John Adams had little work to do, and did not encounter too much difficulty in presiding over the Senate, with a membership of 30, for the short time it was in session.

The executive branch of the Government, under Washington, was made up of three departments—State, Treasury, and War. Today, as I mentioned a moment ago, President Eisenhower has ten members in his Cabinet, representing as many departments, and in addition the Director of Mobilization,

the Director of the Budget, and the Director of Foreign Operations Administration, sit with the Cabinet regularly, while the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, frequently join the group.

So actually today, on this Washington's birth anniversary of 1955, our Government is made up of 13 departments and 48 independent agencies, boards, and commissions, which, in turn, include another 2,133 different operating components to which personnel assignments are made.

You may be interested to know that, when Washington was President, the Treasury Department maintained the most extensive establishment, with agencies and officials in every large town, and in every section of the country. There were tax collectors then, even as now, though not in nearly as great a number. Our original Treasury Department, of course, had the responsibility, not only for the routine conduct of the young Nation's fiscal affairs, but also for such diverse functions as the collection of customs and tonnage dues; establishment of light houses, beacons, buoys, and public piers, registration and clearance of vessels; carrying of mail; surveying of public lands in the western territory; supervision of the banks of the United States; the granting of bounties on fish; and the collection of excise and other taxes.

Washington's War Department, besides operating and managing the Army, handled payment of pensions to disabled war veterans; regulated trade with the Indians; made grants of land to veterans, and regulated the militia of the several States.

The Department of State, then had as its primary duty, the conduct of our foreign affairs, as it does now. But it also granted patents and copyrights, supervised Federal marshals and attorneys, helped govern the Western territories, managed the Mint, took the census, and performed other miscellaneous functions.

The United States Attorney General, although he attended Cabinet meetings, had almost no administrative and few legal duties. It was not until the end of Washington's service as President that the Congress became magnanimous and furnished an office for the Attorney General, and generously appropriated funds to hire a clerk for him.

By the end of Washington's first term the Federal Government had established some nine different field services, outside of the Military Establishments and territorial governments. These services included Customs, Lighthouses, Attorneys of the United States, Federal Marshals, Post Offices, Revenue Cutter service, Indian Superintendents, Commissioners of Loans, and—believe it or not—the Internal Revenue Service.

Even back in those days, the United States had a so-called civil service covering civilian employment totaling 780 persons, not including the Deputy Postmasters of whom about 660 worked for the Department of Treasury. It may be interesting to note that as of last December the total number of civilian employees of the Federal Government, according to our mutual friend Senator Brannan, and his Joint Committee on Federal Expenditures, stood at 2,368,073.

But back in Washington's time the central Government's office staffs, located in Philadelphia remained small, and most Federal employees worked out in the field. For example, the largest Department of Government at that time—the Treasury Department—had only 70 persons employed at its departmental headquarters in Philadelphia. State Department personnel consisted of 5 clerks, 1 interpreter, 1 doorkeeper, and 1 messenger, in addition to the Secretary of State himself.

At the end of Washington's service as President, the War Department had grown to where it had a central staff of 17 people—believe it or not—while Postmaster General

Pickering performed all of the duties of his governmental position in 2 rooms of his own home, with the aid of 1 assistant and 1 clerk.

President Washington and the United States had diplomatic representatives in just five major foreign capitals—London, Paris, The Hague, Madrid, and Lisbon.

Most Federal officers of that time received their official income from two main sources, salaries and fees. Today the fee system, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, as well as in most States, has been entirely eliminated. President Washington drew the highest salary of all the Federal officials of his day—\$25,000 annually, plus some expenses, which amounted to much less than his salary. The Secretaries of State and Treasury each received a salary of \$3,500 annually; while the Secretary of War drew but \$1,500. Perhaps the Secretary of War's low pay was accounted for by the fact that the United States was not then trying to feed, finance, and police the entire world, and uniformed Americans were not serving in more than 75 different lands outside continental United States. Under Washington, who appears to have been a frugal man, the Comptroller of the Treasury of the United States and the Governor of the Northwest Territory, each drew salaries of \$2,000, while the Clerk of the House and Senate received the magnificent yearly amount of \$500 each.

Most Federal officials of that period—outside of the ones just mentioned—were compensated for their services through fees. Some did quite well. For instance, a number of the collectors of customs had higher annual incomes from fees than the Secretary of the Treasury received in salary. At the other end of the line, however, many postmasters in small towns were paid as little as \$25 per year.

As Commander in Chief, Washington had under him an Army of about 5,000 men, but no Navy or armed ships of any kind, until 1794. And I have been unable to find, from sources I believe to be reliable, where George Washington had any kind of an Air Force at all. Today our Army, Navy, and air services consist of well over 3 million men. But when George Washington, in his first term, moved to put down the so-called Whisky Rebellion in western Pennsylvania, he was compelled to enlist the aid of State militiamen, at a time when the States maintained complete control over the activities of their military units.

The Father of our Country, during his two administrations as President, did not have too much money with which to "play around," and certainly not the \$60 to \$100 billion yearly budgets which have been available to recent Presidents. During the 8 years of Washington's Presidency, Federal revenues averaged \$5,717,000 annually, while—believe it or not—annual Federal expenditures during the same period averaged \$5,776,000, which indicates that even the Father of our Country had to worry about "red ink," and Treasury deficits.

Most of the revenues of that day came from customs duties, and, later, from the first excise taxes which were imposed by Congress in 1791 on spirits distilled in the United States. It was this excise tax, by the way, which touched off the Whisky Rebellion. The Federal Government received only meager funds from postage, sale of public lands, fines, penalties, and forfeitures. And at the end of Washington's first term, the public debt of the United States totaled \$70 million, or perhaps a few dollars more. Today our public debt stands at approximately \$280 billion—or, to put it another way—280 thousand million dollars.

But to turn to our Government of today. You may recall it was my original idea and legislative bills which created both the First and Second Commissions on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government,

better known as the First and Second Hoover Commissions. You may also be aware that I served as a member on both Commissions, and have devoted more than 4 years of my life to the study of the organization and functions of the Federal Government, especially the executive branch.

You may be interested in knowing that, in comparison with the 3 postal workers of Washington's time, the Post Office Department now has 8,688 employees here in metropolitan Washington alone, and a total employment of 508,519 throughout the country; that the State Department now has 5,106 employees in Washington, and a total overall personnel of 21,061; that the United States, through its State Department, maintains 68 embassies and 9 legations in 77 foreign countries, in addition to the 106 consulates, which are administered in 105 foreign colonies, territories, and directorates. The Defense Department alone, including the Army, Navy, and Air Force, employs 1,144,994 civilians, of which some 340,000 are nationals of other nations, working overseas. In addition, of course, we have 3,300,000 Americans serving in our Armed Forces.

The Treasury Department has grown from its original 70 to where it now has 13,115 employees in Washington, and an overall employment of 79,459.

Of course, in addition to all of these departmental employment figures I have given you, the legislative branch of our Government has 4,113 employees, and the Federal judiciary 22,125.

You may also be interested in hearing some other facts which have been developed by our Hoover Commission and its task forces. Earlier I talked of travel in Washington's day. Well, today our Federal officials travel much farther and faster, and in more safety and comfort. According to the best information I can gather, not a single Government employee has been injured recently in a stagecoach upset—at least not during the present administration. But the latest reports do show that we have a little more than 261,000 motor vehicles being used by officials of the Federal Government, with an annual consumption of 29,418,577 gallons of gasoline. These vehicles, according to the General Services Administration, traveled the equivalent of 70,000 trips around the world during the past year—or about 1,800 million miles.

The Federal Government is doing something about the health of our citizens. At the present time we have 26 Federal departments and agencies engaged in one or more health programs, at an aggregate cost of approximately \$4,200 million during the present fiscal year. Under them some 27 million Americans are receiving free medical service from the Government. Approximately 10 percent of all American doctors and dentists now work for the Federal Government.

And, of course, we have 104 different Government agencies loaning your money and mine, under one arrangement or another, not only to our own citizens, but to almost every foreign Government or activity in the world, wherever we can find anyone to take our cash. All of this, despite George Washington's warning against foreign entanglements. Yet we are now giving away free to other nations and peoples each year 1,000 times as much money as the entire Government cost to operate in Washington's time.

But before I close my remarks, I think you may be interested in knowing that our public debt, which I mentioned to you a moment ago as standing at \$280 billion, equals the value of all taxable property of every kind and description west of the Mississippi River—and then some. Yet, at the same time our Federal Government owns considerable more property than it did when Washington was President. On June 30, 1954, the

issuable personal property held and owned by the Federal Government amounted to \$66,250,000,000, and this amount, of course, did not include such items as naval vessels, military weapons, vehicles, furniture, and other equipment in use; nor did it include our Government industrial installations—all of which are estimated to be worth an addition \$48,500,000,000.

The overall inventory of the Federal Government's personal property actually totals, at cost price, more than the total inventory of our entire free-enterprise system, all combined.

And on top of all this, outside the public domain itself, our Federal Government today owns real property, purchased at the taxpayers' expense at one time or another, having a total estimated value of \$30,500,000,000. So, all together our Government owns and possesses some \$145 billion worth of property—which is a fairly good offset against our public debt—were it not for the fact that our Government has also incurred secondary obligations, or made promises to pay if someone else does not, an additional grand amount of \$255 billion.

So, I cannot help but wonder, as I suspect you may be doing, just what the Father of our Country—the man whose anniversary and memory we honor here today—would think and say if he were to come back to earth this day, and look about him in this city bearing his name—look at the Government and the country he did so much to create and to establish. Would he think we had made real progress and, if so, in what direction? Would he find our present-day life better, more enjoyable, and less troublesome than in his day?

George Washington had his problems, as did the new Republic he headed. Modern-time Americans have their troubles and problems, too. What do you think? Are we, as Americans, doing as good a job of making free and representative Government work, all things considered, as did George Washington and his compatriots of 160 years ago?

Regardless of your views on the questions I have just propounded, I am sure all of you will agree there is a great difference between then and now.

Housing for Aging Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include an interesting and challenging statement Housing for Aging Families written by John Carroll, vice chairman of the Boston Housing Authority, of Boston, Mass., relating to the housing needs of elderly persons in the United States.

Mr. Carroll has devoted years of unselfish service in trying to improve conditions of low-income groups and underprivileged persons, particularly in trying to improve their condition in the field of improved housing. Mr. Carroll has done this without compensation. He is one of the finest persons I have ever met—progressively unselfish.

His views on the subject of Housing for Aging Families are worthy of serious consideration:

HOUSING FOR AGING FAMILIES

(By John Carroll, vice chairman, Boston Housing Authority)

The problems of the aging are of continually growing importance throughout the whole country. Medical science has made it that more and more persons are living to an advanced age while pension plans, both public and private, are, and will increasingly give greater independence to the elderly. Of great importance is the question of housing of the aging. Housing specifically designed for them is minute compared with their overall needs. Throughout all the cities of the Nation elderly persons are jammed into substandard housing for which they are paying sums large enough to pay the rent for decent federally aided housing of a nature similar to that under presently operated developments.

Old-age assistance recipients in Boston receive as much as \$43.75 a month for gross rent for apartments, which amount is sufficient to pay the required gross rent for federally aided developments in the city. Because so many of them are in one-person families they are ruled out from residence in Federal developments and instead of having decent housing they are forced to live in hovels in slum sections of the city. This rent money is coming out of the public treasury and thus public funds are being used to subsidize dumps instead of making possible residence in safe, sanitary housing.

Thus we find that while pension plans are of ever greater importance, housing plans are not keeping pace with the program in other directions. Not only do we now have social security on the public level, but we also find that private pension plans have grown tremendously in the past 20 years, particularly with the growth of labor unions. But all this progress comes to naught if the pension recipient still has no decent house in which to spend his declining years. The house is of great importance to all, but is of greatest importance to the elderly because they must spend so much time in it.

Housing for the aged is of marked importance in New England because of the large percentage of elderly persons living in the area and the antiquated housing in which so many of them reside. Whereas in 1950, 8.1 percent of the country's population was over 65 years of age, in 4 of the New England States the percentage was 10 or more, and in each of the two other States the national average was exceeded. Specific percentages of population over 65 years were as follows in 1950:

	Percent
Nation.....	8.1
New Hampshire.....	10.8
Maine.....	10.5
Vermont.....	10.5
Massachusetts.....	10.0
Rhode Island.....	8.9
Connecticut.....	8.8

The national average increased from 4 percent in 1940 and studies in population trends indicate that it will ultimately be stabilized at 13 to 14 percent.

In Boston in 1950 the percentage of persons over 65 years was 9.7 in 1950 and is constantly growing. Moreover, the number of aged persons living by themselves is greatest in the area where urban redevelopment is to be undertaken. There aged single persons, together with other single persons, are not eligible for federally aided public housing irrespective of the fact that their present homes are to be destroyed.

There were 82,800 persons over 65 years of age resident in Boston in 1950. About 20 percent of these were old-age assistance recipients. The Boston Housing Authority conducted a survey of these recipients and received over 1,800 returns signifying interest in public housing. These returns were heavily weighted in favor of single persons

presently not eligible for Federal housing. All of these persons would be eligible income-wise for such housing.

The problems of these and other elderly persons may be approached from the point of view of what has been done and what is being done for them in Boston. Lack of adequate income of a great percentage of elderly persons has made the group unattractive to private enterprise and thus almost nothing has been done by private groups toward producing housing architecturally designed and economically planned for the elderly. Thus far statutory limitations defining a family for admission to a Federal development have effectively barred any aid to single persons in federally aided housing, yet almost 3 out of every 4 households headed by a person over 65 years are single-person households.

In the Federal program little provision has been made toward designing units for 1- to 2-person families comprised of elderly persons. Admittedly Federal public housing, under the 1949 act, was set up chiefly for low-income families with children, relegating the childless couples to a position of minor importance. At present, limits are based upon room costs rather than on household unit costs, so that the small units become more expensive and are discouraged.

Nevertheless, in Boston we have built a considerable number of 1-bedroom units, 25 percent of the low-income units in the city are 1-bedroom—and we have built 84 units specifically designed for elderly people. Those units have electric rather than gas ranges; they have stall showers with hand grips to minimize accidents.

Recently the State of Massachusetts has given recognition to the needs for elderly people in the form of legislation designed particularly to make available to single persons units not needed for veteran family use and to allow for the construction of new units for use of veterans of 60 years of age and nonveterans over 65 years of age. It is proposed that these units be built for single persons and couples in a 3-to-1 ratio, favoring smaller units for single persons. Under this legislation it is expected that 1,800 units may be built in Massachusetts, which number is, of course, small considering the overall needs.

Utilizing the allowed admission of 1-person families, 92 such families have been admitted to 1 of the Boston Housing Authority's State-aided projects. It must be borne in mind, however, that such single person families can only be admitted where there are no available veteran families of larger size. In all other developments other than the one to which these single persons were admitted, the list of applications is such as to rule out admission of any single persons.

It is proposed by the State legislation to build new units in 25- to 50-unit developments accommodating a maximum of 75 persons. This size is thought to be the optimum since older persons dislike being segregated in large numbers. Experience elsewhere indicates that projects for the elderly can be too big as well as too small. A goal for such housing should be to provide a social unit which is large enough to provide a variety of friends and a large amount of self-help. At either extreme of project size these benefits are denied. Above all, it is important that the aged be housed in circumstances most closely approximating their natural pattern of life. The housing must have safety factors necessary because of infirmities of advancing years but at the same time be based upon a realization that most of the needs of people in the 65 to 75 year range are not too different than those of other people. It is recognized that there are three groups of aging persons to be considered: (1) Those who are members of family groups including younger persons; (2) those

who live by themselves or with another old person in good enough health to take care of their own needs; and (3) those so handicapped as to require special care. The first group will be housed in housing of common use to all, the third group will be institutionalized. It is the second group with which we are concerned.

Structurally for this middle group the dwelling, according to American Public Health Association standards, must be "oriented for maximum light and sunshine, have no dark corners, stairs or passage and would be equipped with accessible light switches for sufficient artificial light. It would have no slippery surfaces nor changes in floor levels; and the kitchen, bathroom, passageways, closets, cupboards and shelves would be located and arranged to simplify housekeeping and prevent accidents. It would be large enough to accommodate an ill person without disrupting the household." In other words, it would be the exact opposite from so many of the dwellings in which the aged persons are now living in crowded parts of Boston.

Not only are we concerned with what is to happen to aged persons who do not qualify family wise for federally aided housing but we are also bothered by site costs of developments which we plan to build for elderly persons. For best emotional and mental health it is likely that the elderly person should be housed in good units within the environment with which he is familiar. No matter how good the physical structure, if housing in it forces the elderly person to tear up roots and move to a new neighborhood, it may not be good.

This means that in Boston new housing designed for aged in many cases can only be built on sites obtained through demolition of substandard dwellings. This is generally a costly procedure, but most advisable. Specifically, what do we propose that the Federal Government do?

First, we strongly recommend that the definition of a family unit for admission to presently built developments be changed to provide for the admission of 1-person families age 65 years or more. If full relief is not to be given, then at least those aged single persons displaced by urban redevelopment projects should be eligible for admission if qualified income-wise.

Second, money received for old-age assistance should not be counted when computing income for eligibility for admission to federally aided projects. Thus it would be possible for a son or daughter to have a parent on old-age assistance live with them without thereby eliminating his or her needy family from possible residence in a low-rent development.

Third, a liberal policy relating to unit costs should be followed permitting the construction of more small units for housing single persons in developments designed for overall population needs.

Fourth, a housing program specifically for elderly should be adopted supplementing inadequate State programs and designed particularly to aid single-person households. In this program special concern should be given to site costs and a large amount of housing constructed should be on slum sites requiring costly demolition.

Cooperative housing has been proposed as a solution to the ills of housing of the elderly. For some income levels a strong cooperative program would be beneficial but for a great mass of old-age persons nothing other than well-subsidized housing such as the federally aided public housing would be any solution. In this mass are the old-age assistance recipients, holders of small public and private pensions, and those reduced to employment on low-wage jobs. It is likely that the top gross rent (including heat and utilities) which these latter people can afford in Boston is about \$10 a month, which approxi-

mates the top amount allowed under old-age assistance.

No new cooperative housing has been coming on the Boston market and the small amount of private rental housing which was built in the past few years has been at rents in excess of \$100 a month. Actually new rental housing in the Boston area in the past 2 years has been almost nonexistent.

All offerings of new sales housing—generally physically and geographically not adaptable to the needs of the elderly—have been at prices far out of the reach of the families with which we are here concerned.

There would seem to be ample evidence that, in common with all other low income families, no new private rental housing is being made available to elderly persons of low income and there is no evidence of any interest by private enterprise in such housing. There is, however, ample evidence as disclosed by a survey made for the Housing Association of Metropolitan Boston that there are a large number of older people living in decrepit rooming houses in Boston and that tremendous sums in Federal, State and local taxes, paid to old-age assistance recipients for their housing, are actually subsidizing slums, substandard dwellings and decrepit boarding houses in the Boston area.

Welcome to Premier Mario Scelba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we are anticipating in March a visit to our city by the Premier of Italy, Mario Scelba. Premier Scelba comes to Washington at a time when the friendly spirit and co-operation between our two countries has reached an unprecedented level. We welcome this visit as an opportunity to pay honor to Premier Scelba—for in a short period as head of his country's Government, he has, indeed, won the respect and esteem of us all.

Scelba has been Premier a little more than a year—and in that short time he has guided his Government to notable achievements both at home and in its relations toward Italy's neighbors and allies. Scelba was De Gasperi's Minister of the Interior for 6 years; his experience in that office may be said to have prepared Scelba uniquely for the premiership. As Minister of the Interior for 6 years, Scelba became the scourge of Italy's strong Communist following. On becoming Premier, Scelba ejected the Communist organizations from many of the office buildings they had seized from former Fascist owners after World War II. He has forced their press to conform to libel and slander laws and has transferred many Communists out of sensitive positions in the civil service. He has also reduced Communist Party revenue from such sources as businesses run by Communists for profit. In numerous ways he has met the challenge of Communist subversion and infiltration by practical countermeasures.

Some of the other tasks being tackled by Scelba's government are—a public works program which it is hoped will

alleviate Italy's unemployment; an impressive housing program; and new income tax enforcement laws. It is very difficult for the Premier to get such legislation passed in the Parliament, for Communists and fellow-travelers, who hold more than a third of the seats in Parliament, continuously sabotage and delay measures put forward by the center coalition which he heads.

In his government's foreign policy, Premier Scelba has inaugurated a new phase of trans-Adriatic cooperation. For 9 years the Trieste issue set Italians and Yugoslavs against each other and stirred bloody riots and demonstrations. In October of last year, the Italian-Yugoslav agreement returning the port city of Trieste to Italy and giving part of the Trieste territory to Yugoslavia, was signed. Since then Scelba has forthrightly held out the hand of friendship to the Yugoslavs and called for an end to the suspicions and recriminations that long poisoned relations between the two neighboring countries. This was a bold act on the part of Premier Scelba because it brought violent attacks from the extreme right and left in his own country. He has assumed the political risks, however, in order to show clearly his eagerness for peaceful cooperation with Italy's neighbors. The benefits of Rome-Belgrade cooperation extend far beyond the boundaries of the two countries. There have recently been reports that Italy may join the Balkan Entente which already unites Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. Italy's adherence to this group would give the entente additional strength and would add Italy's 10 divisions to the approximately 60 of the 3 Balkan states.

Italy has recently signed the Paris Agreements which bring Italy and West Germany into the Brussels Pact. The Italian Chamber of Deputies has approved ratification of these agreements. This is but one more indication of the marked progress Italy has made in the last year, under the statesmanlike leadership of its Premier, Mario Scelba.

Next month as Premier Scelba visits our city—he may be assured of our high regard and of a very warm welcome.

Immediate Direct Public School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include a telegram from Carl J. Megel, president of the American Federation of Teachers, which I believe accurately states the feeling of many prominent educators throughout the country. It is for that reason that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues in this House.

The telegram follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., February 17, 1955.

Eisenhower administration has been exceedingly reluctant to provide leadership toward enactment of legislation to provide Federal relief for America's schools.

The President's proposal might better be termed Federal aid for bankers since they set up machinery for "lending" not "granting" funds to distressed school districts. School districts throughout the country are already overburdened with debt and most of them are either close to or over the legal limit on their bonded department.

The President's proposal remedies the situation by offering to increase the bonded debt of school districts. Most school districts financially able to issue bonds can find these bonds saleable. If we want to adequately educate our children we must have immediate direct public school aid of a practical nature. Senator LISTER HILL's bill proposing \$500 million a year for 2 years in outright grants is a practical approach even though much more than that amount is needed.

CARL J. MEGEL,

President, American Federation of Teachers.

Address by Gen. B. W. Chidlaw, Commander in Chief, Continental Air Defense Command, at Air Force Association Banquet, Colorado Springs, Colo., February 11, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Gen. B. W. Chidlaw:

Mr. Allison, distinguished Members of Congress, National Guard and Reserve, members of the Air Force Association, and honored guests, having been in Madison, Wis., last night for a talk at the Wisconsin annual airpower banquet, winding up with a midnight surprise inspection of our alert aircraft and crews at Truax, with the temperature standing at a balmy seven degrees below zero, should my voice come forth this evening as something of a cross between that of radio's Rochester and Andy Devine's gravel growl, I ask that you good folks bear with me.

We, of the Continental Air Defense Command, are genuinely delighted that you gentlemen have been able to avail yourselves of this most gracious action on the part of the Air Force Association in arranging this timely meeting—to let us talk together on air-defense matters here in the hometown of CONAD Headquarters—and additionally to have you here in this beautiful setting in which soon will be built the Air Force Academy—the seat of learning and the cradle of tradition for the future of air power in this country.

Air power has, of course, been a living, breathing thing in the imagination of many people—old and young—for years, but it is today striding ever more and more into world consciousness as the tremendous factor in all military schooling and planning—in the economic future of the world—and more and more into the daily lives of each of us.

I think it can be said that air power is no longer considered so much just an equal participant in the family of military serv-

ices, but has become an overall field of the military potential affecting all services. A military potential possessing such a devastating capability that the threat of its use alone might prevent a world commitment to open warfare.

The world's past wars have shown generally that nations' so-called military roads to glory have often taken them along some pretty gloomy trails, milestoned by the skulls and skeletons of man's failures to bail himself out of his dilemma by all other means.

Through airpower, growing evidence indicates that its very existence affects the atmosphere and attitudes at the world's conference tables. Through airpower any imbalance in favor of a possible aggressor—even though local or temporary—frequently shows in the arrogance, the ruthlessness, the baldness of his demands.

Airpower—taken in the larger sense of the complete gamut of missiles and aircraft using the avenue of the air—can now be sent on a terrifying mission of destruction by our enemies—and it could come just as unannounced as it would be uninvited with such a mission.

For no longer do we have the leisure of the chess player to study—then unhurriedly counter action with reaction.

In airpower circles, action calls for action. The attackers—and the nuclear bomb loads or warheads set in motion by them—must be challenged by our own weapons systems as close to their bases of origin and sustenance as is possible, and our challenge must be decisive.

To reckon unleashed airpower in the hands of the enemy as any less than a disastrous capacity, or to leave it unopposed, instantaneously and without quarter, is to die miserably, to die individually, even possibly to die nationally.

Not long ago a story came to me of an old clock which had been placed in a national museum as a relic of one of the early wars on this continent. It was of that rich, deep, brown color, common to aging walnut wood. It showed signs of having been hacked by either a tomahawk or knife, and imbedded in the wood was part of an old flint arrowhead.

This old clock really belonged in this collection of times past.

It still had grace. It had beauty. It was decorative. It was definitely tied to the infancy of our country, and bespoke some of the turmoil in which our Nation grew to its present maturity.

For this reason, it had a place of honor in the museum.

The important lesson this old clock had for me, however—and for my people—who must live alert to each day's problems and be preparing always to meet that greater emergency which might come on any tomorrow was that it rested absolutely on the past.

It had one great defect. It could no longer perform the function for which it was originally built, because the hands of this clock were stilled forever, the mechanism inside clogged with rust and dust. And although it was still referred to in the museum guidebook as a timepiece—it was no longer that. It couldn't tell time.

All our military services are constantly making adjustments, orienting themselves toward today's blunt military facts of life and away from museum thinking. Nationally, we are, I believe, gradually weaning ourselves from the thinking that the next war will be fought—if ever we must fight one—as the last one was fought.

In my many trips about the country I sense that the man in the street—Mr. Average American Citizen—is becoming more and more aware of the fact that America will have to abandon her time-honored role of the protected and secure arsenal of men and weapons and take on the much

more alarming role of being the first and principal target.

No military force can ever afford to become a museum piece, and if there is one thing in the world which will disclose it as one—it is its failure to keep in step with the threat and be truly up to date—better well ahead of it.

Certainly, in this air-defense business the Continental Air Defense Command cannot afford a failure to be completely realistic.

For us, no crystal ball, no ivory towers.

We know that for the Continental Air Defense Command, there is no place of, nor time for sanctuary.

Defense of the United States from air attack is today a No. 1 preoccupation of the American people, and that defense is the mission of the Continental Air Defense System.

Our command is perhaps the first major organization of the few in our whole military structure which must meet its acid test on D-day—in fact, on H-hour on that D-day—and D-day could come tomorrow.

Therefore, the shadow of reality is always as close to us as our own shadow.

And the Continental Air Defense Command must work, tirelessly and ceaselessly. It must undergo constant test—and revision based on the showing of those tests. It must be re-equipped to be ever new—and ever newer. It can never be truly effective if any portion of our system is approaching museum status nor is it ever safe to view or inspect it from the attitude of veneration for past achievement. Rather, it must be continually assessed for vigilance—for virility.

In this vein, I am frequently asked the question, "Since our scientists, our research, and development people, anticipate many major improvements at somewhat later time periods, why should it be necessary to spend large sums of money modifying and improving the present system since ultimately much larger gains in effectiveness can be anticipated at that later date?" Well, gentlemen, viewing the world situation as it is today, I think the answer to that question is pretty obvious. Remembering always in this business that our D-day may be tomorrow, we cannot—we dare not—risk less than achieving the maximum kill effectiveness possible, employing the tools we have presently at hand.

Knowing all these things as realistic and to keep in a realistic vein, I wish to say, here and now, that true air defense is not, in my opinion, confined solely to the erection of a so-called fortress-type weapons system around a particular critical area. Such an approach would resemble that of a boxer who confines himself merely to slipping or warding off his opponent's punches. The boxer, to win, must be prepared to throw a few healthy knockout punches himself, so I include the counterpunch, the left cross, and the good old roundhouse haymaker right all in my definition of defense.

Air defense is then, in the truest sense, the whole tricky, razzle-dazzle, and flexibility of the air weapon used in its full multiplied force and as far out from our homeland as time and circumstances permit.

True air defense takes in the complete array of the offensive and defensive capacities of all services to make up this effective air defense—everything to keep the enemy guessing, everything to keep him off balance—to make him puzzle and pause, attempting to figure our air power out and make him doubtful of his own ability to cope with it.

Thus, I believe our continental air defense system starts with a formidable couplet of the Strategic Air Command with its long-range, atomic packhorses; the Navy's carrier task forces, wherever it is possible for them to contribute; and also those air forces, tactical in nature, which are based far out from

this country and on the fringes of the Iron Curtain, represented in our own commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and those of our partners in this alliance.

We have this partnership with the free world in recognition of the immediacy of the times; that should the free world be struck, our responses would be total, from close in and far away, and be now.

Concerned as we all are that we keep this far-out extension of our defenses and improve them daily, and concerned as we all are to preserve and ever strengthen the mighty fists of our strategic striking air arms, we of the Continental Air Defense Command are also concerned that our assigned mission—that of defending the skies over and the aerial approaches to our homeland—be likewise fully understood and fully appreciated. Appreciated as the Nation's blunting force which may have to endure its greatest battles while the enemy is at full strength and while the enemy effort is freshest.

Facing squarely up to the problem, I feel sincerely, as do all military commanders, that little has altered that old military truism that "the best defense is a strong offense." I am certain that a purely defensive system alone would never be the one single force which would deter—forestall—forever a Russian decision to strike us.

We must, at all costs, maintain our own long-range striking forces, our Strategic Air Command and those other forces which are capable of striking at the vitals, the heartland, of any aggressor. And they must be kept at the highest levels of efficiency and size to do their job, once their mission is ordered.

But, I'm equally just as certain that a major deterring factor lies in being able to guarantee that our striking forces will not be caught in their lairs—be caught in their bases with their planes down. If that aggressor, specifically, if Communist Russia, knows that while she is fighting her way toward her targets over here, that the golden opportunity of easy destruction on the ground has passed and the visitation of death and destruction to their homeland is but a few, very few, short hours away, then a decision by them to launch their first aggressive blow must be born only of sheer desperation.

The objective of our present and any future air defense system is thus, to ward off or reduce to the maximum possible extent the impact of enemy air attack, should our national aim of prevention of war itself fail. I feel—as do my people—that the market value for air defense will undoubtedly be at its highest—at its very peak on D-day. We hope, we pray, that our offensive and defensive efforts will jointly cause it to taper off markedly from that point on.

We know that nuclear armament has revolutionized not only air-defense thinking, but military strategy in its entirety.

We know that A-bombs and H-bombs, plus the means of carting them accurately to and over a target complex for release, compel considerations of national survival itself as the number one mission of our country's military action.

Enemy capabilities—weighed against the cost and effectiveness of a blunting defensive force to put in the way of those capabilities—outline the general dimensions of our air-defense problem.

Dozens of factors; i. e., possible enemy approach routes, his likely target selections, his delivery equipment, prevailing winds and weather, and the like, dictate our defensive deployments.

And always the question of national economics is before us. For example, must we or should we try to add a couple of fighter interceptors, or a new guided missile position to our defenses as the Russian adds new types

or numbers to his long-range air army inventory?

And in these considerations, there is always the thought that there may be, somewhere along the line, a "point of diminishing return" in this air-defense business as we currently know it or visualize it and that—in light of the constantly increasing threat—it is and will be extremely difficult to determine just exactly where this point lies.

One thing we can be sure of, however, is that to willfully stop short of this admittedly somewhat indeterminate point could be disastrous.

Stopping short is like the old story of throwing a 20-foot rope to a man who has fallen down a well 30 feet deep. It wouldn't bail him out. It wouldn't save him. And only a gesture has been made in the right direction. And whatever was spent for the rope represents a loss since it did not accomplish the mission.

Obviously, though, if we assumed complete desperation and tried to completely blanket the Nation with radar in overlays and layers—at the same time providing the well over 3 million square miles of our country with maximum intensity fighter-interceptor and guided-missile coverage, we would run into economic and manpower impossibility.

It is up to us, therefore, to go about the job of doing the most we can—and the best we can—with those present and programed forces of men and weapons which can be made available to us.

Our national sense of morality—our tradition of never having struck the first aggressive blow—would, I imagine, cause the enemy to assume—and we must assume—that he will have on his side the initial advantage because of his ability to select the time (and place) of attack and start unmolested the takeoff for delivery of what he hopes will be the first great blow.

He patently will have many avenues of approach which gives him great flexibility in choosing and charting his hydrogen highways—as it correspondingly confronts us with multiple problems in blocking any aerial power play he initiates.

He undoubtedly assumes—and we must assume—that he will have to go for a package deal in target arrangements—a veritable bag of varieties. In a civilization and defense system as complex as ours, he must know that there is no one solar plexus—no single touchpoint—which when struck could leave us totally paralyzed—broken—completely subdued and subjugated.

Therefore, his offensive efforts would logically have to be as big as the target bag, and be designed to put us in an atomic vise.

In such a packet, we must figure that he would undoubtedly attempt to neutralize or wipe out our counteroffensive capability such as our retaliatory forces and their bases and the origin of our atomic stocks—certain of our major population, communication, Government centers—and our industrial capacity for military production.

In the language of the poker player or crap shooter, if he were ever to set off on this package-deal expedition, he would truly be, as the expression has it, going for broke.

He would be shooting the works and trying to break the bank.

It would perhaps be comforting to say that very few who shoot the works and go for broke actually ever break the bank, or that few real gamblers would go up against such odds. We should never be foolish though and not consider that there is more than an outside chance that such a course could or might be taken.

There is grave reason for us to respect the outside chance with Russia.

Over there they originated the game called Russian roulette. In this game a man puts one cartridge in the cylinder of a revolver, gives the cylinder a spin to obscure the exact

location of the bullet, points it at his head, and pulls the trigger. If it doesn't fire, his partner in this interesting parlor game then takes the gun and duplicates the feat. You will admit that this is a pretty fair test of nerve and somewhat indicative of the way they look at things. The fact that these playful antics usually take place at the height of a vodka bout doesn't necessarily dim the light it throws on its practitioners.

Who would have thought that a train ride from Switzerland to St. Petersburg, sponsored by the enemies of his own homeland, would pay off for an expatriate conspirator by causing the overturning and taking over of a government and deifying the man who took that long-chance ride?

Yet, it happened to a man named Lenin and he was a Russian.

Who would have had the nerve, the political ruthlessness, to gamble away the lives of his own people, give up rich land space, order a scorched earth, and draw in—mouse-trap—the forces of his enemies until he had them in the position where his counteraction would be decisive and on this would build a character and debt in blood which made him well-nigh all-powerful at councils of nations?

Yet, it happened to a man named Stalin and he was a Russian.

Who would have had the audacity to face up to the greatest and most entrenched secret police system the world has ever known, its leadership and position seemingly invulnerable, and pull off a successful denunciation of that leadership, topped by a firing squad party for the opposition.

Yet, it happened to a man named Malenkov and he is a Russian. Anyhow, we have new names to ponder over; Khrushchev, Bulganin, Kaganin, Mikoyan, and the ever-articulate Molotov. Names which, to some observers conjure up a reversion to the policies of Stalin—a get-tougher attitude toward the West, a new all-out drive for heavy industry and arms production. More guns, less butter? Again, who knows?

I believe we can safely and wisely assume, though, that any nation which produces leaders like this, who rise to its leadership on taking the long chance, have not laid aside the tendency toward Russian roulette when it has proven successful on occasion or when there may seem to be no other course.

For these reasons, we must seek constantly for outward extensions of our warning and tracking capability to take maximum advantage of area defense weapons in the Continental Air Defense Command. Our action must start with his action, so our forces must be so disposed in depth as to make him run a gauntlet of continual harassing and destructive attack as soon as we make contact with him.

To be certain that our response is instantaneous and rapid toward any hostile threat, our controls must be decentralized. Our full national potential in air defense must be available and have its well-defined place in the Continental Air Defense Command system, the organization which will probably fight its major battle on the day and hour the fight starts.

All usable fighters of other Air Force commands—those based in this country—must be slotted into usable places in the system. All Navy and Marine Corps fighter aircraft based coastally or inland—even those on carriers in or near port—figure in the system. The shore-based radar equipment of the Navy and various proving ground and guided missile test centers can make their contribution. The antiaircraft guns of naval vessels in port must have their place alongside the guns and missile batteries which our strong right hand, the Army, contributes to the regular defenses. The National Guard and certain parts of the reserve forces strength must come into the bag with us.

The contribution of these forces—taking their control and operational direction from the Continental Air Defense Command—can be an enormous help in CONAD. We are now going forward rapidly with the planning which will make thorough use of all these augmentation elements and to make sure that the control machinery is fully ready.

Our first and most pressing need is that we obtain the greatest possible advance warning of any attack. To achieve this, we are shoving our radar detection nets further and further to the north—further and further out to sea—extending our detection, identification, tracking, and control capabilities as rapidly as circumstances permit. Our second, and nearly as pressing need, is for streamlining the processes by which we put into motion all the vast resources of those strengths I have mentioned, and putting them into motion toward the places in the system where they will contribute the most, the quickest, and to maximum effect.

As I said before, all military services today are engaged in a fight to stay out of the museum and to be in step with what must be done to make certain our national survival.

Developments in science and engineering are so fast and furious—the struggle to stay out of the museum—that to avoid being categorized as the clock which would no longer tell time is demanding on all of us.

We must be sure at the first flicker that the enemy is taking to the high aerial road, that we set up a series of toll gates—barriers—in his way as soon as he gets on that road. These toll gates, these barriers, should be all the missiles and jet-propelled carriers of destruction we can put out along that road to regulate or halt that travel as he comes on his atomic outing.

He must pay heavily at those toll gates. He must be fought to a standstill there—shot down out there—and God willing, his whole effort die out there. Because every uninterrupted second that we let him come on and every mile we let him penetrate our borders to get in reach of his strike position makes the cost ratio in blood, in life, and treasure of this country mount.

If we have the means to erect these toll gates when it has to be done, the Nation lives.

If we do not, the Nation could die.

To those of us who wrestle with this enormous problem—who live with it every minute of every hour of the day and night, it is just as simple, just as cold turkey, as stark as that.

There are mighty few gray areas left to consider in this business. It is possible now in this atomic age to see mostly only in black and white.

I know that this problem is on the minds of you gentlemen of Congress and other of our highest Government leaders and our top military commanders.

My feeling on Air Defense is that it amounts to the sum total of all the things which can be brought to bear on any enemy who would see in an all-out air attack the most lucrative, the quickest, and the most decisive way to get at our vitals and to knock us to our knees. The Continental Air Defense Command is a complete rationalization of that Air Defense potential in terms of making every mile—every yard—every foot of an attacker's thrust count for us and against him.

In a measure, we are blessed with God-given geographic depth for our defenses, removed some distance from the bases of any aggressor's birds of prey.

We would indeed be profligate with our responsibilities—and going against all military lessons and training—if we did not figure on making every mile of that intervening distance pay dirt for us and a place for our enemy to bite the dust.

Looking back, we can all remember the time when those of us in the military were somewhat removed from the so-called plain American citizen. We didn't know too much about each other—we didn't give each other too much thought. They went about their business—we went about ours. They sent for us when they needed us, and we sent for them to give us the increased strength we needed in time of a national emergency.

This is not true today.

Today we are in each other's business right up to our necks, because no matter what any man or woman thinks his or her business is today, it is really the business of insuring individual and national survival.

Because of this feeling, we have been able to get with us in the Continental Air Defense Command some 400,000 civilian volunteers in the role of ground observers. They have become interested in what they can do to help and are willing to give us that help because they wanted to know a role into which they can fit smoothly should D-day ever come. Because of this growing awareness and desire in American people to know a place to do volunteer duty, I feel we are stronger than we have been for a long while. Because in addition to what these ground observers do in plane spotting, they have provided the first ripple in the great wave to come as Americans become more and more conscious of what each man and woman must do if we are to be safe and remain safe.

By coming into our family of air-defense weapons freely and as volunteers, they have put their apathy and complacency into the museum alongside that old clock. Complacency today is just as useless as that old clock—the clock which could not tell time.

Let us all make certain—civilian and military man alike—that we discard now and forever any semblance of complacency.

Let us not believe that because we have never lost a war that we couldn't lose one.

Let's make certain we don't lose it.

Let us never rest on today's weapons system or be content that what we are doing today is just good enough. We all must dig deep to pull out that little something extra in us.

Gentlemen, as I look out over this audience tonight I see many friends with whom I have worked over the years. Hal Stuart, Joe McNarney, Bill Kepner, Pop Powers—my old bosses in the Air Force. I see the leaders of our aircraft industry, men with whom I grew up, worked with, played with, frequently argued with, more often had to agree with during the many service years I spent on the materiel side of the fence. I see here tonight many distinguished Members of Congress, men who daily grapple with the major domestic and foreign problems of our country.

Thus, I realize, gentlemen, that I possibly have been presumptuous in discussing at such length our Nation's air defense problem here tonight, because I know that, in some respects, you are just as close to many of the facets of that problem as are we in the Continental Air Defense Command.

However, in these few closing sentences I am going to presume still further and ask that you consider and take back a message to your people. This message:

That, working together, we must see to it that our military clock is ever kept cleaned, oiled, conditioned, and adjusted to that split-second accuracy demanded by today's troubled old world.

Because in these perilous times, should a mainspring snap—a jeweled bearing give way—and our military clock slow down and grind to a stop, chances are that it might never start again.

And, if our military clock stopped, it quite probably would never even find its way into a museum.

There could be no museum left to put it in.

Thank you.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

The Office of the Legislative Branch in the Formulation of National Security Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1955, it was my honor and privilege to deliver an address at the National War College, Washington, D. C., on the subject: The Office of the Legislative Branch in the Formulation of National Security Policy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of that address, as follows:

THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH IN THE FORMULATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

(By PAUL J. KILDAY, Member of Congress)

In discussing the office of the legislative branch of our Government in the formulation of national security policy, I believe it would be of value to review some of the basic principles of political science. The key word in all forms of government is "sovereignty." That is, in whom does it lie? In whom is vested the supreme power of the state? For centuries, because of the doctrine of the divine right of kings, sovereignty reposed in the monarch. In 1776 the colonists, as British subjects, lived under a system of government which recognized this philosophy, except insofar as the power of the king had been circumscribed by historical rights wrung from him in such great accomplishments as the Magna Carta of 1215.

So, in 1776 Thomas Jefferson proclaimed, and the Continental Congress confirmed by adopting the Declaration of Independence, that:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The divine right no longer exists in kings, it now reposes in the people. The sovereign people. This has remained and still is the theory of the American form of government.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

On our subject for today, among the facts submitted to a candid world by that declaration were:

"He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislatures."

"He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power."

And the Continental Congress also complained of pretended legislation: "For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us: For protecting them by a mock trial from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States."

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

After an unsatisfactory experience, during and subsequent to the Revolution, the Congress approved the suggestion for a convention at Philadelphia "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures such alterations and provisions therein as shall when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the States render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of Government and the preservation of the Union."

In accordance therewith the convention met and, on May 30, 1787, went into secret session, as a committee of the whole, for the consideration of propositions for a plan of government.

This convention was composed of delegates from the several colonies fully aware of the causes of the Revolution and fully informed of the facts submitted "to a candid world" by the Declaration of Independence. After approximately 3½ months the convention produced, not a revision, but a new plan of government.

THE CONSTITUTION

The preamble of this new plan of government declared as one of its objects to "provide for the common defence." By its express delegation of powers in article 1, section 8, this Constitution delegated to Congress the power "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." And thereafter, in that article, committed to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Congress, in clauses 11 to 16, both inclusive, the following powers in this language:

"To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

"To raise and support armies, but no appropriations of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years."

"To provide and maintain a Navy."

"To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

"To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions."

"To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

Notwithstanding the clear knowledge possessed by the members of the Convention, and generally understood by the people through the publication of the Federalist, that this new Government was one of limited powers delegated to it by the sovereign people, fear of an all-powerful Federal Government persisted. Therefore, as a condition precedent to the ratification of it, those same foreign people demanded the submission of the first 10 amendments which constitute our cherished Bill of Rights. Pertinent to our subject, they provide:

Amendment II: "A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Amendment III: "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

Amendment V: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation."

I have included all of the fifth amendment simply to keep before us the fact that even in these confused times it contains provisions of great value to all of us.

By article 2, section 2, it is provided that "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." And by the same article and section: "He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, * * *, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; * * *." And by section 3 of article 2 (the President, "Shall commission all the officers of the United States."

It is clear, therefore, that our Federal Government is a government of powers delegated to the Congress and to the President. With each power goes its limitation. It is essential to the orderly process of our Government that each branch of government know the powers it possesses and the wise limitations placed upon those powers. That each operate within the area provided by this basic charter. That neither attempt to exceed the powers actually granted and possessed by it. In my opinion, it is equally important that each jealously guard the exercise of its powers that there be no usurpation by the other branch. Though I am a member of the legislative branch, I beg that you believe me to be sincere when I state that it is essential to our well being and our continuance as a Nation that there be no trespass upon the powers of the executive by the legislative branch. In comparatively recent times we have heard many protests of usurpation of legislative power by the executive. We have heard little of the intrusion of the legislative upon the executive. Such there has been, as I expect to show. Both are equally to be avoided.

It is now my purpose to consider these various functions, the exercise of which constitutes the office of the legislative branch of our Government in the formulation of national security policy.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

The common defense is stated by the preamble to be one of the reasons for the establishment of the Constitution; the power to provide for it is committed to the Congress. Only Congress can levy and collect taxes, only Congress can pay the debts. Therefore, only Congress can provide those things necessary for the common defense. As with individuals, so with States, self-preservation is the first law of nature. Only

the State which can preserve itself can be a State. In this Federation of States, the defense of all of them, the defense common to all of them, the common defense is committed to the Federation of the people. As Joseph Story has said (1 Story, Commentaries on the Constitution, sec. 462), "For example, the preamble declares one object to be, 'to provide for the common defense.' No one can doubt that this does not enlarge the powers of Congress to pass any measures which they deem useful for the common defense." The preamble is, rather, the declaration of basic rights. It does not establish those rights. They already exist. This document then is to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty, the only thing ordained, the only thing established is "this Constitution for the United States of America." Thereupon the Constitution commits the provision of that defense to the only branch of Government which can provide it, the Congress which lays and collects taxes and pays the debts.

ONLY CONGRESS CAN DECLARE WAR

The President is Commander in Chief in time of peace, as well as in time of war. Therefore, the power of Congress to declare war and the power of the President as Commander in Chief, become very closely entwined.

As the people must fight wars, and despots increase their power over their own people and other peoples by war, it is only natural that the sovereign people would express their new-found sovereignty by vesting in the direct representatives of the people the sole power to declare war. Even today the people are quite vocal in their desire that only Congress declare war. On the other hand, a review of the 166½ years since the adoption of the Constitution will show rare indeed have been the occasions upon which Congress alone has declared war. As a matter of fact, Congress has never in its history declared war except as a consequence of the President's acts or recommendations. It has never refused a request from the President that war be declared.

On five occasions this Nation has participated in formally declared wars. However, in four of those instances the declarations of war recognized the prior existence of war. The fifth, being the War of 1812, stated—"War be and the same is hereby declared to exist" (2 Stat. 755).

On May 13, 1846, Congress declared: "Whereas, by act of the Republic of Mexico, a state of war exists" (9 Stat. 9). As to the Spanish-American War, Congress on April 25, 1898, provided: "... that war be, and the same is hereby declared to exist, and that war has existed since the 21st day of April ... between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain ..." (30 Stat. 364). The First World War was declared to exist by the declaration of war of April 6, 1917, which provided "that the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared" (40 Stat. 1). The day after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Congress, on December 8, 1941, declared: "Whereas the Imperial Government of Japan has committed unprovoked acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it resolved ... that the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared ..." (55 Stat. 795). The action of the German Government caused the language of the declaration of war against her on December 11, 1941, to read: "Whereas the Government of Germany has formally

declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it resolved ... that the state of war between the United States and Germany which has been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared" (55 Stat. 796). On the same day Congress declared war against Italy in the same language (55 Stat. 797).

The courts have recognized the fact that war actually existed from the moment the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and that legally it was not necessary to wait for the formal declaration, the language being: "We can discern no demonstrable difference in the supposition and the actual facts, and we, therefore, conclude that the formal declaration by the Congress on December 8 was not an essential prerequisite to a political determination of the existence of a state of war commencing with the attack on Pearl Harbor." (*New York Life Insurance Company v. Bennion* (1946), 158 F. 2d 260.)

PRESIDENT IS COMMANDER IN CHIEF

Turning now, to the occasions upon which the United States has engaged in serious and extended campaigns or uses of force against other nations without a declaration of war, we find that very early in our national life such campaigns became necessary. While we had previously engaged in the undeclared naval war with France during 1798 to 1800, the best known early action of this character was Thomas Jefferson's move against the Barbary Pirates. Even though the Bey of Tripoli declared war on the United States in 1801, and a bitter debate ensued as to the necessity for Congress to declare war, no declaration was made. Jefferson dispatched a squadron of frigates to the Mediterranean, but its mission was limited strictly to defense and the protection of commerce. Even though this debate had such great authorities as Jefferson and Hamilton on opposing sides, Congress took the position that a declaration of war was not necessary. It did actually pass a statute authorizing the President to instruct the commanders of our armed vessels to "seize and make prize of all vessels, goods and effects, belonging to the Bey of Tripoli, ...; and also to cause to be done all such other acts of precaution or hostility as the state of war will justify, ..." (2 Stat. 129).

In the intervening period there have been many instances of the use of the Armed Forces by the Commander in Chief. You, above all others, are familiar with them. I mention such instances as the second Barbary War, 1815; the American-Mexican incidents between 1914 and 1917; the Boxer uprising in 1900 and 1901; the almost innumerable instances of intervention in Latin America; Haiti; the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua. We should not ignore the almost providential presence of our Army in the area which became the Panama Canal Zone, "to protect the American-owned Panama Railroad," when Panama was engaged in the revolution which established her independence, to be followed so quickly by President Theodore Roosevelt's recognition of the new republic and equally quickly by the treaty for the construction of the Panama Canal.

Within my own memory, and area of some responsibility, are those instances immediately prior to World War II, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt dispatched elements of our Armed Forces to many parts of the world. You recall those instances as well, or better than I, because no doubt some of you participated personally in those expeditions. Naturally, as a Member of Congress throughout that period, my interest in the right and power of the President to do those things was more than casual. That interest caused me to give some thought and study to the subject, and lead me to the same conclusion as that reached by the Judge Advocate General of the Army when he stated:

"He (the President) may not raise armies. This the Congress is responsible for doing ... Once raised, an Army of the United States is under the sole and exclusive direction of the President. Their movement and implementation is at the President's discretion, limited only by whether or not an intended use would constitute an initiation or declaration of war by the President, if carried through." (Memorandum to the Adjutant General, June 17, 1940).

At an earlier time one able to speak with more experience than even the Judge Advocate General had expressed the same conclusion. Moreover, he spoke at a time when the country was not torn by conflicting views and sharp debate, nor the threat of war. Former President William Howard Taft, after he was President and before he became Chief Justice of the United States (in 1925) stated:

"The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the militia when called into the service of the United States. Under this, he can order the Army and Navy anywhere he will, if the appropriations furnish the means of transportation. Of course, the instrumentality which this power furnishes gives the President an opportunity to do things which involve consequences that it would be quite beyond his power under the Constitution directly to effect." (Our Chief Magistrate and His Powers, p. 94).

There can be no doubt of the power of Congress to limit appropriations, as former President Taft recognized. While some commentaries would indicate that Congress has some power to restrict the use of forces in the active service under its power to raise armies, the existence of such congressional power is certainly not clear. The Supreme Court has discussed such varying powers, but has not, to my knowledge, in any instant case enforced any such distinction. (Selective Draft Cases, 1918 (245 U. S. 366); *Coz v. Wood* (1918, 247 U. S. 3)).

I would not presume to discuss with this group the nature of the activities in Korea. Too many of you were there. Whether it was a police action, a deployment of the Armed Forces, or war, you will know. In any event we know that Congress did not declare war, that there was much fighting, and there were many battles. We also know that Congress responded with appropriations of billions in money and millions of men.

As I stated earlier, there have been some attempted intrusions by the Congress. In the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, Congress included a provision that none of the persons inducted into the land forces should be used outside the Western Hemisphere, except in the Territories and possessions of the United States and in the Philippines. This provision was subsequently suspended for the period of the war and finally repealed. (Public Law 783, 76th Cong.; Public Law 338, 77th Cong.; Public Law 473, 79th Cong.) However, in the extension of the act in 1945, Congress included a restriction of the use of persons under 19 years of age in combat until they had received 6 months of training. (Public Law 54, 79th Cong. Also intruding upon the executive branch and of doubtful validity are provisions for coming into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the two Houses on Defense Department acquisitions and disposals of real estate, the submission of certain contracts to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and others.

I know of no instance in which any of these restrictions was violated. Still the power of Congress to raise an army, which must of necessity pass to the control of the Commander in Chief, and at the same time restrict his use thereof, remains most doubtful. The danger of legislation of this character lies in the fact that in some quarters the inclusion of this restriction is

being used as precedent for the right of Congress to control the deployment of the Armed Forces by the Commander in Chief. The President's power in this regard has always been essential to our national welfare. Its necessity in these days of undeclared wars and the concept of instant retaliation cannot be overemphasized.

Precedents are all-important to the lawyer, customs and traditions of the service to military men, and our historic and traditional form of government to all of us. The fact that certain things have always been done in a certain way lends sanctity to the form of procedure. It comes down to the fact that because a certain thing was done in a certain way on one occasion, it should be done that way on all occasions. It is difficult for foreign nations, even democratic nations, to fully comprehend freedom of speech and of the press as recognized in the United States. Unlimited subjects for debate in both Houses of the Congress and the freedom with which that debate extends into areas which are not within the legitimate field of activity of the Congress, is bound to be confusing to other nations, friendly or otherwise. Therefore, the value of the display of unity in the prompt adoption of the Formosan resolution after it was requested, was, no doubt, of great value with our friends and potential enemies. It is to be hoped that that display of unity was not bought at a price which might handicap us in providing for our own welfare and safety because of any precedent which it could be construed as forming. My views on this matter are more fully expressed in the debate upon that resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, 1955, at page 552.

The request having been made by the President, it was essential for Congress to act and act immediately; and it did so. We must hope that President Eisenhower, or any subsequent President, in future instances of necessity will not feel that he is required to submit the question to Congress, and that the free and untrammelled authority of the Commander in Chief will be maintained inviolate. The stationing of our troops in Iceland presented a not dissimilar situation. The occupation of Greenland was of similar character. In the latter case, the Secretary of State announced the conclusion of an agreement signed by himself and the Danish Minister that Greenland would be occupied. As to Iceland, the President concluded an agreement with the Prime Minister of Iceland and transmitted the documents to Congress for information. He asked for no action by Congress. In his message the President said:

"As Commander in Chief I have consequently issued orders to the Navy that all necessary steps be taken to insure the safety of communications in the approaches between Iceland and the United States, as well as on the seas between the United States and all other strategic outposts." (H. Doc. 307, 77th Cong., 1st sess.)

The debate on the Formosan resolution seems to make it clear that had President Eisenhower done as President Roosevelt did in the case of Iceland, and reported to Congress, for its information, the action he had taken would have met with comparable unanimity.

Finally, it resolves itself into the situation that no matter how theorists may discuss the question, what debate there may be or what fine distinctions might be drawn, the Commander in Chief is still the Commander in Chief. Where or how he deploys the Armed Forces, in either peace or war, is limited only by so practical a thing as the availability of money. It also seems quite clear that there has never been a President so lacking in perspicacity that he could not find that filthy commodity in some desk drawer or some appropriation bill if the accomplishment of his purpose depended upon it.

TO RAISE AND SUPPORT ARMIES—TO PROVIDE AND MAINTAIN A NAVY

The Declaration of Independence made complaint against "standing armies" and "armed troops." There was no complaint against "a navy" nor against "sailors." Obviously, the commingling of ground forces with the population produced the irritation. As in the Declaration, so in the Constitution, there is a difference in language as to the two services. For instance, there is the power "To raise and support armies, but no appropriations of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years." There is the power "To provide and maintain a navy," but no limitation of appropriations is included. "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law." If the language be taken at its face value, apparently a sailor can be quartered in any house, in either peace or war, and the manner thereof need not be prescribed by law.

These provisions serve to emphasize that the Constitution reflects the spirit of the times in which it was written. It provides against the abuses with which the people were familiar. It reflects their knowledge of the history of Britain, of which they had been loyal subjects, until it became "necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them." These provisions were not lightly included. They were not simply to give the new plan of government the power to "raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy." There could reasonably have been an inherent power in a sovereign nation, sovereign in that the sovereign people had delegated a portion of their sovereignty to the federation, to have both armies and navies. The overriding reason for these provisions is to make it clear that this power existed in the Congress and not in the President. Blackstone had said that under the British Constitution the king had "sole power of raising and regulating fleets and armies." (I. Blackstone, Commentaries 263, Wendell's ed. 1837.)

Story in his Commentaries on the Constitution, puts the matter in proper perspective when he says:

"Our notions, indeed, of the dangers of standing armies, in time of peace, are derived in a great measure from the principles and examples of our English ancestors. In England, the king possessed the power of raising armies in the time of peace according to his own good pleasure. And this prerogative was justly esteemed dangerous to the public liberties. Upon the revolution of 1688, Parliament wisely insisted upon a bill of rights, which should furnish an adequate security for the future. But how was this done? Not by prohibiting standing armies altogether in time of peace; but . . . by prohibiting them without the consent of Parliament. This is the very proposition contained in the Constitution; for Congress can alone raise armies; and may put them down, whenever they choose." (II Story, Commentaries, sec. 1187, 4th ed., 1873.)

There can be no doubt but that Congress can establish the military policy of the Nation by authorized strengths for the Armed Forces and by appropriated strengths. However, these can only be maximums. It is quite impossible for Congress to establish a minimum. Actual military strengths are completely beyond the control of Congress. Should Congress establish an unrealistic maximum which could not be supplied by the manpower pool available for induction, in time of draft, or willing to enlist when there is no draft, of course that maximum could not be reached. Equally, if the executive branch of the Government should be un-

willing to maintain that maximum by failure to enlist, draft, or retain on active duty, Congress has no machinery by which it can impose its will upon the Executive, and it should not have. In only one instance, so far as I am informed, and surely only once in recent times, has Congress attempted to provide a minimum. That is the law of the 82d Congress (Public Law 416), providing that the Marine Corps shall consist of not less than 3 combat divisions and 3 air wings. Though I have great admiration for the Marine Corps, I am afraid I lost some friends therein when I opposed that law. My opposition was based entirely upon my theory of our Government, and that it is a fallacy to attempt to fix minimums. It is an attempt to delude ourselves and, I am afraid, an attempt to delude the Marine Corps.

We all remember quite well the fight during the administration of President Truman as to whether the Air Force should consist of 70 groups, notwithstanding the position of the President that it should have a lesser number. We won that fight in Congress by appropriating more than \$800 million more than the President requested. The President signed the appropriation bill, but the same day he froze the extra funds.

Currently we have the question of whether the Army should be reduced by 70,000 men during the present fiscal year; and whether it should be reduced an additional 70,000 men by the end of the next fiscal year. As to the remainder of this fiscal year, the funds are already appropriated, and the numbers they provide are within the authorized strength. If, however, the President should insist upon failing to provide replacements for those whose terms expire, or if he should grant early releases to come within his contemplated reduction, that is his power, and with it goes the responsibility. The Congress and the President in this instance should assume their own full powers and responsibilities. The Congress by making the means available for what it regards as the proper number to accomplish the military policy of the Nation; and the President assuming his full responsibility for the safety of the Nation. Only time will then justify the one or the other.

The fear of standing armies is reflected in the limitation of appropriations to a period of 2 years. There is no other provision in the Constitution limiting the time during which appropriations may remain available. It is true that the vast majority of appropriations expire with the fiscal year for which made. It is not uncommon, however, for appropriation bills to provide that sums appropriated shall remain available for an additional period of time, or until expended. In 1904 the Solicitor General ruled that the appropriations limited by the Constitution "are those only which are to raise and support armies in the strict sense of the word 'support,' and that the inhibition of that clause does not extend to appropriations for the various means which an army may use in military operations, or which are deemed necessary for the common defense. . . ." (25 Opinions Atty. Gen. 105). Thus quarters, ordnance equipment, or anything which could be construed as other than strict "support" are not subject to the limitation. The Navy has never been subject to any limitation in this regard. Under the National Security Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 495) the Air Force was established as an executive department within the National Military Establishment. In 1948 the Attorney General ruled that there was "no legal objection to a request to the Congress to appropriate funds to the Air Force for the procurement of aircraft and aeronautical equipment to remain available until expended." (40 Opinions Atty. Gen. 555.) Some were apprehensive, at one time at least, that all legislation for compulsory training or service being based upon the power to raise and sup-

port armies and to provide and maintain a navy, a question might arise as to the induction of men into the Air Force, should it be construed to be neither an army or navy. No difficulty in this regard has been experienced, but there has been no authoritative disposition of the question. During the 80th Congress (1948) a joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives, proposing a constitutional amendment to provide and maintain an air force, to make rules for its government and regulation, and to designate the President as Commander in Chief. (H. J. Res. 298, 80th Cong.) Congress took no action on that resolution, and some feel such nonaction might be construed as a belief by Congress that the Constitution already conferred ample power for that purpose.

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The military power of the Nation has always had a most intimate relationship to, and connection with, foreign affairs and foreign relations. The power of the President as Commander in Chief and his most sweeping authority in foreign relations complement each other. We have seen that his power to deploy the Armed Forces is limited only by the availability of appropriations for their transportation. We now see that the President makes treaties and appoints ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls. The only mention of either House of the Congress is the requirement that two-thirds of the Senators present advise and concur in the making of treaties; and that the Senate advise and consent to the appointment of ambassadors and other foreign representatives. Indeed, past history has shown little participation by the House of Representatives in any matter having to do with foreign affairs. Until the foreign-aid programs were instituted with the lend-lease program of World War II, the House was concerned with the pay of ambassadors and consuls, provision of embassies, entertainment funds for the embassies, and such matters of management only. The use of public funds in international relations has greatly enhanced the role of the House of Representatives in such matters.

In 1936, the Supreme Court, in an opinion by Justice Sutherland, gave expression to the proper view of the powers in foreign affairs and also the war powers, saying:

"As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown, not to the Colonies severally, but to the Colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America. Even before the Declaration, the Colonies were a unit in foreign affairs, acting through a common agency—namely, the Continental Congress—composed of delegates from the Thirteen Colonies. That agency exercised the powers of war and peace, raised an army, created a navy, and finally adopted the Declaration of Independence. . . . It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The power to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality." (*United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304.))

TO MAKE RULES GOVERNING LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

This is the practically all-inclusive power of the Congress. It controls the entrance into the service, promotion, pay, and retirement. These are the provisions which reach the individual as such. They are the ones which require the larger portion of the time,

attention, and concern of the Congress. There is practically no limitation upon them. Their proper enactment is committed to the sense of justice, fairplay, and a proper concern on the part of Congress for the well-being of our national defense system.

Included in this power, also, is the great body of military law. The Congress has passed and placed into operation a uniform code of military justice. I am fully aware of the view of some officers of our Armed Forces that this code has constituted a severe handicap in performing their duties and functions of command. The code has been in effect long enough now that Congress should take another look at it. We should evaluate how effective it has been, how restrictive it has been, and what amendments may be necessary or desirable. On the other hand, I know of many criticisms leveled at the code which should be pointed elsewhere. I fear there is a tendency to charge to the code restrictive departmental regulations which were not promulgated because of the code. Likewise, it may be that the code is an easy scapegoat for some deficiencies of command. I make you a fair proposition: While Congress is reappraising the code and its work in formulating the same, you reevaluate the criticisms you have made of it, and determine how many thereof should be directed elsewhere.

OTHER POWERS

Questions having to do with the militia, its calling, organization, arming, disciplining, the power of the States with reference to it, need little further elaboration. Its favored position under the Constitution might be pointed out and the fact mentioned that the governors of the several States possess unlimited power with reference thereto, should they, or any of them, decide to do without Federal recognition. Provisions with reference to appointing and commissioning officers need no elaboration, except to point out that notwithstanding our many provisions for the appointment of officers, the power of the President to nominate is unabridged, if he can secure the advice and consent of the Senate in any individual case.

APPROPRIATIONS

We now come to the one all-powerful question of appropriations. Other than the limitation of appropriations for the support of the Army to a period of 2 years, there is no restraint on the power of Congress. It can be niggardly or generous, capricious, vindictive, or forthright. Jefferson spoke of the checks and balances of our Government, and here is the all-powerful check of the Congress. Armies may move on their stomachs, but without appropriations they move on empty stomachs and they walk on bare feet, without arms or ammunition, and that capitulating word of the military, "logistics," loses its meaning. The great handicap of our military policy has always been our periods of feast or famine and peaks and valleys. The American people are the easiest in the world to frighten; and when frightened the military cannot be expanded rapidly enough, nothing is too good for them. No demand for numbers is ever too large. There should be no limitation of divisions of ground forces, wings for the air or naval tonnage afloat. Unfortunately, our people are reassured as quickly as they are frightened. They seize upon the first moment of relaxation to indulge in wishful thinking that all is right with the world. They demand cutbacks and demobilization. The money we have lost through rash programs of preparation and demobilization, which was actually disintegration, would have maintained an adequate military force for a long, long period of time. But this is a democracy. We can have in government only what the people will provide. With the present unstable con-

dition of the world no one is in a position to say for what period of time the present tension will continue. No one is so sanguine as to believe that stability in world affairs will return in so short a period as 10 years, many feel that prudence requires that we plan for a period as long as 50 years. We cannot tell and, perhaps, we must take calculated risks, but we must remain strong. Militarily, yes, but economically also.

The national budget for fiscal year 1956 amounts to \$58.6 billion. It forecasts expenditures of \$2.4 billion in excess of anticipated receipts. Of that budget \$32.9 billion is for the military services. That is 56.1 percent of the total. There is demand, yes, insistence, that the budget be brought into balance without delay and that it then be reduced. Experience shows that the people always get what they want in this country; it may take a long time for them to get what they want, but they finally do get it. The people want the budget brought into balance, and they want it reduced. You can be sure they will finally get what they want.

You can neither balance nor reduce a budget of which 56.1 percent is devoted to the military without reducing the amount apportioned to the military. The military budget must be reduced. It should be reduced by the friends of the military and those who know the necessity of the military for our national survival. Therefore, it should be done by the military themselves. But this much I know, because I know the American people. I am in contact with them. I go to them every 2 years for election to the office I hold. I can assure you if the military does not reduce its own budget, the enemies of the military will surely do so. The pacifists, and worse, will seize upon the desire of the people for a reduction. When the enemies of the military and the others go to work on the military budget, they will do a job of it, and they will do it with a meat ax. I don't pretend to know how to reduce the military budget, and do the least harm; I am a civilian. You are not only military men, but the best of our military; we all expect the most of you. You either know or can find out how that can be done. Perhaps it can be accomplished by a number of things, including reduction of the division slice, elimination of numbers from the pipeline, interservice inventories, consolidation of procurement of standard items, standardization of weapons, transport, and other things which are better known to you than to any civilian. What I say here is not in criticism, but in fear of the type of retrenchment I have seen in my own time. This deserves and should have the full attention of the very best minds in all of the services.

CONCLUSION

In discussing the office of the legislative branch in the formulation of national security policy, I have deemed it best to go to the fundamental documents of our Government, rather than speaking in general terms of my own. These grants of power must be construed in connection with the limitations upon them and the actions taken in accordance with them. Precedent and tradition are all-powerful in any government, in fact they constitute the only constitution of our great sister democracy, Great Britain, from whom we acquired our basic ideas of government and its form. By taking advantage of the lessons of history and impingements upon liberty by unworthy governments of the past, our forefathers were able to create here the best form of government yet known. So good in fact that a great Englishman was inspired to say that our Constitution is the most nearly perfect instrument of government ever stricken off in a given time by the mind and purpose of man. It is our sincere desire to keep it that way. You have devoted your lives and your talents to its preserva-

tion. Your capacity and your patriotism have been tried in many lands, on many fields of battle, in many forums, and in many pursuits other than the military; you have never been found wanting. You constitute the group in which the American people have the greatest confidence. If at times it seems there is lack of appreciation, or criticism is just a little too barbed; remember that there is no one too high in the democratic system to escape therefrom.

If at times it seems that some of us who constitute the legislative branch fail to understand your problems, remember the opposite is also true; some of the military fail to appreciate our problems. As a matter of fact, the powerful Secretary of War of times past, Elihu Root, said of the great work "Military Policy of the United States," by Gen. Emory Upton: "The work was written from a purely military point of view, and in some parts shows a failure to appreciate difficulties arising from our form of government and the habits and opinions of our people with which civil government has necessarily to deal in its direction of the military arm."

At the termination of World War II, Sir Winston Churchill paid a visit to the Pentagon, and to the officers assembled there he recited some lines he attributed to a veteran of the campaigns of his illustrious ancestor, the Duke of Marlboro; they will bear repeating here:

"God and the soldier we adore,
In time of danger, not before.
But danger past and all things righted,
God is ignored, the soldier slighted."

Shall We Allow Our Schools To Become Overcrowded, Broken-Down Firetraps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, February 19, 1955:

We say that nothing is too good for our children.

We work hard to give them opportunities that we never enjoyed.

In fact, most of our lives are dedicated to this purpose. So that they will become happy and constructive citizens for their own fulfillment and that of the Nation.

As they leave home for school each day, we take it for granted that the classrooms in which they spend so many of their formative years will be fit for this great responsibility.

Like our churches, however, we sometimes expect our schools to get by on spirit alone.

Forgetting that our teachers are entitled to a living wage, and that they and the children have a right to schoolhouse accommodations that will produce the best results.

How long is it since you visited the school where your children are being trained to meet the eventual responsibilities of life?

In some areas you would be shocked to find that our schools are fast degenerating into slums because of public neglect.

Consider these facts.

The school population is increasing at the rate of 1 million each year.

Present elementary and high-school enrollment is well over 30 million students.

There is both a building shortage and a teacher shortage.

States and communities are finding it impossible, for a number of reasons, to meet the problem.

The present building rate is 60,000 classrooms a year, requiring an investment of \$2 billion annually, but even at this rate we are falling behind in the job of providing adequate school facilities for our growing population.

How much does it cost us for educational outlays, figured on cost per pupil per year? This varies from State to State, ranging from \$83 in Mississippi to \$328 in New York.

The average person thinks nothing of spending \$800 or \$900 a year for the ownership and operation of a motorcar. It would seem that the education of his children would be worth at least half this cost per child.

Our failure to meet the educational obligations we owe to our children is a disservice to them.

Seven hundred thousand are now in schools operating on a 2- or 3-shift schedule; 800,000 are in buildings that are so ancient that they have become firetraps; 300,000 are in flimsy, temporary shacks that look more like hastily assembled military barracks than schools; 400,000 are assigned to garages, halls, and churches that have been rented for school purposes in the emergency that hard-pressed authorities are striving to overcome.

The problem has become so acute that the President of the United States delivered a special message to Congress last week on this subject.

His school-aid plan can be condensed briefly as follows:

1. The Government would purchase school bonds if the communities could not sell them at a reasonable rate of interest, set at 3½ percent. The United States Government would appropriate \$750 million over a 3-year period for the purchase of these bonds.

2. The States would be encouraged to build \$6 billion worth of schools within the next 3 years. Districts that had gone beyond their borrowing powers, would be able to get additional funds. The State agencies would build the schools and rent them to the local communities, eventually repaying the original Federal and State grants through rents.

3. Hardship communities would be able to draw on a Federal fund of \$200 million over a 3-year span. This help would come on a matching basis. The States would contribute the same amount as the Federal Government. Only genuine hardship communities could qualify.

4. The United States would also provide \$20 million to pay half the administrative costs of studies by the States to plan long-term financing programs along modern lines.

The President stressed that his program of Federal aid would not result in Federal control or interference.

Educators, Congressmen, and the general public, are grateful for the President's recognition of the problem.

Many of us, however, do not believe that it goes far enough.

We question whether it will bring enough help and in time to meet the school crisis on the local level where the battle for adequate school facilities is being fought.

The situation in many States and communities is not far from desperate. The President's program is little more than a loan fund when direct and substantial aid is imperative.

Apart from overcrowding which handicaps teachers and pupils, a survey of all school plants in the Nation reveals a shocking situation that would never be tolerated by American industry in its buildings. On the basis of structural adequacy, sanitation facilities, and safety, schoolhouses get very poor marks. The ratings show that one-

third of all school plants are unsatisfactory, 27 percent are barely satisfactory, and the remainder are only fair.

In Massachusetts, we have always taken pride in our locally administered schools. It comes as a shock to learn that overcrowded elementary schools are forced to use corridors, halls, libraries, and even basements as classrooms for the younger children. Yes, even in Massachusetts.

Eighty percent of the support of our public schools comes from local taxes, which is 20 percent more than the national average. Clearly, the local tax rates cannot be increased to meet the deficit. Aid must come from the Federal Government and from the vast revenues it collects from all citizens. When we think of the tens of billions of dollars that have been given away to other nations, we rightly ask why a small percentage of this cannot be channeled to meet the pressing needs of our schools upon which the future of our democracy depends.

Although this is not the place to go off on a tangent, I sometimes wonder if there is not some possible connection, among other factors, between the increase in juvenile delinquency and the rundown condition of our schools.

A survey by the United States Office of Education reveals that public-school enrollment will be one-third greater by 1965. Due to the bumper crop of babies born since World War II, high-school enrollment will be even greater, up 58 percent.

Recalling that school construction almost reached a dead stop during the years of World War II, we have the double problem of replacement and increase.

Both Government and private studies have come to the following conclusion: "Many communities are finding it impossible to build their share of these classrooms on a current-account basis; and, even though they might be willing to borrow to finance such schools as they need, this would be impossible because of existing debt limits and the difficulties of changing them. Classroom construction is, therefore, being delayed."

Federal aid for education is not without precedent.

In fact, before the Federal Constitution was adopted, the Continental Congress, in 1785, set aside the 16th section of every township in the Northwest Territory for the support of public schools. Over 175 million acres were finally set aside for this purpose in addition to money grants ever since.

Testimony given before Senate and House Committees from all sections of the country agree that a serious situation exists, and the solution for it cannot be postponed.

I want to bring you part of the statement given by Mrs. Clifford N. Jenkins, chairman of legislation, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, before the House committee, on the subject of Federal aid for education.

Mrs. Jenkins, speaking for 9 million members of 39,000 PTA's in every State of the Union, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii, said, and I quote:

"All across this Nation communities are faced with makeshift classroom, building shortages, and unsafe structures. This has become a national emergency, and emergencies require special consideration.

"I would call your attention to a headline in last night's paper in my neighborhood entitled 'Children Attend Classes in the Strangest Places.' One was listed as a reconverted garage being used for five classrooms; another is an 1890 frame house which is now being used to house kindergarten classes. There are all kinds of buildings being used today in many areas.

"In this all-important crisis we cannot overlook the health menace nor the safety hazards that are involved in makeshift housing. Many classes are being held in cellars, cellars for children, unspeakable I think. In Buffalo last winter a number of

children were burned to death because they could not be reached, nor could they get out of the cellar.

"There are many examples of Federal-aid programs that have been, and still are, going forward admirably, without control by the Federal Government. To name but a few: The land-grant colleges, the school-lunch program, the GI bill of rights, the vocational programs, hospital construction, and many others.

"The shortage of classrooms is an immediate need. Together, you, the lawmakers, the representatives of the people, and we, the parents and teachers of the land, ought to be able to make our efforts count. An emergency is upon us. Let us be alert to the challenge."

The Office of Education reports that the school-facilities survey reveals a current need for public elementary and secondary school facilities equivalent to a single-story structure 50 feet wide extending from the Statue of Liberty to the Golden Gate Bridge.

The Democratic Party believes that the States and the communities are doing their best, but are just unable to do the whole job alone.

We believe that the Federal Government, which collects most of the tax revenues, should make actual grants to finance a big school-building program with a minimum of Federal control.

The needs of our school, all our children, will permit no delay.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Miss Barbara Faris, of Fond du Lac, Wis. Miss Faris was one of a number of students competing in a program initiated by the Fond du Lac Junior Chamber of Commerce to have students express themselves on their understanding of our Republic and what it means to be a citizen.

The many speeches that were delivered were outstanding, and it was extremely difficult for the judges to make a first choice. However the address of Miss Faris was chosen as No. 1.

Participation in a program of this nature indicates to me that the youth of this country do have a full understanding of the responsibilities they must shoulder within a few years.

The address follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

"Nothing is big enough to scare me."

Pretty bold words aren't they? Yet not too bold to be heard from the lips of Woodrow Wilson. Are they too rash—for me?

After all, who am I to be boasting like that? That's it. Who am I? I repeat, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." I sing, "My country, 'tis of thee, sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing. Land where my fathers died, land of the pilgrims' pride, from every mountainside let freedom ring." Why just I or me; why not we or they?

Once Wilson said: "Gentlemen, we are not working for our own interests, we are not

working for today, we are all going to pass away. But think of what is involved. Here are the tradition, and the fame, and the prosperity, and the purity, and the peace of a great nation involved." That's where I fit in.

I am that generation nurtured in the heart of George Washington; nurtured by the vigilance of Paul Revere and by the courage of Nathan Hale in 1775. I am that generation suffered for in 1812 with Washington in flames. I am that generation ransomed in American blood on American soil at Gettysburg, Vicksburg, and Savannah. I am that generation fought for in 1893 at Santiago Harbor and San Juan Hill. I am that generation that was given life through the death of 126,000 Americans in World War I, where in the Meuse-Argonne Forest one dead body was left for every foot of ground conquered. I was given life through the death of America's fathers, and husbands, and sons who forged their bloody way to victory at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood. I am that generation born in the blood of 323,000 dead in World War II; and sadly glorified in the cross-studded cemetery overlooking Omaha Beach and the unnumbered fields in France, in Italy, in Germany, and in England. The names of the millions dead to give me life and liberty are known only to God.

Nothing was big enough to scare them; scare them enough to forsake liberty and justice for all—for me.

Was I worth it? They trusted me, these men of death-courage, with the destiny of their nation. They trusted me to speak for democracy; not only today—when we, the youth of America, stand in competition to resound in robust prose or in delicate poetry the glories that make America; that make American democracy the ideal form of government for man, a creature of intelligence and free will, a creature with an eternal destiny, a creature with a mission among men—but every day.

I can speak for democracy every hour of every day when I think. I can think as an American; not as a Jew, or Italian, or Swede, or German, or whatever nationality I may be, but as an American. We are all one. I can be patriotic to democracy through my love of God, love of country and love of fellowman. Is it too much to ask that we who speak for democracy join with care-worn Lincoln to pledge again on every battlefield " . . . that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Nothing is big enough to scare me because I am the living foundation of democracy under God. I am the nucleus of freedom and the core of justice. My ideas and my ideals add to the formation of a great nation.

I am the life or I am the death of a democracy under God. May I be all that I should be.

The Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, a Great Newspaper, Celebrates Today Its 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a tribute to one of the great

Democratic newspapers remaining in the United States, the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, which today is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

The first issue of this paper was published on February 24, 1880, by two great brothers, whose names have been marked for their achievements in the fields of journalism, literature, and their contribution to the spread of democratic ideals. They were Charles J. and Edward Bellamy, whose newspaper was one of the earliest selling for a penny. Both were lawyers, but they were much more interested in writing novels and essays than in drawing writs and addressing juries.

Soon after the founding of the Daily News, Edward retired to his home where he wrote Looking Backward, one of the most influential books of all time. Charles remained to build the Daily News into the city's largest newspaper, and one of the most influential Democratic papers published. Edward's son, Paul Bellamy, left newspaper work in Springfield in 1907 to join the staff of the Cleveland Plain Dealer. He recently retired from the editorship of that paper. Charles' son, Charles, Jr., is still a member of the staff of the newspaper his father founded.

In 1915 the Daily News was sold to the Republican Publishing Co. Sherman H. Bowles, a member of the famous Springfield publishing family, became head of the Springfield newspapers, but permitted such complete latitude to the editors that the Daily News never changed its character, nor abandoned the course set by Charles J. Bellamy.

Three great editors have directed the editorial operation of the Daily News since the founder and first editor, Charles J. Bellamy, Sr., died in 1910. They are the late John B. Callaghan and George M. Doyle, and the present editor, Frank H. Kelly.

Mr. Callaghan, who died last July 15, retired in 1939 after an active editorship of 30 years. He was succeeded by Mr. Doyle as editor. Mr. Kelly was named executive editor in 1941, and upon the death of Mr. Doyle on June 21, 1946, Mr. Kelly became managing editor.

The present editor joined the Daily News staff upon graduation from high school at the age of 17. While rising to the top editorial position on the Daily News, Mr. Kelly was also attaining prominence as a Catholic layman. He is trustee of the Republican-Daily News employees beneficial fund, a member of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, and an incorporator and director of several leading civic organizations in the Springfield area.

Under the editorship of Mr. Kelly, the Daily News has not veered from the ideals set down by the Bellamy brothers 75 years ago this week. It is still the people's newspaper, and it has grown rich in esteem with each succeeding year.

Today I sent the following telegram to Mr. Kelly:

Heartly congratulations to the Daily News on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. On this February 24 I salute a great newspaper, one that has lived up to the glorious traditions of the American press. In its span of 75 years the Daily News has given distinguished news service and contributed im-

measurably to the public good of our community. My best wishes to your entire organization.

Mr. Speaker, I also call to your attention the following greetings to the Springfield Daily News from LeRoy Keller, vice president of the United Press Associations, New York City, as follows:

DEAR MR. KELLY: It affords me real pleasure on behalf of the United Press to salute the Springfield Daily News on the glorious occasion of its 75th anniversary February 24th.

Noting this, I was prompted to dig back into the files. I discovered with pride that we had begun service to the News on September 8, 1897, nearly 58 years ago, so that together we have recorded all of the history of the 20th century thus far. It goes without saying that there is even greater news ahead for both of us.

Hearty congratulations. Long may you wave in Springfield.

Sincerely yours,

LeROY KELLER.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Estonian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps difficult for Americans, who enjoy the fruits of religious freedom, to appreciate what life is like under the rule of a regime that denies the existence of God and seeks all ways to destroy religious belief. The 37th anniversary of Estonian national independence provides an excellent occasion to illustrate not only the severe conditions under which the Estonian people live but to demonstrate particularly their energetic efforts to keep alive the faith of their fathers.

In all areas of the world where they rule the Communists have as their long-range objective the complete destruction of religious life. The campaign to destroy religion in Estonia began immediately after the first Soviet occupation and was resumed after the second Soviet occupation in the autumn of 1944. The Soviet attack on Estonian religious life came from all sides. Churches no longer enjoyed protection under law. The economic base upon which all religious institutions were built was undermined by the imposition of such policies as expropriation of land and property, inordinate taxation of the clergy and church institutions, and prohibition of voluntary contributions. Religious institutions were, moreover, stripped of their educational function and all means for propagating religious ideas were curtailed or destroyed. Deportations of many Estonians during the first Soviet occupation and the escape to the West of many clergymen from almost certain persecution or even death as the second Soviet occupation was about to envelop the nation further weakened Estonian religious life.

However, if past experience is any guide, Estonians can look to the future

with confidence that, however severe the antireligious onslaught of the Soviets may be, Estonian religious life will survive. So strong is the attachment of the Estonian people to religion that any success the Russian Communists might have can be no more than transitory.

On this 37th anniversary of Estonian independence, let us, therefore, join in spirit with those Estonians now imprisoned within the Soviet Empire and in prayerful solicitation to the Father of us all ask that the strength of this unfortunate people neither be diminished nor their will to resist be unabated. We must never lose faith in them, for if we do, where else will they turn?

Foothill Electric Corp., of Oakland, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission commending the Foothill Electric Corp., Oakland, Calif., located in my district for the excellent job it has done as electrical subcontractor to Kaiser Engineers Division of the Henry J. Kaiser Co. at the AEC's Hanford, Wash., project.

The AEC through the chief of its Engineering and Construction Division praises Foothill for its "high quality of workmanship while performing on schedule and within estimated costs." Performance of this type should generate a high sense of satisfaction on the part of the American people in view of the vital role of the atom in the defense plans of this country.

The letter follows:

UNITED STATES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,

Richland, Wash., December 1, 1954.

FOOTHILL ELECTRIC CORP.,
Oakland, Calif.

Attention: L. H. Misner, Corporation manager.

Subject: Electrical construction performance on 100-K reactor area, contract No. AT(45-1)-638.

Gentlemen: We want you to know that Foothill Electric Corp. has done an excellent job as electrical subcontractor to Kaiser Engineers on our 100-K reactor area. Foothill has maintained high quality of workmanship while performing on schedule and within cost estimates.

Mr. Walter W. Tohlen, project manager at Hanford for Foothill Electric Corp., has maintained complete control of labor relations throughout the job. Jurisdictional disputes and other complaints have been settled within the organization. In 2 years of construction there has been only one brief labor stoppage for Foothill when all other trades were out simultaneously, and the issues were completely in the hands of AEC.

The electrical engineering accomplishments of Foothill Electric have included extremely complex reactor controls, large power generation plants, and a highly critical electric power system for water pumping purposes.

Industrial relations have been maintained smoothly and effectively with the AEC area engineer's forces, General Electric Co. and Chas. T. Main, Inc., 7 AEC prime contractors operating within 100-K area and 55 Kaiser Engineers subcontractors.

We express our appreciation for the commendable job accomplished by Foothill Electric Corp.

Very truly yours,

J. I. THOMAS,

Chief, Engineering and Construction Division.

The Late Dwight L. Rogers

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when I heard of the sudden death of DWIGHT L. ROGERS I was shocked. I had just left him several weeks before this occurred. In fact, I believe that he and I played the last game of golf in which he participated at the Burning Tree Club. When we left the clubhouse he told me he was going home to Fort Lauderdale to help his sons in their law practice and also to play some golf at Fort Lauderdale, Fla. Little did I think that this would be the last time that I would see my friend. He looked like a person in perfect health, both mentally and physically.

During our service in Congress, DWIGHT ROGERS and myself became very good friends. He was an able pleader for the things that he thought were right. I never saw him exhibit any acrimony in debate, but he zealously and effectively pleaded for legislation which he supported.

He was a member of the great Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and I have personal knowledge that he was very highly regarded by his colleagues on the committee. A man's legislative life in the House of Representatives revolves around his committee assignment.

Mr. ROGERS also was a Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. He was a man who had a keen sense of humor. He had a fine family life, and in every way was an excellent citizen. His sudden death reminded me of the expression "Nothing is so certain as death and nothing so uncertain as the time of death."

He died the way I hope I may die. He was in perfect health and had his full mental vigor up to the last minute of his life.

DWIGHT L. ROGERS was a true representative of his people. He listened to his constituents, he studied the proposals on which he was called upon to vote, and he made his decision as to what course of action he should take by his vote. Knowing him as I did, I know that whatever his vote was it was for what he believed to be for the best public interest.

It is very pleasing to us who admired DWIGHT L. ROGERS to have one of his sons

with us in the House. We are sure that he will carry into his work the high standard of service that his distinguished father practiced.

Soil-Conservation District Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, soil conservation is one of the great challenges of our generation. The work of saving the soil, rebuilding eroded and depleted land, and the conserving of water on the ground is a task that is worthy of the greatest honor—and those men and women who are active in their local soil-conservation districts and who serve as supervisors and officers have earned the gratitude of both the rural and the city dweller. For, without their efforts, the basic resources of America would be lost or wasted and the future of our Nation would be doomed.

For this reason, it is pleasing for me to receive and study each year the annual reports of the local soil-conservation districts from the area I am privileged to serve. Eastern Arkansas, and the first district in particular, is fortunate to have strong, aggressive soil-conservation districts with active and able supervisors.

Although the first district did not participate in the district program prior to 1937, today there are 2,650 soil-conservation districts in the United States, covering four-fifths of the Nation's farmlands and almost 90 percent of our farms. Each county in the First Arkansas District is fortunate in that each has an active soil-conservation district.

As an example of the kind of work that they do, let it be pointed out that the Central Crowley Ridge Soil-Conservation District, with offices at Jonesboro, reported:

Nine group jobs were completed this year. This is a record for us, and we believe for this part of the country. Twenty-seven thousand three hundred and seventy-seven acres were planned for soil and water conservation, and more people learned more about their soil-conservation district than in any other one year that we know of.

This fine report is signed by the board of supervisors, consisting of Chairman Frank Barton, Joe C. Willett, Dr. Ralph Sloan, L. C. Stark, and J. W. Crafton.

The splendid work of the St. Francis Soil Conservation District, headed by Supervisors Homer Towns, W. W. Campbell, V. O. Turner, Burt Sulcer, and Thomas McDaniel, has resulted in great savings on the 407,040 acres inside the district. The 1954 annual report states:

In 1954 there were 83 new agreements covering 18,461 acres. This makes a total of 913 agreements covering 271,417 acres. Conservation surveys (soil maps) have been completed on 348,726 acres.

The Lee County Soil Conservation District, which covers an area of 396,300

acres under the direction of Supervisors Harvey Wilson, Lon Mann, Tom Gist, R. H. Lindsey, Jr., and Carl Nash, states in the 1954 report:

During 1954, 80 farms were planned with a total of 13,241 acres, making a total of 887 farms and 199,618 acres under agreement.

The Greene County Soil Conservation District has issued a fine report for 1954 stating their accomplishments and also containing an excellent philosophy of soil conservation. It is a credit to the good men who are supervisors for this district, Chairman George Wadley, King O'Neal, Earl Gramling, Curtis Cruse, and Judge J. Ed Thompson.

The Clay County Soil Conservation District, under the direction of supervisors W. H. Irby, Charles Smart, Fred Ahrent, Ed Bellmeyer, and Roy Barnett, has issued a fine 1954 report which shows that the district now has 1,129 cooperators covering some 159,379 acres. This is an increase during 1954 of 100 new co-operators and 16,137 acres.

The Phillips County Soil Conservation District, under the leadership of supervisors George Brandon, Earl Wells, F. F. "Happy" Kitchens, F. A. Clements, and Weldon Jackson, states in their 1954 report:

We now have 312 cooperators working with us, and they have 139,642 acres in their farms. Twenty-four farmers signed cooperative agreements in 1954, bringing in 34,032 acres. Sixty cooperative agreements were changed to basic conservation plans during the year. Three farms had 7,946 acres in them.

Space is not available to list all of the districts in eastern Arkansas, but each of them could show, through their reports, the fine work that is being carried on. It must be remembered, that these supervisors work without compensation, each district operates under its own financing, and is a legal subdivision of the State of Arkansas.

I am very proud of the fine men of Arkansas who give their time and effort to the work of soil and water conservation. It is a pleasure to salute them—supervisors, cooperators, and those public-spirited individuals who, by their efforts, support the work of the districts. This list would include the newspapers of the district, the radio stations, the banks, the merchants, and public officials. The crusade for conservation moves ahead.

Postal and Federal Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement I made before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, endorsing legislation providing for an adequate and justifiable increase in pay for our postal and Federal employees:

POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DESERVE A RAISE AND A SUBSTANTIAL ONE

Why the heavy turnover in Federal employment?

Because there is not enough appreciation of the work done by our civil servants and not enough recompense.

There was a time when men and women would devote their lives to a civil-service career, because they saw opportunities for promotion and for gradual increases that would keep them ahead of the rising cost of living.

Consider, for instance, the responsible work done by the staffs working for Members of Congress, and consider what Congressmen would do without the knowledge and dependability of these employees?

The Congress, which is in the favorable position of voting a pay increase for itself, has just done so, and in a very impressive way, while a proposed pay increase for all Federal workers was given exhaustive hearings in the last session of Congress, without overcoming the final hurdle, and is going the rounds again in this session.

All the facts are in, and they make a convincing case, but they are being prejudiced by political maneuvering.

Our only recourse, then, is to hammer away with the facts until reason and conscience break through the artificial logjam that impedes the progress of these bills, and with the aid of public opinion, put into effect pay increases that will boost the income of Federal workers and also boost their morale.

General Motors Corp., peace setter of our private industries, pays an average wage of \$96 a week, under a formula that provides for increased productivity and for a cost-of-living allowance.

The Federal Government, which dwarfs General Motors, in number of employees, in its progressive effect upon our economy, and in its worldwide responsibilities, still considers its faithful workers as poor relatives who should be content to work overtime in some cases without extra compensation, and without any bargaining rights.

The average weekly wage paid to Federal employees is far from \$96 a week, even though the Federal Government tries to enlist the best brains in the Nation for its service.

Here is a shocking fact.

More than half of our post office clerks cannot get by on their present salaries. Some of them are even giving up their so-called job security in favor of the more rewarding work they find in private industry.

A 10-percent increase is the very minimum that will raise them from a deficit income to a break-even level.

One of the arguments advanced to justify a whopping increase for Members of Congress, is relevant here.

In fact, an \$800 yearly increase would be necessary for postal employees in order to regain for them the 1939 standard of living.

Even on a 10-percent increase they are only asking for a part of what is due them.

Because taxes have soared.

Because the living standards of all other workers have improved.

And because the increased productivity of Federal workers has not been given its economic recognition.

Statistics reveal that the post office clerk, since 1939, has received increases ranging from 18 to 135 percent less than the rest of American workers. And this is representative of the economic loss suffered by all Federal employees.

At this life-or-death crisis in our history, a struggle that may go on for decades, we cannot afford to skimp on the wages paid to career personnel of the Federal Government upon whom we depend in the overall picture to service the Nation and to maintain our strength and security.

The leaders of the United States Government, in positions of burdensome power and responsibility, are only as good as the sum of all the talents, and energy, and devotion of our public servants.

To strengthen that essential core of Federal employees with pay incentives that will make them the equal of their fellow Americans who are working for private enterprise, we should authorize a 10 percent across-the-board increase in wages.

The Congress saw fit to make its own major salary increase retroactive to the beginning of 1955.

I believe that this is an additional and compelling reason why a pay increase for all Federal workers should be passed, retroactive to January 1, 1955, and without delay.

We cannot afford the resentment and the loss of faith which failure to take this action will precipitate.

I hope, and I am confident, that the Congress will appreciate and recognize the valuable services of our post office and Federal employees by granting them a generous increase in wages and salaries.

Tomorrow's Leaders Look at 300 Years of Jewish Life in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, from September 3 to 9, 1954, the seventh annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference met at Cejwin Camps, Port Jervis, to discuss Tomorrow's Leaders Look at 300 Years of Jewish Life in America. The sessions were interesting and thought-provoking, and I am pleased to direct to the attention of the Congress the following resolutions on national issues adopted by the delegates from more than 300 Jewish centers and councils:

NATIONAL JEWISH YOUTH CONFERENCE RESOLUTIONS, 1954 ANNUAL ASSEMBLY FREEDOM

Whereas we are now celebrating the 300th anniversary of Jewish settlement in the United States under the theme of "Man's Opportunities and Responsibilities Under Freedom"; and

Whereas we believe that today the dangers to freedom of thought and speech have multiplied and the protections which guard these freedoms weakened; and

Whereas the liberty to examine, to discuss, and to evaluate in all fields of learning is basic to the further development and preservation of our democratic institutions and way of life; and

Whereas these threats to our liberties and freedoms result in equating conformity with patriotism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reassert our traditional opposition to all threats to freedom, including communism, fascism, McCarthyism, and others; be it

Resolved, That the 1954 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference condemns any effort to curtail civil liberties and opposes any threats to basic democratic principles of our free society; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon the American Jewish community to reexamine and re-evaluate its role in American life so as to

determine how we as Jews, and Americans can best preserve democratic liberties within the framework of man's opportunities and responsibilities under freedom.

UNITED NATIONS

Whereas unreasoned attacks are continually being made upon the United Nations and its specialized agencies by a small group who seek to destroy public confidence in these fortresses of freedom, peace, international good will, and humanity; and

Whereas there is no other international organization available to mankind to prevent the scourge of war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 1954 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference reaffirms its faith in and support for the efforts of the United Nations to achieve peace for our time; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the United Nations and its specialized agencies for its efforts to secure for all people their fundamental human rights * * * to establish the kinds of conditions under which justice, progress, and a better standard of living can be achieved for all men regardless of race, creed, or color.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON SEGREGATION

Whereas the National Jewish Youth Conference recognizes the common brotherhood of man: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the seventh annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference actively support the recent Supreme Court decision to eliminate segregation and calls upon all Jewish centers and council groups to cooperate in the implementation of this decision.

OPPOSITION TO THE M'CARRAN IMMIGRATION LAW

Whereas the United States from its birth has been the haven of the persecuted and the oppressed; and

Whereas an immigration policy which is consistent with traditional American ideals should be founded upon a basis of need, rather than national origins; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walters Immigration Law is firmly imbedded in an inflexible, unrealistic and un-American concept of quotas based on national origins rather than on present needs; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walters immigration law has proven to be ineffective and oppressive in its execution and, in addition, has served to lower the prestige of the United States in the free world: Be it

Resolved, That the seventh annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference urges that the American immigration policies be revised and rewritten in accordance with the highest concepts of equity and justice, which are part of our tradition as Americans and as Jews.

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD

Whereas the National Jewish Welfare Board during the past 7 years has rendered a service to the American Jewish community and to all American Jewish youth by its continued support of the National Jewish Youth Conference; and

Whereas the National Jewish Welfare Board has unselfishly provided during this time the framework in which to work together; and

Whereas it has continued its unqualified support of the goals of the conference in times of financial burden: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the 1954 annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference express not only its appreciation and gratitude to the National Jewish Welfare Board for its steadfast support during the past years but congratulates and commends our sponsoring body for its assistance, sponsorship, and sincere cooperation.

I know the Members will also be interested in the following excerpts of addresses and messages delivered to the assembly:

TOMORROW'S LEADERS LOOK AT 300 YEARS OF JEWISH LIFE IN AMERICA

(By Dr. Oscar I. Janowsky, professor of history at the City College of New York; editor of the American Jew; chairman, Commission for the Study of Jewish Education in the United States)

The vitality and adaptability which enabled Jews to master destructive forces in the past are still strikingly in evidence. Frustration there is aplenty, but despair is unwarranted. There is a future for American Jewry, but the positive and constructive elements must devote themselves to the fashioning of that future.

The morale of American Jewry is high. The fears and insecurities engendered by nazism in the 1930's have faded. The feeling of impotence in the face of the gross injustice to the refugees and to Jewish Palestine has been mastered. This psychological security has been enhanced by the rise of Israel and by the certainty that the existence of the Jewish state involves no conflict of loyalties for American Jews.

There is a keen awareness of the deficiencies and shortcomings in the functioning of Jewish institutions. The anarchy in Jewish organization life has been and will continue to be challenged. But the most urgent need of the American Jewish community is an overall body, broadly representative of the various strands in American Jewry and responsive to public opinion. Our needs may soon outrun our means, if they haven't already done so. Priorities will have to be determined and every cause will be called upon to establish its prior claim to public support. Such determination must not restore competing pressures. The whole Jewish community should have the opportunity to discuss in full democratic review its needs and its services, and that can be done only through an overall representative body of American Jews.

WORLD JEWRY

(By Dr. Judah J. Shapiro, director of cultural and educational reconstruction of the Conference on War Claims Against Germany)

The lesson of the history of the Jews in America is the parallel development of the American Jewish community and its service to Jewry in other lands. The leaders of tomorrow will be required to supply resources for Jewish survival at home and abroad. Dr. Shapiro urged "strong identification by the National Jewish Youth Conference with programs of service to Jews overseas." He pointed out that not only fund raising was necessary, but active participation in the efforts at Jewish cultural reconstruction in Europe, north Africa, and Israel.

Continued requirements are for the reestablishment of Jewish communities in Western Europe; for emergency aid to Jews in north Africa and their political protection; and for the building of Israel and the establishment of its security. A program of material assistance is, however, meaningless without a concurrent effort at cultural reconstruction.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

(By S. D. Gershovitz, executive vice president, National Jewish Welfare Board)

Live with the fact of an atomic world with all of its potential horror but work for the peaceful and constructive use of its great powers for the benefit of all mankind. Don't be obsessed with the need for excessive security. Live adventurously, carry on the historic and natural role of youth in society of looking and attempting new horizons.

Think for yourself. Listen, observe, and learn all there is to learn, but don't become

a member of a group or team because it is the thing to do. Do so only because you have seen through your own thought processes that what the group is doing is sound and wholesome and constructive and what you personally believe in. Bring to that group personal clarity of belief and conviction. Don't join because you expect, by some magic, to have someone give you the answers you vaguely feel a need for. Take a vigorous role as a young adult in the community.

YOUNG ADULTS SERVE THE LOCAL COMMUNITY
(By Sanford Solender, director, Jewish center division, National Jewish Welfare Board)

American youth today are indicted in many quarters for a loss of their traditional idealism, a cynicism, and a preoccupation with having a good time and making money. They are condemned for a lack of community interest and for failure to assume their share of responsibility for community affairs.

These charges, while often exaggerated, contain too much truth for comfort by any of us. Many factors in the present scene explain this condition. Youth's natural concern for personal adjustment and the uncertainties of the times in which we live play their part. In many ways, youth mirrors the apathy of the adults and reacts to the failure of adults to recognize the capacity of youth for responsibility.

An American way of life has a great stake in the bestirring of youth today. Our society relies upon intelligent participation by all its citizens, the capacity for which must be built into their personalities as they mature. We need the idealism, courage, creativity, and optimism of youth in meeting the perplexities confronting our Nation today. Our Jewish tradition of social responsibility provides a vital inspiration for such activity by Jewish youth.

We must strive to give youth a feeling of being an integral part of the community. We must help them to link their deep personal concerns, for personal self-realization, marriage, and economic adjustment, to the possibilities for intelligent and dignified participation in their community.

This is a major task, a vital challenge for youth leaders and adults alike.

EXCERPTS FROM MESSAGES TO THE SEVENTH ANNUAL ASSEMBLY, NATIONAL JEWISH YOUTH CONFERENCE

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles:

"I am pleased to note that the program for the seventh annual assembly of the National Jewish Youth Conference stresses leadership and participation of young people in community and world affairs. These are significant factors in a free society at any time, and in the age of crisis in which we seem fated to live, it is particularly appropriate that maximum emphasis be placed upon both."

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York:

"I am extremely pleased to note the growing importance of the role which the National Jewish Youth Conference is playing in improving the community leadership among the youth and young adult groups of our Nation. The participants in the seventh annual assembly have an opportunity to discuss and to plan for the many challenges facing the young people of America."

Hon. Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel:

"It gives me great pleasure on behalf of myself and the Israeli Government to convey to the seventh annual assembly, National Jewish Youth Conference, best wishes. The work in which the conference is engaged is of greatest importance to Jewish youth. I sincerely hope that your organization continues as a strong factor in existing cooperation between great American Jewish community and the people of Israel."

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York:

"The activities of the National Jewish Youth Conference represent a notable contribution to American life by helping Jewish youth to become an even more vital force in the community. The young people of American Jewry, by their conduct, their fidelity to the precepts and noble traditions which they have inherited from their fathers, as well as to the principles and aspirations inherent in the free institutions of our country have well entitled them to the respect and friendship of their neighbors, regardless of creed."

Dr. Martha M. Elliot, Chief, Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"Best wishes on the occasion of your seventh annual assembly. Your program is an important one as are the young people who in carrying it out will make such a rich contribution to their country and to their own communities."

Who Has Guarded Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. PILCHER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Who Has Guarded Freedom," which appeared in the Moultrie Observer, Moultrie, Ga., February 19, 1955:

WHO HAS GUARDED FREEDOM?

President Eisenhower's trips to Georgia may be responsible for such a statement, but the Chief Executive has told the Republican National Committee that Democrats should not be put in the same class with Communists when they line up to fight their enemies.

Mr. Eisenhower has, since becoming President, visited in the Augusta and southwest Georgia area several times. He has come to know and like the people. Many of them have been lifelong Democrats—the kind of Democrats that would die for their country and will remain loyal to democratic principles and the Democratic Party as long as they eat and breathe.

So when Mr. Eisenhower goes before his own party's policymakers and gives voice to a warning against referring to Democrats as Reds, he is displaying a courage born of knowledge and respect for those who do not subscribe to Republican ideals, but have strong and worthy ideals which would maintain American freedom and produce progress for the masses.

"Let's not build up a picture that the worst enemy anyone can have is a Democrat," the President has told the GOP national committee. "Far from it. We just don't think they can do as good as we do. As a matter of fact, we know it."

Democrats won't go for these latter statements. The Republicans haven't convinced any Democrats yet that they have better policies or can do a better job of administration. That is a mere matter of opinion, to be shared or rejected.

The fact that Democrats are not to be classed as Communists, however, is indisputable. It is still shocking that certain of the Republican leaders, in their intense desire to win election and control of Government, have resorted to such low and loose phrases which are entirely false.

We need only to point to the South as a positive illustration. Nowhere can be found a people more patriotic or more loyal—or more ready to fight to preserve the basic freedoms. There would be no problem of Communist infiltration if all Americans were as solid as those of the South.

Tribunes of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the condensation of an article, *Tribunes of the People*, by James Burnham, appearing in the February issue of *Reader's Digest*.

Discussion of congressional investigations has stirred many comments. It has been suggested by some that because of alleged abuses there should be a curtailment of power, or, at least, more rigid rules.

Because investigations are one of the more important arms of Congress, the review, analysis, and conclusions contained in James Burnham's article are interesting and necessary in helping to achieve a proper perspective on the subject.

I unhesitatingly and earnestly recommend it for your consideration.

The article follows:

TRIBUNES OF THE PEOPLE

(By James Burnham)

When the Founding Fathers established our government structure of liberty under law, they borrowed from the ancient Romans a remarkable device—the tribunes of the people. The job of the tribunes, officials elected from the ranks of the Assembly of the People, was to see that the laws were enforced, that justice was done to the ordinary citizen. The fathers of our country, realizing that this function of the tribunes was indispensable to liberty, assigned it to the investigating committees of Congress.

Like the Roman tribunes, congressional investigators are immune from arrest or prosecution. They are, therefore, able to challenge without fear of reprisal the immense power of the police, the Army, and the executive. Congress—our own Assembly of the People—charges its investigators with the task of finding out whether our laws are being enforced and whether new laws are needed. On the basis of facts unearthed by its investigators, Congress is also empowered to impeach and expel from office any member of the executive and judicial branches of Government—even the President or a Justice of the Supreme Court. Short of impeachment, the investigating committees can check executive action by appeal, through public hearings, to the final court of a democracy: the citizen voters.

Congressional investigators can reflect the ignorance and the passions of the people as well as the people's traditional wisdom, loyalty, and strength. But they are irreplaceable champions of our liberty. In 1936 Hugo Black, now a member of the Supreme Court, then a Senator, wrote: "The probe is one of the most powerful weapons to restrain the activities of groups who can defy every other power. Public investigating committees exist always in countries where the people

rule. They have always been opposed by groups that seek or have special privileges." The first congressional investigation took place in 1792, just 3 years after adoption of our Constitution. The Indians of the Northwest Territory had all but annihilated a Government force led against them by Gen. Arthur St. Clair, and popular opinion demanded an explanation.

When the House of Representatives selected an investigating committee, one Congressman argued that an inquiry would be insulting to President Washington, who had appointed St. Clair, and that Congress should merely request the President to look into the matter himself. The majority insisted, however, that Congress make its own investigation in its own way.

The inquiry, as it turned out, absolved General St. Clair of personal blame, but made constructive criticisms that led to improved organization of the War Department.

All but 3 of our 84 Congresses have authorized investigations. The areas investigated have included every department of the executive branch of Government; every war except the Spanish-American; all sorts of election scandals; railroads, shipping, oil, banking, housing, insurance, utilities—in fact, nearly every major industry. Investigations of conspiracy and espionage are by no means a 20th-century novelty. Even before 1800, espionage—in behalf of France and Spain—was investigated. Subversive conspiracy was the issue in inquiries of 1808 concerning Aaron Burr's associates.

Violent controversy has always swirled around congressional investigations. In the 1920's a variety of individuals and organizations denounced Senators Borah, La Follette, Wheeler, and Walsh for the inquiries that brought to light the shocking scandals of the naval reserve oil leases. Owen J. Roberts, later an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, speaking before the American Bankers Association, condemned the oil investigation as propaganda for nationalization. The Wall Street Journal dismissed it as only a political smokescreen. Discussing this and the parallel investigation of Attorney General Daugherty, the New York Times declared in February 1924 that Congress was investigation mad, and was trying to introduce government by clamor. The Times upheld Daugherty as one who was defending decency and honor.

Within 6 months Daugherty had resigned in disgrace—after the investigators had shown that during his 2½ years in Washington on a \$15,000 salary, his personal financial position had shifted from \$19,000 in the red to \$100,000 in the black.

At the time of this Teapot Dome probe, the Senate investigators were termed "scandalmongers," "mud gunners," "assassins of character." Their inquiries were described as a lynching bee, poison-tongued partisanship, twittering hysteria. But as a result of their disclosures, one corrupt Cabinet member (Harry Daugherty) and one who winked at corruption (Edwin Denby) were forced to resign. Albert Fall, along with oil magnate Harry F. Sinclair and a variety of lesser figures, went to jail. Four oil millionaires skipped the country.

The scandalous leases of naval reserve oil at Teapot Dome, Elk Hills, and Buena Vista were canceled, with a saving to the taxpayers of hundreds of millions of dollars. Reorganization of the Justice Department, another consequence of these investigations, brought major benefits to the Nation through stricter, more equitable law enforcement.

Only congressional investigation could have produced such results. Individual citizens were helpless. The courts were powerless to initiate action. The executive agencies were either unaware of what was happening or conniving at it. Tribunes of the people, armed with sufficient power, were required to expose the wrongdoing, arouse public opinion, and force remedial action.

The first bread-and-butter function of investigating committees is to assist Congress in its constitutional task of making and changing our laws. In order to make laws wisely, Congress must have before it the relevant facts. But Congress cannot simply take the alleged facts of a situation from some other agency, or from the executive branch. It must take the full, independent responsibility itself for the information upon which its lawmaking decisions will rest. Congress gains this information by conducting its own investigations in its own way.

A related function of congressional investigations is to check up on what happens to laws after they are passed. Committees like the watchdog committee of World War II, in which Harry Truman made his mark, have saved billions of dollars by keeping a critical eye on the Government's military contracts and administrative methods.

Nearly every important reorganization of governmental structure has come as a result of congressional inquiries. Repeated 19th-century investigations of frauds in private mail contracts, for example, led to the formation of the General Post Office.

Time and again investigations have been used to clean Congress' own house, from as early as 1797 when William Blount was expelled from the Senate for stirring up the Indians to rebellion. Only a congressional probe was able to penetrate the vast Crédit mobilier scandal which by 1872 has engulfed both Europe and this country, and involved even the United States Vice President and former Speaker of the House, as well as many of the Nation's leading financiers.

In our own day congressional investigations were the first agency to inform the public concerning totalitarian threats to liberty. Beginning in 1938, the House Committee on Un-American Activities exposed first the Fascist and Nazi groups that were then actively conspiring against our security, and next the Communist apparatus that continues to conspire. It was this committee that dug out the case of Alger Hiss, along with the operations of the Silvermaster, Perlo, and Ware espionage cells. In recent years its work has been supplemented by the Senate's Internal Security and Permanent Investigations Subcommittees.

These committees, granted their excesses, deserve chief credit for the fact that today, both by more adequate laws and through sterner administrative action, we have at last begun to deal effectively with the subversive conspiracy against our survival as a free Nation. Despite the attacks to which they have often been subjected—and which they have sometimes deserved—congressional investigations have thus proved themselves an essential part of our system of government.

The new Congress now has before it a number of proposals for the "reform" of investigating committees by the establishment of strict rules of procedure. Undoubtedly there have been abuses in the conduct of investigations—great power is always liable to abuse and corruption. But can they be corrected by detailed rules laid down in advance? The reputation of an author may be damaged by an unfair review, but we do not demand a law that would prescribe in detail the methods of book reviewing. A committee hearing is not a trial. It cannot take away a man's life or liberty. Many of the meticulous rules of the courtroom are inapplicable.

Recent discussion has invariably arisen in connection with the committees investigating Communist subversion. Although honest liberals are now advocating reforms out of a concern for civil rights, we should remember that the aim of the Communists is to put an end to all investigations of subversion, treason, and espionage.

The procedures of the committees are governed by congressional tradition, by special rules adopted by each committee, and by the

personal influence of leading members, particularly the chairmen. As a matter of tradition and privilege they accord to witnesses nearly all the rights that would be made a matter of inflexible law if the bills now before Congress are passed: for example, the right to have counsel, to submit a written statement, to answer accusations by other witnesses, and so on.

The effect of transforming these privileges into law would be to obstruct or even paralyze the work of committees. If the law required the presence of counsel for a witness, a Communist lawyer could stop a hearing merely by becoming so obstreperous that it could not continue. If the committee threw him out, it would then have to adjourn until the witness produced another lawyer—who could start the whole ruckus over again.

There has been objection to one-man hearings. It does seem fair that at least 2 committee members, 1 from each party, should be present when a witness is questioned. But under a rule requiring the presence of two members, many Senate investigations could never be finished. With all they have to do, there are just not enough Senators to go around, particularly when many committee hearings must be held in distant parts of the country. Furthermore, if an investigation were hurting one of the political parties, the committee members belonging to that party could bring it to a halt merely by staying away from the hearings.

In reality, the only requirement on this point that is both fair and practicable is that all members of a committee should have advance notice of every meeting, so that they may attend if they wish. The basic problem of one-man hearings is the man, not the rules.

Some critics have said that we should copy the responsible and objective investigating techniques of the English Royal Commissions. However, those Royal Commissions are composed of laymen chosen for their interest in the subject, and they question only volunteers who desire to give information.

It does seem desirable that Congress should eliminate the overlapping of its committee jurisdictions, so that there will no longer be the wasteful spectacle of 3 or 4 different committees competing, and interfering, with each other in the investigation of some problem. These investigations should doubtless be confined to one committee in each House. Some Congressmen go further, and have introduced bills to set up a single Joint (Senate-House) Committee on Internal Security, modeled after the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

In general, however, abuses by investigating committees are not going to be corrected by enactment of a code of rules. When a congressional committee attempts to cite an individual for contempt, the individual has the right to bring forth all facts and circumstances in support of his assertion that his constitutional rights had been violated.

And if a congressional investigator blatantly disregards truth, dignity, and justice, Congress may at any time bring about his removal from committee assignment, his censure or his expulsion. Moreover, the people in their turn will have the opportunity to vote him out of public life.

Thirty years ago a clamor for changes in procedure arose in connection with the Teapot Dome investigations, just as today they arise in connection with the investigations of Communist subversion. At that earlier time perhaps the most eloquent defense ever made of congressional investigation came from the pen of the young Felix Frankfurter, who was destined for later membership on the Supreme Court:

"Critics seek to shackle the future by suggesting restrictions in the procedure of congressional investigations. No limitations

should be imposed. The methods and forms of each investigation should be left for determination of Congress and its committees, as each situation arises. The safeguards against abuse and folly are to be looked for in the forces of responsibility which are operating within Congress and are generated from without."

Textile Industry and New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., February 19, 1955, which clearly shows why it is so necessary for New England to fight and retain its textile industry:

REVIEW OF OUR TEXTILE INDUSTRIES: WHAT'S HAPPENING TO NEW ENGLAND?

(By Dr. J. Laurence Phalan)

The number one employment problem in New England is in the textile industry. The big question is should the industry be written-off as far as New England is concerned and should we take steps to speed substitution of newer growth industries, or, should we make strenuous efforts to hold the industry within the area?

Despite the decline in New England of total textile-mill employment since World War I, the industry remains the most important source of industrial employment in the area. Textile employment accounted for slightly more than 5 percent of the total nonagricultural employment in New England in September 1954. About 1 out of every 8 workers in manufacturing was at work in a textile mill, 172,800 workers were thus employed in September 1954.

FIGURES

As large as these figures are they are small compared with those of 30 or more years ago. Following are figures showing what has happened to textile employment over the past years.

New England employment in textiles

Year	
1919	439,600
1929	355,600
1939	281,300
1947	282,100
1954	172,800

The New England textile industry defined in computing these figures includes many different types of manufacturing plants which are generally classified as woolen and worsted, cotton, rayon and silk, dyeing and finishing, and miscellaneous groups. These plants process natural fibers such as cotton and wool or man-made fibers such as rayon or nylon. The industry turns out products which consumers may use directly or which go to the garment, shoe, automobile, millinery, or other industries. The industry is most complex because of its thousands of products and the possibility of having integrated manufacturing processes in one mill or having the individual stages in production performed by a number of plants, each specializing in a particular process.

REASONS FOR LOSS

The loss of industry to other sections of the country has been chiefly due to labor costs differentials, disadvantages in power

rates and taxes and antiquated plants. Moreover, the net effect of much Federal legislation has been unfavorable to the New England mills.

While it is dangerous to generalize on such a heterogeneous industry as the textile industry, it seems that there will be some further decline in total overall textile activity in New England or at least continuing strong pressures toward such a decline.

In view of these circumstances there has grown among some a negative attitude toward the industry. Such feeling is based upon thinking that the loss of the industry in New England has been beneficial and a blessing in disguise and that industry in the area has been upgraded as a result of the textile losses. That is, that the lost textile industries have been replaced by industries which in the long run may be more rewarding than those which have lost.

This position places emphasis on adjustment of the community and workers to a new type of enterprise. The assumption being that workers can transfer readily from one type of occupation to another. Information on the subject indicates that only under the most favorable circumstances is that optimistic assumption justified.

The adjustment of a community to industry loss is often difficult and slow. It often entails hardship and heartbreak for the workers involved. Many of the older textiles workers are reluctant to enter other industries, even if they have the opportunity. They would have to abandon their years of experience and start over in a new type of work, usually at lower wages.

While loss in the textile industry has forced communities into aggressive action toward recruiting replacement industries, that is not the same as to say that the loss of textile jobs has created an economic vacuum which has automatically drawn other jobs into New England. More often than not, lost textile jobs have left empty spaces which still need to be filled.

NECESSARY STEPS

It would seem essential that new growth industries be attracted to New England and that strenuous efforts be made toward retaining those textile companies which we now have, thus minimizing the drift of the industry toward the South. Attempt at retention of the textile industry requires numerous steps.

1. All efforts must be made toward elimination of labor cost differentials between the North and South. Reduction of the differentials may be accomplished to some extent through further wage cuts to northern workers. However, this method is not very satisfactory and will meet with tremendous resistance. Better ways are through increased productivity in New England and more equitable wages in the South. A definite step in the right direction is contained in the proposal by President Eisenhower to raise the minimum wage to 90 cents an hour from the present 75 cents.

2. Increased productivity will be greatly aided through an accelerated modernization of plant facilities. Yankee ingenuity has accomplished much but is rather helpless in competing with modern plants, and mills which have failed to modernize have passed and will continue to pass out of existence.

3. Modernization of plants and methods, of necessity, leads to changes in job operations, and it is required that such changes be appreciated by union leaders. The industry is highly unionized in New England and union leadership must cooperate in the acceptance of the challenge of such changes.

4. The use of manmade materials, contrasted with pure cotton and wool, must be encouraged. This calls for increased emphasis on research. This research should be directed toward providing new methods of processing and using old materials as well as discovery of new materials.

5. Methods must be found to offset tax and power rate differentials drawing mills to the South. While these differentials are perhaps of markedly less importance than are labor cost differentials, they nevertheless are important. Particularly so, when in some instances southern communities have furnished migrant companies with completely new tax-free plants.

6. All of the above requirements must not be used as a screen behind which poor management may hide. There is ample proof that an aggressive, well-managed mill can operate successfully in New England.

The importance of the textile industries makes it imperative that much thought be given to the above-outlined requirements and to the importance of further decline in textile employment in the Boston archdiocese. Within the archdiocese, Lowell is classified by the United States Bureau of Employment Security as an area of substantial unemployment while Lawrence is classified as one of very substantial unemployment. These classifications are contrasted with the employment situation for the entire metropolitan Boston area. In the latter overall area, unemployment is not overly large and fairly approximates the national average.

These classifications for Lowell and Lawrence give firm evidence to the fact that displaced textile workers are not being absorbed by growth industries. It is thus amply shown that the expansion of nontextile industries in New England has not been of direct advantage to some displaced textile workers. Most of the expanded employment in the electronics industry, for example, has apparently come from new entrants into the labor force. Employers often prefer young people who are accepting employment for the first time.

Although there is evidence that displaced textile workers can adapt themselves to a wide variety of occupations, often the location of New England's expanding and contracting industries do not coincide, as shown in Lowell and Lawrence. When a major textile mill closes in a principal textile center, such as those two cities, the opportunity for easy transition to alternate employment is often slim. The same is also true in the small town, particularly so, if it is rather isolated from a large metropolitan area.

Thus, we feel safe in concluding that New England must fight with all fair means to retain its textile industry, whose migration does not create a vacuum into which new industry automatically flows. Our unemployment ills will be best cured by adding growth industries to a strong textile industry. Thereby, we have growth by addition and not by subtraction.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution unanimously adopted, after due deliberation, by the executive board of district seven of the Lithuanian Alliance of America, of Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties, Pa., in conjunction with the 37th anniversary of the declaration of independence of

the Republic of Lithuania commemorated on February 16, 1955:

"Whereas exactly 37 years have passed since February 16 when the Council of Lithuania, meeting in Vilnius, the historical capitol of Lithuania, proclaimed to the world the determination of the Lithuanian people to embark on an independent life; and

"Whereas for us Lithuanian Americans it was a source of special satisfaction to observe that our brothers and sisters in Lithuania were ably managing the affairs of their country, successfully raising their welfare, and elevating their cultural and educational standards; and

"Whereas as American citizens we were proud of the quick and decisive action on the part of the Government to condemn publicly the flagrant Soviet acts of violence against Lithuania and the other Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia; and

"Whereas the people of the world are putting their hopes and the destinies of their future in the steadfast and unconditional adherence by the free democracies to the principles of justice and humanity: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Americans of Lithuanian descent of the counties of Luzerne and Lackawanna, Pa., affiliated with the Lithuanian Alliance of America, district seven, being aware of the graveness of the international situation and concerned over the fate of the Lithuanian nation, urge the Government of the United States to combat the forces of aggression until peace is achieved."

MICHAEL KUPRIS,
President.
JOSEPH MACKINA,
Secretary.

The Commercial Appeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in last Sunday's edition of the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal there appeared a very fine article concerning the production of rice in the Midsouth. The article was written by the newspaper's Washington representative, Mr. Morris Cunningham.

Because of the excellence of the article, and because it gives one of the best pictures of the Midsouth rice production, as well as an indication of the difficulties encountered by these growers under the 1955 rice-acreage allotment program, the article should be read by every Member of the Congress.

Mr. Cunningham gives figures on production and shows graphically the rising importance of rice on the Nation's economy. The article reads as follows:

MIDSOUTH LANDS NOW GROW 54 PERCENT OF ALL THE RICE PRODUCED IN UNITED STATES—ARKANSAS' OUTPUT APPROACHES 1.5 BILLION POUNDS LOUISIANA RAISES ANNUALLY—MISSISSIPPI'S CROP TOTALED 221 MILLION POUNDS LAST YEAR

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—This may come as a surprise, but the Midsouth is now producing more than 50 percent of the Nation's rice crop.

Agriculture Department figures show that Midsouth farmers raised 3.2 billion pounds of the 5.9 billion pounds of rice produced in the United States last year. That's 54.2 percent of the national output.

Last year's rice crop put an extra \$150 million into the pockets of Midsouth farmers. And though that's still far short of cotton income, it's still a sizable amount of cash.

Memphis, for years the Nation's cotton capital, may soon be an important rice market if the trend continues.

Southern Louisiana and a few counties in Arkansas, particularly Arkansas County, have long been rice producers.

But in recent years—stimulated in part by forced cutbacks in cotton acreages—the production of rice has spread into new areas of the Midsouth.

All of eastern Arkansas, from Randolph and Clay Counties in the north to Ashley and Chicot Counties in the south, and westward to Perry, Faulkner, and Pulaski Counties, is now listed by the Agriculture Department as a rice-producing area. The Department also lists Hot Springs and Clark Counties in the south central section, and Little River, Miller, and Lafayette Counties in the extreme southwest corner.

And in Louisiana, immediately south of Ashley and Chicot Counties in Arkansas, the Department lists production in the Louisiana parishes of Morehouse, Richland, and East Carroll. This is in addition to the traditional producing areas in southern Louisiana.

Meanwhile, production has been rising across the river in Mississippi. The Agriculture Department now lists these Mississippi counties as rice producers: De Soto, Tunica, Tate, Panola, Quitman, Coahoma, Tallahatchie, Bolivar, Sunflower, Leflore, Washington, Humphreys, Sharkey, Issaquena, and Hancock.

Arkansas, where production has grown most rapidly, last year produced more than 1.4 billion pounds. This was only slightly behind Louisiana, which had a crop of 1.5 billion pounds.

Mississippi, no match for these States, had a crop of 221 million pounds.

Missouri produced 18 million pounds and Tennessee 1 million.

Increasing Midsouth production has contributed greatly to a general upward swing in American rice output. Prior to World War II, American production averaged about 2 billion pounds a year. During the war it advanced to about 3 billion pounds. Since the war it has moved forward rapidly, setting one record after another, to last year's 5.9 billion pounds.

Mississippi produced only 13 million pounds in 1947, compared to last year's 221 million pounds.

Arkansas production was 765 million pounds in 1947; jumped to 1.4 billion pounds last year.

Louisiana produced slightly less than 1 billion pounds in 1947; last year had 1.5 billion pounds.

With the increased production has come many of the same problems that are besetting cotton—acreage allotments, marketing controls, and surpluses.

The term "inequities and hardships," previously restricted to small cotton farmers, is now being applied to rice producers as well.

Many Midsouth Congressmen whose interest in farm commodities formerly was restricted almost solely to cotton now are having to spend an increasing amount of time on rice problems and legislation.

Representative E. C. GATHINGS, Democrat, of Arkansas, is one of these; and Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Democrat, of Mississippi, whose position as chairman of the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcom-

mittee gives him a broad view of the farm economy, obtained and supplied some of the statistics in this article.

Though American production of rice has been increasing, the United States still is not one of the large rice-producing nations.

Free-world production last year is estimated at 262 billion pounds. This excludes production in Communist China, North Korea, and Russia.

Of the free-world total, America produced 5.9 billion pounds.

However, American production has increased faster than the rest of the world, and this country now commands a bigger slice of the market than before World War II.

Mr. Speaker, from this it may be seen that Arkansas, as one rice-producing State, contributes more than 1.4 billion pounds of rice each year, although only a few years ago the State produced just about three-quarters of a billion pounds.

H. R. 4304

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of the Members of this House who voted for the passage of H. R. 1 did so with the conviction that the advantages which it will bring to labor and industry within the United States, as well as the assistance it will give to those conducting our foreign policy, outweigh the disadvantages in unemployment and the harmful effect it will have upon certain areas and industries.

However, I believe that Members of the Congress who support the principle of reciprocal trade agreements are not blind to the human problems and the economic difficulties which this act creates. I am equally sure that the vast majority of my colleagues do not want to leave any impression that we are callous or unwilling to try to do something to solve these difficult situations.

It is in this spirit that I introduced yesterday a bill, H. R. 4304, which will, if the matter is not taken care of on the Senate side or in conference, require the President to report to the Congress—by including in his report, provided for by section 350 (e) of the Tariff Act of 1930—such data and statistics as will be useful to the Congress in ascertaining the amount of unemployment and economic disability which has resulted from actions taken under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. It would also require him to include such recommendations for legislative action as he may deem wise in order to (a) preserve the vitality of industries needed in the national defense and (b) make the necessary economic adjustments to alleviate unemployment and to assist those industries whose operations have been substantially curtailed as the result of executive action authorized by the Congress.

In other words, if the Government, through its action, creates undue hard-

ships on certain groups within labor and industry, I believe that the Congress will also feel that it has a responsibility to lessen these hardships and to assist in the necessary relocations that have been thus required.

I hope that my colleagues will give their support to this legislation, believing, as I do, that it will make the people of our country far more understanding and sympathetic to the principle of reciprocal trade agreements.

The Flow of Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following column by George Sokolsky entitled "The Flow of Goods" from the Washington Post and Times Herald under date of February 8, 1955:

THE FLOW OF GOODS
(By George Sokolsky)

I walked into a hardware store a few days ago and picked up a chopping board. It was made in Yugoslavia. The same day, I read an item that a Hollywood motion-picture company is planning to produce Tolstoy's War and Peace, and that the production would be made in Yugoslavia. Maybe the chopping board could be made more efficiently in Tito's realm, but has Hollywood sunk so low that thousands of American workers have to be kept out of jobs because there are superior technicians in Yugoslavia? The picture will be shown in this country; its profits, if any, will be earned here. Why, then, do this job in Yugoslavia?

Now along comes a release from the American Knit Handwear Association which reports that in 1953 there were 30 American firms in this industry; today, there are only 22. In 1952, more than 4,000 Americans were employed in it; today, there are less than 1,500, which means a decrease of 63 percent.

From the standpoint of the free market, these American firms, if they cannot compete with British and Japanese manufacturers, ought to go out of business. In terms of strict capitalistic theory, no one should be protected against the consequences of competition. But from the standpoint of social conditions in the United States, the peril is that we shall have unemployment and we shall have ghost towns and we shall have disturbed conditions. The economic doctrine of the free market here comes into conflict with the social doctrine of full employment and must be resolved politically. John L. Lewis is already making the telling point that the enormous unemployment in the coal industry, partly due to the import of residual oil, be met by distributing food surpluses to American miners instead of foreign governments.

Wool handwear imports have increased from 32,000 dozen pairs in 1946-48 to an estimated 1,200,000 dozen pairs in 1954. In the United States wages in this industry average \$1.13 an hour; in Japan, the same industry pays just under 12 cents an hour. A protective tariff could be devised to keep Japanese knit gloves out of this country, but then we have political problems with Japan

such as the necessity of providing a market for Japanese goods in the United States to keep the Japanese from moving into Red China's corner.

Unless we open our markets to Japan, they will have to cultivate trade with Red China and even with Soviet Russia, if they can get it. The danger to the American manufacture of products with which Japanese products can compete in American markets is that politics rather than economics will prevail. There is no free market as long as the determining consideration is not competition but politics.

This, then, is the peril that the small American manufacturers face and they go before the Ways and Means Committee to present their case knowing full well that their arguments are going to fall on deaf ears because so many of our legislators have become statesmen who forget the needs of their constituents in the face of the deterioration of our relations with foreign countries.

TVA Yardstick Helps Competitors Reap Sound Profits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Times which has been reprinted in the current March issue of the Democratic Digest.

This editorial, while brief, tells a dramatic, factual story of how the electric utilities have benefited most profitably from the very agency they would destroy, the TVA.

The question arises in my mind, Mr. Speaker, as to the reason behind this ruthless enmity in the face of proven benefits. Could it be that greediness knows no bonds and now, having been enhanced with fat profits through the means of the low TVA yardstick, the utilities would move in to set a higher yardstick and gorge its coffers further at the expense of the consumers of the Nation? It is something on which we should think clearly and give attention to where our first loyalties lie—with the public interest.

The editorial, which speaks so eloquently, follows:

TVA YARDSTICK HELPS COMPETITORS REAP SOUND PROFITS

Citizens for TVA, Inc., has released some statistics to refute the oft-repeated contention that the Tennessee Valley Authority is in unfair competition with private power.

These show that between 1937 and 1952, the first 16 years of large-scale TVA power production, the common-stock earnings of the Nation's larger electric companies more than doubled. Rates came down—an average of nearly 60 percent—but more electricity was sold.

This fact alone might signify nothing more than that the power business has shared in the vast industrial expansion that began with World War II. Everybody has earned more, sold more since 1937. This, however, is significant; while earnings in the power industry generally were doubling, those of

the 9 private utilities surrounding the TVA area, according to "Citizens," multiplied 5 times. The statement goes on to say:

"Why? Because the utilities surrounding TVA are most exposed to the TVA example of low cost and high use of electricity. Under pressure from the TVA example, these companies were induced to cut their rates the deepest, increase their service the greatest, and take in money at a faster rate than all the other utilities in the country."

What better evidence that TVA has fulfilled its original purpose as a power yardstick?

Not a Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I should like to submit for the consideration of the Members an ably written and pertinent editorial which appeared in the Albany (N. Y.) Times-Union on February 17, 1955. It raises a significant point in connection with the question of whether the Post Office Department is or should be operated as a commercial enterprise or as a public service.

The editorial follows:

NOT A BUSINESS

Postmaster General Summerfield's proposal to put the Post Office Department on a self-supporting basis has raised the question: Can the Department really be operated as a business activity?

Many businessmen believe not, for the simple reason that the Department does not exist as a commercial enterprise. An excellent presentation of this point of view has been made by Mr. Cranston Williams, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, in a published letter to the Washington Post and Times Herald. Mr. Williams wrote:

"Much is being said about putting the Post Office Department on a break-even basis, which means it should take in as much money as it pays out.

"I am wondering how it would be possible to put the Post Office on a break-even basis when the cost ascertainment report for the fiscal year 1953 (last available) shows that rural free delivery mail service for salaries and transportation alone cost \$192,430,334. Creation and maintenance of rural-free-delivery service was voted by the Congress as public policy in the general welfare. I see no possible way for the rural-free-delivery service ever to carry enough mail to pay even a small portion of the cost of maintaining that service.

"Furthermore, the Post Office Department operates more than 40,000 different post offices, and no business expecting to break even would try to operate that many outlets. You can imagine what would happen to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., with a volume of nearly \$4 billion for its fiscal year ending March 1, 1954, compared with Post Office Department volume for fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, of a little over \$2 billion, if A. & P. tried to operate through 40,000 retail stores. A. & P. operates about 4,300 stores."

The breakdown is convincing. And another fact is worth keeping in mind. The Post Office Department was established by the Federal Government out of necessity. For much of its work it collects and should collect revenue; but much of its work cannot be put on a fee basis.

The Post Office Department is considerably like the Coast Guard and the Public Health Service. Nobody expects either of them to be conducted on a break-even basis.

Detroit Payrolls at All-Time High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an article taken from the February 21 issue of the *Detroit Free Press*, the weekly publication of the Detroit Board of Commerce, entitled "Detroit Payrolls at All-Time High." This article, which predicts a very prosperous 1955 for the city of Detroit, should be an emphatic rebuttal to those who claim this city is still in the throes of recession.

The article follows:

DETROIT PAYROLLS AT ALL-TIME HIGH (By John R. Stewart)

Detroit is headed for a long and impressive list of "firsts" in 1955. Average earnings of wage and salary employees in this area appear certain to reach a new peak. With employment second only to that of 1953, total payroll should top that of any previous year. Spendable income likewise should be at all-time high.

Retail sales at an expected record level of over \$5 billion, peak activity in service industries and an all-time high in construction, will mean higher employment in non-manufacturing occupations than ever before. Wage and salary rates of these workers should top like figures for all previous years.

Peak population should insure higher counts of utility customers and greater consumption of electricity, gas, and water, than in any preceding year. Bank activity should be at record high.

Part of Detroit's high level of business and industrial activity this year may be credited to the automotive industry's strong showing. Thus far in 1955, phenomenal popularity of 1955 passenger cars and high truck sales have boosted retail deliveries to record high for this season of the year. To meet this unprecedented demand and also build up sufficient dealer stocks for spring selling needs, production has been pushed to a level which seems certain to give the industry its biggest first quarter in history. Car and truck production for the 12 months ending December 31, 1955, is estimated at 7 million units, or about one-third more than in any year prior to 1949. Only 1950 and 1953 topped this year's expected figure.

Other types of manufacturing in the Detroit area in 1955 should be at or near peak levels. The machinery industry, Detroit's second largest, should have its biggest year. Manufacture of nondurable goods was at peak in 1954—a new record should be set in 1955.

Employment in the Detroit area in 1955 is expected to average about 1,300,000 wage and salary workers, or 60,000 more than in 1954. Only 1953 enjoyed higher employ-

ment. Of the 1955 total, 630,000 will be in nonmanufacturing, a new peak; 320,000 will be employed in automotive factories; and 350,000 will be working in other types of manufacturing. Gains over 1954 are expected to be 15,000 for nonmanufacturing, 30,000 for nonautomotive manufacturing, and 15,000 for Detroit's automobile industry.

A nearly constant level of nonautomotive manufacturing employment and a rising trend in nonmanufacturing employment throughout the year should offset a possible dip in automotive payrolls in the second quarter and cushion the usual decline in automotive employment at model change-over time. All major employment groups should end the year on a rising trend.

If wages follow the upward trend of recent years, and if average earnings of other employees in the area equal or exceed those of hourly rated factory workers, both reasonable assumptions, workers in the Detroit area should receive over \$6 billion in wages and salaries this year, an historic high.

With taxes lower than in the previous peak year of 1953 and with living cost virtually unchanged, this tremendous payroll should insure a prosperous 1955 for Detroiters.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following letter from the president of the Mohawk Carpet Mills in Amsterdam, N. Y., under date of January 20, 1955:

MOHAWK CARPET MILLS, INC.,
Amsterdam, N. Y., January 20, 1955.
Hon. BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
House of Representatives, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: The renewal by President Eisenhower of his request for a 3-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, with power to reduce tariffs another 15 percent, and the introduction of H. R. 1 designed to implement the program, again casts uncertainty on the future of the American carpet industry. I would be remiss in my responsibilities to the owners and employees of the Mohawk Carpet Mills, to the carpet industry in the United States, and to those charged with the responsibility of making and administering equitable and progressive laws, if I did not question the desirability of authorizing (with or without receiving reciprocal concessions) further reductions in the tariff on imported carpet.

My reasons for questioning the fairness and desirability of further tariff reductions on machine-made carpet were outlined in some detail in my May 4, 1954, letter to you. These reasons are equally valid today and for your convenience in reviewing our position I am repeating substantially my earlier letter. Minor changes have been made in it in recognition of more recent information.

Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, the tariff on foreign-made carpets has already been progressively reduced from 60 percent ad valorem to 25 percent—a reduction of 58 percent. As a result of the reductions, imports of machine-made carpets have been increasing—since 1946 the rate of increase has been 26 percent per year. Last year, about 2,800,000 square yards of machine-made carpet were brought into the

United States. Every yard of this carpet represents the loss of 1 hour's work to an American workman—the 2,800,000 yards mean a loss of more than 2 weeks' work for each of the 30,000 workers in the United States carpet industry.

The desirability and the propriety of further opening our market at this time to foreign competition through additional tariff reductions such as are possible under H. R. 1 must, it seems to me, be seriously questioned. I should like, in the following paragraphs, to outline some of the issues and the responsibilities which those who advocate further reductions must face.

1. FULL EFFECT OF PAST REDUCTIONS STILL UNKNOWN

The tariff reductions which have been made under the Trade Agreements Act cannot as yet be appraised, for the United States has had no experience for any extended period of time under normal conditions. The act was passed when we were in the midst of a depression. Later trade was distorted by World War II, by the Korean war, and by the vast rebuilding programs in which we engaged. All this while tariff reductions were being made. Only very recently has our humane gesture of rebuilding war-torn European economies—a program to which the carpet industry has contributed millions of dollars in taxes—been reflected in increased competition from abroad.

Carpet imports may continue to expand even under present tariffs, particularly if wage rate increases or wool price increases force adjustments in our retail prices. Under these circumstances, it would seem desirable to withhold opening our market still further through additional tariff reductions until the effects of the extreme reductions already made can be appraised.

2. EFFECT OF FURTHER TARIFF REDUCTIONS ON CARPET INDUSTRY

Further reductions in tariffs will inevitably encourage additional imports of machine-made carpets. Such a further division of the market will reduce the opportunity for employing American workers and for operating profitably in the carpet industry.

These inevitable consequences would be inflicted upon an industry which is already extremely competitive and which, because of these conditions, is offering quality merchandise to American consumers at prices too low to provide a reasonable return on invested capital. Currently, too, most of the carpet mills are operating far below capacity—increased imports at this time could only accentuate these layoffs and work reductions that have already taken place.

Work reductions would not present the serious human and economic problems they do if the freedom of movement so glibly assumed by many free-trade theorists in fact existed. But today alternative opportunities are not abundant, particularly in a number of areas where carpet mills are located, and where these mills represent the major industrial activity in the town. There is entirely too much at stake in human and economic considerations to pass over the problem lightly.

The seriousness of this problem is well illustrated by Amsterdam, whose livelihood is almost entirely dependent upon the Mohawk and Bigelow-Sanford mills. At one time last year, unemployment rose to over 20 percent. Currently, it is probably about 12 to 15 percent. Local citizens, in an effort to reduce this hardship, have contributed over \$370,000 to encourage a nontextile manufacturer to locate here and offer employment opportunities. Further tariff reductions on carpet could only contribute added unemployment to Amsterdam, and to other carpet producing localities as well.

3. THE FAIRNESS OF FOREIGN COMPETITION

The inroads which imports of machine-made carpet have and can make into the

United States market are not the result of inefficiency in the United States carpet industry. Mills in Belgium and England, our major foreign competitors, have no technological or natural resource advantages—they must also import raw carpet wools and jute, their workers are no more efficient, and their looms and other machines are substantially the same as ours. (In fact, these countries have reached their present productive capacity through the plants, machines and technical assistance given to them since the war.) Their competitive strength emanates almost entirely from wage—not physical productivity—differences.

Wages of industrial workers in Belgium and Britain, the major foreign sources of carpets, are the highest of the carpet industries' foreign competitors, yet they average only about 48 cents per hour. This is less than one-third the average hourly wage of United States carpet workers, yet it is against such and lower wage levels that the carpet industry in the United States is being asked to compete. In addition, foreign competitors copy the styles and patterns developed and tested by American manufacturers, and capitalize without cost to them on a market developed, through advertising, by American concerns.

Competition of this type would not be condoned within the United States. Compensatory use taxes protect merchants in one area from the competition of merchants in bordering areas that do not have sales taxes. Minimum-wage laws (and other laws of similar purpose) prevent a concern from gaining a share of the United States market through the exploitation of its workers. It seems only consistent with the American conception that, to be desirable, competition must be fair, and to ask that a fair tariff be maintained on foreign carpets—a tariff high enough to compensate for payments the United States carpet industry is making to American workers and to our Government which are over and above those made by the carpet manufacturers in foreign countries.

At present, this is the only way to enable unionized firms in the carpet industry to compete with low-wage foreign firms, and thus preserve the jobs and living standards of the American workmen in the industry. Failure of our Government to provide this support would seem to make a mockery of our Government's dedication to fairness in competitive relationships.

4. TARIFF REDUCTIONS ALSO REDUCE IMPORTS

The aim to increase our total trade with foreign countries is desirable—the emphasis that has been placed upon tariff reductions to achieve this end has probably been exaggerated.

In the carpet industry, increased imports of foreign-made carpets will result in decreased imports of raw wool (the major raw material in carpet production) and jute. All wool and jute now used in carpet manufacture is imported from foreign lands—in 1953, these imports amounted to over \$100 million. To the extent that the American carpet industry is supplanted by foreign producers, the raw material supplying nations will lose their markets in the United States—in effect, through tariff reductions on carpets, we are opening our market for carpets and closing our market for raw materials. The increased volume of carpet imports (and larger foreign credits) that would result from lowered tariffs on carpets would, therefore, at least in part be offset by reduced imports (and smaller foreign credits) of carpet wool and jute. In effect, the only increase in our imports is the labor and

profit lost to workers and firms in the United States carpet industry.

Aside from the fact that the increase in imports made possible through reduced tariffs on carpets will be offset by the reduction in raw material imports, the desirability of the changes produced in our trade seems open to question. The countries supplying carpet wool and jute are primarily South America, New Zealand, India, and Iraq—none highly industrialized. Trade with them should be most productive of the mutual advantages that are ascribed to free trade. If, through tariff reductions on carpets, we reduce our domestic production of carpets and consequently our purchases of their raw materials, we will deny to these countries a market they have enjoyed, and we will also reduce their ability to purchase the products of our industry. In effect, we will be transferring to the industrialized nations of Western Europe which manufacture carpet, the purchasing power which formerly went to South America, New Zealand, India, and Iraq—all predominantly rural areas which should be good markets for products of American industry.

In presenting these specific consequences of further reductions in the tariff on foreign-made carpets, and the issues of principle they raise, I want to make it clear that I am not in disagreement with the objectives of the President's recommendations on foreign policy. There can be no question that increased trade such as will promote the security and the economic prosperity of the United States is desirable.

There are, however, two serious questions in my mind as to whether a tariff-reduction program will in fact contribute to these nationwide objectives. Under the present conditions of world trade and finance and international monetary instability, it seems utterly unrealistic to expect that further tariff reductions by (or unilateral trade for) the United States can be a material factor in correcting the current instabilities and imbalances in the western world. Other impediments should first be corrected. Secondly, under our system of private property and our standards of fair competition, it seems unfair to continue a program which mean sacrificing one group of industries in order to maintain or expand the market for another. Tariff reductions are now being urged primarily by our mass-production industries and by industries without foreign competition, as a means of increasing foreign purchasing power, to compensate for expected reductions in American aid. To achieve this objective, they belittle the serious effects on the import-vulnerable segment of our economy—a segment which undoubtedly employs many more workers than are dependent upon exports for employment. Possibly some of the sacrifices needed to balance international payments without aid, and to make our allies strong, should be borne by these, and by our growing industries, and not shifted entirely to those who have invested their skills and equipment in industries which, by chance, now exist in foreign countries.

I make no apology for supporting the carpet industry in its request for fair tariff protection. I sincerely believe that the inclusion of carpets among the commodities selected for negotiation of further reductions in tariff rates would be harmful both to our economic prosperity and to our national security.

Thank you very much for giving consideration to this letter.

Very truly yours,

HERBERT L. SHUTTLEWORTH II,

President.

Electoral Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the New York Times today, February 24, 1955, written by a distinguished commentator and reporter, Arthur Krock, concerning proposed reforms in the method of electing Presidents. It will be noted that Mr. Krock characterizes House Resolution 4 and Senate Joint Resolution 3, proposing the district system, as follows:

This would be the true electoral reform, and it reflects early American thinking.

The article follows:

BLOCS IN THE PATH TOWARD ELECTORAL REFORM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—The merger of the two great sections of organized labor which their leaders say is impending—despite John L. Lewis and Michael J. Quill—has alarmed disorganized masses of the people by evoking a vision of the largest and most effective pressure group in our history. Since (runs this reasoning) the AFL and the CIO demonstrated under recent Democratic Presidents that separately they could exchange political support for the highest favors of Government, in unity they raise the threat of absolute control of the economy.

Those who for this reason view the merger project with alarm realize that labor leaders cannot ever be sure of delivering their rank and file to specified candidates for office so long as the ballot remains secret. On the record of past performance they suspect that the vaulting ambitions of Walter Reuther may at any time disrupt the ranks of the trades unions after they have formally merged. Therefore, if organized labor were as amenable to the laws as industrial groups are, the fears of the projected merger would be minimized.

But organized labor has legal privileges and immunities denied to all other groups in national production. These are the potentials of an industrial monopoly and a political pressure mass that could dominate the American system.

Through protective statutes, friendly judicial decisions and the favoritism of political administrators organized labor has been granted special rights in the United States. And the Taft-Hartley Act has left uncurbed the two principal ones. The first is general immunity from the antitrust laws for actions which would be illegal if performed by employers. The second, specifically, is freedom to bargain on a nationwide basis and to strike, if desired, a nationwide industry vital to the general welfare.

ORIGINS OF PRIVILEGE

The origins of these immunities are threefold. One was the social need to redress the long-sustained condition in which the rights of workers were spurned by selfish capital interests. Another was the rise in the Democratic Party of doctrinaires who favored union labor domination of our capitalist

economy. The third was the political strategy of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations—to attract by official favoritism organized labor groups which, voting solidly, could tip the electoral balance in great States closely divided in popular allegiance to the 2 major parties. Until President Eisenhower's personal appeal broke this latter combination it operated powerfully to keep the Democrats in national control.

It was able so to operate because of the laws which give the entire electoral bloc of a State to the party candidates who acquire a plurality of the voters, however small. Two examples are enough to illustrate this. In 1884 Grover Cleveland was elected President by getting all New York's electors because of a plurality of 1,149. In 1948 Ohio helped to assure President Truman's election by giving him its electors on a plurality of 7,107 of almost 3 million votes cast. In each instance the victor polled a minority of the total vote.

This system provides all sizable pressure blocs with their opportunity to tilt the scales for the candidates of the party which they think or know will respond to their pressures for special consideration. Organized labor leaders, when their followings were divided, made the most of this opportunity. It is hardly to be expected that, united, they won't hope to do even better; consequently, they look coldly on the revived effort in Congress to reform the electoral system.

TWO PROPOSED REFORMS

For this there are currently two principal proposals. The first, advanced by Senator DANIEL, of Texas, and a group of senatorial cosponsors, would change the law to provide a pro rata division of a State's electors. If, for instance, the Democrats got three-fourths of a State's votes and the Republicans a fourth, the electors would be proportionately allotted. And so on. The other reform proposal, originally advocated by Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., of Princeton, N. J., is again being pressed by Representative COWERT, of New York City. Electors of the President and the Vice President would be chosen in the same manner as Senators and Representatives are. Each congressional district would choose 1 elector by a majority or plurality of its resident voters; each State would likewise elect 2. Thus each State would have the same weight in the choice of the President and the Vice President that it now has in Congress, making the executive and the legislative political base the same. Also, the great State delegations would lose their immense bloc power in the national conventions.

This would be the true electoral reform, and it reflects early American thinking. But the Senators will probably stand by their partial remedy; the House remains indifferent to change, and for obvious reasons the pressure blocs cordially approve that indifference.

Our Debate Tournament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Herald:

OUR DEBATE TOURNAMENT

Thanks to the willingness of King's College to play host, an intercollegiate debate tournament of impressive scope will be held on the campus on February 19. The fact that

30 colleges and universities from the North, the South, and the East will be represented is enough to command keen interest. Fully as arresting is the fact that the topic will be one of nationwide, even worldwide concern: *Resolved, That the United States should extend diplomatic recognition to the Communist government of China.*

Heated controversy has been boiling around the question wrapped up in the topic chosen for this year's debate at King's.

So heated has been this controversy many colleges and universities are not debating the issue. Such institutions as the United States Naval and Military Academies are among them.

We are reminded by our friend, Robert E. Connelly, director of forensics at King's, that newspapers such as the New York Times have commented upon it editorially, such periodicals as Time and Newsweek have covered it, and TV programs like Edward R. Murrow have televised actual debates.

We join in the sentiment that it is encouraging to note once more that free discussion and debate are allowed in our great Nation and can be pursued in good temper, however vital the issue—something that Russia and her sisters in suppression would never tolerate.

Congress Gets a Prayer Room

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. KEITH THOMSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, we see daily increasing indications that our Nation and its leaders are turning to a divine source for guidance and counsel in troubled times, but all too often this wholesome fact goes unnoticed.

It is gratifying, therefore, to see that a Wyoming newspaper has taken editorial note of the prayer room in the House, and I commend it to your attention. The editorial is taken from the Wyoming State Journal at Lander, Wyo.:

CONGRESS GETS A PRAYER ROOM

For the first time in more than 150 years Members of Congress have been provided with a prayer room at this session. The prayer room, which was authorized last year, is open to Members of Congress only, and is not to be used for any other persons or groups.

The idea is to provide the legislators with one room in the Capitol where they can find seclusion, peace, and quiet. The prayer room's special window was built by volunteer labor from California's 21st Congressional District.

Clergymen of all faiths were consulted about furnishing the prayer room, and a large oak altar was finally selected. The room is covered with green carpet, there are chairs along the walls, in front of which are wooden screens to furnish privacy. Adequate copies of prayer books, Bibles, and other literature are available in the room.

Anyone who ever worked in the Capitol, amid the tensions and pressures which are exerted on the legislative branch, knows there has long been a need for a prayer room such as this. We hope that on more than one occasion, in the future, this room of meditation and inspiration will be useful in helping to guide decisions made by the highest elected legislative officers of our country in these critical times.

Does Distribution Cost Too Much?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, at noon on Tuesday, February 8, and again that evening I was privileged to attend the meetings of the National Wholesale Distribution Clinic sponsored by the National Association of Wholesalers and held at the Shoreham Hotel.

I am a small wholesaler myself, president of a very modest size wholesale wallpaper and paint corporation, but as I listened to the greeting from NAW President George Wedemeyer, of Ann Arbor, Mich., and the luncheon address by Warner S. Shelly, president of N. W. Ayer & Son, of Philadelphia, on the subject Advertising and Wholesaling Are Handmaidens, I began to realize how very infrequently we who are in Congress recognize the importance of the wholesaler, or, in fact of our highly specialized distribution system.

The voices of the representatives of producers, farmers, and manufacturers alike, are often heard in these Chambers. The spokesmen for labor are properly articulate. With the possible exception of the consumer, those engaged in the distributive trades receive the least attention directed to the solution of their problems. As a means of distribution wholesaling involves bringing goods from places too distant or too numerous for the retailer to deal with and in quantities too big for him to handle, in order to bridge the gap between the producers and the consumer. It seems obvious that our economy, based as it is on mass production and mass consumption, could be seriously crippled if a gap existed anywhere along the line between producer and consumer. As Mr. Warner S. Shelly said in his opening address:

The reason for talking about advertising and wholesaling in the same breath is that they have certain things in common. The most obvious of these is the fact that both are less understood by the public, and more frequently criticized, than almost any other operating parts of our economic system. They are often neglected, frequently criticized, and nearly always given hard chores to do. The wholesaler is often called a grasping middleman, and the shout goes up "Let's eliminate the middleman." Advertising gets the huckster label in some quarters, and the slogan here is: "Let's cut out advertising." The producer blames advertising and wholesaling if sales are poor. The consumer blames them if prices seem high.

It is interesting to explore the reasons why there has been such a limited appreciation of the problem of distribution, especially wholesale. I suppose one reason is that wholesaling with only about 250,000 firms, employs a relatively small number of people. As a minority group wholesalers have not been either consistent or vigorous in keeping their congressional representatives informed of the problems which they face individually. As Mr. Shelly noted, public ignorance of the nature of wholesaling and

the confusing terms by which the wholesaler tries to explain his business to the public adds to the difficulty.

He stated:

Public ignorance is intensified by the fact that people have been encouraged to think in terms of stock phrases and pat labels. Thus we have the poor but honest farmer, and the oppressed consumer, both under the thumb of the grasping middleman. As any thinking person knows, these labels do not fit. There are good and bad people in all lines of work and all classes of society. There are farmers and consumers who will steal your eyeteeth and then complain because there aren't any good fillings in them, just as there are advertising men and wholesalers who will do the same. But mostly people of any type are a pretty good sort.

During the evening meeting, after the pointed observation of Herb Shriner, the clinic heard an address, the American Economy Is Cushioned by 250,000 Wholesalers, by Herb R. Askins, immediate past president, National Standard Parts Association, and former Under Secretary of the Navy. I was particularly impressed by this discussion but the remarks of Joseph Kolodny, managing director of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, seemed to me to be those which would be of the greatest interest to Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following address of Mr. Kolodny, a dynamic influence in distribution, whom I have known personally for several years:

DOES DISTRIBUTION COST TOO MUCH?

(By Joseph Kolodny, managing director, NATD)

Let us, at the very outset, endeavor to clear the atmosphere by dissipating the fog arising from the endless and contentious arguments relative to the cost of distribution.

The air has been acridly contaminated ever since the 20th Century Fund stirred up the emotions of both protagonists and antagonists by propounding the question, "Does distribution cost too much?" and thus casting a cloud on the efficiency and proficiency of the distribution instrumentalities.

It seems foolhardy, in a dynamic society, to indulge in vainglorious pronouncements accentuating the ultra efficiencies of any operations, be they manufacturing, distributing, or servicing. Propelled by the impact of scientific and technological creations we are constantly either on the alert or forced to entertain and attune our operations to new ideas, new devices, and new developments. The distribution system, though somewhat tardily, has made notable progress in that direction.

To the "know-it-all" segment of our populace, who may never have taken the time to study the contents and conclusions incorporated in this exhaustive 20th Century Fund document, the question seemingly implied that "distribution did cost too much." It occurs to me, however, that we can consider the subject matter with infinitely more realism if we change the question to, "What does the consumer want or require?" In the final analysis, the consumer—and only the consumer—is the arbiter of our economic destiny. He and he alone dictates and determines the direction of our pursuits. No form of distribution can be superimposed upon him. He accepts that which he approves and rejects—that which does not meet his fancies. In exploiting "consumer appeal" and catering to "consumer demand," the advertising fraternity shows itself to be especially conscious of this phenomenon.

The influence of consumer attitudes has acquired potent significance in recent years. The emergence of 2- and 3-color automobiles, as epitomized by the 1955 models, vividly underscores the lively attention paid by the manufacturer to the wishes of the consumer.

Since the word "distribution" has, rather, little meaning for us when applied in the strictest "dictionary" sense, and only acquires animation and vitality when wedded to the product and related services, that the whole issue can be more accurately examined by linking the product with the user and determining what sort of service he expects or desires at the time he is ready to acquire it.

At this point, it is essential to dwell, if only briefly, on the circumstances which have contributed markedly toward bringing about a sharp change in our thinking and actions in recent years in relation to the far-flung sphere of distribution. The amazing technological achievement of this Nation in mass production and its corollary—mass advertising—together with its concomitant, "pre-selling"—have vastly altered the relationship between the entrepreneur and the product. Prior to the fantastic mass production achievements, the product came principally from the hands of the local craftsman. It was a personal activity and the product was closely identified with the man who made it. Today, such local craftsmen are almost nonexistent and the mass-produced article has lost that touch of personal identity.

It is not an exaggeration to assert that the public, except in rare instances, doesn't know and, moreover, doesn't care who heads the firm or who is the directing genius of the manufacturing entity which produces the article. The product itself has become supreme and the consumer is guided in his purchase by what he learns of its quality and dependability. Before embarking upon a shopping trip, Mrs. Consumer has predetermined, to a large extent, what products she intends to buy. When by virtue of modern packaging and display she is exposed to and enticed by the known branded product, she responds almost impulsively. As an inescapable result, the product and the method employed in gratifying the consumer's needs and wishes becomes wholly subordinate to the consumer's thinking and action.

Let's not be unmindful that the consumer, informed or uninformed, influences, controls, and even dictates the cost of distribution. She—and I say "she" advisedly because it is axiomatic that women control the Nation's pursestrings—can make or break any system or method of distribution ever devised or contrived. And, by the amount and extent of service she demands, she controls the factor which, more than any other, determines the ultimate cost of distribution.

Nowhere in the world is the consumer placed on such a high pedestal as in our own country. Not only is she catered to as if she were a queen, but she is shielded on all sides from exploitation. She is served by many agencies of the Federal Government and a multitude of laws protect her from dishonest or monopolistic operations and manipulations, including the Pure Food and Drug Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and many others. The States also exercise their police powers in the consumer's behalf, especially in the area of fair business practices, and the local governments control the activities of the predatory schemers through the operation of their license bureaus and racket and bunco squads. Add to these the watchdog alertness of the better business bureaus and other organizations set up by private business to root out dishonesty and foster ethical conduct.

Our being a free economy, the consumer has an unrestricted choice as to what she

shall buy and where she shall buy it. The price she pays will be influenced by whether she demands full service, minimum service, or no service at all.

Mrs. Consumer may choose to drive to the market. Although she disregards it, the cost of operating her car is inseparably linked with the cost of distribution. Arriving at the market, she grabs a pushcart and manipulates it interminably up and down the length of the aisles, fetching from the neatly arranged shelves her food and sundry household requirements.

Mrs. Consumer then elects to cart or carry the heavy bags of groceries to her car—as a tacit manifestation of domestic economy. Upon arriving home, and staggering under the burden of her packages, she carries them into the kitchen or pantry—again mindful that she has saved a few pennies.

In sharp contrast, another housewife merely lifts her phone and leisurely speaks to the grocer or other merchants, placing her order for an assortment of products and admonishing the merchant that it must be delivered by a specific time. Upon receiving the call, the grocer or his clerk sets about to assemble the order, which involves a cost of time and effort. They then load it into a delivery conveyance to transport it punctually to the customer's home and, upon arrival, carry the packages into the house or apartment and place them on the kitchen or pantry table. This store-to-door operation involves the cost of the clerk's time, the use of the vehicle, and the services of the delivery man.

How are we to properly differentiate between basic distribution costs and optional service costs? Obviously, certain elements of cost are stationary, such as—

(a) The warehousing of the merchandise, which is prerequisite in both cases.

(b) The transportation of the goods to the retail outlets—again an inescapable cost in both instances.

(c) Placing the merchandise on the shelves for easy accessibility and handling—likewise required in both cases.

At this point, there is a parting of the ways. The cost of conveying the goods to the home must be assumed either by the consumer, who elects to drive her own car or carry her own parcels, or by the retailer who provides delivery service.

Also, in selecting the type of service she desires, the consumer has to choose between—

(a) Allotting time and effort in shopping on a cash basis in nonservice stores, or

(b) Taking advantage of the conveniences of the service stores—including delivery and credit.

Instead of phoning the dry cleaner, she can take the garments to him and earn a discount of 15 to 20 percent. She can have a bottle of fresh milk or fresh bread delivered to her doorstep by the milkman or baker's man, or she can get them cheaper at the store. If she needs a new appliance, and is willing to forego the servicing advantages afforded by her local or neighborhood dealer, she may effect a saving by searching for a discount house. Mail-order houses also offer numerous savings if she is willing to wait an indeterminate period for delivery. If she has the patience, she can also wait for seasonal clearance sales by the department stores.

In the matter of cost, differences are relatively slight. The product costs exactly the same to produce and advertise, whether it is destined for the chief of the service store or nonservice store. In the item of carrier transportation costs, there is a slight differential in carload versus less-than-carload lots, but this is a very minor factor in the aggregate cost of distribution. For all practical purposes, the cost of goods to merchants is almost identical.

The impact of the consumer is virtually nonexistent until the merchandise com-

mences its movement into the wholesale and retail outlets. It is at that stage that the consumer first begins to exert the terrific force of her power of selection.

There are types of stores and types of services to meet the wants of every consumer. The merchandise may come to rest in a fashionable shop catering to the carriage trade, which relies on this type of merchant to satisfy its whims at a moment's notice. It may involve a rare food delicacy from a distant corner of the earth. It might be a costly item of jewelry or any other product for which the demand is uncertain and inconstant. When the merchant stocks such a product, he does so with the knowledge that he may have to retain it in stock for weeks or months before it is sold. If a large portion of this shop's capital is tied up in slow-moving inventory, there obviously must be an unusually high markup, which translates itself into high distribution cost.

On the other hand, certain merchandise comes to only a momentary halt in the retail store, such as cigarettes, where the frequency of turnover is almost daily and the cost of handling far less. It is almost axiomatic that the ultimate price of any product is governed very largely by the rapidity of its turnover.

The consumer of limited or less-than-average income, who is obliged to seek out sources of supply which will enable him to stretch his dollar farthest, has many avenues open to him. For the most part there are retail establishments which provide a minimum of service and where overhead cost is also kept at a minimum. A typical example may be found in the type of men's clothing store which operates in a low-rent district and on virtually a self-service basis. The customer selects his own suit or coat from the racks with little or no assistance from a clerk. He gets a makeshift fitting or he may find it necessary to take the suit to his own tailor to have it fitted properly. The whole process is a test of patience and fortitude. But he finally gets a suit for what he believes he can afford to pay.

The consumer who is less economy-minded goes to a conveniently located establishment where he knows he can obtain clothing of excellent material and workmanship, where attention is showered upon him by the floorwalker, the manager, the clerk, and the fitter. He can look over dozens of suits at his leisure without being shoved or pushed around. All this comes under the heading of service, the cost of which is incorporated into the price of the suit.

I have mentioned only some of the distribution devices available to the consumer which offer money-saving opportunities. The fact that these channels are able to compete successfully for a share of the consumer's dollar attests to the elasticity of our free economy.

The conventional patterns of distribution, fortunately for us, continue to find by far the greatest favor among the Nation's consumers. America today enjoys the highest standard of living in all the world's history and that high standard is based, in substantial part, on the enjoyment of the conveniences and even the luxuries of service.

The rapid development of the self-service grocery store, notably the supermarket, is perhaps the outstanding merchandising phenomenon of the postwar era. There is nothing basically new in the idea because self-service has been with us ever since the advent of the cafeteria. Do these supermarkets offer customers noteworthy savings? The most detailed study relating to supermarket sales was made recently in 5 Cleveland, Ohio, supermarkets over a period of 13 weeks. Records were kept on every item accounting for five one-thousandths or more of the total store sales.

The 5 stores averaged \$45,520 sales per week. Customer purchases averaged \$6.63.

In round figures, grocery items accounted for 44 percent of total sales, meats 28 percent, produce 13 percent, frozen foods 4 percent, and baked goods 3 percent. The average gross margin of profit was 17.9 percent, but the survey revealed striking variations in the profit rates, ranging from about 5 percent to more than 40 percent. The lowest markups applied to fast-moving staples such as cigarettes, sugar, coffee, butter, flour, soap, baby foods, shortening, gelatines, etc., on which the gross profit ranged from 5.4 percent to 9.8 percent, an average of 7 percent.

While the growth of chains and supermarkets has been huge, it must not be assumed that American consumers are exerting their power to make or break any type of distribution to the detriment of the conventional type of grocer who provides more service. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The so-called independent grocer in 1953 accounted for slightly more than half of total food sales, with chains doing about 30 percent and the remainder represented by sales of food products by stores other than grocers.

Quite frequently, in evaluating distribution processes, the claim is made that the multiplicity of distributive outlets, both wholesale and retail, result in a duplication of effort which pyramids distribution costs. Such an assertion belongs to that category of superficial arguments that lack authentic support. In the first place, this Nation is the strongest bastion of free enterprise, preserving the right of any aspiring individual to embark on a business career of his own—with all its attendant risks—and either succeeding or "losing his shirt." Secondly, there is not one iota of evidence that because there are a number of grocers, druggists, or haberdashers in one neighborhood, the consumer is saddled with greater costs. On the contrary, it is the very existence and presence of these coterie of competing merchants that is the best safeguard against unwarranted hiking of prices.

Since I am associated with the tobacco industry, it is, I feel, not inappropriate to use the experience of my industry as a point of illustration. Here are some of the basic facts about the principal tobacco product—cigarettes.

In the 1940-53 period, the combined net sales of the five largest cigarette manufacturers increased from \$1,014,000,000 to \$3,100,000,000 or 206 percent. At the same time the sale of cigarettes by units expanded from 157 to 391 billion, or 150 percent. But the cost of leaf tobacco soared 337 percent in crop value and Federal excise taxes jumped from \$640 million to \$1,614,000,000 or 152 percent. Federal and State income taxes spiraled from \$33 million to \$181 million—an astonishing 444 percent. The result was that net income increased only 39 percent and common dividends only 15 percent, in each case less than the depreciation in the value of the dollar. In short, the industry in 1953 handled a cigarette business which had tripled in dollar volume and increased 2½ times in physical volume, at a profit which was less in actual value than in 1940.

Actually, considering the depreciation in the value of the dollar, cigarettes are relatively cheaper today than 15 years ago. Since 1940, the retail price of standard cigarettes, exclusive of State or local stamp taxes, has increased on the average of only 4½ cents a package and of this 2 cents was made mandatory by increases in the Federal excise tax from 6 cents to 8 cents per package. The other 2½ cents has been entirely absorbed by increased costs of tobacco, labor, packaging, shipping, etc.

In 1940, the prevailing average price of the popular standard brands was 18 cents a package, including all excise taxes. The Government estimates that on the basis of what the dollar would buy in the 1947-49 base period, it would have bought \$1.669 in

1940 but only \$0.87 in 1954. On a comparative basis, therefore, the same cigarettes should retail for 34 cents, instead of the prevailing average of 23-24 cents. The fact that the operating costs of tobacco wholesalers are approximately 5 percent, coupled with a very modest retail profit, is another item on the credit side of the consumer's ledger. This, therefore, is a sound explanation why the consumer today is spending less, proportionately, for cigarettes than in 1940.

What about the availability of these cigarettes to the consuming public? Notwithstanding the shrinkage of profit to the manufacturer, the modest and barely-break-even margins to wholesalers and retailers, cigarettes are more easily available and more readily accessible than at any other time. They are handled and dispensed by 1,300,000 retail outlets, which accounts for more than two-thirds of such outlets.

The portrayal of the cigarette picture does not even remotely imply that the experience depicts any outstanding exception. To a larger or lesser extent, a similar example can be applied to drug toiletries, blades, many confectionery products, and chewing gum, numerous food products, including cereals, and many other commodities.

It candidly does not entail the erudite propensities of auditing or accounting experts to realize that the combined costs of wholesale and retail distribution on these products, exclusive of transportation, ranges around 20 percent and that certainly is an exceedingly modest figure.

Present-day exigencies dictate a careful reexamination of all elements of cost. The keenness of competition forces us to draw on every resource at our command in striving for the goal of irreducible costs. Let us not be unmindful, however, that in appraising the cost of distribution it is the consumer who governs the character and type of services he or she demands, and that with the advent in recent years of all sorts of distributive media, the consumer does not have to be too much perturbed about anyone's ability to mulct him or her with exorbitant costs of distribution.

Pennies for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly subscribe to the sentiments expressed in the following editorial which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Star Ledger, of February 23, 1955:

PENNIES FOR FREEDOM

If you've got spare nickels and dimes in your pocket, we can't think of a better place to send them than to the Crusade for Freedom.

The crusade's on a \$10 million fund-raising campaign now. It uses the money to let the people behind the Iron Curtain know what their masters don't want them to know. The crusade's main instrument is Radio Free Europe, which beams the truth to Eastern Europe, but it also uses other devices.

It was the Crusade for Freedom which drew an official protest from Hungary last December. It dropped millions of leaflets, via balloons, telling the Hungarians to fight for freedom. Hungary complained to Washington. Washington replied sweetly that it couldn't do much about this, because the

Crusade for Freedom is a private organization and it's free to do what it pleases.

The protest proved that the leaflets are being read, and that the crusade's work is fruitful. Every penny it gets is needed, and well-spent.

Democratic Leaders Attempt To Buy Voters for \$20 Head Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 23, 1955:

DEMOCRATIC ATTEMPT TO BUY VOTERS FOR \$20 HEAD SEEN

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 22.—There's an even more penetrating way to "share the wealth," as the late Huey Long phrased it, than the Democratic Party leaders have thought of with their \$20 cut in taxes, for everybody. It's equally logical and it could mean an even bigger potential in vote getting.

Thus there are about 55 million citizens with incomes under \$5,000 a year. This is a sizable number of voters and enough to win an election if they vote solely on selfish grounds.

A scheme could be devised to free this entire group from the payment of any Federal taxes whatsoever. It would cost the Treasury of the United States \$8.5 billions. But if demagoguery is to be the rule, then there's a simple way to make it up—just increase the taxes on the persons with incomes of \$25,000 a year or more. They're paying \$8.7 billions a year already. The addition of \$8.5 billion in tax payments would, of course, virtually confiscate the incomes of the most thrifty and the most successful citizens. Confiscation, however, is the eventual goal of the Socialists, and the Democratic Party is rapidly becoming the socialistic party in America anyway.

It so happens that there are about 800,000 taxpayers in this country whose incomes are \$25,000 a year or over. They pay more in total taxes than do the 55 million who have incomes under \$5,000 a year. They are carrying the heaviest tax burden already.

LABOR STANDS TO LOSE

If the share-the-wealth doctrine is to become dominant, it would mean the eventual destruction of incentive and a consequent drop in the incomes of all persons now earning incomes over \$5,000 a year. The goal of communism—as well as of its twin brother, socialism—is to do away with the managerial class or so to weaken its spirit as to cause the whole private enterprise system to collapse.

Union labor, which has thrived under the system of risk capital, would not be able to get the increases in wages or pension benefits now enjoyed if the management class in America were wiped out as it has been in Soviet Russia or in countries where state capitalism is in vogue.

It is a paradox that the labor-union leaders in America have lined themselves up politically with the Democratic Party, whose latest program confirms a suspicion that the party is bent on impairing the very economic system that has benefited labor so widely. But

the rank and file of the workers do not have much to say about the political maneuvers of the labor bosses. Their dues, which are supposed to be used for union benefits, are applied to pay big salaries to executives of the unions who spend a large part of their time in political activities.

WHAT DEMOCRATS PROMISED

Also, by the use of the compulsory unionization law, the union bosses hold the power of economic life or death over the worker and, unless he goes along with the political campaign programs, even though they lead to socialistic ends, the ordinary union member can lose his job as a punishment for failing to conform.

The Democratic Party in the last election said through its leaders that it would support the President and promised also to favor policies of fiscal soundness. But the Democratic-controlled Congress has been here less than 2 months and it is becoming crystal clear that such campaign pledges have already been abandoned.

A pattern of strategy is emerging. The Democratic leaders favor more and more spending—more billions for all kinds of socialistic adventures, including a program of Government-owned electric-light-and-power projects. They also favor more and more exemptions from taxation for the maximum number of voters. Both approaches, while contradictory from any standpoint of fiscal soundness, mean a budget unbalanced by a wide margin. Then the Democratic Party spokesmen will claim that the Eisenhower administration has failed to balance the budget as promised in 1952.

It is beginning to look as if the 1954 election was very costly to the American people because it was influenced by the most deceptive piece of campaigning that the country has ever witnessed. The Democratic argument was that a depression was coming and that the number of unemployed would increase. It turns out now that the mild recession was short-lived and that business is booming because, in making 1955 plans, businessmen have had confidence in the fiscal policies of the Eisenhower administration. They expanded facilities after making a remarkable adjustment to the post-Korean war shrinkages in Government spending.

If, however, the budget is to be heavily unbalanced and the Democratic Party in Congress—which never balanced a budget in 20 years—is to continue in power after the next election, the country will experience a real inflation. That would come from a rapid increase in the cost of living and a severe drop in the purchasing power of the dollar. That threat apparently has no terrors for the Democrats, who are out to win in 1956 by what Representative DANIEL REED, of New York, a veteran member of Congress, describes as a scheme for buying the electorate. It remains to be seen whether the electorate can be bought by a \$20 tax cut per voter, and whether socialism, as offered by the Democratic Party leadership, is going to be accepted in preference to a sound dollar and a system of private enterprise.

Votes at \$20 Each?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the membership to an editorial from the Rochester

(N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle which I believe succinctly expresses the attitude of the majority of our people with reference to the proposal to reduce taxes by \$20.

I expect to support the President's plan to give further tax relief at the proper time, but the proposal which is now before us is ill-timed and unsound. We have not yet passed a single appropriation bill this year, and we do not yet know how much money we are going to have to spend to run the Government. It would certainly be no service to the people to hand each of them \$20 if we must borrow this money from the same individuals in order to make the gift.

Under leave granted, I include the following editorial:

VOTES AT \$20 EACH?

Twenty dollars is not much for an American citizen to contribute to his country. It is a trifling amount these days. It means 3 or 4 gasoline fillings for the car. A night at the races. A weekend party. Twenty dollars just doesn't go far. That is, it doesn't go far for the individual. Multiplied by many millions, it means more than a billion dollars, which still remains quite a sum even for our expensive Government.

The proposal to reduce everyone's taxes by \$20 is a cheap bribe, the child of cheap politics. It is an insult to the average man, who must put a higher price than that on his vote. It is an insult to any citizen who is not only expected to contribute to his Government, but is eager to do so.

Higher Pay for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Daily Tribune, of Royal Oak, Mich., dated February 21.

This paper is one of the outstanding publications in the State of Michigan. It is my hometown paper. It serves a great portion of the people of my congressional district, the 18th Michigan.

The Tribune has published some comment on the present proposal for increased pay to Members of Congress. The view that it takes in pointing out that more than one-third of an increase in the salaries of Members of Congress would have to be paid back to the Federal Government in taxes is sound and correct. We all know that the salaries of Members of Congress are all taxable.

The editorial reads as follows:

HIGHER PAY FOR CONGRESS

The House bill would make the pay of Senators and Representatives \$25,000 a year, of which \$2,500 would be an expense allowance. A bill reported favorably in the Senate calls for \$22,500 as the total.

The present \$15,000 stipend with the \$2,500 expense allowance was set in 1946. In the following 9 years average consumer prices rose by more than one-third, and \$15,000 in 1946 dollars would be around \$20,000 in 1955 dollars.

But most Members of Congress insist that, because of their special expenses, they need more today than in 1946. Representative VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Democrat, Oklahoma, 49-year-old father of 4 children (2 under 20), reported on February 9 that he is now going into the red by \$4,900 a year and that in his dozen years in Congress his outlay has exceeded his salary by \$39,000.

But don't overlook the Federal income-tax bite. It would absorb about \$3,400 of a \$10,000 raise for Representative WICKERSHAM even if he had no outside income of any kind (he used to be a real-estate operator), and the Oklahoma State income tax would take \$600 or so more.

And most Members of Congress have outside income, so that the Federal income tax alone would take more—in many cases, much more—than \$3,600 out of a \$10,000 pay increase for them. So we shouldn't expect a raise of \$7,500 (as in the Senate bill) or even \$10,000 by itself to tempt hordes of better men to run for Congress or by itself to keep all the best Members there.

George F. Kennan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 19th Congressional District is the home of a number of distinguished men. These include the President of the United States, Gov. George M. Leader, of Pennsylvania, and a man whose distinguished diplomatic service has been recognized by all save the present administration. I refer to the Honorable George F. Kennan, widely recognized as one of the most authoritative experts on Russia.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following article about Mr. Kennan from the Washington Daily News of February 23:

CONSULTANT GOES UNCONSULTED—KENNAN'S LINE SEEMS TO HAVE A SHORT

The State Department has not consulted George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to Moscow, on American-Soviet relations for almost 2 years, it was disclosed today.

One of the Nation's top Soviet experts, Mr. Kennan's retirement from the State Department was announced April 6, 1953, after he and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had feuded openly over American policies toward the Soviet Union.

AGREEMENT

When Mr. Kennan left the State Department, it was announced that plans had been worked out for him to serve as a regular consultant to the Government. This agreement, it was said, was satisfactory to both Mr. Kennan and Mr. Dulles.

However, administration officials said today that Mr. Kennan had not been asked, since his retirement, to give the State Department his views on Soviet affairs. This was confirmed by Mr. Kennan at Princeton, N. J., where he has been working in the Institute for Advanced Studies.

"I have talked over these matters from time to time with friends in the Government, but I have had no consultations with the Department of State," Mr. Kennan said.

Diplomats said Mr. Kennan had stopped by from time to time on an informal basis to

chat with old friends. There was no indication, however, that he had even seen Mr. Dulles since April 1953. It is possible, however, that Mr. Kennan has had some contact with the super-secret Central Intelligence Agency headed by Allen W. Dulles, younger brother of the Secretary of State.

AUTHOR REJECTED

During the 1952 presidential campaign, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles strongly criticized the Truman Administration's "containment of Russia" policy. Mr. Kennan was the author of the policy. Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles urged a more "dynamic" positive but peaceful policy of "liberation" of millions enslaved under communism.

Mr. Kennan made no bones about his fears. He warned against what he called the danger of misunderstanding and bitterness which could flow from such policies. He predicted that the competitive power of freedom would prove itself and that "totalitarian despotism will prove in the end to be self-destructive."

The question of Mr. Kennan's postretirement service with the State Department came up in connection with the latest Moscow power fighting. Ousted Premier Georgi M. Malenkov openly admitted his "guilt and responsibility for the unsatisfactory state of affairs which has arisen in agriculture." Diplomats recalled that Mr. Kennan had written 3 years ago that forced collectivization of Soviet agriculture was probably "the greatest single cause of discontent in the Soviet Union." "Agriculture," he said, "is the Achilles heel of the Soviet system."

Rotary's 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Rotary clubs around the world are looking forward to continued "service above self" as they observe Rotary's 50th anniversary this month.

The world-encircling nature of this organization, which started modestly a half century ago, emphasizes the growing importance of the advancement of international understanding, good will, and peace through world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service.

It is with profound pride and a deep sense of obligation that I regard my membership in the Rotary Club of Paterson, N. J. It is good to know that the same warm, friendly atmosphere, the same high idealism that exists in the Paterson Rotary Club exists in more than 8,400 Rotary clubs with some 400,000 members in 89 countries.

Although Rotary has become worldwide, it has managed to keep its warmth, its helpful community spirit, its ideals of service to others, and a goal of peace.

Recently the board of directors declared that Rotary International "has declared unequivocally for the liberty of the individual, for freedom of thought, speech, and assembly, freedom of worship, and freedom from persecution."

It is obvious—

Said the board—

that everything for which Rotary International stands is the very antithesis of communism. * * * Where freedom, justice, truth, sanctity of the pledged word, and respect for human rights do not exist, Rotary and the ideal for which it stands cannot survive.

Rotarians will not rest on the yeoman service they have performed since 1905, but look forward to another half-century of community aid and promotion of international understanding.

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have again received a monthly review of employment developments and prospects for the York, Pa., labor market, covering the situation in January 1955 and issued by Leroy W. Gohn, manager of the York office of the Pennsylvania State Employment Service.

The January data shows that unemployment rose 37 percent to a new high of 7,400, more than double the number of unemployed a year ago. The report states that this high level is expected to be only temporary and will level off to about 5,600 by mid-March.

This would appear to be a scant ray of hope since it represents more than 6 percent of the civilian labor force available.

January unemployment is 2,000 greater than the figure for November of 1954 and the expected leveling off in March will be 200 greater than actual unemployment in November.

Despite the glowing reports about the prosperous condition of the national economy which the Congress continues to receive from the administration, and which the American public continues to receive from administration public statements we have a difficult time convincing the 7,400 idle workers in the York labor market.

It is imperative that the Congress act upon conditions it knows exist rather than upon ephemeral visions of prosperity conjured by the administration hucksters. A step in the right direction, Mr. Speaker, is the proposal to grant income reductions to individual taxpayers. This should add approximately \$1 billion to the Nations purchasing power and it should be considered as merely one phase of a program designed to provide a full employment economy.

As I understand the mandates of the Full Employment Act of 1946 the Congress has no choice but to adopt a program for full employment. I believe the administration is also mandated to establish and maintain such an economy. It is up to the Congress then to step into the breach created by administration failure.

The report follows:

TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT REDUCTION

A sudden drop in employment beginning in December caused total employment to fall from 93,150 in November to an estimated 90,700 in mid-January, a decrease of 2,450,

or 2.6 percent. However, most of the personnel reductions were seasonal, with mid-March employment levels expected to return within 400 of the November figure.

The following table presents a quick glance at current and anticipated trends:

Item	2 months ago, November 1954	Current, January 1955	Net change 2 months ago	Estimated 2 months hence
Civilian labor force available.....	99,050	98,100	-950	+250
Unemployed, total.....	5,400	7,400	+2,000	-1,800
Workers in industrial dispute.....	500	0	-500	0
Employed, total.....	93,150	90,700	-2,450	+2,050
Wage and salary workers.....	78,450	76,350	-2,100	+1,800
Other workers (including agricultural).....	14,700	14,350	-350	+250

The decrease in nonagricultural workers was evenly divided between manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries, with a drop of 1,050 recorded in each. Layoffs of a seasonal nature, totalling 2,200, were included with the following industries affected: Food products, fabricated metal (tire chains), tobacco products, roofing materials, con-

struction, and retail trade. A reduction of 400 in furniture was attributable chiefly to insufficient orders. The only substantial gain in any industry was 600 in nonelectrical machinery, of which nearly 500 constituted return of workers who had been out on strike for 3 months.

SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE FORECAST

Based upon reports from 267 establishments, it is estimated that some 92,750 workers will be employed by March 15. This would be a gain of 2,050 over current levels, bringing total employment within 400 of the November 1954 level. Factors influencing this development will be recall of laid-off workers by the tobacco and construction industries, plus moderate expansion in several other industries. Highlighting the latter will be forecast expansion of 600 in the nonelectrical machinery industry, with the resumption of production of domestic air-conditioning equipment.

UNEMPLOYMENT SURGES UPWARD

Unemployment rose by 2,000, or 37 percent, to a new high of 7,400 (2,900 female). This was more than double the 3,600 unemployed a year ago. There are indications that this high level will be only temporary and will drop to about 5,600 by mid-March. In fact, the number of continued claims for unemployment benefits during the week ending February 10 were already 480 below the mid-January level.

Estimated employment, earnings and working time in manufacturing industries,¹ York labor market area,² January 1955

	Employment			Average weekly earnings			Average hourly earnings			Average weekly hours worked		
	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago	January 1955	Month ago	Year ago
All manufacturing.....	42,600	43,850	47,150	\$62.15	\$62.85	\$62.53	\$1.55	\$1.55	\$1.57	40.2	40.6	39.8
Food.....	3,100	3,250	3,150	58.00	60.17	56.56	1.40	1.40	1.36	41.4	43.1	41.5
Tobacco.....	2,000	2,400	2,400	41.88	38.77	40.38	1.13	1.09	1.07	37.0	35.7	37.6
Textiles.....	3,250	3,200	3,150	55.95	55.40	52.23	1.39	1.37	1.35	40.4	40.5	38.6
Apparel.....	4,700	4,750	4,700	41.55	43.44	40.88	1.13	1.19	1.19	36.8	36.6	34.5
Lumber.....	550	600	600	47.23	70.24	42.85	1.19	1.16	1.15	49.0	49.0	37.2
Furniture.....	3,850	4,100	4,150	65.23	70.24	64.74	1.59	1.63	1.58	41.1	43.2	41.0
Paper.....	2,550	2,500	2,500	89.50	93.41	85.55	1.81	1.83	1.75	49.5	51.1	49.0
Printing and publishing.....	1,900	1,900	1,850	90.29	86.36	83.23	2.21	2.19	2.11	40.8	39.4	39.5
Chemicals and petroleum.....	550	650	600	68.26	64.61	65.49	1.64	1.64	1.61	41.9	39.3	40.7
Leather.....	2,250	2,250	2,200	41.52	41.20	39.67	1.08	1.07	1.08	38.3	38.5	36.6
Stone, clay, and glass.....	1,100	1,050	1,100	70.89	73.23	67.85	1.67	1.67	1.64	42.5	43.8	41.4
Primary metal industries.....	550	550	550	60.65	56.84	58.62	1.75	1.71	1.70	34.6	33.2	34.5
Fabricated metal products.....	4,200	4,350	4,900	68.24	69.50	62.96	1.71	1.72	1.63	40.0	40.5	38.6
Nonelectrical machinery.....	8,100	8,100	10,300	74.55	76.63	80.87	1.87	1.89	1.92	39.8	40.5	42.1
Electrical machinery.....	1,000	1,000	850	65.20	62.96	61.07	1.61	1.58	1.55	40.6	39.8	39.3
Transportation equipment, including ordnance.....	1,100	1,200	2,150	67.97	69.28	-----	1.77	1.78	-----	38.4	38.9	-----
Other manufacturing industries.....	1,850	1,800	2,050	59.67	59.72	57.25	1.49	1.48	1.47	40.1	40.3	39.0

¹ Estimates of employment include production and nonproduction workers in non-Government establishments. Average earnings and hours cover only production workers.

² County included: York.

Note.—Figures for current month are preliminary.

Infiltration Into Reputable Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the two appended articles are by two distinguished columnists, Roscoe Drummond and George Sokolsky, who certainly never consulted each other before tackling this most important and dangerous subject.

Both men sound a sharp warning that we in Government should give great attention to, namely, the possible, nay very likely, infiltration into reputable labor unions of the A. F. of L. and CIO by Communist unions who are looking for a cloak of respectability behind which they can pursue their labors and capture unions and influence policy from within.

This is a serious matter and one which the Attorney General's Office should go to work on before it is too late. Time is of the essence, and time is growing short:

The articles follow:

OUSTED UNIONS FACE REGISTRATION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The labor unions which were expelled from the CIO because they were Communist-dominated now are trying to barter and badger their way into the American Federation of Labor in an effort to acquire a new cover of respectability.

From recent editorials in the Daily Worker it is clear that directions have gone out from the Communist Party that now is the time for the expelled unions to renew their efforts to get under the umbrella of one or another of the big labor organizations, and as soon as possible.

There's a reason for this urgency on the part of the Communists.

The reason is that time is rapidly running out on Communist-front and Communist-infiltrated organizations in the United States. This means that if the expelled unions do not find shelter soon the law will catch up with them; the law requiring such organi-

zations to register and thus to function openly for what they are.

The circumstance is that the Attorney General now is authorized under the Communist Control Act of last year, to institute proceedings before the Subversive Activities Control Board against Communist-infiltrated organizations as well as against Communist fronts and Communist action groups.

Obviously the unions—such as the United Electrical Workers, the United Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, the American Communications Association, Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, and the International Fur and Leather Workers—which were voted out of the CIO for the very reason, that is, Communist infiltration, that the new law requires such unions to register, are going to feel the force of this new law as soon as the Attorney General can assemble all the needed evidence.

But the expelled unions have a potential lifeline which they hope to grab, if they can possibly make it. That potential lifeline is the provision in the 1954 act which gives any union affiliated with the A. F. of L., the CIO, the United Mine Workers, the Railway Brotherhoods something near to immunity. It is written into the law that such affilia-

tion gives a presumption of non-Communist infiltration, whatever the past record.

This is why the Communist Daily Worker is exhorting labor-union progressives, which is the Communist term for Communists, to try to grab hold of the developing merger between the A. F. of L. and the CIO and get the expelled unions into it.

An important test of the merger, says the Daily Worker, "is whether it will be expanded to embrace . . . the workers of the progressive-led independents"—that is, the expelled unions.

That is the visible Communist Party line. The Communists want the unions, expelled for Communist infiltration, in the new merger in order to get the maximum immunity from the Subversive Activities Control Act. They know that a Communist-dominated union can make no appeal to American labor unless its Communist domination is substantially concealed. If it has to operate in the open for what it is, namely, a Communist Party tool and agent of Moscow, its effectiveness is undercut.

No wonder the Communist Party wants to get the expelled unions under this protective shield before the Attorney General can begin prosecution.

There is every reason to believe that George Meany, president of the A. F. of L. and designated head of the superunion, will be an alert and earnest opponent of the Communist-infiltrated unions. But because of the independence of the separate units of the A. F. of L., it cannot be taken for granted that its national leadership can prevent the Communists from getting in.

Already negotiations are well advanced by which the A. F. of L. Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen would take in the CIO-expelled International Fur and Leather Workers. While Meany is warning against it, the project is nearing completion. Nothing could be more harmful to the American labor movement nor to the A. F. of L.-CIO merger than to allow the Communists to use either as a seeding ground for subversion—and that's what the Communists now are trying to do.

LABOR'S BIG MERGER

(By George Sokolsky)

There was a time in the middle 1930's when it was possible to argue over the future of trade unionism in the United States. In the middle 1950's, that is no longer a moot question. The strong, well-financed, politically powerful trade union has become a norm of American life. About one-quarter of the American labor force, 15 million workers, belong either to A. F. of L. or CIO unions. To argue that these members are coerced into paying dues and striking against their will is to raise an unsolvable issue. There has been no demand on the part of any large group of workers that unions be abolished.

The new A. F. of L.-CIO will not only represent an enormous concentration of manpower but several billion dollars of reserves, much of which is being invested in common stock, often in the particular industry which the union serves.

The new national labor organization will be more powerful than either international union was during the period of competition between them. But with power must come responsibility. The agreement was correct in excluding racketeers and subversives, but that is not good enough. The racketeers need to be excluded actually and physically. All labor leaders know who they are and what unions they have invaded and which they control.

Similarly, the trade union leaders know who the Communists are and they do not strengthen public confidence by permitting unions expelled for having been led by subversives to return to American trade union-

ism by the back door of amalgamation with decent unions. That can only mean an open door for infiltration.

That many unions are accepting their responsibilities seriously is apparent in the publication of annual reports. But the democratic method of choosing union leadership is still to be hoped for and will undoubtedly come as the unions become more stabilized and businesslike.

The criticism of the labor union therefore shifts from theorizing as to whether they should exist at all to objections to racketeering, subversion and unstable practices. The course fixed in the middle 1930's of a recognized American type of trade unionism regulated by act of Congress and supervised by the National Labor Relations Board is now fixed in the American industrial system. The remaining independent unions are not very different from A. F. of L.-CIO unions and often are as great a trial to management. No large industry in the United States is without some type of union organization.

The fear of the merger then is unrelated to the industrial aspects of trade unionism but does arise from the uncertainty of the use of manpower and cash for political manipulation. While tight limitations are placed on political contributions of corporations and individuals, practically none are placed on the trade union or their related organizations. They could corrupt the entire electoral process with their abundant tax-free dollars if they so chose. Furthermore, they could develop a class-conscious political system which might be modeled after the British Labor Party or become affiliated with international communism.

This fear could not have existed in the era of Samuel Gompers; it merits thought and study these days when a doctrinaire socialist, such as Walter Reuther, may be the effective leader of 15 million men. It is not altogether impossible that by 1960, this may be the prevailing issue in a presidential campaign.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Kearny (N. J.) Observer under date of February 17, 1955:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Brotherhood Week is the vehicle designed by the National Conference of Christians and Jews for the advancement of justice, democratic principles, understanding, and good will among all peoples.

All men are created equal, they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. As Americans we believe that—however imperfectly we may carry it into practice.

It is wise that a week be set aside for the eradication of prejudice in our thinking, for the betterment of social justice, and for the promotion of harmony.

It should not be a week of mere superficial attention to nice gestures toward brotherhood. It should be a week of renewed devotion to the great underlying principles which make brotherhood attainable.

Patience with one another, love of neighbor as of self can cement the people of America into a spiritual force with an effort beyond our power to appraise. In the very

nature of things such a force cannot be confined to the borders of America.

Brotherhood Week carries the wholehearted endorsement of leaders of every faith, of business figures, labor chiefs, educators, Government officials, men and women in every line of endeavor.

Brotherhood Week gives the impetus for intensive interest in human values that should carry through all the weeks of the year. Emphasizing its theme helps to bring to reality the highest type of idealism. Let us be thankful for the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Brotherhood is the common bond among children as they play together, unaware of any chasm between them. It is the link that makes buddies of soldiers who fight together. Brotherhood impelled the chaplains of three different faiths to give up their lives at sea for the men they served.

Let us therefore practice this brotherhood in our everyday contacts, as we transact our business and as we kneel in our sanctuaries. Let us export it in such quantities as people beyond our borders will accept.

Matusow Lies Raise Question About Ex-Reds' Testimony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial from the Reading (Pa.) Times:

MATUSOW LIES RAISE QUESTION ABOUT EX-REDS' TESTIMONY

In confessing that he had perjured himself when he was a witness at Communist trials, Harvey Matusow, former member of the Communist Party and former aid to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, spoke about the strange kind of glamour the ex-Communist has in this country. Matusow may be a very mixed-up man and may one day find himself in durance vile, but in this remark he spoke truly. But he spoke only part of the truth.

The other part of the truth about ex-Communists is that some of them are execrated as greatly as some are glamorized. Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Whittaker Chambers—these are all former Communists and these are the names the professional anti-Communists conjure with. As Matusow says, their synonym is glamour in many a bright lexicography. Whatever they say about communism and its practitioners is taken as gospel.

Matusow forgets former Communists like James Wechsler, editor of the New York Post. He's a member of the ex-Communist lodge in just as good standing as Miss Bentley, Budenz, and Chambers. Yet when he got before the McCarthy committee, his recantation was tossed aside by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, who sought to picture him as one who was still playing the Communist game, though under the cloak of anti-communism.

The answer to Matusow's half-truth would seem to be that being a former Communist really doesn't matter. What's important would seem to be the kind of ex-Communist you are and whom you play ball with after you are converted from the mass psychosis that is communism.

In the meantime, it will be interesting to see what the grand jury that has summoned

Matusow, the confessed perjurer, will do with this unsavory specimen and how such men as Owen Lattimore, who was accused by him, will fare now that Matusow is dealing from another deck.

Ambassador to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial from the Manila Chronicle of January 25, 1955, entitled "Ambassador to Washington":

AMBASSADOR TO WASHINGTON

For almost 2 years now our government has had no representative in Washington, D. C., the most important diplomatic center in the world today. As a matter of fact, Washington may well be called the diplomatic capital of the free world.

Major decisions are formulated and proclaimed from this nerve center of world diplomacy that, because of their impact on international affairs, cannot but influence our own national interests.

We render ourselves proud in saying at appropriate times that we have special relations with the American people by reason of our tutelage in the democratic way of life under the United States and, consequently, that we have special interests to foster and serve. Yet it is strange that we have not come around to naming our own Ambassador up to this time to fill the post vacated by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo early in 1953.

Our Government has lately named ambassadors and ministers with the personal rank of ambassadors to less important diplomatic posts, the maintenance of which would entail great expense without expectation of any immediate or tangible benefits to our Government and people.

In most of the countries where we have sent diplomatic representatives, there are at present only a handful of Filipinos whose business and other interests, if they have any, could effectively and at relatively small cost be handled by consuls or commercial agents.

And yet we have opened embassies and legations, with large staffs, in the capitals of these countries when what our Government should have done was name our Washington Ambassador first. Were these posts created to accommodate lame ducks and political proteges?

Even Soviet Russia and the Iron Curtain satellites maintain full-fledged ambassadors in Washington to take care of their respective national affairs and interests. Yet the Philippines, it seems, would allow this awkward situation to continue notwithstanding our irrevocable ties with the democracies by relying solely on the services of Presidential Envoy Romulo.

What we need in Washington today is a full-time ambassador, not a special envoy which, to all appearance, is but a special accommodation.

The need for the immediate appointment of a regular ambassador is understood by the fact that the United States Congress is now ready to consider the Laurel-Langley agreement on the revision of the Bell Trade Act. His presence there at this crucial moment would also stifle persistent calls for

President Magsaysay to visit Washington so that his popularity could be availed of in the performance of a purely ambassadorial job.

Moreover, the Government's continued failure to name an ambassador to Washington could be misinterpreted to mean that for all practical purposes we have severed our diplomatic relations with Washington ahead of the Soviet Union.

Bureaucrats at Your Kitchen Range

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the very brilliant publicist, Alice Widener, appeared recently in the magazine U. S. A. I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the Congress and citizens of our great country.

The Supreme Court's decision of June 7, 1954, may well wreck the natural gas industry and end by pricing it out of the market. This economical fuel on which our people have come to depend should be encouraged and not hampered with bureaucratic regulation under the Supreme Court decision of last June. This may soon happen.

BUREAUCRATS AT YOUR KITCHEN RANGE

(By Alice Widener)

If you want to cook the family dinner and heat your home with plenty of cheap natural gas, you had better learn the bad news that you might be in for trouble due to unwarranted Government interference in your domestic affairs.

On June 7, 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Power Commission has the right to regulate the price of natural gas at the wellhead in the fields. This bureaucratic control is ostensibly designed to keep down the price of gas. But—as any American woman who bought meat at a butcher shop during the nineteen forties can tell you—Government price control results in eventual scarcity of supply and high prices.

If housewives in the United States don't want to queue up in the future for scarce, expensive cooking and heating gas (as housewives are forced to queue up for expensive necessities in many Socialist-dominated foreign lands) they must see to it that this new fangled right of regulation granted to the FPC is quickly taken away.

How can this be done?

In the good old American way. As an alert citizen you can get the facts about natural gas supply and price, then ask Congress to enact legislation nullifying the bad situation created by the Supreme Court decision.

What are the facts? Following is a record of the main ones:

In 1938, Congress passed the Natural Gas Act which recognized that the industry falls into three parts:

1. Production and gathering of the gas.
2. Transmission in interstate pipelines.
3. Local distribution and sale.

The act didn't materially affect part 3 because distribution and sale were previously regulated by State public utilities commissions or local authorities.

Concerning part two, most oil and gas companies readily acceded to the need for

regulation because pipeline transmission is a kind of necessary monopoly exercised through right of a single franchise. Nobody in his right mind would be prodigal enough to build parallel pipelines to a single destination, or locally to residential and industrial areas.

But in dealing with part one of the industry, which involves many complicated intrastate and interstate transactions, the Natural Gas Act specifically stated that its provisions "shall not apply . . . to the production or gathering of natural gas."

HEADS, I WIN—TAILS, YOU LOSE

A basic reason for this wise exemption is that in the United States of America most exploring for gas, and most of its production, is done by intrepid wildcatters and by other independent men and companies with courage enough to take big risks of total financial loss, and with ingenuity and gumption enough to cope with the strongest kind of competition. There are 5,000 large and small producers looking for gas. They find it in only one out of every nine exploratory wells drilled.

In regard to exploration for new supplies vitally needed as fuel for increasing home and industrial consumption, and also for the national defense effort, the Federal Power Commission regulation of prices actually amounts to a ukase to producers and gatherers: "You can take all the risk of losing your only shirt when you go out exploring. But if you strike it rich, you can't make money enough to buy more shirts than we say you can have."

Offered such a deal, even the wildest of wildcatters is likely to declare: "No exploring for me. I'd better stay home and hang on to the shirt I've got."

If the gas explorers do stay home, then millions of American families waiting to install new home cooking and heating equipment adapted to the cheapest and best fuel are going to wait and wait and wait. The lucky families already using natural gas will pay more and more for scarcer and scarcer supply.

FUEL OF THE FUTURE

How badly does our country need new sources of gas?

Last year the Empire Trust Co. of New York City stated: "In 10 short years natural gas achieved something of a miracle of progress. It now supplies about one-fourth of the Nation's energy needs." Nevertheless, in 1946 we had only an estimated 32 years future supply of gas. In 1953, despite new discoveries and increased productivity, the known reserves in the ground had dropped to a 23-year supply. Yet today 25 million families cook with natural gas, 18 million families rely on gas to heat water, 4 million families own gas refrigerators, 14 million families heat their houses with gas.

What part of our country does this fuel come from?

Mostly from fields in Texas, Kansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Mississippi.

How do consumers residing in other States get gas?

Through pipelines. And it is the cost of pipeline construction and maintenance, plus the cost of distribution to the customer, that accounts for at least 90 percent of your household gas bill if you live in one of the nonproducing States.

As a matter of fact, a 10-percent cut in the price of gas at a Southwestern wellhead wouldn't reduce an easterner's or a midwesterner's gas bill by as much as 1 percent.

THE FEDERAL INTRUDER

Then how and why did the Federal Power Commission get this harmful new right of regulation at the gas wellhead?

A major part of the real explanation lies in the story of "creeping socialism" in our country. It is a story about the long and

slow growth of a huge regimenting Federal bureaucracy which has been foisted on the Nation by a group of determined men with plenty of Marxist ideas and very little plain commonsense.

Extremely conceited, these men believe themselves to be the wisest possible planners for a planned society controlled from Washington, D. C., and are convinced they know better than anybody else what is wrong and right for America. Most of them don't dare use the word "socialism" today because they know it is obnoxious to Americans. Therefore these planners double-talk about "a new social order" and "a better democracy" and "a welfare state."

One of their number is a longtime New Deal favorite, Mr. Leland Olds. In 1939, only a short while after Congress passed the Natural Gas Act, he was appointed Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. During his 10 years occupancy of this important post, Mr. Olds waged war on the oil and gas companies in a struggle which he invariably characterized as "the conflict between the public and the private interest."

COURSE OF A LONG CAREER

But what is Leland Olds' view of the American public and private interest? Clearly, it is based on the Marxist slogan "Production for use and not for profit."

As a youthful member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, for example, he wrote an article for the April-May 1919 issue of its official magazine in support of a proposal "that the Government turn over to the railway employees the entire management of the railroads of the United States." He defined the issue as "between national capitalism and industrial democracy," and advocated a form of guild socialism which was gaining momentum in England.

Pleased that this "ism" was "in line with even deeper social movements," Olds explained that "it is to all extents and purposes the Anglo-Saxon expression of the Russian Soviet principle."¹

Using his own particular brand of expressions, Olds then indiscriminately smeared "financial interests which have milked the [rail] roads for so many years."

Olds always remained extremely close to the Intercollegiate Socialist Society which in 1923 altered its title to "The League for Industrial Democracy." The membership evidently believed that under a new and deceptive name, a bunch of red roses might smell sweeter to the American public.

In 1952, still using his own brand of Anglo-Saxon expression of the Soviet principle, Leland Olds wrote an article for the League for Industrial Democracy on "the need for a moral awakening in America."² In a stale, rabble-rousing diatribe, he vilified all American business and accused "the great corporations" of having bred in our country "a great impersonal, amoral system of irresponsible ownership."

Parroting Stalin, Vishinsky, Molotov and company, Mr. Olds branded the entire ethics of American business corporations as based on "maximizing profits after taxes" and declared that he himself often witnessed the corporations' "enthronement of selfishness above patriotism or religion." Then he talked about "the many phases of western life which are repulsively materialistic. . . . The spirit of business gain . . . the utter selfishness of uncoordinated activity."

THE SENATE REBELS

Precisely what kind of western life does Leland Olds want? The bureaucrat-controlled type that leads inevitably to the self-

less, coordinated activity existing in the eastern life of the Soviet slave empire?

Evidently, the United States Senate found the answer to the foregoing question. Tired of Olds' fulminations against American business in general, and the oil and gas companies in particular, the Senate in 1949 refused his reappointment as Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

Immediately, certain leftwing newspapers and columnists tried to make a national martyr out of Olds. The general public, however, remained coolly skeptical of the New York Post series of articles, "My Fight With the Power Lobby, by Leland Olds."

But the hard core of Marxists in the League for Industrial Democracy and their leftwing spokesmen and fellow travelers never say die. And so, October 8, 1951, Columnist Joseph Alsop tried to absolve Olds from senatorial charges of Socialist bias, and also took up the prejudiced leftwing hue and cry against the oil and gas companies.

Under the title, "The Big Potatoes," Alsop told a tale of how Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, "a millionaire, the owner of vast oil and gas properties of his own" had started a fight in 1945 to relieve the natural-gas industry of Federal Power Commission ratemaking. Alsop charged that the Senator had tried to pack the FPC with members of his own choosing, but was frustrated by the incorruptible and determined Commission Chairman, Leland Olds who organized protest deputations to the White House.

Continuing the tale, Alsop wrote: "The temporary setback did not discourage Senator KERR. Olds' term as Power Commission Chairman expired, and his re-nomination had to be approved. KERR, now transferred to the Senate's larger sphere, organized an intense attack on Olds as a sinister Socialist, offering in evidence the more foolish utterances indulged in by Olds as a very young, excessively idealistic Congressional minister. Outraged by the threat to free enterprise, the Senate rejected Olds. Meanwhile, the Oklahoma Senator also offered the Kerr bill, giving the natural-gas producers legal protection against Power Commission ratemaking."

POWER BEHIND THE THRONE

Goaded by Olds, President Truman vetoed the Kerr bill, after Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois (another Olds-ter member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and/or the League for Industrial Democracy) had stirred up what Alsop described as a big row on behalf of the gas consumers, whose gas prices were about to be inflated.

Joseph Alsop and his cronies were not, however, able to veto justifiable criticism of the hardened Socialist Olds-ters.

It is true that some misguided, idealistic Americans who embraced socialism during college days should not now be harshly rebuked. Their subsequent careers show plainly that they grew wiser as they grew older, and they abandoned sophomoric naivete.

But a discerning public should not be fooled by Alsop's whitewashing the pink past of a person who verbally denies present attachment to marxism but acts according to its tenets.

Naturally, the leftwingers were displeased by the appointment of former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, to succeed Olds as chairman of the FPC. According to Joseph Alsop's slanted version of this replacement:

"Wallgren gave KERR what he wanted, control of the Power Commission. In a case started by KERR's old friends, the Phillips Petroleum Co., the Wallgrenized commission immediately reversed itself, briskly enacting the vetoed Kerr bill by simple administrative ruling."

What Alsop failed to tell is that the FPC itself had many times disavowed any power

to regulate the producers and gatherers of natural gas, in rightful defiance of Chairman Olds' opinion.

LEFTWING WINNER TAKE ALL

At the end of Alsop's left-leaning column, he declared that the stakes in the Power Commission struggle are really almost incalculable.

They certainly are. And every American has a stake in finding out what are the facts. For if the right of regulation by the FPC over natural-gas producers and gatherers should remain unchallenged or unaltered (as it was acquired through the Supreme Court's 5 to 3 decision in the Phillips Petroleum case June 7, 1954), then the legal precedent is set for establishing a price-controlled economy in the United States.

On November 9, 1954, the New York Times carried a headline, "U. S. Control of Natural Gas Held Forerunner of Widened Socialism," and reported that Mr. A. M. Rippe, manager of the Phillips Petroleum Co.'s natural-gas department, said at a Chicago meeting of the American Petroleum Institute: "It is no more logical to regulate the producers of gas than to regulate the producers of coal, the growers of wheat and cotton, or the miners of iron ore."

In Tulsa, Okla., last fall, Mr. L. F. McCollum, president of the Continental Oil Co., explained in a human, simple way:

"The American housewife has become accustomed to using gas for heating, cooking, and even for drying her washing. Is she going to be happy to have to give up the clean fuel that provides her with convenience and comfort?"

"Our job is to let Mrs. America know what Federal regulation of field gas prices will mean to her—not in technical, legal terms, but in terms of her own everyday experiences of cooking, cleaning, washing, and keeping warm."

Mr. McCollum wasn't crying wolf about the danger of severe shortage for housewives' use. If interstate sale of gas becomes unprofitable, the producer will abandon it and sell his product in his home State to increasing numbers of industrial consumers.

NEEDED: CLOSER CONGRESSIONAL LOOK

What all Americans need to know in non-technical terms is that the Supreme Court decision on natural gas was reached in opposition to Congress, and in spite of 11 adverse rulings by the Federal Power Commission itself.

Unfortunately, many patriotic and high-minded municipal officials and legislators now support the Court's decision in the mistaken belief that they are protecting the best interests of consumers in nonproducing, gas-served areas. But when Congress takes a closer look at the real situation of the natural-gas industry, and at the activities of a Marxist-minded minority pressure group, the legislators will surely act according to the best interests of our country as a whole.

Surely, Congress will examine carefully the views of those oldsters inside and outside Government who advocate excessive bureaucratic control.

A SUPREME EXAMPLE

For example, there is Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter who wrote a special assenting opinion in the Court's decision in the Phillips case last June.

At a League for Industrial Democracy birthday banquet for materialist philosopher John Dewey in 1949, Justice Frankfurter paid tribute to the guest of honor by quoting the words of a dead poet: "For man is omnipotent."³ And though Harvard University's professor of English recently described Dewey's thinking as the "philosophy

¹ The Intercollegiate Socialist, April-May 1919, New York City, pp. 22-23.

² Needed: A Moral Awakening in America, League for Industrial Democracy, New York City, 1952, pp. 17-18.

³ John Dewey, At Ninety, League for Industrial Democracy, New York City, 1949, p. 11.

of barbarism," Justice Frankfurter admires it so much that he wrote:

"Not the least of his (John Dewey's) insights is his realization that civil liberties draw only limited strength from legal guarantees. Constant preoccupation by our people with the constitutionality of legislation or executive action rather than its wisdom tends to preoccupation with a false value. . . . The ultimate reliance for the deepest needs of civilization must be found outside their vindication in courts of law."

Surely these are most unusual views for a Supreme Court Justice to hold. Did Justice Frankfurter find justification outside of law for his decision in the Phillips case?

One thing is clear: If his seeming belief that man is omnipotent is correct, then God pity humankind. For Sir James Fraser pointed out in his classic masterpiece, *The Golden Bough*, that there is a solid layer of savagery beneath the surface of society which is a standing menace to civilization.

"The deepening sense of religion," wrote Fraser, "affects only those higher intelligences who have breadth of view enough to comprehend the vastness of the universe and the littleness of man. Small minds cannot grasp great ideas; to their narrow comprehension . . . nothing seems really great and important but themselves."

THE FINAL ANSWER

Thus Fraser furnished a final answer to the oldsters who believe in "Government ownership and control" as a remedy for all the ills of society. They never are willing to face the fact that "the state" is merely an ever-changing assembly of fallible human beings to whom the least possible degree of power should be entrusted.

Chances are that the chairman of a Federal Power Commission is a human being very much like the chairman of the board of an investor-owned power company. People being what they are, society needs restraints. The most just and effective ones are based on natural and divine laws.

Leftwing economists and bureaucrats are rash indeed to tamper with the laws of supply and demand, of diminishing returns, and of a heavenly bounty so miraculous that man can find a share of it in the form of a fuel under the ground.

Happily, the average American housewife recognizes the littleness of herself and of her own family, and she cherishes the greatness of traditional American principles. If one of them is weakened, all are endangered.

Free, competitive enterprise is a basic American principle. If it was damaged last year for reasons "outside of law" by the Supreme Court in the Phillips case, then Americans will this year exert their constitutional right of congressional redress.

* *Ibid.*, p. 12.

No Help, Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the *Geneva (Ohio) Free Press* of January 19, 1955, which presents a novel and refreshing point of view, entitled "No Help, Thanks":

No Help, Thanks

The following story, which happens to be true, would be better on St. Patrick's Day. But, at a time when Washington is debating how many millions to give away in Asia, it really won't keep.

Two weeks ago, a series of torrential gales swept over Eire. Now gales are anything but a novelty in Ireland, but these were something special. The River Liffey at Dublin rose far above its banks, flooded thousands of homes, and paralyzed all nearby businesses. Naturally, there was great distress.

Before the official guardians of the United States purse could get to work, the Washington branch of the Ancient Order of Hibernians sent a cable to President O'Kelly at Dublin, offering to send material assistance to flood victims. Immediately he got a reply: "Thanks, but the Irish Government can cope with the damage without outside assistance and will do so."

The demands on Uncle Sam's purse are infinite. The amount of American money thrown away in the past dozen years would pay off the national debt of most countries on earth. But every once in a while a nation comes along—usually a small one, like Finland or Eire—which not only can stand on its own feet but insists upon doing so. More power to them.

Urge Congress To Intensify Fight Against the Pink Bollworm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to call to the attention of the House of Representatives and particularly to the members of the Appropriations Committee a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Missouri General Assembly and urge that every favorable consideration be given to the problem posed by the pink bollworm.

The resolution follows:

House Resolution 59

Whereas a committee created by the house of representatives of the Missouri General Assembly known as the special pink bollworm committee was designated and authorized to ascertain the danger of the pink bollworm invasion into the cotton-producing areas of Missouri; and

Whereas said committee was composed of members of the house of representatives, Missouri General Assembly; entomologists representing the State department of agriculture; the University of Missouri; and the Missouri Cotton Producers Association; and

Whereas said committee has made a personal investigation of the pink bollworm menace in the infested areas of several States and has consulted with persons in charge of control and research measures of the States of Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, and the Republic of Mexico; and has carefully considered the evidence obtained; and

Whereas, in the light of the information gathered by this committee, the house of representatives concludes that the pink bollworm constitutes a serious threat to the continuance of the South's basic industry which is raw-cotton production; and

Whereas the pink bollworm, following in the footsteps of the boll weevil, has been steadily invading the Cotton Belt and in recent years there has shown an ominous acceleration in its rate of spread in the face of quarantine and application of all known control measures; and

Whereas that the pink bollworm, if allowed to get out of hand, will rival or surpass the boll weevil in destructiveness; and that it constitutes a real and immediate threat to the cotton industry of the State and of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Missouri recommend and urge the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the intensification of research and control practices now current throughout the South, and that particular emphasis be placed on the work now being done at the United States Department of Agriculture Pink Bollworm Research Center at Brownsville, Tex.; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress be requested to authorize and implement a comprehensive research and control program with which the Department of Agriculture and the control agencies of the various States may cooperate and coordinate in the fight against the pink bollworm to the end that with adequate research, a successful weapon against the pink bollworm may be found; and be it further

Resolved, That the advancement of said research be fostered by adequate appropriation and by any other possible means; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative from Missouri in the Congress, and to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress.

Lithuanian Declaration of Independence Day, February 16, 1918

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter embodying resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Americans of Brockton, Mass., during their program in observance of the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, sponsored by the Catholic Federation of St. Casimir's Parish:

BROCKTON, MASS., February 20, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D.C.:

The Lithuanian Americans of the city of Brockton, during their program in observance of the 37th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, sponsored by the Catholic Federation at St. Casimir's Parish Hall, unanimously resolve:

1. Their wholehearted support to achieve lasting peace and justice throughout the world.

2. Respectfully urge the United States Government to develop an overall dynamic program against the international Communist conspiracy.

3. To incorporate into this program as an integral and inseparable part, the restoration of full sovereignty to Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved nations.

Respectfully submitted.

LEONARD KUMPA,

President.

SUSAN K. BOROSKAS,

Secretary.

Return of Servicemen Now in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to extend my remarks and include in the RECORD a statement and letter addressed to me by the national commander of the National Association of Korean War Veterans of the United States. This letter pertains to and expresses the opinion of this Korean veterans' leader in opposition to the diplomatic recognition of Communist China and seeks support of all the citizens of this great Nation to return our servicemen from captivity in Red China. These, too, are matters of great concern to me; and I would call them to the attention of this House of Representatives for I feel these opinions of men who have offered their lives in far-eastern conflict to protect the shores of our own Nation and the opinion of the great majority of Americans are one and the same.

The matter follows:

HOLLY HILL, FLA., February 17, 1955.

The Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
United States House of Representatives,
First Congressional District of Florida,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRAMER: In reviewing world history between 1933 and 1950, it can be found that international communism under the leadership of the Soviet Union was enabled to take over 14 independent nations, including the Republic of China.

In 1933 we find that international communism was, in fact, a very minor threat to the United States or to the world in general, when President Franklin D. Roosevelt granted the Soviet Union diplomatic recognition. It is noted that the Soviet Union was granted \$12 billion in lend-lease during World War II and another \$3 billion through UNRRA. For our friendship and help throughout the past 22 years we now find that the Soviet Union supports and directs the activities of Communist China, which is showing every sign of being an enemy to the United States.

Evidence of what is going on in the minds of the leaders of Communist China and the Soviet Union can be easily seen when we observe that our servicemen are being held in Communist Chinese prisons and denounced publicly as spies, when they were actually captured in the uniform of the military forces of the United States. It can be seen that our patriotic servicemen are being held by Communist China as a pawn to help in their campaign for diplomatic recognition by the United States and to obtain a membership in the United Nations.

Let us ever oppose diplomatic recognition of Communist China, as we can now see that by recognizing Soviet Russia in 1933 we made a great mistake, and by recognizing Commu-

nist China we shall be favoring an enemy who would stop at nothing to overcome the nations of Asia and place them in the orbit of international communism.

We can now easily see what caused the downfall of Nationalist China. The Honorable Patrick J. Hurley, who was sometime President Franklin D. Roosevelt's special ambassador to the Republic of China during World War II, has eloquently said:

"Our diplomats surrendered the territorial integrity and the political independence of China in a secret agreement at Yalta. The Yalta secret agreement is a blueprint for the Communist conquest of China. Every step in the Communist conquest of China has been engineered by our own diplomats, in cooperation with the Chinese Communists and Russia. Yalta is the most disgraceful chapter in the history of American diplomacy."

Let us sincerely hope that the blunders of our leaders during the period 1933-50, which resulted in World War II, the Korean conflict and the fall of many nations, including the Republic of China, will ever be criticized and that the United States will again assist those enslaved nations to regain their individual sovereignty.

It is believed that the Korean conflict was the result of an international Communist plan to undermine the prestige of the United States and the free world in the eyes of all the world. It is sincerely believed that if Gen. Douglas MacArthur had received the support of his Commander in Chief in his hour of need that the Korean conflict would have been ended much sooner and with less loss of life. We are indeed thankful to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his assistants for being instrumental in bringing the Korean war to an end.

It is our hope that all citizens of our great Nation will earnestly pray for the return of our servicemen now in the Communist Chinese prisons and that the day will come when our great prestige will no longer be undermined by such activities as the Korean conflict unveiled.

Thanking you for your continued cooperation, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

VIRGIL VASCOE HARTON, Jr.,
National Commander, National Association of Korean War Veterans of the United States, Inc.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the annual observance of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence, a noteworthy event in the history of human freedom, I desire to extend my best wishes and encouragement to the people of that afflicted land and reaffirm my active faith in the eventual liberation of that nation and all the nations now embraced in the tyrannical Red Communist orbit.

The Ukrainian Nation has struggled for centuries against great odds for its freedom and independence. Of impressive historical interest is the old Ukrainian Kivan State which existed from the 9th to the 14th century, the Ukrainian Kozak which extended from the 17th to

the 18th century, and of more recent memory, the Ukrainian National Republic established in 1917 and smashed by Bolshevik tyranny in 1920.

The area embraced by this Nation is large and vital to the Soviet Union since it is the so-called breadbasket of Russian economy. Since Soviet domination the people of the area have undergone intensive suffering and trials embracing the destruction of its nation's churches, famines by governmental edict, mass murders of its innocent and helpless citizens, and cruel purges and deportations engineered by Red leaders. This territory embraces Kiev, noted in history and tradition for its rich culture and high state of civilization.

Although the Ukrainian people were visited during the Second World War by the scourge of nazism, their will is indomitable and unshakable, and their courage in the face of oppression and tyranny undeniably tenacious. The mailed fist of communism has descended upon their heads, but the people have never ceased their resistance in spite of the ruthless brutality of tyrants which steadily rains down upon them.

Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain and because of its spirit, independence, and devotion to liberty, it is a natural ally of all nations opposed to dictatorship, totalitarian government, and marxism.

This nation and its suffering, gallant people, is entitled not only to our sympathy and encouragement, but to our affirmative assistance in sharing their aspirations and making every contribution we can to promote and advance them toward the goal of liberation.

Let us hope and pray that the day is not too far distant when all enslaved nations will enjoy the liberation they seek and struggle for, and Ukraine will again be acknowledged as a sovereign and independent nation associated with that great partnership of free nations which is struggling to forge a free world, unfettered by the shackles of oppression, and untouched by the abominable curse of tyranny.

Twenty Dollars for Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the following editorial from the Newark Evening News of February 23, 1955, entitled "Twenty Dollars for Everybody":

TWENTY DOLLARS FOR EVERYBODY

Apart from its political origin, the mischievous thing about the \$20 tax-reduction scheme concocted by House Democrats is the form in which they propose to send it to President Eisenhower.

Speaker RAYBURN and the Ways and Means Committee refuse to let the \$20-for-everybody proposition stand on its own. Instead

Democrats plan to write the provision into a bill providing for necessary extension of excise and corporation taxes. Unless these levies are specifically continued by Congress, some will expire and others will be automatically reduced by 5 percent on April 1 at a total cost of nearly \$3 billion.

Thus President Eisenhower would have to kill the whole bill in order to veto the \$20 reduction for every taxpayer and dependent. Congress could, of course, reenact an extender for expiring excise taxes and continue corporate imposts at prevailing rates. But the resultant confusion and possible loss of additional revenue further validate the effective indictment of Secretary Humphrey who said the House plan represents Democratic abandonment of responsible financial management of the Federal Government.

Poor management it is, but House Democrats obviously think it is good 1956 politics to cut income taxes by \$2 billion and to strike nearly 5 million taxpayers from the rolls. No doubt they have the votes to pass the bill. In the Senate, however, there are indications of more responsible leadership by such Democrats as Byrd, of Virginia, and George, of Georgia. Mr. George, describing the House scheme as unwise and unfortunate, confirms Secretary Humphrey's estimate.

Everybody likes the idea of paying less money to the Government, and it is certainly new and novel to find Democrats after all these years so suddenly solicitous about the taxpayer. Mr. Eisenhower has promised relief when it can be given without harm to defense, the budget, and other commitments. But orderly reduction has no appeal for House leaders. With them politics gets priority over prudence.

The Upper Colorado River Basin Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, it is of some concern to me that the upper Colorado River basin storage project is being viewed by many as benefiting only the upper basin States. I am pleased to have the privilege of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. Alan E. Brockbank, of Brockbank, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah, which pictures the project in its true light; namely, as an economic asset of inestimable value to the entire Nation as well as an unmitigated blessing not only to the Upper Basin States but to every State.

The letter follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, February 12, 1955.
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been watching the articles very closely that have appeared recently in the newspapers and in periodicals concerning the Echo Dam project. It seems to me that we are still not quite telling the entire story. We are not appealing to the whole United States to show the necessity of this great project.

Recently I had an opportunity to spend a little time with Byron H. Mock, who is retiring, I believe, the 15th of February, as a western head of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. Mock drew a little diagram on a piece of paper, of the area of western Colorado, southern Wyoming, and eastern Utah. He then drew a sketch of the area where the oil shale was located and told me there was more oil in that area in the shale than there is in any oil field in the world and likely more than there is in all of the oil fields of the world. Now this may be a little exaggerated, but it tends to indicate the terrific possibilities of that piece of ground.

He then drew another sketch of the Colorado Plateau and told me in that area was the greatest amount of uranium presently known to exist in the free world under private enterprise ownership and control.

Then he drew a third sketch on the map of the coal of Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming, and told me that in the Utah-Colorado area were the greatest deposits of coal, in his opinion, that existed in the hands of a free nation, and he felt water was the main ingredient to the development of these three great national resources, all of which are the very lifeblood of this or any other nation, and an asset that could mean the difference between loss or winning of a great national conflict.

This puts the area into an entirely different category from that of an area stewing as to whether it is more important for people to have drinking water than it is to have a great scenic project. I think all of the people of the United States are interested in the natural resources of this country and in the preservation of the greatest sources of energy there are in this country.

Mr. Mock even went so far as to say it could easily happen that within the next 50 years, there would be a city in southeastern Utah of half a million people, if they could get water.

Now it seems to me it is important for us to try to interest all of the people in this great project, if this is the greatest source of energy that exists in the free world. Therefore I want to call it to your attention and suggest that, if possible, our plan of attack be adjusted so we indicate the importance of this project to all of the people—not just a few—in which case I would say, we have a very good chance of success.

I would appreciate your thinking in this matter.

Yours very truly,

ALAN E. BROCKBANK, INC.

ALAN E. BROCKBANK, President.

Tampering With Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, this Nation's soil-conservation program has saved precious topsoil from being washed into the sea. Many generations will profit from the foresight of those who planned and administered this program.

The little money spent by the Federal Government to maintain an adequate soil-conservation program is repaid many times by the preservation of adequate soil and water resources for all the people of America.

Those who would tamper with the soil-conservation program and play poli-

tics with the workings of the Soil Conservation Service, are doing a disfavor to this Nation.

A resolution adopted by the supervisors of 67 countywide soil-conservation districts in Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, at its annual meeting in Madison, Wis., on February 3, 1955, follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, FEBRUARY 3, 1955

In looking back over accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service in soil conservation districts in Wisconsin, real progress has been made. Cooperation between this agency and others working in the field of soil and water conservation in the State is most excellent.

Wisconsin has long recognized the wise use and vital importance of our natural resources and has helped develop soil and water conservation and good land use for the agriculture within the State.

We recognize the sound farmland and water policies adopted by Congress in the past and would very much like to see it continued.

Whereas the Soil Conservation Service has demonstrated its ability to serve with outstanding efficiency and skill in soil conservation districts of America; and

Whereas any transfer of responsibilities or change of organization of this agency would delay and decrease progress in our soil and water conservation efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wisconsin State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, in annual session, That it favors:

1. Continuation of the Soil Conservation Services under the present financial and administrative form with responsibility for carrying out programs developed by the locally administered soil conservation districts and for furnishing technical assistance in the development of small watershed conservation projects.

2. Appropriation of Federal funds for the Soil Conservation Service in sufficient amount to permit accelerated progress in the important work of protecting and saving our vital soil and water resources and for additional responsibilities under the small watershed act; further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative in Congress.

Thriving Europe and American Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very pertinent and interesting release recently issued by the United Nations concerning the increased and increasing production rate and general prosperity of Western European nations.

This is a very significant document and should be read by every Member of Congress. It clearly demonstrates that the charts all indicate that a European economic health continues on its post-war upgrade; in fact, the pace of the

steady upward climb is faster than the world rate. In the 6 years just past Europe has pushed its industrial production index to 157, well above the world figure of 133.

According to this source, Western Germany has taken the greatest strides since 1948 with its production index climbing from 100 in 1948 to 275 for the first three quarters of 1954. Statisticians at the U. N. state that the figures they are working on now show that the upward trend in Europe is continuing into this year.

There is little doubt that heavy United States financial and economic aid under the various relief and rehabilitation programs authorized by the Congress is reflected in this climb. Our outlays and grants have been most generous and without any precedent in history. The staggering amounts out of the pockets of American taxpayers poured by the billions into Europe since the end of World War II invaluable contributed to her economic recovery. Our Nation is happy to note that our associate nations in the free world have successfully emerged from war and postwar maladjustment and depression and are now stronger economically than ever before. In some respects these statistics show that many of these nations are in better economic condition than the United States in that they do not have the huge debt hanging over their taxpayers and peoples.

They are industrially strong, economically vigorous, competitively alert, strengthened by reconstruction and new construction of their industries by American grants and accommodated by the reciprocal trade treaties by broad access to American markets.

As I have pointed out before these nations are therefore in a position where they can compete successfully with American industry and business for foreign trade and domestic trade alike. To what extent this situation will further depress some of the sick industries of America and cause further unemployment throughout our country is highly speculative. That the enlarged European potential of production and trading coupled with low tariffs in the United States will cause deep repercussions in our economic life hardly any well trained economist or informed realistic student of government could possibly deny.

We rejoice in the prosperity of our European friends but we hope that it will not be used under the reciprocal trade treaty to promote less favorable economic conditions in this country.

The matter follows:

EUROPE ECONOMY ON UPGRADE—HEAVY UNITED STATES AID REFLECTED IN PRODUCTION RATE

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y.—Europe came whirling around the corner into 1955 after its most prosperous holiday season in years. And the charts here indicate European economic health continues on a postwar upgrade.

In a dozen different countries in a dozen different categories providing sign-posts of recovery, the figures show a steady upward

climb. Their pace is faster than the world rate.

WELL ABOVE WORLD FIGURE

Europe began in 1946 at a lower point in industrial production than the world average.

As the bar graphs on the accompanying map show, Europe's industrial production index—with 1948 equalling 100—stood at 76 in 1946. The index for the world (not including the Soviet bloc) was 7 points above at 83.

In the 6 years since then, however, Europe has pushed its score to 157—well above the world figure of 133.

Figures available here at the U. N. are up to date in 1954 and they pinpoint the elements in European recovery.

As indicated by the figures of the map, West Germany has taken the greatest strides since 1948 in industrial production. That country's production index has climbed from 100 in 1948 to a whopping 275 for the first 3 quarters of 1954.

Unofficially, statisticians at the U. N. say the figures they're working on now show the uptrend in Europe is continuing into this year.

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTED \$55 BILLION

Heavy United States aid is reflected in this climb.

From July of 1947 through June of 1954, United States aid to Europe in recovery programs, point 4 technical assistance, and contributions to U. N., infant aid, refugee, and other programs totaled a little over \$55 billion. Approximately \$3 billion had been distributed in 1946 and early 1947.

The programs kept people alive, provided scarce materials for industry, and provided the necessary priming for Europe's industrial pump.

President Eisenhower has made new predictions of continued American prosperity, lower United States tariffs, and continued foreign aid. The tariff and aid programs still must hurdle Congress. These, if approved, plus American tourist trade growth promise to keep the European economy expanding in 1955.

Here are a few of the happy figures in West Europe's statistical tables: In 1946, European freight railway traffic was counted at a little above 100 billion ton-miles. In 1953, it climbed without one setback to 174 billion.

In 1946, Europe loaded 67 million tons of goods for shipping; in 1953, 189 million. In 1946, it unloaded 179 million tons of goods; in 1953, 330 million.

The pattern of European economic progress can be plainly seen in the steady rise of its industrial-production index. The first quarter of 1954 was 8 index points up over the first quarter of 1953.

The third quarter was up 9 index points over the same quarter of 1953, which in turn was 8 points above the third quarter of 1952.

In several individual countries it shaped up this way, in each case the advance being over the corresponding quarter of 1953:

Austria: First quarter up 9 points, second quarter 16 points, third quarter 15 points.

France: First quarter up 3 points, second quarter up 8 points, third quarter up 14 points.

West Germany: First quarter up 10 points, second quarter up 16 points, third quarter up 11 points.

Italy: First quarter up 10 points, second quarter up 16 points, third quarter up 11 points.

Britain: First quarter up 7 points, second quarter up 8 points, third quarter up 5 points.

Who Pulled the Wool Over the President's Eyes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the people of every State from Wisconsin to Washington along the northern tier of the Nation have been wondering who it was that pulled the wool over the President's eyes, on February 1, when he issued his order cutting Northwest Airlines out of the Seattle-Hawaii run, giving a monopoly to Pan American Airways.

The staff officer in question who gave his Commander in Chief such dubious advice is indicated by the following news articles:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 19, 1955]

IKE HAVING AERONAUTICAL HEADACHES

(By Drew Pearson)

President Eisenhower is having aeronautical headaches. He's just had a terrific headache over an air route between Seattle and Hawaii, and he's about to have more over a route to Alaska. Part of the trouble is the present White House system of staff work whereby the President, following the general staff system in the Army, takes the recommendation of his staff without knowing too much about the facts behind their recommendation.

Here's the inside story of what's been happening.

After long study, the Civil Aeronautics Board recommended that Northwest Airlines continue its present operation between Seattle and Hawaii in competition with Pan American Airways, and that Northwest be given a permanent license to fly the great circle route over the Arctic to Tokyo.

This decision against Pan American, the pet airline of both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, automatically went to the White House for confirmation. And this is where Ike's headache began. For his Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks immediately moved in, together with Under Secretary of Commerce Robert Murray, even though Murray had just submitted his resignation.

They recommended that the President reverse the findings of his CAB and rule for Pan American. Trusting his two Commerce Department executives, that was exactly what the President did. He ruled that Northwest Airlines could no longer fly the route between Seattle and Hawaii, leaving Pan Am to fly that route without competition; also refused to give Northwest a permanent route over the Arctic to Tokyo, thus opening a possibility for Pan Am to get that route later.

EXTRA SATURDAY SESSION

When this news broke, things really began to pop around the White House.

First, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, phoned Governor Orville Freeman, new Democratic Governor of Minnesota, requested that the Minnesota Legislature pass a resolution demanding that Ike follow the advice of the CAB. The legislature promptly did so.

Simultaneously, also, Senator HUMPHREY phoned Assistant President Sherman Adams,

"The President's ruling will jeopardize one of the most important enterprises in the Northwest," he said. "He should be better informed before he reverses experts who have been studying this question for months."

HUMPHREY, a Democrat, asked for an appointment to see the President but was told Ike couldn't possibly see him for about a week. This was on Thursday, February 3.

However, as protests began to roll in, Adams hastily called Republicans to a conference for a Saturday morning, February 5. Ordinarily Ike goes away on Saturdays. But Adams knew that on the following Monday mayors of Minneapolis and St. Paul, plus the Governor of Minnesota, would be descending on the White House.

To head this off and to take the play away from Democrat HUMPHREY, Ike held an emergency meeting with two Minnesota Republicans—Senator Ed THYE and Congressman WALTER JUDG. Secretary Weeks and Under Secretary Murray, who originally caused the trouble, also attended.

At the meeting Ike complained that he hadn't been given all the facts. He had been told that Northwest Airlines had received a greater subsidy than Pan Am, a piece of information based on an outdated report and definitely not the case. Pan Am's total subsidies are greater than any other airline's.

Result: The President completely reversed himself, came out for Northwest as originally recommended by the CAB.

[From Time magazine of February 21, 1955]

PRESIDENTIAL ERROR

President Eisenhower got caught in the propwash of an airline battle last week. As a result, he came within an ace of knocking Northwest Airlines off one of its most prized routes. The dogfight was between Northwest and Pan American World Airways over which should fly the Pacific between Seattle-Portland and Hawaii, a profitable run that both have been operating on a temporary basis since 1948. The Civil Aeronautics Board finally reached a unanimous decision: Northwest should have the route alone. But when the CAB recommendation went to the White House a fortnight ago, it ran into opposition.

Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks, under whose department CAB operates, advised the President to reverse the CAB decision, drop Northwest, and give the route exclusively to Pan American. Pan American has lower Government subsidies than Northwest and in the past 2 years carried more passengers to Hawaii—18,192 to 11,671 for Northwest. The President, who is interested in saving money on airline subsidies, decided to reverse CAB and signed a letter giving the route to Pan American alone.

In the uproar that followed, the President soon learned that there was a lot more to the case. Northwest's scrappy, 42-year-old President Don Nyrop flew to Washington. A onetime CAB chairman who knows his way around the Capital, Nyrop got Minnesota's Republican Senator EDWARD THYE to call on the President with a new sheaf of facts and figures supplied by Nyrop and CAB's Acting Chairman Chan Gurney. Pan American had indeed led in passengers for the last 2 years, but most of its bulge came in 1953, when plane-short Northwest had to shift its Boeing Stratocruisers from the Pacific to domestic and Orient runs and fly DC-4's to Hawaii. In 1954 Northwest made up most of the loss, ran almost neck and neck with Pan American. Over the entire 6-year test period, Northwest was the real leader, having flown 31,038 passengers to Pan American's 30,700. As for subsidies, Northwest had previously said that it would fly the route without Government subsidy, expected to be self-supporting by 1956. From other sources Ike also got a quick inkling that his decision against Northwest was highly unpopular in

Minnesota and the Northwest, with Democrats ready to capitalize on it.

Last week Ike fired off a new letter to CAB, reversing himself and giving back Northwest its Honolulu run for 3 more years, in competition with Pan American. At his press conference, Ike said bluntly that he had made an error. Said Minnesota's THYE: "As soon as he got the facts, he changed his decision."

The President, the CAB, and States-Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been reported that the CAB has recommended or will recommend to the President that certain air service from the States be denied to some of the major communities of Alaska. This is a matter of vital concern to my constituents and to the economy of the Pacific Northwest. I have registered with the President vigorous protest to the possible discontinuance of this air service, and wish to register it again. I include the following House Joint Memorial 6, approved by the Washington State Legislature on February 3, 1955, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

House Joint Memorial 6

To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Honorable Chan Gurney, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition, as follows:

Whereas it has been reliably reported that the Civil Aeronautics Board has voted to issue a decision in the States-Alaska Case, Docket No. 5756, et al., which would reduce the number of air carriers now operating between the Pacific Northwest and the Territory of Alaska from 4 to 2 carriers; and

Whereas the continuance of adequate air transportation services to Alaska is of vital importance to the further economic development of the Territory, the State of Washington, and to the national defense interests of the entire Nation; and

Whereas the Board's decision would deprive every major city in Alaska of competitive air services, except the city of Anchorage; and would further deprive such important communities as Nome, Cordova, Kenai, Homer, Kodiak, and Bristol Bay of through services by any air carrier operating from the State of Washington and would thus require time-consuming and costly transshipment of all passenger, cargo, and mail traffic destined to these communities; and

Whereas Alaska is almost wholly dependent upon air transportation facilities because of the recent discontinuance of passenger steamship services and because there is no railroad linking the Territory with the State of Washington, nor any satisfactory highway network; and

Whereas Alaska is almost entirely dependent upon the State of Washington and other areas of the continental United States for its

labor force and for virtually all of its foodstuffs, supplies, and materials, and is therefore peculiarly in need of adequate air transportation facilities especially tailored to its own needs; and

Whereas the Territory is now on the threshold of significant business and industrial development which would be seriously impaired by any curtailment of air services as now contemplated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

Whereas the board's decision has resulted in an unprecedented storm of public protest throughout the entire Territory and the Pacific Northwest, resulting spontaneously in the sending of thousands of letters and telegrams to the board and to the White House; and

Whereas this public protest has been vigorously supported by the entire congressional delegation from the State of Washington, by virtually all of the other public and civic leaders in the Pacific Northwest, by newspapers, radio and television commentators, and by most of the business concerns and labor unions in the State of Washington having trade interests with Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider the pending decision in the States-Alaska case to insure that existing air transportation services to the Territory of Alaska are not curtailed, that competitive air services be maintained from the State of Washington to all of the principal gateway cities in Alaska, that through services by air from the State of Washington be preserved and expanded to as many Alaskan communities as possible, that the selection of the individual air carriers to perform such services be determined solely upon the basis of merit, and that paramount consideration be given to the vital need of Alaska for a system of air transportation services especially tailored to the peculiar requirements of the Territory and which will fully utilize the integrated operation of air carriers indigenous to Alaska, whose primary and exclusive interests are in serving the Pacific Northwest and the Territory; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

Passed the house February 2, 1955.

JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 3, 1955.

EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Rayburn Saves the Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for February 21, 1955:

RAYBURN SAVES THE TRADE ACT

To be fully effective, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be relieved of the crippling clauses which protectionists have succeeded in adding over the years. Yet the House on Friday barely defeated a move to add yet another crippling clause to the law.

The newcrippler, which would have narrowed the President's freedom to overrule proposals of the Tariff Commission, lost by just seven votes. Republicans voted overwhelmingly for it, 119 to 66. Democrats, responding to a personal appeal by Speaker RAYBURN, voted strongly against it, 140 to 80.

So President Eisenhower saw illustrated within 24 hours his earlier statement to the GOP National Committee that the Republicans can't have better allies than the Democrats. On this occasion, had there been no alliance undoubtedly there would have been no House passage of tariff legislation in substantially the form requested by the President.

The measure now goes to the Senate, where we hope a concerted effort will be made to remove the crippling clauses already in the law.

The House in its present mood may not consent. But the Senate should write the kind of law it regards as best, and then settle any differences in conference. If nothing else, a heavy vote for liberalization of the present law would put the Senate in a strong tactical position to resist further House efforts to add new cripples.

Congressional Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, this debate regarding pay raises for ourselves gives me an opportunity to say something that I could not say at any other time.

During the past few days, as I thought about this raise, I was able to build up a good case for it. But our constituents are not aware of all the things we do. The folks back home just do not know how tough the modern legislator's job is. Of course, they know about our campaigns and all the work and sacrifice that entails. They know too of all the letterwriting, speechmaking, handshaking, and backslapping a Congressman must engage in. Some of them realize, I am sure, that banquets, cocktail parties, political dinners, and the like can become an awful bore. However, the folks that send us here figure that is all part of the job, and if we are not satisfied with the pay we can stay home the next time and let the other fellow come and take our place.

But as I say, there is a whole lot of things we legislators do that the home folks never hear about. For instance, how could they ever know how many hours we discuss, debate, and labor over just how much money we will give each year to the folks in Tennessee so that they can get electric power at half price? Or what do our constituents know about the time and effort we devote arriving at wonderfully complex formulas which spell out for us what price we can guar-

antee to the corn and wheat farmer for their produce? The public is not conscious of the great amount of testimony we must hear or the literature we must read before we can determine what wages an employer must pay his employees. Unless they sat in the galleries each day, the home folks cannot begin to realize how difficult it is to provide homes for the folks in the city, electricity for those in the country, and social security for everybody.

And then there are taxes. The folks that elect us always complain about the taxes. But all they have to do is to pay them. We must figure out whether taking nine-tenths of a man's income or over three-fourths of his estate leaves him too much money.

Another thing the folks at home do not know much about is the added duties we have taken on in the last few years. We not only provide money for dams in Tennessee but also in France; we authorize school construction in California and Ethiopia; we appropriate money for our own Army and one in West Germany; we build airfields in Texas and in French Morocco; we pay our own salaries and those of the United Nations. In short, we Congressmen legislate not only for ourselves but for all of Adam's children.

When you stop to think about it, Congress is in much the same position as a father. He arranges for his children's shelter, food, electricity, education, and the other necessities of life. But they never comprehend how much he is doing for them and they always demand more. One of his toughest jobs is to see that all get their share, for if any are not included in the distribution of his bounty, he is not a good father.

And as I have pointed out the family of Congress has grown awful big and the job of taking care of them all is tremendous.

One difficulty is, whom are we going to soak to provide the money for this raise? It doesn't seem democratic to charge the general taxpayer since at least one quarter of his estate has already been conveyed to the Federal Government. We can't hit the Government because it is heavily in debt and broke. I don't see how we can assess the folks at the subsidy trough because how could we decide whom to pick on? Perhaps the thing to do is to ask all the foreign folks whom we have helped when they were in need, to return the favor by digging into their pockets now to help us out. They are our constituents too and it is to their own interest that the legislators of the world's greatest democracy are sufficiently paid for their labors and good works.

Some Congressmen have qualms about this raise. There might be some people in the Nation who would look at it as an attempt by Congress to elbow its way into the public trough to get its share. But on reflection, their earlier fears are unfounded because the people for whom Congress provides food, shelter, power, education, loans, gifts, pensions, and so forth, make up the majority of the voters in the country. In case any one is not sure about that I refer him to the January 25, 1955, issue of Look magazine where it is shown that 76,276,110 people

receive \$60,688,037,000 annually from the Government. Now, these people are not going to begrudge Congressmen a few thousand dollars more a year. In fact, they will be glad for Congressmen to get theirs as long as they get theirs. Besides our checks will not be noticed in the 300 billion that are written annually by the Government and rushed out at the rate of 400 a minute.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on the showing made above that all the folks the Congress supports are getting theirs, how can there be objection to Congress getting theirs?

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the reciprocal trade bill for two reasons. First, because I believe that America's trade policies abroad should be determined in relation to the cost of manufacture in the United States and, secondly, the decisions must be made by the Congress as required by the specific provisions of the Constitution. Its responsibilities cannot be shifted to a single person, not even to the President. I want as most Congressmen want, reciprocal trade instead of aid with the other nations. But nearly half of Congress voted against the present bill and voted to send it back to committee for correction.

We want free trade among the nations somewhat as we have it between the various States of the Union. Free trade has undoubtedly made a great contribution to the tremendous prosperity and high living standard enjoyed by the American people. The constitutional prohibition of trade barriers between the States has benefited both business and the public.

Our success as free traders amongst ourselves is proof that free trade is the best trade in the conduct of commerce. We all believe that. But before it can be applied to international trade, certain political conditions must be present. These are: First, there must be peace among the trading parties so that none is denied vital raw materials and manufactured products. The United States could well have used a tariff-protected synthetic-rubber industry during the Second World War after the Japanese had gained complete control over most of the world's supply of natural rubber; second, there must be a common currency, unrestricted in flow and not subject to political manipulation that stops much of our world trade today; and third, there must be a reasonably uniform wage and hour scale, which determines the cost level of all goods produced entering into trade. These conditions are met, of course, within the United States. But they are not met as between the nations of the world. Because of the grave dan-

ger of war nearly all countries are building up their own defense industries and they are protecting those industries with tariffs and other trade barriers against goods from the United States. Many nations restrict international movement of their currencies so that if we sell goods to them we cannot get paid. The fixed rates of exchange are frequently punitive in effect against us. Trade with them is on a one-way street. There is no uniformity of wage and hour standards throughout the world and that results in a great variety of cost and price levels. As long as the foregoing conditions exist, free trade among the nations like that enjoyed among our States is impossible.

The most objectionable feature of the 1955 tariff legislation is the delegation of arbitrary, unreviewable and absolute authority to the President to fix tariffs. We do not mean President Eisenhower. We mean any President before or after him. This was the original objection in 1934 to the first Reciprocal Trade Act. Prior to that time Congress had always fixed tariffs. Tariffs have been considered more as matters of local concern than of national policy. As a practical matter, the Congress better reflects the attitude of the people than the Presidency does because the Congress is closer to the people. Accordingly, it makes sense that Congress should retain its powers to control the tariff level. Besides all this, the Constitution itself provides that Congress must do so.

Reciprocal trade legislation has been on the books for 20 years. It has not accomplished much as an incentive to lowering trade barriers of foreign countries as pointed out above. On the other hand, considerable injury has been sustained by American industry. Some firms have gone out of business such as the Alexander Smith Carpet Co. has done in Yonkers. Others are operating on a marginal basis, and in some cases, whole industries are threatened with extinction. There were 10,000 skilled watchmakers employed in the United States in 1948. Today there are only 4,000. Whole States, such as West Virginia, where coal mining is the chief industry, are prostrate because of the importation of cheap residual oil. In New York State, the glove industry, the hat industry, and others are practically out of business. The chemical industry has testified that it has been hurt by previous tariff cuts and that any more may finish them off. The necessity for a strong domestic chemical industry was demonstrated in World War I. At that time the United States was completely dependent on Germany for chemical products, and when the war broke out, our only source of supply was gone. The pottery industry in the United States and in New York State is virtually extinct. Since 1948, imports of China tableware has increased 138 percent so that 86 percent of all China tableware purchased in the United States is foreign made. Since 1950 imports of foreign bicycles has increased 1,300 percent and now absorbs more than one-third of the American market.

In theory, the reciprocal trade legislation provides an opportunity for relief to these stricken industries. Under the law a lowered tariff may be raised if it is found the domestic industry is being severely hurt. Upon an application from the aggrieved industry, the Tariff Commission holds public hearings and then may report to the President with recommendations for relief if it finds relief is necessary. The President may or may not act as he sees fit and there is no appeal from his decision. This provision for relief is called the escape-clause procedure. However, relief by this procedure has seldom been realized.

Since 1948 there have been 59 applications by American firms for relief. The Tariff Commission, the agency set up by Congress to act as a court in tariff disputes, took action on 15 of these applications and made recommendations to the President for relief. In only five of these cases did the President take action to protect the domestic industry against injury from foreign competition. In the remaining cases, the President, acting on the advice of some State Department bureaucrat, ignored and overruled the recommendations of the Tariff Commission. This is permitted under the past and present proposed law. The President can make his decision on facts that were never before the Tariff Commission and which the industry involved has had no chance to refute. And, as I have already pointed out, there is no appeal from the Presidential ruling.

Now consider what that means. The jury, which in this case would be the Tariff Commission, hears the pleadings and the evidence and then renders a verdict. The judge, viz the President, can then, on the basis of facts not presented to the jury, reverse the verdict and no appeal is permitted. This is bad law, bad procedure and outrageous politics in dealing with American industry. It is in utter violation of all the basic tenets of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and of the concept of constitutional representative government. The American tradition prefers the wisdom and experience of jury verdicts instead of verdicts by a single judge.

There is another danger inherent in this unprecedented procedure. Those who may have access to the President's ear through some State Department bureaucrat, may ignore the proceedings before the Tariff Commission and present their case directly to the President. This amounts to government by personal rule rather than by law. This is not intended to be derogatory of the present Presidential incumbent. My use of the word "President" is entirely impersonal.

When tariffs are subject to congressional control; when tariff disputes are resolved by court procedures; and when American businessmen whose business lives are threatened, may have their day in court, then I shall vote for reciprocal trade legislation. I believe in the principle of it.

Five Proposals To Amend the Refugee Relief Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, there is unquestionably widespread dissatisfaction and no small degree of disappointment concerning the operation of the refugee relief program. Enacted just about 18 months ago—August 7, 1953, to be exact—this law authorized the admission of 214,000 aliens to become permanent residents of the United States by the end of 1956, with preference being given to refugees, expellees, escapees from Iron Curtain countries, and certain close relatives of American citizens.

After 18 months, what are the results?

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the results to date of this refugee relief program are very meager, indeed. Here are the latest available official figures:

Number of visas issued, 18,936—as of January 23, 1955.

Number of refugees admitted, 15,034—as of January 28, 1955.

Such is the dismal result of this program after about half of its effective period has elapsed. It is clear by now that the goal of 214,000 refugees to be admitted will never be reached in the time specified. While I dislike to speculate on the number finally to gain entry under this program, it does not seem to me that we will even fulfill half the program by the time it expires.

Such was not the intention of Congress when it enacted the refugee relief program in 1953. When Congress set a figure of 214,000 to be admitted over a 3-year period, it was done so in the belief that this goal could be reached. Unfortunately, certain sections of the act and administrative interpretations have made the law unworkable and the whole program has become a travesty.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see eye to eye with Judge Francis Walter, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, on matters of immigration. Yet even Judge Walter, who is opposed to liberalized immigration, recently stated in a public address:

I consider the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 a fraud and a phony.

He also referred to it as an example of sloppy legislation, an ill-conceived and half-baked proposal, and an unworkable law. And he is so right about it.

There is also tremendous dissatisfaction among church groups and voluntary agencies which are active in obtaining housing and employment assurances for the aliens and helping them to meet other requirements of the law. In fact, some of them are considering giving up their programs because of the great difficulties involved. On January 30, 1955,

the Washington Post and Times Herald published an Associated Press report from New York which stated that church agencies were on the verge of junking huge programs for bringing refugees to this country because they could not get them through the redtape. The report then added:

So far, church officials said, the requirements for admission of refugees have been so complicated that only a mere trickle have gotten through the maze of checks and doublechecks.

By way of example, the report cited the meager accomplishments of these church groups due to the complications of the act:

Up to the end of 1954, Church World Service had 115 refugee arrivals. The Roman Catholic War Relief Service reported 147, the Jewish United Hias Service about 50, and the Lutheran Service 9.

This would be less than 500 refugees brought here in the act's first 18 months. In comparison, under the old Displaced Persons Act whose terms were less restrictive, 114,494 DP's were resettled in the first 18 months.

Mr. Speaker, the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 needs to be amended drastically, and it needs to be done as soon as possible while there is still sufficient time to complete the program successfully. Each month, each week that we wait will mean the loss of thousands of visas going to waste when the program ends in 1956.

Consequently, I am now introducing a bill containing five important amendments to the act which, I feel certain, will speed up the flow of refugees in the short time that is left and will make possible the successful completion of this program.

The five changes recommended in my bill are the following:

First. Age limit for admittance of orphans: Under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 a total of 4,000 orphans are permitted to enter the country as nonquota immigrants, but they must be under 10 years of age. Because of the age limitation and other difficulties, less than 500 orphans have gained admittance to date. I, therefore, propose to raise the age limitation to 14 years. This should make possible the successful completion of this part of the program.

Second. Elimination of employment and housing assurances: It is generally admitted by all concerned, including State Department and immigration officials, that the greatest factor in delaying the flow of immigrants under the refugee relief program is the requirement that certain assurances must be submitted in behalf of an alien before he is granted a visa. Section 7 (a) of the Refugee Relief Act provides that three assurances must be given by an American citizen on behalf of the alien seeking a visa:

(a) That the alien will have suitable employment without displacing some other person from employment;

(b) That the alien will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing; and

(c) That the alien will not become a public charge.

I propose to eliminate the employment and housing assurances and to leave only the requirement that the alien is not to become a public charge. The housing shortage has eased up considerably in the country and is no longer as acute as a few years ago. Employment, too, is holding up in recent months and the general economic situation does not appear to be threatening. There is no need to retain these requirements in the law. By eliminating them it will be possible to increase greatly the entry of immigrants under the refugee program.

Third. Elimination of readmission guaranties: Another factor contributing to the slowness of the refugee-relief program is the requirement that an alien must present an unexpired passport or other suitable travel document and a certificate of readmission from the country where he obtained the visa guaranteeing he will be readmitted to that country in the event he is later found to be deportable from the United States. This has been a real bone of contention and aroused much dissatisfaction and protests from a number of European countries. I propose that this section be eliminated from the act.

Fourth. Refugee relief commission: Under the present act, the refugee-relief program is administered by the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State. There has been considerable criticism of the Administrator of this Bureau, Mr. Scott McLeod, for the manner in which he is administering the whole program, his rigid interpretations of the act, and his general approach to the problem.

I propose to take this program out of the Department of State and set it up as a separate and independent Government agency to be known as the Refugee Relief Commission. The commission is to consist of three members, appointed by the President, each of whom shall receive a salary of \$17,500 annually. The commission shall formulate regulations in compliance with the Refugee Relief Act, and it shall report annually to the President and to Congress on the operations of the program. This commission and its operations would be similar to that of the Displaced Persons Commission which administered the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 with such success.

Fifth. Termination of the act: The termination date of the refugee-relief program has been set for December 31, 1956, after which no visas are to be issued under this program. In view of the small number of visas issued under the act to date and the fact that nearly half of the time has already expired, it is generally conceded that the program's goal of 214,000 immigrants, as envisioned by Congress originally, will not be reached by the end of 1956.

Therefore, I propose that all visas authorized under the Refugee Relief Act which remain unissued after December 31, 1956, shall be redistributed proportionately among the countries and categories established in the act, and that these visas be issued only to relatives of American citizens. I further propose that the time be extended for the issuance of the unused visas for a period of 1 year until December 31, 1957.

My purpose for extending the termination date is twofold: First, so that more time is allotted for the unification of families; second, so that as many of the unused visas be utilized in the extra time allotted. The unification of families has always been a traditional and humane principle with the American people. The extra time allotted is to make up for the slow start of the program in setting up its administrative machinery, which is another factor in the delay of entries until now.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I feel reasonably certain that if these amendments are enacted the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 will be administered in the spirit in which Congress intended it to be administered. I also feel certain that these amendments will enable the program to be successfully completed and the full goal of 214,000 immigrants to be reached.

We must correct the early errors committed under this program, particularly the lapse of valuable time and the unnecessary requirements for housing and employment assurances. Let us consider the people who stand to benefit from these changes, the very people for whom the whole program was initiated. I mean the relatives who desire to join their families in this country and cannot do so because the regular immigration quotas in their countries are oversubscribed, the refugees and the escapees who are the victims of religious and political persecution.

I call upon all my colleagues to support these changes. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 was overwhelmingly supported by both parties. Let us amend it so that the Congress and the people of America will be proud of this act and its accomplishments, instead of regarding it as a fraud and a phony. Let us make it a workable act.

Where Is the Promised Policy of Liberation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, many of our citizens possessed with retentive memories of the campaign promises of 1952 are raising the significant question, "Where is the promised policy of liberation?" Sooner or later, some sort of answer must be given to it.

In an address delivered before the New York affiliates of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, who is the president of this dynamic national organization, and also a professor of economics at Georgetown University, raises this fundamental question and proceeds to demonstrate that our foreign policy of the past

2 years is patently not the one promised. He points out, too, the fallacy of the simplistic notion deliberately circulated these past few months that the only alternative to what is euphemistically called peaceful coexistence is preventive war.

Most important perhaps is the impregnable logic of his address, showing the certain long-run trend of the basic variables in the Russian Communist calculus for world conquest. If his analysis is correct, then the outcome of our present policy action of containment by threat of massive retaliation will be global war itself—paradoxically, the very thing we seek to avoid.

I am convinced that the most effective way of clearing the atmosphere of the many confusions of thought regarding our foreign policy is to initiate a great debate in Congress on this issue. Reasoned analyses, such as outlined in this address, would dissipate such confusion and lack of distinction in thought with the net advantage of showing the real gravity of our present position. With regard to these points, I wish to insert into the RECORD, under leave obtained, the pertinent excerpts of Dr. Dobriansky's address, as follows:

**WHERE IS THE PROMISED POLICY OF
LIBERATION?**

In the presidential campaign of 1952 the American people were promised a realistic, sound, and courageous policy of liberation. Since then, there hasn't even been a whisper of this new policy originally advocated by the present administration. Instead, we have been treated to slogans of "massive retaliation," "peaceful coexistence," and others which belong to the same old containment species. For millions of Americans who are not deluded by the illusions of short-run peace and peaceful coexistence, the time has come to raise the appropriate question, Where is the promised policy of liberation? Our policy today is merely containment by threat; it is not the policy of liberation which alone is capable of preventing a third world war and maximizing the real possibilities of freedom everywhere, including those of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

It is a grave error to maintain, as our President has, that the only alternative to peaceful coexistence is preventive war. A moral policy of liberation is the realistic alternative to both the Moscow-created illusion of peaceful coexistence and preventive war. Many who uttered the liberation policy in 1952, and those who opposed it, failed to understand its meaning and content. They failed to see that it is in essence a continuous process of political warfare waged on the terrain of the Russian Communist Empire to obstruct, above all, the genocidal consolidation that is now going on from East Germany to Northern Korea. Our present policy permits this vast consolidation, and enables Moscow to form its chief springboard for world conquest and domination.

The three essential and irreducible factors in the Russian calculus of world conquest are consolidation, adequacy in arms, and fear of retaliation. Once Moscow succeeds in consolidating its empire it will not even need a superiority in arms, which it now enjoys in several military areas, to attain to a reasonable expectation of success in its drive for world conquest. This consolidation through genocide destroys nations both within and outside the Soviet Union, prepares a robotic and servile mass of 800 million people as fodder in a gigantic war machine, and thus lays the basic groundwork of estimated suc-

cess for Moscow's fixed and unalterable world design. With the achievement of this consolidation, and with the additional advantages of a world conspiracy and the guaranteed opportunity of the initial attack, Moscow will need only a strategic adequacy of arms to create regional Pearl Harbors in the free world that might well neutralize the massive retaliatory power about which we now boast. Its fear of retaliation from us decreases in inverse proportion to its ability to consolidate its empire and produce arms in adequate amounts, not even with overall superiority.

This massive consolidation for the next and, perhaps, decisive step toward world dominion is rapidly advancing behind the whole facade of Moscow-sponsored coexistence which is being built upon intentions for liberalized East-West trade, planned student visits to the Soviet Union, extensive Soviet participation in international bodies, the entertainment of members of the British Parliament, the 6 months' celebration of the Pereyaslav Treaty between Ukraine and Russia, and now even the contemplated transfer of the Soviet Government from the blood-soaked Kremlin. The Pereyaslav celebration has been staged on the hoax of Ukraine's union with Russia in 1654 in the same manner as these other events are staged on the hoax of peaceful coexistence. While Moscow celebrated this fabricated union with much fanfare about Ukrainian independence and brotherhood, it continued to perpetrate genocide in Ukraine by shifting masses of youth to Kazakhstan and other areas of central Asia. While it stages its current show of peaceful coexistence, neatly calculated to lull the free world into a false sense of security, it is feverishly engaged in its program of genocidal consolidation without which its own security cannot be founded and its ultimate objective cannot possibly be realized.

The tremendous work of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, under the chairmanship of Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN of Wisconsin, has revealed the scope and depth of this diabolical program. Our present policy of containment by threat stands in virtual acquiescence to the realization of this program and thus to the eventual loss of the captive nations as our natural allies. Only an imaginative policy of liberation can forestall this systematic excision of the patriotic sinews of these nations and impede the formation of this primary basis for world conquest.

An American policy of liberation is both sound and practicable. Much of practicable worth can and must be done to launch this political offensive by peaceful means in order that global peace itself will be maintained. Practical aid to the still existing national undergrounds in Poland, Ukraine, Slovakia, Hungary, and East Germany should be given for their expansion and the conservation of the national interests of their countries. Impeded in its efforts at consolidation, Moscow would hardly embark upon the next step of aggression with a feeling of growing insecurity within the empire that only a political offensive can produce. Also, the President has the power to implement the Kersten amendment to the Mutual Security Act, and should take the necessary steps to form free national military units of Poland, Ukraine, Slovakia, Lithuania, and others in the free world as an electrifying symbol of freedom to their enslaved brethren in the satellite and Red armies. In quality and significance, these units would bear greater value than even a score of French divisions.

The dynamics in a policy of liberation necessitate a complete reappraisal of our diplomatic relations with Communist-dominated governments. There are two measures in Congress that pose this reappraisal which the State Department cannot, as it has done in the recent session, avoid. If there is intelligence and symbolic freedom

value in maintaining American Ambassadors in Communist capitals, then let us be rationally consistent by extending our representation to the two most restive areas in the Russian Communist Empire—Ukraine and Byelorussia—as called for by House Concurrent Resolution 58. If the State Department cannot demonstrate these values, then let us withdraw all of our representatives from behind the Iron Curtain, as urged by the Jenner-McCarran resolution in the Senate. The State Department exerted pressure to do nothing about these measures in a wait-and-see vein while Moscow is at work planning for our destruction.

These are only a few of the many things that can be done to wage the necessary political offensive to prevent the Russian empire consolidation for war. The overwhelming forces of enlightened nationalism in the Red Empire, especially in Ukraine, Poland, Slovakia, and elsewhere, are yet to be harnessed to the incalculable detriment of Moscow's plans for world domination. Our present policy exposes these nations, our natural allies, to doom; it exposes our Nation to a grave disadvantage in the event of an armed showdown. Words about their eventual liberation become hollow where no practical deeds are performed to fortify their hopes and efforts toward the goal of national freedom and independence. In preparation for their bleak future, they, too, have every right to ask, "Where is the promised policy of liberation?"

**The Office of the President of the United
States**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the following speech I delivered before the Consular Law Society on February 23, 1955:

It is a singular honor to be appearing before the Consular Law Society. I say "singular" advisedly, since here I am facing the soul-chilling scrutiny of the expert. The Congressman envies the expert, and I often believe that the Congressman is called upon to have opinions on everything, conviction on nothing, and the little learning the poet Pope has dubbed dangerous.

Nonetheless, I secretly confess to holding a dozen or so convictions, and it is on one of these to which I would like to address myself tonight. That is, the Office of the President of the United States.

During my 32 years in Congress, I have watched 6 Presidents, each in his own way, define the Office of President: Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. It is in this definition of the line that both weaves together and at the same time separates the executive and legislative branches of the Government, the line that is most generally and, I might add, most loosely, called checks and balances, that each has differed; and it is in this difference of personal definition that has set, and continues to set, the course of the ship of state.

Where the President is fully aware that his office is the governing office of the country, he accepts both the tones and the overtones of power and the awful responsibility that goes with the possession of such power. Particularly is this true in the conduct of foreign affairs. He in the office of the Presi-

dent is charged with that responsibility. The ultimate decisions must be his. You can no more separate the loneliness and the loneliness of the man in this office than you could separate the tides of the ocean from the pull of the moon. The President who seeks to divest himself, in all good faith, from the loneliness and loneliness of the office, deserts the charges of responsibility that office has placed upon him.

Undoubtedly today we have in our Chief Executive a man with the will to peace. If sincerity were the only quality the office of the Presidency demands, we could then say, without reservation, that the office had found its man. But I have come to believe that the office of the Presidency, as it is being defined by Mr. Eisenhower, has been invested with a much narrower meaning than was ever intended by the Founding Fathers. The office of the President is not that of adjudicator, conciliator, or merely administrator in the sense of delegating authorities and duties. It is not the echo of short-term public opinion. Nor is it merely the coordinate branch of the Government.

In the relationship, for example, with the Congress, the Executive must realize that the Congress has many more explicit ways of curbing the Executive than the Executive has of curbing the Congress. The Congress, through its control of the purse strings, can check the Executive. Another check lies in the investigatory powers of Congress. The Senate can halt the Executive by withholding consent and approval of treaties. The same is true of Presidential confirmable appointments. While it is true that the Executive can veto a bill, the ultimate power still lies in the Congress while it is in session by the overriding veto. But there is a vast area of power consciously not made explicit by the framers of our Constitution who were aware of the curbs placed on the Executive without corresponding explicit curbs which the Executive could use in its relationship with the Congress, and it is in the use of this area that a President fails or succeeds in the government of his country.

It is because the fathers of this country had an image of what the President must be to match the responsibility of the office—decisive, subtle, informed, and imaginative—that this area of power exists. When the office of the President is filled with a man limited in the exercise of these qualities, the country must suffer. So it is today.

We have had, unfortunately, too many commissions and not enough decisions. We have had a reliance on the resonant phrase: "dynamic massive retaliation"; "liberation"; "agonizing reappraisal"; to catch the public mind. We have had to swing around from "liberation" to "containment." We have had an unleashing and a re-leashing of the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. We have had decisions made, remade, and un-made again, from the first decision that the Tachen Islands are vital to our defense to the un-made decision to evacuate the Tachens. We have had the decision of defending Quemoy and the Matsu Islands through the promise of Secretary Dulles to Chiang Kai-shek and again through "implications" in Mr. Dulles' foreign policy statement of last week. Now we are not quite sure what the decision will be since the President's statement to the Senate on the Formosa resolution. We have had the decision to defend Dien Bien Phu and then the decision not to defend Dien Bien Phu. What was at first the relentless decision not to consider the Chinese Communist government as either *de facto* or *de jure*, we now seek, through the language of the Formosa

treaty and through the efforts of cease-fire, to bring ourselves to the point of acknowledging the existence of two Chinese governments, one for the mainland and one for Formosa.

I do not quarrel with some of the decisions that have ultimately been made; I make only the point of the circuitous, contradictory routes that have been passed through to reach them.

Perhaps the severest test placed upon the office of the presidency is that of silence. In the delicate operations of negotiation upon which, perforce, the conduct of foreign affairs must hinge, there are changes from day to day which alter or amend earlier decisions. The volume and the complexity of such exchange among governments can be known to the President alone. The public cannot know what they are, nor should they. I am talking, mind you, of the day-to-day exchange among governments. Hence a dramatic announcement of policy must be watched lest it be tainted with the poison of prematurity.

We have seen just such a public scramble relative to the now ex-Premier of France, Mendes-France. It was first the violence directed against him in the repudiation of EDC by France, and then the reassessment upon the completion of the Paris agreements. Our policy in the Far East has been paralyzed by public statements emanating from the White House. Good intentions are not a substitute for firmness, nor over eagerness for public approval a substitute for delicacy and imagination.

This, of course, is not a brief for the withholding of information from the public. It is, rather, a reminder that the hasty jumping into public print carries with it a danger that public opinion, unaware of new and subtle developments, may compel a rigidity in the operation of foreign affairs which new developments no longer warrant. This eagerness for public announcement has already resulted in unnecessary confusion at home and abroad and has left the unwarranted impression that the United States leaps before it looks.

Hamilton has said it well in discussing the powers of the President:

"In the article which gives the legislative powers of the Government, the expressions are, 'All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.' In that which grants the executive power, the expressions are, 'The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States.' The enumeration ought therefore to be considered, as intended merely to specify the principal articles implied in the definition of executive power; leaving the rest to flow from the general grant of that power, interpreted in conformity with other parts of the Constitution, and with the principles of free government."

It is well that those of us who are concerned with the conduct of government become increasingly aware of the relationship between the office of the President and the Congress of the United States. The indispensable factor must be Presidential initiative. There has been—unfortunately, I say, despite the fact I am a Member of Congress—a growing dependency upon congressional support, in the conduct of our foreign affairs particularly. If this tendency develops to too great a degree, we shall find a radical disturbance in the distribution of powers, an imbalance which bodes ill for the country.

This growing imbalance can only be redressed by the man who, by the strength of his visions, understands the responsibilities, duties, and the powers of the office of the President.

Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the New York Times of February 22, 1955, entitled "Political Taxmaking" and an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, 1955, entitled "Tax Cuts a la Mode."

The editorials follow:

[From the New York Times of February 22, 1955]

POLITICAL TAXMAKING

The Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee approved yesterday a proposal to give a rebate of \$20 to every income-tax payer in 1955 and raise the allowance for each dependent by the same amount. This represents the application of politics to taxmaking in as pure form, we think, as even the oldest inhabitant will recall.

It is usually possible to clothe a move such as this with at least some semblance of financial or economic plausibility, however superficial. For example, a year ago the Democrats attempted to substitute an across-the-board reduction in personal exemptions for the administration's own carefully conceived program for tax reduction. At that time business activity was scraping the bottom of the 1953-54 readjustment. It was possible, in the circumstances, to make something, at least, of the argument that what the country needed was a shot of purchasing power such as that measure might be expected to produce. Today there isn't even the plausible pretext that existed a year ago. Yet Speaker RAYBURN, in discussing the proposal, is quoted as saying that such relief would "reach the people who would put the money back in circulation."

It is clear that Mr. RAYBURN hasn't followed very closely the figures on national income and its distribution. Because if he had he would know that people who put money back into circulation actually presented us with a record performance in the year just ended.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 23, 1955]

TAX CUTS A LA MODE

Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee engaged in a piece of capricious irresponsibility in approving an income-tax cut of \$20 a person. It is dismaying to see Speaker RAYBURN and Floor Leader McCORMACK lending their prestige to the disruptive kind of politicking. The chagrin of the Democrats over the administration's gambit in holding out hope of a tax cut in 1956 is, of course, understandable. The administration, too, has its eye on the 1956 campaign, and it attempted to steal the Democrats' thunder. The difference is that a cut at the end of this year would play hob with a budget already submitted. It comes with ill grace for the Democrats to be talking about greater defense expenditures and chiding the administration about an unbalanced budget, and then voting to unbalance the budget further.

Moreover, the cut is unnecessary as an economic stimulant. The economy has recovered from the recession, and the pious concern for the plight of low-income taxpayers has far more political than economic justification at this time. All groups benefited from the tax cuts last year. If a further reduction were warranted now, a broad interest in keeping the economy expanding would call for permitting the scheduled reduction in corporation taxes and the elimination of certain excises to take effect. The administration has opposed even these reductions in the current year, and possibly the Democratic strategy is to put the administration over a barrel by giving it a choice of accepting a \$20-per-person cut or a lapse in the higher corporation rate that could be exploited demagogically. The hope of curbing this jag of irresponsibility seems to lie in the Senate and in the statesmanship of such men as Senators GEORGE and BYRD.

Higher Pay for Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 24, 1955:

HIGHER PAY FOR CONGRESS

The Senate showed courage and good judgment in voting to increase the pay of its Members and of Federal judges by \$7,500 a year. It would have done even better to have accepted the House bill raising congressional salaries by \$10,000. Several groups of experts who have studied the subject have advised increases substantially higher than those voted by either house. The controlling fact is that both the judges and the legislators have been carrying responsibilities wholly out of keeping with their remuneration.

A few Members have sought to make political capital out of opposition to the increase. In this newspaper's opinion, they have been very ill advised. The country is not well served by keeping its judges and legislators worrying about how to make ends meet. In recent years, many able men have given up or turned away from careers in Congress and on the bench because of the economic sacrifices entailed, and a conviction has been growing that wealth is necessary to avoid constant embarrassment in public office. No system of representative government should be subjected to such strains.

Congress has delayed this pay raise for many years because of fear that it would be misunderstood. We have no doubt that it will now be misunderstood by a vast number of persons who know nothing about the expenses that a Congressman must bear. But the proper course was not to yield to uninformed sentiment on the subject, in the way Senator MOSS seemed to do on the Senate floor the other day. What is needed is a campaign to acquaint the people with the circumstances that make a pay increase for Members of Congress a national necessity. If the people have the facts, we do not think they will expect their Congressman to mortgage his home, to divert his energy into lecturing, or to accept expense money from potential lobbyists in order to pay the expenses incidental to his public service.

Members of Congress who voted against the pay increase will be strongly tempted to make a political issue of it in the next election as will the opponents of Members who voted for the raise. In each case it will be well to ask, however, whether the complainant is independently wealthy and whether he has accepted the increase in his own pay or will accept it if elected. If any Member honestly feels that he does not need the higher salary, nothing will prevent him from refusing to accept it. That would be an honorable course. But politicians ought to beware of making a political football out of this salary increase if they themselves are taking advantage of it or intend to do so if elected.

Saps or Self-Styled Saviors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal:

SAPS OR SELF-STYLED SAVIORS?

A shocking thing increasingly stands out in any consideration of when and about whom Harvey Matusow lied:

Lying has been made easy by the Government, the gullible, and the self-appointed saviors of the country.

There has been in this Nation, until the fever recently diminished, a willingness and even an eagerness to suspect anyone and everyone, particularly persons in public positions or in intellectual activities. That fervor for witch hunting has invited irresponsible, pathological or sinister individuals like Matusow to smear, falsify and fictionalize.

Our Government and those who made it their anointed task to capture a quota of suspects even if they had to be invented gave the professional witnesses money and notoriety for their lies and encouraged them to lie.

The manner in which Matusow was used and encouraged by men like Senator McCARTHY and Roy Cohn is a matter of record. How could they have helped knowing that some of the things he said were lies? The best that can be said about them in things Matusow lied about is that they were gullible or so irresponsible as not to have put his statements to the slightest test.

The same can be said for the Justice Department. Individuals like Matusow, Paul Crouch, Marie Natvig and others lied in testimony given before Government agencies or courts. The ordinary checks on veracity that police give stool pigeons were not applied to these witnesses. This created a situation which encouraged them to lie.

But not only Government and those in official positions were guilty of these irresponsibilities. Advertising agencies handling radio and television shows and others in private life eagerly listened to informers like Matusow. Performers and others lost their jobs because of false accusations. Matusow even sold lists of suspects, lists he now says were false.

Not all informers have been liars, of course. But enough have to cause widespread uneasiness over the possibility of injustices that still have not been brought to light. And enough have been liars to make Americans

ashamed of the irresponsibility of some of their officials who were more eager to believe ill of individuals than they were in verifying charges.

It's bad enough to know that some of our self-appointed saviors have been played for saps. It is shameful to see evidence that some have actually connived to play the American people for saps. The least that can be done now is for the Government to institute safeguards against liars, to punish those who have lied and those who may have connived, and to try to set the record straight on those who have been lied about.

Partisanship on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 21, 1955, entitled "Partisanship on Taxes":

PARTISANSHIP ON TAXES

Speaker RAYBURN and his Democratic colleagues in the House are treading on dangerous ground in their obviously partisan maneuver on taxes. This is not the time to talk about personal income tax cuts. The real tax issue before the country is what to do about the corporation and excise taxes that are due to expire April 1. President Eisenhower has urged a continuation of the special excise taxes on autos, tobacco, liquor, and gasoline for another year. He also wants to retain for another year the 52 percent corporation income tax which, under the present law, will fall to 47 percent. The special excises are onerous taxes that should not be allowed to become a fixed part of the tax structure. They should have some sort of priority, therefore, when there is talk about tax cuts. The same is true of the excessively high corporate tax.

The individual income tax has such a far-reaching effect on the operation of the national economy that partisan considerations should play no part in the making of policy regarding it. The fixing of the tax rates is no longer just a matter of equity but also is a matter of the highest economic importance. Today it is too early to know whether, from an economic viewpoint, it would be wise to cut individual income taxes later this year. What we do know is that the unbalanced state of the budget and the operation of our economy on a very high level are powerful arguments against tax cuts now. Before lower taxes are ordered, moreover, we need to know much more than we do now about this year's appropriations—appropriations for school and highway assistance, for example, and about the Asian aid program.

In his budget message last month, President Eisenhower sought to beat the Democrats to the punch by expressing the hope a general tax cut would be justified in 1956—a presidential election year. He even adopted the Democratic theory of cutting at the bottom of the personal income tax scale when he said a cut should be designed to spread relief among all taxpayers. Now the Democrats have retaliated in kind with a proposal that is purely partisan in origin and character. In doing so, they have

weakened their claim that they will not play politics with the national interest.

The administration will doubtless oppose this move with all its strength; it has no reasonable alternative. And this in itself is unfortunate because it tends to freeze the position of the two parties on the vital question of tax policy instead of leaving them free to adapt themselves to changing economic requirements.

The Dirty Business of Wiretapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial broadcast over station WMCA in New York City by Nathan Straus on Friday, February 18, 1955.

As I pointed out during the debate on the bill to permit wiretapping by the Federal Government in treason and espionage cases, the practice of wiretapping is continuing, and in fact, growing day by day. The recent disclosures in New York City of illegal wiretapping has once again brought this question to the fore. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the tapping of wires is prohibited by section 605 of the Communications Act; yet the law is being increasingly disregarded by the Federal Government and many States, as well as private individuals and organizations.

As I have pointed out before, the law should and must be enforced. Wiretapping is a police-state method, and should be stopped. I fully agree with the statement made by the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes when he said:

It is a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part.

The editorial follows:

THE DIRTY BUSINESS OF WIRETAPPING

(Editorial broadcast over station WMCA by Nathan Straus, Friday, February 18, 1955)

There is one precious freedom that we are in danger of losing in this country. It is freedom of communication over the telephone, the right to speak without fear of eavesdropping. Does this sound like an exaggeration? Does it strike you as though WMCA were making a mountain out of a molehill?

If you know the facts, you may feel differently.

The FBI is authorized by Federal law to tap private telephones and listen in on private telephone conversations. This specific authorization was given by the President, in 1941, shortly before our entry into World War II. The FBI has continued the practice in cases involving internal security. Attorney General Brownell so testified last year before a Senate committee.

While the FBI is authorized to tap private telephone wires, the information so obtained, according to Supreme Court decisions, is not admissible in court as legal evidence.

This confusion should be cleared up. If it is legal for the FBI to listen in on private telephone conversations, as and when it pleases so long as the claim is made that our internal security is involved—then evidence so obtained should be admissible in

court. If evidence obtained by secret wire tapping carried on by the FBI is not admissible in court, then the practice becomes not only morally dubious but legally useless—and it should be banned by law.

In most States—and New York is one of them—the use of State courts of evidence obtained by wire tapping is sanctioned. While the New York State constitution forbids wire tapping in general, the State law authorizes a judge of the New York Supreme Court or a county court to issue an order permitting secret wire tapping when a police officer above the rank of sergeant swears there is reasonable ground to believe that evidence of crime may thus be obtained.

As a New York Supreme Court justice recently pointed out, when such authorization to tap a private telephone is granted, the most intimate conversations, personal, social, professional, business, or even confidential, of an unlimited number of persons may be laid bare.

The fact is that the average judge in New York City readily signs mimeographed wire tapping orders presented by any police officer—an order that authorizes the tapping of someone's private telephone for up to 6 months. Of course, the public is not told how many wire tap orders the police obtain every year. But we do know from Supreme Court Justice Douglas' latest book, *An Almanac of Liberty*, that in 1952 in New York City a total of 58,000 wiretap orders were issued by judges. This is an average of more than 150 a day.

And even this is not the whole story.

There is reason to believe that New York City is honeycombed with wiretaps. Taps are put on wires not only by law enforcement officers, but by private individuals—illegally. Perpetrators are private detectives, divorce lawyers hunting for clues, unscrupulous business men manipulating large deals, labor racketeers, and occasional politicians.

The illegal wire tap is easily executed. A ten dollar bill slipped to a building superintendent may gain admittance, or it is not too difficult to pose as an employee of the telephone company who wants to check the equipment.

While our State law makes this kind of illegal wire tapping a crime, we have never heard of anyone being punished for it.

As the late Justice Brandeis pointed out, a wiretap is a dragnet. It enmeshes many innocent persons along with an occasional criminal. A certain switchboard, for instance, in an apartment house or a business office, may be tapped; as a result all the conversations held on lines leading into that switchboard are recorded—confidential talk between husbands and wives, between business associates, between close friends—words spoken with no thought of their being intercepted.

The same invasion of privacy occurs when a party line is tapped; every subscriber to that line, as well as every person who makes a call to anyone on the party line has his words recorded, unknown to him.

When you make a call from a public phone booth you feel sure you have absolute privacy. But it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that even the pay station may be tapped. Small wonder, is it, that the late Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Oliver Wendell Holmes, called wiretapping a dirty business?

These secret taps, so foreign to the practices of a free country, have grown and grown because the general public doesn't know how many or whose wires are tapped.

Wiretapping, both legal and illegal, has become so widespread that we think our lawmakers should get back to first principles and reread the fourth amendment of the Bill of Rights which says: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon prob-

able cause . . . and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

Certainly wiretapping is an unreasonable search, and a seizure without a proper warrant, since no court order authorizing secret wiretapping can name all the persons whose privacy will be invaded.

WMCA believes that the right to tap private telephone wires should be permitted to the FBI only in cases involving internal security or kidnapping, and only when the FBI shows that there is reasonable ground to believe an actual crime has been committed. An order to permit tapping of wires by the FBI should require the approval of a Federal judge, one in each district, especially empowered by the United States Supreme Court to grant applications for tapping. The order, when granted, should be valid for only 90 days, to be renewed if necessary.

The law should require that all wire tap recordings be sealed by the FBI and, if intended to be used in court, the law should require further that they be supplied to the counsel for the defense. Finally, the Department of Justice should be required to publish monthly and annual reports on the number of wiretaps it had made, together with the number of prosecutions and convictions resulting from wire tapping. The law should provide strict punishment for all unauthorized wiretapping.

As for the New York State law, WMCA believes that denying the police the right to tap wires would represent a far greater social gain than loss. We agree with the *Wall Street Journal* that the medicine of wiretapping, the invasion of many people's privacy, is worse than the illness, a possible unapprehended bookmaker or other criminal. Justice Holmes has well said, "It is a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part."

Our New York State law, it is true, would not be so dangerous to civil liberty if it were strictly interpreted by the judges. But, however, strictly safeguarded against abuse, wiretapping is a practice that is rather a fit tool for a police state than a proper technique for criminal apprehension in a democracy.

WMCA believes it is high time that the "dirty business" of wiretapping, as Justice Holmes characterized it, be curbed lest it spread and spread until we have lost beyond recall one of our basic freedoms, the right to be let alone, which the same Justice described as "the right most valued by civilized man."

Wheat for the People Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I sent a letter to President Eisenhower urging him to give his approval to a proposal to send some of our surplus wheat to feed starving people behind the Iron Curtain. I suggested in my letter that it be undertaken as a "people to people project" and listed four major reasons why such a project should be adopted.

I was gratified to see a few days later that a newspaper like the *New York Daily News*, which is certainly known for its anti-Communist views, devoted an

editorial to my proposal and spoke of it as an interesting and provocative suggestion.

For the information of my colleagues in Congress and the country at large, I am placing into the Record the text of my letter to the President, as well as the brief editorial from the New York Daily News of February 23, 1955:

FEBRUARY 19, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT,

*The White House,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1955, carries a story on the front page that there is before you a proposal to offer to Premier Bulganin of the Soviet Union some of the surplus wheat in our country "to relieve human suffering due to the officially announced breakdown of Malenkov's collectivized farm program." According to the same story, you and the members of your Cabinet will consider this proposal within the next few days.

I am writing this letter to urge you to consider this proposal at the earliest possible moment and to give it your approval. I am informed that our surplus of wheat reaches a total of 675 million bushels, which is enough for a 2-year supply for our own country—not counting the 1955 wheat crop. In other words, as far as the people of the United States are concerned, we are confronted with a problem of surplus rather than with the threat of a shortage. We could safely spare fifty or one hundred million bushels without seriously depleting our reserves.

Aside from the surplus factor, however, there are three other very good reasons why this proposal has merit:

First, it would be a worthwhile humanitarian act in the best American traditions to use part of our food surpluses to relieve famine-afflicted areas. We have done this on numerous occasions in the past, and surely we can afford to show our mercy in this instance, too.

Second, it would be an act of good will on our part toward the people of Russia, for it would prove to them that we seek peace and friendly relations. A gesture of this kind may perhaps be the beginning of improved relationship between the two countries and a lessening of international tensions which the whole world would cherish.

Third, it would be a desirable act from the standpoint of propaganda for the United States and its way of life since it would show up the glaring weaknesses in the Soviet economic structure which cannot feed its people properly. Nations throughout the world, whether allied with us, neutral or opposed to us, would surely take notice of this need of mercy on our part even to those who are supposed to be our enemies. The fact has always been emphasized by us that we have no complaint against the Russian people, but rather against their leaders who lust for power and world conquest.

Let this come then as an offer from the people of the United States to the people of Russia with whom we have no quarrel and with whom we desire to live in peace. In other words, let us try to make it a people to people project. We stand to gain nothing by denying this food to the hungry Russian people, except their hatred. We can have high hopes of gaining their friendship by extending to them a helping hand in an hour of need.

Given to them under these circumstances, it would be most difficult for the Russian leaders to reject our offer. Such callous disregard of human lives for selfish political motives would surely earn them the everlasting enmity of their own people.

Cordially yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Daily News of February 23, 1955]

SOME WHEAT FOR RUSSIANS

Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat of New York, has gone on record as urging President Eisenhower to offer some of this Nation's surplus wheat to the semistarved Russian people. He feels, without much chance of contradiction, that we could spare 50 or 100 million bushels of the stuff.

This looks like an interesting and provocative suggestion to us. Certainly, from the standpoint of propaganda, it would put the Kremlin slavemasters on a two-way spot. If they accept the bread-makings, they're admitting in public that the despised capitalist system can feed its citizens and even grow excess food, which Communists can't. If they turn the offer down, they're notifying the world that Russian hunger couldn't bother them less.

HOW ABOUT OUR FRIENDS?

But, on the other hand, how about our friends who might be able to use some of that grub? Shouldn't they get first whack at our excess? Japan, for instance, is banking more and more heavily on wheat as a solution to her diet problem. Japanese schoolkids are learning to enjoy bread instead of rice in their school lunches.

There no doubt are other angles to this one. But in no other nation on earth has a responsible official proposed such a people's friendship gesture. With proper safeguards, this proposed wheat deal might go far toward convincing the miserly Russian people that the outside world is aware of their plight, and is willing to do something about it.

Address by Hon. James P. Mitchell,
Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include the following address by Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, before the brotherhood dinner, sponsored by the Washington region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Tuesday, February 22, 1955:

There is a synagogue in Washington which bears these words: "To the glory of God and the brotherhood of man." All of us—regardless of our religion—would do well to dedicate our lives in this fashion.

The very discovery of America contains lessons in brotherly cooperation for all of us. In fact, the brotherhood of the New World was quite literally the result of unbrotherly acts in the Old World.

We are all familiar with the fact that many of those who first settled in America were motivated by a yearning for religious freedom. And the great diversity of groups settling in our country was apparent from the very beginning. We had the English settlement at Jamestown, Va., in 1607, the Dutch at New Amsterdam in 1614, the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock in 1620, and the Jews who landed in New York in 1655.

These were among the forerunners of the mass migrations to our shores for 3 centuries. Here millions of people have found the fulfillment of their dreams of freedom, brotherhood and opportunity.

Here we have built a country in which the highest and best aspirations of individual human beings can be realized and rewarded. Here we have everything necessary for people to lead their lives in freedom, with dignity and with charity and brotherhood toward their fellow man.

We can be proud of what we have accomplished, but we cannot be satisfied, even today, with the conditions within our own land. Just this month, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America advised its 35 million members that racial prejudice is sinful and un-Christian.

It would be nice if we could say that from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, and from Sandy Hook to the Golden Gate, all Americans were brothers and prejudice, discrimination and intolerance were nonexistent.

Unfortunately, however, despite all the progress of 350 years, we still have far to go. Less than 2 months ago, a leading public opinion analyst estimated that "discrimination in employment wastes \$10 out of every \$75 paycheck on the phony luxury of indulgence in our prejudices." He estimated that the annual cost of discrimination to American business and industry is \$30 billion annually.

We all know of persons who preach brotherhood but do not practice it. Covert quotas still exist in some colleges and prep schools. Some businesses drastically restrict the level to which persons from minority groups may rise. One manufacturer will not have a Negro in a secretarial position; a law firm will not permit a Catholic to become a partner; an industrial enterprise will not promote Jews to executive positions; a financial institution will hire only native-born Americans. Some private employment services accept job orders that say "gentiles only," "white only," or "no non-Caucasians."

These forms of discrimination are still prevalent today. Unfortunately they sometimes occur even in firms whose officers or owners claim to practice brotherhood. They protest with indignant self-righteousness that some of their best friends are Jews, or that they have nothing against Negroes, but—

We may properly ask: How come all this at this late date? What is stopping us as a people, individually and collectively, from living up to the principles we profess? Why aren't we translating into daily living those basic tenets which are the foundation of every religion?

In a country in which persons of various races and creeds have served in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal, State, and local Governments, how can we afford to reject any man, upon the basis of his race or religion or national origin? Have we not seen persons of every type make invaluable contributions to the national well-being, both in public and private life? Have not business, the arts, the sciences, the professions, labor, and public service benefited from the contributions of all the highly diversified population of our country? Who can stand before God and say that he is better than his neighbor because of the color of his skin, the way he worships God, or the country from which his ancestors came?

In a world that is one-third yellow, one-third brown, and one-third white, how can America maintain its position of leadership if we consider inferior the non-white, two-thirds of the world's people?

To ask these questions is to answer them. It is obvious that there is neither excuse nor justification for prejudice and discrimination. It is clear that as a Nation, both domestically and internationally, we are injured by prejudice and intolerance.

More than 2,500 years ago, the brotherhood of man became the Jewish fundamental law. As long ago as 500 B. C., Confucius said, "All

within the 4 seas are brethren." About 2,000 years ago, Christ taught us that we must love thy neighbor as thyself.

And we here in the United States have the words and actions of our own leaders to teach us the need for brotherhood and love of our fellowman.

When George Washington visited the Hebrew congregation at Newport, R. I., Moses Seixas, the warden of the synagogue, referred with a great sense of gratitude to the privilege of living under a Government which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance; but generously affording to all liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship, deeming every one, of whatever nation, tongue, or language, equal parts of the great Government machine.

President Washington set the theme and direction of our national aims when he replied, "It is now no more that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoy the exercise of their inherent natural right, for, happily, the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that those who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Thomas Jefferson expressed the epitome of brotherhood when he said, "All men are created equal."

It was for Abraham Lincoln to emancipate the slaves and officially remove this stain upon our democracy. In his life and literature, Lincoln left us a heritage of brotherly love, "with malice toward none; with charity for all."

Our progress toward full democracy for all our people has been slow. Minority groups have had a long and tedious climb to obtain fair treatment. Those who pioneered in breaking down racial and religious barriers showed courage and foresight. Down through the years, one after the other of our Presidents has by word and deed contributed to the forward march of democracy and the greater acceptance of brotherhood.

From President Jackson to President Eisenhower, our Chief Executives have shown that people can be appointed to high office regardless of religion or race.

Since Lincoln's day the Negro has made steady progress. One occupies today a sub-Cabinet position, and another has for several years sat on the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. Segregation has been eliminated in the Armed Forces.

It was in 1948 that the Supreme Court struck down the restrictive covenant on real estate; and it was in 1950 that the Court opened the doors of white universities and colleges to Negroes who could not get equal facilities elsewhere.

In 1954 the Supreme Court found that segregation in the public-school system is repugnant to our Constitution.

The clause in Government procurement contracts which prohibits racial and religious discrimination in employment is being enforced vigorously through the work of the President's Government Contract Committee.

You can see that there is no one person, no one party, and no one era that can claim credit for all that has been done. Sometimes our progress has been greater, sometimes less. The fact that we have moved constantly forward, however, speaks well for the American people. It denotes their determination to take those steps necessary to make our democracy grow and to strengthen our institutions and our people.

If the progress of the past is any key to the future, it is safe to predict that in the lifetimes of many of those now sitting in this room, the last traces of discrimination

based on race, color, creed, or national origin will be swept away.

The America free of prejudice which I foresee will not come by itself. It will require the continued efforts and determination of groups such as the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It will require the continued observance of Brotherhood Week on an ever larger scale. It will require patience, understanding, cooperation, and good will. It will require the translation into our daily living—at work, in our schools, and at our places of worship—of all the principles of brotherhood.

In Brotherhood Week we have a great opportunity for the Christian to prove his practical Christianity and the Jew to prove his devotion to the teachings of his fathers. This is not asking too much for people of good will. It is not beyond the reach of those who wish to practice the principles to which we as a Nation are devoted.

We are all aware of the fact that children of every race, color, and creed can play together without difficulties. They even overcome barriers imposed by language differences, and by disparity in age. It is only from their elders that they learn the prejudice which corrodes and warps their spirits and hardens their hearts.

We have shown in many of our houses of worship, in hundreds of thousands of businesses across the land and in the Armed Forces that there is no more reason for adults to discriminate against their fellow human beings than there is for children to do so. We have shown that persons of all races, creeds, and national origins can work and live together in the military forces, in peace and war. Numerous employers and workers attest to the ease with which all types of persons can work together smoothly, efficiently, and profitably. And in thousands of communities across the land, persons of different races can pray together.

These examples of brotherhood in action have demonstrated conclusively that it can be done and that it should be done. I am convinced that reason and principle will prevail and that we shall continue to make progress until we have achieved our goal.

So far I have discussed only the discrimination based upon race, religion, or national origin. Other types of prejudice are equally costly and equally unjustified.

We are faced with a growing problem of discrimination against those of mature and advanced age. The extreme accent on youth which seems to be a part of our current national philosophy is not justified by the facts. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that the older workers, properly placed, are more steady, more reliable, and at least as productive as their younger fellows. In safety and attendance the records they compile set examples for younger workers to follow to advantage. Management's investment in training them is amply justified by the lower turnover rate among mature and older workers.

As a nation, we are growing older, both with respect to the population as a whole and our labor force. There are 42 percent more workers over 45 today than there were in 1940. There are 40 percent more workers over 65 than there were 15 years ago. This trend seems certain to be accelerated in the years ahead. It is estimated that by 1970 almost half of our people of voting age will be 45 or over.

In addition to the moral wrong involved, we cannot afford the waste that is caused by discrimination against older workers. It is far more profitable to have them productive than on public assistance.

This is another area in which we must work to break down prejudice and promote understanding.

There is still one other form of prejudice which is worth studying, and that is on the

basis of sex. While women are accepted as the boss in the home, they are not always accorded the status of equals in the labor market. The affection which we feel for mothers, wives, and daughters is not always translated into an equal break for women workers at the employment office. In addition, we too often pay women less money for the same work than we would pay to a man who did that job.

The brotherhood tradition is to use each and every one of our human resources. The increasing acceptance of women in all phases of this country's activities is evidence of the progress being made in the achievement of the goals for which we are working. Both President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Eisenhower named a woman as a member of their Cabinet. Women have served our Nation as Ambassadors—our present Ambassador to Italy is a woman. Women are Members of the Congress and of State legislatures, and a number of them are serving as judges. Large numbers of women hold important posts in State, county, and local governments. And business and industry depend in large measure upon women workers. The total number of women workers, as of the latest estimate, approached 19 million. This was close to a third of the total working population of the Nation.

We in America have far less manpower than do the Communists. In numbers we stand no chance of matching them. Our effectiveness must be based upon the training and skill of our workers and the utilization we make of the talents they acquire. Those prejudices we still have based on race, color, religion, national origin, age, or sex hamper us in the effective utilization of our manpower. To that extent they weaken our country and impair our chances of survival. As individuals and as a Nation, we cannot afford the cost of this prejudice.

I am glad to see that there seems to be a growing awareness of this fact. There seems to be a real determination on the part of millions of Americans to throw off the blinders of discrimination and prejudice. There seems to be a growing realization that each man and woman is entitled to be judged upon the basis of his or her merits. There could be no better philosophy to guide us in our daily living than that which He enunciated in the Golden Rule 2,000 years ago.

If we are to achieve our goals in the field of brotherhood, all of us must (1) practice brotherhood in our daily lives; (2) teach and train and hire and promote upon the basis of ability alone, without regard to race, religion, color, or national origin; (3) urge others with whom we work, study, pray, or socialize to practice and promote brotherhood; (4) be positive and courageous in our attitude toward brotherhood.

If we will all follow these general rules every day of the year, we shall succeed in making a real contribution toward the strengthening and improvement of our great democracy.

Intellectual Freedom, Oppenheimer, and National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, last summer, soon after the release of the findings by the Personnel Security Board in the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, Mr.

Glenn A. McLain, director of the Eastern Kentucky State College's Center of International Relations, wrote an article entitled "Intellectual Freedom, Oppenheimer, and National Security."

I had fully expected to have the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before the close of the session. Even though the Oppenheimer case has slipped in news value, I believe the thoughts embodied in the article written by this university professor are very deserving of our thoughtful consideration today.

The article is written in two parts, the first of which follows, and it is my intention to insert the second part in tomorrow's RECORD:

INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM, OPPENHEIMER, AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The beginnings of a great debate are becoming apparent concerning the Oppenheimer case. Since the release of the findings by the Personnel Security Board in the case of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and the Atomic Commission hearings, much heat and not much light have been thrown upon this very vital matter. American scientific groups have rushed into print criticizing the decision. Many of these groups failed to wait until the complete report was published before offering their comments. This type of hasty action before the facts were all in has been followed by a great deal of rash editorial comment. The usual special articles by columnists who are automatically against any investigations have been delivered with much alacrity. These dispensers of public information would do well to carefully analyze the findings before trying to mold public opinion in this matter. The climate of opinion in America is of such a negative type in this age of suspicion that many supporters of American liberties seem to be guilty of using the same kind of smear tactics they so often deplore. Let us examine these issues carefully before drawing conclusions which strike at the heart of two fundamental problems present in America today—intellectual freedom for the individual and national security.

The American people cannot be expected to read the 32 pages of closely printed report material inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 2, 1954, pages 7095-7105. Those who enjoy their reading on the slick paper format can find the report in full in the June 11, 1954, issue of U. S. News & World Report. While few people can be expected to have, or to take the time to read these documents, the general public has the right to expect the gentlemen of the press, TV, and radio to give us the facts from the original sources. Perhaps this will eventually be the case, but it seems apparent that the American temper is not to weigh the original facts before formulating opinion. Is this too much to expect in 1954? Have we traveled so far down the road to intellectual serfdom that clichés such as the suppression of scientific thought, banishment of the unorthodox, and many others pass unchallenged by the American people? Does the American public actually trust the executive branch of our Government or must we actually relinquish power to legislative servants and informational savants who write before they read? These are some of the side issues which append themselves to this case. Let us go to the report itself for a true understanding of these problems.

The Gray board members stated the dilemma facing them in making their decision. They deplored the fact that free citizens cannot exercise uninhibited judgment because of the requirements of national security. The security system of the United States was thus considered to be on trial both in matters of procedure and as to sub-

stance. The three board members, Mr. Gordon Gray, president of the University of North Carolina; Mr. Thomas Morgan, former head of the Sperry Gyroscope Co.; and Maurice V. Evans, chemistry professor of Loyola University, concurred in the view that public opinion in America has polarized itself in two directions. The first was that our security program was compounded of fear, prejudice, and arbitrary judgments. The second point was that in recent years our Government had been less than careful of loose or pliable attitudes toward security. Cognizant of these facts, the board approached its task in a spirit of inquiry. Even the most bitter critic of investigations would have to admit the hearings were carried on with an air of impartiality, objectivity, and scrupulous fairness. Dr. Oppenheimer was allowed familiarity with the contents of every relevant document in the case. He was given the opportunity to cross-examine all witnesses and was represented by counsel, four in number, at all times. In his own words "he received patient and courteous consideration at the hands of the board." The entire proceeding was based upon the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, and subsequent acts or decisions made by the Commission and executive branch since that time.

The decision of the board may be evaluated in terms of four issues of importance: The activities and sympathies of Oppenheimer from 1940-45, "his susceptibility to influence" during this period, "the arrogance of judgment" of Oppenheimer during the entire period of his Government service, and his opinions concerning the H-bomb crash program since the Truman directive to produce this weapon.

In a detailed series of findings covering the period from 1940 until 1945 specifically and some activities since that time the Board states that Dr. Oppenheimer had shown little doubt he was deeply involved from 1936 until 1942 with many people who were active Communists. It was further concluded that Oppenheimer's activities perhaps diminished after his filing of a personnel security questionnaire in April 1942. The first affirmative action on the part of Dr. Oppenheimer in this report was his resignation from the independent citizens' committee of the arts, sciences, and professions. The Board would have preferred to have found an affirmative action at an earlier date.

In the criteria for the evaluation of these activities of Oppenheimer the Board found that:

1. There is no indication of disloyalty on the part of Dr. Oppenheimer by reason of any present Communist affiliation.
2. Oppenheimer had bad judgment in continuing his past associations into the present.
3. Oppenheimer is concluded to be a loyal citizen.

It would, therefore, seem that Oppenheimer was judged clear of complicity in reference to his activities before 1945.

The second issue of importance was that of Oppenheimer's susceptibility to influence in matters of judgment. Under the provisions of President Eisenhower's Executive Order No. 10450 criteria for removing an individual from a sensitive security position were given to be "for any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual might be subjected to coercion . . . or which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of national security." In the findings the Board clearly found that "there was a susceptibility to influence or coercion within the meaning of the criteria" although it was also admitted Oppenheimer's actions might merely be called bad judgment.

The most important example of coercion or influence revolved around Oppenheimer's contacts with Dr. Edward Condon. Dr. Condon had openly protested Oppenheimer's efforts to have a Communist physicist deferred

from the Army at the request of Oppenheimer. The physicist, Giovanni Lomanitz, had received his job at the University of California Radiation Laboratory at the insistence of Oppenheimer. This happened in 1943, but in 1949, Lomanitz and another Oppenheimer friend, David Bohn, both refused to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the usual constitutional grounds.

In the findings, Oppenheimer admitted his close professional association with these two Communists. He also affirmed the allegations that he had known Lomanitz was very much a Red from the first and that he gave Bohn a recommendation for a position in Brazil despite the fact he was worried about Bohn having pleaded the fifth amendment before the Un-American Activities Committee. Dr. Condon wrote about the Lomanitz case in a great sense of outrage. Another incident between Dr. Condon and Dr. Oppenheimer is of great significance. Dr. Oppenheimer testified before the Un-American Activities Committee in 1949 that one Dr. Peters was a dangerous Red and former Communist. After this testimony appeared in the newspapers, Oppenheimer repudiated his statements as a result of protestations by Dr. Condon and other scientists. This was the first strong indication that the scientific brotherhood had begun to exert pressure on Oppenheimer. In the findings, the Board concluded that Oppenheimer had failed to appreciate the impropriety of making statements of one character in a secret session and of a different character for publication. The almost clannish loyalty of the scientific group was clearly shown as Dr. Condon had first bitterly assailed Oppenheimer, but when the Oppenheimer testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee was repudiated, Condon supported his friend as before. In this second issue of importance the Board finally concluded that "while loyalty to one's friends is a noble quality . . . being loyal to one's friends above reasonable obligations to one's country and to the security system . . . is not clearly in the interests of security."

The third issue of importance was the matter of Oppenheimer's arrogance of judgment. This matter touches upon the importance of intellectual freedom. Modern war is conceived and developed by intellectuals, including physicists, whose professional existence depends upon the right to make mistakes. Few men of intellectual capacity would quarrel with this principle. However, according to the findings of the Board, Oppenheimer has gone a step further in the matter of intellectual freedom. "He has repeatedly exercised an arrogance of his own judgment with respect to the loyalty and reliability of other citizens to an extent which has frustrated and at times impeded the workings of the system." Several cases of this type of arrogance are cited in the findings, but the Chevalier case illustrates the point of the Board decision. Dr. Chevalier is an old friend of Oppenheimer. Some indication of Oppenheimer's opinion of his friend may be gained from the findings' analysis of this association which stated: "Dr. Oppenheimer declined in 1946 to discuss a meeting of Communists at the home of Chevalier on the ground that it was irrelevant." Although Oppenheimer was interviewed by security agents several times during his Los Alamos work concerning this and other front meetings where Chevalier and other friends congregated with him, blank refusals were consistently made until the Board hearings.

Dr. Chevalier's Communist background and association were clearly known and admitted by Oppenheimer in the hearings. In item 23 of the findings, Oppenheimer clearly admitted that Chevalier had solicited security information for transmission to Russian scientists in 1943. This information was re-

fused by Oppenheimer. In that same year Oppenheimer refused to identify Chevalier as a Soviet agent for the security agencies. Later, Oppenheimer identified three other Soviet agents to the proper authorities after he was ordered by a superior to divulge the information. But he still refused to identify Chevalier.

Although Chevalier visited Oppenheimer at his home and tried unsuccessfully to get this classified information, Oppenheimer lied to Colonel Landsdale on August 26, 1943, concerning the details of this incident. During the hearing Oppenheimer admitted his complicity in this case and said he was an idiot and that he knew Chevalier was deeply involved. Apparently Oppenheimer learned nothing from this mistake as his connections with Chevalier continue until the present time.

Chevalier and Oppenheimer consulted together in 1946 after Chevalier had been interviewed by the FBI. In 1950 Chevalier wrote Oppenheimer asking him the details of his testimony before the Un-American Activities Committee. In view of the fact that Oppenheimer knew without a shadow of a doubt of Chevalier's long record of Communist complicity, as well as Chevalier's open solicitation of American atomic secrets, it seems strange that Oppenheimer would consent to give Chevalier a summary of what he, Oppenheimer, had testified before the Un-American Activities Committee. The importance of this Oppenheimer letter was highlighted in the findings by the statement that this letter was later used by Chevalier in support of his application for a passport.

In December 1953, after these incidents should have resulted in a break between the two for the purposes of national security, Oppenheimer visited Chevalier in Paris. At this meeting, after the nature of the cold war could no longer be in doubt even to the most naive citizen, Chevalier informed Oppenheimer that he had used his name to establish a claim for a job with the United Nations as translator. Chevalier explained his problem to Oppenheimer as one of a security nature. He was worried because he was under investigation by the U. N. and was doubtful whether he would be cleared. Oppenheimer quickly responded to this crisis by dining with an official in the United States Embassy, although he denied assisting Chevalier in keeping his passport.

In summation of this third issue of importance in the Oppenheimer case, it is interesting to note Oppenheimer's continuing affirmation of friendship with this Communist, this open espionage agent of Russia and ideological intellectual. Dr. Oppenheimer, in his testimony, has stated that his association with Chevalier has continued and he still considers him to be his friend. The average citizen in our democracy might well ask: "Does the free flow of science require association between free scientists and Communists? Is it a threat to intellectual freedom if the genius is restrained from open association with Communists?" If so, the ordinary rules of our security system must be changed for the species homo genius. This type of action would seem to be incompatible with the workings of our security system which is firmly based upon the realization that Communist scientists are not free and that they are dedicated to the destruction of the West. No political party in America could institute security regulations on any other basis. No pious speeches will make America fit for world leadership. Only our conduct is the criteria. This conduct must apply to all citizens, geniuses as well as typists. Or so reads the decision of the Board which said, "Dr. Oppenheimer's continuing conduct and associations have reflected a serious disregard for the requirements of the security system."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentations be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbutt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thos. G., Miss.-----6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----3971 Langley Ct.,
Apt. 596-B
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, John J., Jr., Calif.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4545 Conn. Ave.
Andersen, August H., Minn.-----
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----5309 2d St.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio.-----
Bailey, Cleveland M., W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio.-----
Beamer, John V., Ind.-----110 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Becher, Page, Okla.-----
Bell, John J., Tex.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----7304 Bradley Blvd.
Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----2720 Terrace
Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio.-----
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----
Bolton, Frances P., Ohio.-----2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., Ohio.-----
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., Ill.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Brooks, Jack B., Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio.-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., Ind.-----
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buchanan, Vera, Pa.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho.-----
Burdick, Usher L., N. Dak.-----
Burleson, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Burnside, M. G., W. Va.-----
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrd, Robert C., W. Va.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carlyle, F. Ertel, N. C.-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., Pa.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., Nebr.-----
Chatham, Thurmond, N. C.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----

Chipperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Christopher, George H., Mo.-----
Chudoff, Earl, Pa.-----
Church, Marguerite Stitt, Ill.-----2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----
Clevenger, Cliff, Ohio.-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, N. Y.-----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, Oreg.-----
Cooper, Jere, Tenn.-----The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., N. Y.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., Conn.-----
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., Ind.-----
Cunningham, Paul, Iowa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Davidson, Irwin D., N. Y.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., Wis.-----2550 South Joyce,
Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William A., Utah.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Deane, Charles B., N. C.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dempsey, John J., N. Mex.-----2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Devereux, James P. S., Md.-----
Dies, Martin, Tex.-----
Diggs, Charles O., Jr., Mich.-----The Congressional
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----
Dodd, Thomas J., Conn.-----
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Dolliver, James L., Iowa.-----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., Mich.-----The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Donovan, James G., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., Pa.-----3101 4th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Ellsworth, Harris, Oreg.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, Calif.-----3840 Lorcom Lane
Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klingie St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio.-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., N. Mex.-----200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., N. Y.-----
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., Mont.-----
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----3627 Chesapeake
St.
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----1521 Mount Eagle
Pl., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----3251 Q St.
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., Tenn.-----Fairfax Hotel
Freelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., N. J.-----3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gamble, Ralph A., N. Y.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
Gentry, Brady, Tex.-----
George, Myron V., Kans.-----3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., Ill.-----

Granahan, William T., Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith, Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Gregory, Noble J., Ky.-----2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa.-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Gwinn, Ralph W., N. Y.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Hale, Robert, Maine.-----2722 N St.
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, N. J.-----
Harden, Cecil M., Ind.-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----4519 So. 34th St.,
Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., Nebr.-----
Harvey, Ralph, Ind.-----110 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, Ark.-----314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, Mich.-----
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----104 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., Ohio.-----125 Marthas Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hesclton, John W., Mass.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio.-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hill, William S., Colo.-----110 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., Calif.-----
Hinshaw, Carl, Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa.-----2108 Sultland
Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., Ill.-----
Hollfield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holmes, Hal, Wash.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Hope, Clifford R., Kans.-----3541 Brandywine
St.
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr., Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Hyde, DeWitt S., Md.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
James, Benjamin F., Pa.-----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jenkins, Thomas A., Ohio.-----The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa.-----The Washing-
ton House
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Leroy, Calif.-----630 North Caro-
lina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----215 Constitution
Ave. NE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----3613 Greenway
Pl., Alexandria,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., Ala.-----
Jones, Woodrow W., N. C.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Kean, Robert W., N. J.-----2435 Kalorama
Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), N. Y.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., N. Y.-----1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, W. Va.-----
Kelley, Augustine B., Pa.-----
Kelly, Edna F., N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, Karl C., Pa.-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio.-----
Klein, Arthur G., N. Y.-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Knutson, Coys, Minn.-----
Krueger, Otto, N. Dak.-----The Coronet

Appendix

Let's Put America First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] before the Dallas Public Affairs Club and the Committee of One Hundred, at Dallas, Tex., on February 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S PUT AMERICA FIRST

(Address by Hon. WILLIAM E. JENNER, of Indiana)

It is always a pleasure for me to leave Washington and travel to one of our great States, to meet with the people there and to discuss our national problems. I believe fervently the strength of our Nation resides not in the Capital but in the vast expanse of our country. Empires are represented by, as they are governed by, their capital cities. Free countries are not divided into a capital city and the provinces which are ruled by it.

It is a special pleasure for me to come to Texas, because in my State of Indiana we still believe the United States is a Union of sovereigns, and our State is in every respect the sovereign equal of the Federal Government. There is no deference in Indiana to the glamour and show which are now so evident in Washington. We believe that we, the people, govern the country, and Washington is the front office, part of the administrative headquarters. I am sure that doctrine will sound right and proper in the State of Texas.

It is a favorite argument of the collectivists that foreign policy is something remote and abstract, which can be understood only by experts who have spent years in the precincts of the State Department or on the staffs of certain daily newspapers. Congressmen, who have not had the benefit of long indoctrination in the mysteries, and you, who do not even breathe the air of Washington, are supposed to sit patiently and wait until the great minds have handed down what you may know.

Americans never accepted such nonsense. Our greatest diplomatic achievements were the work of laymen, who had spent most of their years in private life. In the last few years we have been bewildered and bemused by foreign relations experts in Washington offices, but the moment has come when the American people need to decide what kind of foreign policy they wish to stand for, and then tell our Government to follow it.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S COMMITMENT TO THE FREE NATIONS

President Eisenhower's message on defense of the nationalist stronghold on Formosa will certainly be a landmark in American foreign affairs, but what kind of a landmark it will be is not yet certain.

First let us look at the documents themselves—the message of the President, and the resolution of Congress supporting the President's position.

In the words of the message and the resolution, the United States reaffirms its close ties with its loyal ally, the Nationalist Government of China, and makes a commitment to defend the Nationalist stronghold with American military power if the Communists carry out their threat to attack it.

This statement does not solve all the problems of our foreign policy in the western Pacific. There is no good reason why it should be. We have had 20 years of mismanagement of our activities in Asia. It is not reasonable to ask that any single statement clear away all the confusion.

The message is significant because it deals with the most important question. We have announced that we shall tolerate no new retreat in Asia. The Red Chinese will not be permitted to breach the frontiers of the still free world. We will make it clear that we shall meet Communist military action with military action, the only argument the Communists understand. We will not start the shooting, but if the Communists choose to start a war, we will finish it.

A foreign policy carefully worked out in many conferences, publicly stated on the authority of the Chief Executive, and supported by Congress and both parties, should be firm as a rock.

But I say to you, what you know well, that the foreign policy established in the Formosa papers is not firm at all. The fact that it is clearly stated in a Presidential message, and formally approved by the legislative branch, may mean nothing. It is wholly possible that we shall follow the opposite policy of appeasement of the Communists, surrender of our advantage, and a sellout of our loyal allies in Asia.

Why am I so certain that the wishes of the American President, the American Congress, and the American people, may be flouted?

TWO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY CENTERS

The reason is, briefly, that we have two lines of authority in foreign policymaking. One is the line of responsibility laid down in our Constitution and followed by all those who believe in our Constitution. The other is a network whose members deliberately disregard our Constitution, our President, and our Congress, and act as a law unto themselves.

The sad fact is that no public document, no formal commitment, no legal mandate, can determine American foreign policy today. Our fluctuating foreign policy is a tug of war between these two forces. It is an unsettled question which group will be triumphant in the struggle to shape our Nation's destiny.

We have seen again and again in the last two decades, that the foreign policy put forward in our public statements, is not the foreign policy carried out by our Government.

This is not because the American Government has suddenly become untrustworthy. That would be a most inaccurate statement of what has happened.

The reason is that the American Government is a two-headed monster. It is led by two different organizing centers. The never-settled question of which center is to determine our foreign policies has kept us in

constant turmoil, and made us look futile and ineffectual before the world.

This conflict between two heads of our Government will not end until one or the other is wholly defeated, uprooted, and destroyed.

For years now our Government has been pulled in two opposite directions in making its decisions.

ONE CENTER IS PRO-SOVIET

The hearings of the so-called Tydings committee disclosed clear evidence, in spite of the whitewash, that a powerful and ruthless group were guiding our decisions to the advantage of the Soviet Union. This was not news. Committees of Congress had been making the same charge for years.

The Russell committee, which investigated the dismissal of General MacArthur, and investigations by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, showed that a secret faction in our Government had worked out its own foreign policy, to suit its own ends, and had by infinite skill, patience, and ruthlessness, put it into effect, regardless of the legally established foreign policy set by Congress and by our President.

Throughout all of 1951 and 1952 the Congress, especially the Senate, was engaged in a great debate to turn the light on this secret foreign policy and destroy its influence.

You know the achievements of this secret group.

After the defeat of Japan in World War II, our official foreign policy was to defend and strengthen the Nationalist Government of China. But the secret faction in our Government was determined we should support the Chinese Reds. In the name of the United States Government, they insisted on a united front government in China, with the Communist rebels retaining their own armed forces. Our representative gave the Reds a long cease-fire by which they could rest and re-equip their armies, and he set up an embargo on American bullets for the guns of the defenders.

Since 1950 we have had two policies for the Nationalist Government on Formosa. Our official policy was to support the legal Government and help rearm the Nationalist forces. Congress voted the money again and again as proper for our own defense. But the hidden faction in our Government intended that we should "disengage ourselves"—as the polite phrase goes—from the Nationalists. Their real policy for Formosa paralleled the famous advice of Owen Lattimore—to let Korea fall, but not let it look as if we pushed her. In December 1949—5 years ago—our State Department even issued instructions to its personnel abroad to show no regrets when the Government on Formosa fell—according to plan.

During the war in Korea we were ostensibly fighting to defeat the Red Chinese attackers. Our military leaders, our people, and I believe most of the members of the administration were loyal to that objective. But the invisible group had a different policy. They were determined to prevent military victory over the Reds. They intended to return by force the Chinese prisoners of war who did not wish to go back to Communist China, as they returned the hopeless refugees in Europe after 1945. They intended to leave North Korea a wasteland, occupied by Red troops who could infiltrate South Korea at will and descend at a moment's notice on free Korea with armies rested and reequipped.

The secret group won every objective except the return of the pitiful prisoners of war, who were saved by the insistence of Congress and the unremitting determination of our military leaders.

The same double purpose can be found in our German policy, in Austria, in Italy, in Greece, and in the tragic surrender of all Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union.

The public policy of the United States, which has in almost all instances denounced conquest and supported the independent peaceful nations, has faded away. The secret policy of the faction so friendly to the Soviet Union has in almost every instance been triumphant.

Our public policy of resisting communism has succeeded only in Turkey, and to a limited extent in Greece. But Secretary of Defense Forrestal, who was determined to block the Communist advance; and who won over President Truman, was driven to an early grave. His hard policy of armed resistance to communism was replaced by the soft policy of economic aid to Europe.

From 1945 to 1952 the power of the Soviet Union spread east and west, until it covered one-third of the world and put millions of people in bondage. The conflict between freedom and slavery was not lost in Asia or in Europe. It was lost in Washington, because the little group in our policymaking which favored the Soviet Union was stronger than the people who believed in a pro-American policy.

ITS PROGRAM IS DEFEAT OF THE FORMOSA POLICY

I say to you that the Eisenhower policy, for defense of the perimeter of the free world where it is threatened in the Formosa Straits, will be undermined, eroded, covered up, twisted, and made over into a policy favoring Red China, unless we learn our lesson, and deal with the realities of politics today.

Already erosion is apparent. We constantly hear it dinned in our ears that it is all right for us to defend Formosa, but very wrong to defend Quemoy and Matsu. That is as if the UN should say to the United States, "You will reduce tension with the Soviet Union if you give up Alaska, which is nearer the Soviet border than it is to the United States. The Soviet Union says Alaska belongs to it. It does not matter if you need Alaska for radar information, whether information, and early warning of threatened attack. You must give up Alaska to the Soviet rulers so their tension will be lowered."

Another form of erosion is hidden in the warnings that Formosa really belongs to Japan, and so it is alright for the United States to intervene, but Quemoy and the Tachens belong to China, and therefore, if we defend the coastal islands, we are threatening Red China. That argument omits the minor fact that we are not threatening the Reds. They are threatening us. They cannot get the coastal islands except by conquest. They have already tried and failed. It is they who talk of new conquests, not we.

A third form of erosion is the attempt to get a cease-fire in the United Nations. A cease-fire would tell the Nationalists they could never win back their own country. That would be like telling George Washington he could have a cease-fire if he would remain in Valley Forge, but make no effort to reconquer New York, or Philadelphia, or Yorktown.

A cease-fire would free the Red armies for a new attack on Indochina.

A cease-fire would give further recognition to the Red Chinese. It would tell the desperate people on the mainland they had no hope. It would tell the people of Poland, the Balkans, and East Germany, that the United States had no interest in their fate.

Other pitfalls are the proposals to establish two Chinas, and sooner or later to put

free China under a U. N. trusteeship. We know where that will lead. After Red China is safely installed in U. N. as a peace-loving nation, it will bring up the demand that Formosa be surrendered to it, and cite the Cairo declaration as proof we have already agreed to the proposal.

Perhaps the most serious threat of all is the recent report that our Government intends to ask other members of the U. N. to help us patrol the Formosa Strait. That would end all pretense of either a pro-American or an anti-Communist policy. It would mean another victory like Korea.

THE UNITED NATIONS MAKES NO COMMITMENTS TO FREEDOM

Whatever you make of U. N. in general, it should be possible to get agreement among all good Americans on a few facts. The Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations. So are her satellites. She has a permanent seat on the Security Council, with the veto power.

The U. N. has no commitments to support freedom. For every obligation to the free nations it has corresponding obligations to the Communist nations. Its staff includes a proportion of open Communists, but it also has a substantial number of secret Communists. The U. N. recently awarded large damages to some American fifth amendment Communists on its staff, who were dismissed only because of hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The U. N. is in the middle, seesawing between the free world and the Communist world.

The most favorable policy to us which the U. N. can adopt is neutralism. It is nearer to downright coexistence.

This is the minimum of undisputed fact about U. N. on which all Americans can agree. The U. N. is an agent of both Communist, anti-Communist and neutral nations. It has no justification for favoring the side of the free. It has never pretended to do so. Nowhere in the vast outpouring of documents that flows from the U. N. is there any commitment to freedom. The U. N. works for peace, for welfare, for one world. It does not pretend to work for liberty.

PRO-COMMUNISTS CANNOT BE STOPPED BY PAPERS

Why do I say that these proposals to soften up the Formosa resolution—so dangerous to the interests of the United States, so shameful a breach of our moral obligations—will probably prevail, in spite of the solemn commitment by the President and the Congress to a true American line of action?

The reason is this. A group of gangsters cannot be stopped by a written contract. A power group in government cannot be stopped by a state paper. A revolutionary junta, whose purpose is to take over the sovereignty, cannot be stopped by a resolution of congress. The only answer to a ruthless political-action group, determined to destroy the honor of America, is a political s Troy the honor of America, is a political-action group determined to support American political ideals and defend the men in Government who are loyal to them.

We have talked loosely and superficially about this rival-power system. But talk is no longer good enough.

We have called the product the Acheson foreign policy. This dual control of foreign policy was operating in our Government as nearly as 1940 under Harry Hopkins. It operated under Dean Acheson, but it has operated just as effectively since he left. We have no reason whatever to think this group lost its hold because Mr. Acheson resigned. Everything we know indicates the contrary.

Who then are the people we are discussing? Where do they operate? On what foundation does their power rest?

THEY DO NOT OPERATE UNDER CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINTS

Part of our confusion comes from the fact that this group does not operate along constitutional lines at all. Our legal foreign relations staff works in the State Department, under the direction of the President, and within the policy framework laid down by Congress. But the extralegal foreign-policy-making conspiracy operates all over the lot. Like a cancer growing wild, it ignores all the restraints inherent in a healthy, well-balanced organism. This collectivist machine operates, in part, in the State Department, in part, in the White House Secretariat, in the super-Cabinet agencies of national defense, in the Foreign Operations Administration, in the CIA. But a substantial part of it operates outside government. It may be found in the press, in the parties, in the colleges, in labor unions, in business, in the United Nations. The important point is that all the parts of this political machine are coordinated. They operate, as one, from some control tower we cannot see.

We have tried to blame our Presidents, the State Department, the party in power, for our failures in foreign policy. I am convinced we shall never recognize the octopus we have to fight until we realize it is not part of the legally established government at all. It is a revolutionary junta, operating within our Government, and through our Government, but not for our Government, our Constitution, or our Nation.

What keeps this cabal in power, under Democratic and under Republican administrations? Why has it been impossible for three Presidents and many Congresses to demolish it? That is a long story but it can be summarized in three p's: pressure groups, propaganda, and pelf—that is, big spending.

You are going to ask me whether this group is entirely Communist directed. I doubt if our problem is that simple. This group has, we know, included Communist Party members and Communist agents, and may still include them. It includes Socialists, collectivist one-worlders, ambitious individuals greedy for power, willing in time of trouble to advance themselves at the expense of their country. It includes trimmers and collaborators who believe they can make deals with the unscrupulous, who think they can get votes or power or contracts or publicity, from the Communists, and then cast aside their temptors. It includes the innocent and the simple minded, who love big words that have no meaning.

I do not know what proportion of these people are Communists, but I know for certain that everything they do is of benefit to Moscow, because it is directed by Moscow. The Soviet leaders are the most skillful people in the world today in the new political arts of propaganda, brainwashing, camouflage, and what I have called revolution by assembly line. We can save ourselves a great deal of time and thought if we realize one fact. As conditions are today, the Communist world revolution will control and use all the bits and pieces of collectivism, one-worldism, centralism, internationalism and all their variations. None of them will be helpful to us.

How are we going to redress the balance, and give strength to the vast majority of true Americans, so they can manage their own government?

We must give up our reliance on legalism.

The pro-Communist, internationalist, collectivist foreign policy, with its favoritism for everything which helps the Soviet Union, has triumphed again and again because of the energy, intelligence, and determination of a self-directed elite. We fight this advancing army with statements, promises, papers and laws. We will never win until

we oppose the collectivist political faction with resolute political action by men determined to put America first.

The pro-American group within our Government today is more numerous, abler, stronger, more devoted, than the collectivist group. It is supported by the vast bulk of the voters of both parties. Its weakness is that it is trying to win a debate under the rules of American political life. It should be fighting for victory over opponents who know no rules.

PRO-AMERICANS ARE UNDER ATTACK

We must know first the names of leaders of the pro-American group. You can find out who lead the American branch of our two-headed Government by the enemies they have made. The left-wing press and the collectivist collaborators are always ready to attack Secretary of Defense Wilson. They center much of their fire on Admiral Radford.

Khrushchev, speaking in Red China last fall, violently denounced Admiral Radford, and bracketed him with the Communist-hated Senators KNOWLAND and McCARTHY. Isn't it significant that left-wing American columnists today follow exactly the line spoken by Khrushchev 4 or 5 months ago?

You remember this bloc did not exactly like MacArthur. They denounce the Senators who support the free nations of Asia. They criticize President Eisenhower if he dares cooperate with Republicans they have not recommended.

The collectivist press has not yet started to attack Herbert Hoover, Jr., who is now our Under Secretary of State, but it is a rule of theirs never to call attention to good people on our side until they have to. Assistant Secretary of State Robertson has escaped their attack for the same reason.

Today, pro-American officials have not one moment's security. They are constantly under attack, mostly by moves they cannot see. If you need a blueprint of how the collectivists keep dangerous anti-Communists under constant pressure, I suggest you analyze the series of moves which they employed to destroy Senator McCARTHY, from the day in Wheeling, W. Va., when he tore down the curtain of censorship hiding the Communists in our State Department.

I tell you just such a subtle, complex, perfectly timed, secret campaign is already under way against the men who dared advise the President to resist the Chinese Reds. The strategy is worked out, and broken into steps. It will arise, spontaneously, from all directions. It will be echoed in all quarters of the world. The line is already apparent in the inspired British press and that of the Continent.

From a well-informed left-wing magazine I learn the shape of coming events. Once the U. N. is well in the picture the plan is to "build up enough pressure to make imperative the gentle liquidation of Chiang Kai-shek, and the establishment of true self-government for the Formosans under U. N. trusteeship." But, my friends, the Nationalists are not Formosans. Self-government will give the island to its prewar inhabitants. Can you see the Nationalist armies, driven from Formosan soil by a demand for neutrality, wandering like a ghost army about the world, as helpless as General Anders valiant Polish fighting men? Next we are told "binding multilateral agreements for the reduction of armaments are imperative." These agreements will blind us but not the Communists. Finally we are told, "then the gamble that the President has taken will start paying off. The greater his success, the more likely he is to acquire the freedom of action he needs to (and I urge you to note) shed his most troublesome aides."

ONLY POLITICAL ACTION WILL SAVE US

The bloc which intends to destroy the true Americans in our Government is in action. Is there a bloc to defend the true Americans

and drive out the secret enemies of our country? I am not urging you to help our friends in Asia. I am urging you to prevent the humiliating defeat of our country and everything it stands for.

You ask who are the leaders of the collectivist bloc. Who is taking Acheson's place today?

I can guess but I have no legal proof. Remember, the physician cannot have proof that his diagnosis is correct. He can get that only from the autopsy.

But I want to point out one significant fact. We are never going to have legal proof, about the most dangerous enemies of our country. We will not be able to use what proof we have, when the culprit is close to the top. Attorney General Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover told us how FBI reports on Harry White, for example, were sent to President Truman, and his Cabinet officers again and again. We know President Truman and his top Cabinet members opposed promoting Harry White to the International Monetary Fund, in view of his record. But he was promoted.

Who could tell the President of the United States he must promote a known Communist collaborator? I have been told who was the person responsible but I have, so far, no proof. Shall we sit and do nothing, when we have political proof that some of our officials are selling out our country, merely because we have no affidavits of what was said in their secret conferences?

One thing we know. The Communists and their collaborators push their best men close to the top, because that is the safest place to be. No one could remove Dr. John from his job in Germany though more than one person knew he was disloyal. We may get the little traitors by assembling legal proof. We will never get the big ones, except by political counterattack.

The pro-Communist attack on our political institutions is political action. We must use political action to remove from public life every man or woman who is beholden to the Communists, or committed to a philosophy alien to our Constitution. We cannot wait until we see a party card.

POLITICAL ACTION WILL BRING ABOUT AN AMERICAN POLICY

We must also know American policy. It is all very well to know Communist policy, but it is more important to know American policy.

We must have a clear American foreign policy and a clear American military policy before we enter any conference with other nations in the United Nations or outside.

There is no harm in conferring with foreign governments, inside or outside of U. N. so long as we put America first.

Nationalist China has perhaps half a million men eager to fight for their independence.

Korea has courageous soldiers ready to fight on their own soil. Indochina can provide others, with American training. Altogether free Asia can furnish millions of troops eager to guard their sectors of the frontier of freedom.

Can we guarantee that no one in our State Department or FOA will hamstring the funds Congress has voted to arm them? Can we guarantee that agencies of our Government will not conspire to undermine Chiang Kai-shek or Syngman Rhee or Vietnam? If the great brains, who have abandoned newspaper work for pontificating, sow planned confusion or attack our pro-American leaders, are we ready to meet them with better newspapers, better writers, better radio and television programs, or, if necessary, by mimeograph machines in every block?

The Chinese Communists have started four wars in the last 10 years, with no penalty. The Red Chinese know they can never put down the Chinese on the mainland, while the Chinese on Formosa have an army. They

will never be satisfied with less than total destruction of that army. They must destroy the armies of Korea and of Indochina. They count on the aid of their supporters in our councils.

Support of the armies of free Asia is American policy, as destruction of these armies is Communist policy.

The Communist regimes are weak and their people rebellious. The only strength they possess is the faction within the American Government which puts the Soviet Union first.

We must deal first with our own dual Government. If we will organize political action, to support the pro-Americans in our Government and in public life, the world conflict will soon be over. We can win true peace for all the world if we will gird ourselves to defeat the enemy within.

Tax Relief Under H. R. 4300

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk to the effect that the Republican tax program of last year did practically nothing for lower bracket taxpayers, specifically those with incomes below \$5,000. Let us put the record straight once and for all.

In the first place these statements have referred only to the big tax-revision bill. This ignores the fact that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was only one part of the entire tax program and, from a revenue standpoint a relatively small part. The entire tax reduction provided last year amounted to \$7.4 billion, of which the revision bill only accounted for \$1.4 billion.

The biggest single portion of the program was the across-the-board individual income-tax reduction which went into effect a year ago last January. That reduction amounted to \$3 billion. There are some who say that that reduction was provided for in a law enacted by a Democratic Congress. Of course, we all know that the actual reduction could never have been permitted to take effect unless tremendous expenditure reductions had not been achieved by the Republican Party. The \$3 billion reduction was achieved by a tax cut in the rate of about 10 percent in the lower and middle income brackets and ranging down to a little over 1 percent in the upper brackets. About 31 percent of the tax relief in that bill went to individuals with adjusted gross incomes of less than \$5,000. It should be pointed out that this was approximately the same percentage by which these individuals had previously had their taxes increased. In other words, we went down almost exactly the way we had come up.

Moreover, it should be recognized that this group with adjusted gross incomes of under \$5,000 to whom 31 percent of the tax relief went, actually bear about 29 percent of the total income tax burden. Therefore the percentage reduction in the below-\$5,000 area represented an

FEBRUARY 10, 1955.

Mr. J. E. BARR,
Chief, Inspection Branch,
Grain Division,
Agricultural Marketing Service.

DEAR MR. BARR: I am writing you in reference to the series of meetings you are conducting throughout the country concerning a proposal to define or classify soybeans with green seed covers, which in cross section are yellow, as green soybeans.

The growers in the section of Arkansas which I represent have been growing Ogden Lee, and Dortchsoy beans, all of which have a yellow meat but a green cast on their coats.

Such a reclassification, I am informed, would cause such beans to be labeled "mixed" and, as such, would sell for less. In addition, I am advised, they would receive a lower loan rate, and growers and producers would have greater expense of handling.

From information here in Washington, it would appear that there is some belief that within a few years these varieties will be replaced by others which have been given some trial in other sections. If this is true, I would be interested in knowing if sufficient trial has been given to assure that these new varieties will replace the beans now being grown in this section. This would, in a short time, eliminate the need for a reclassification.

Such action would prevent added economic difficulty to these growers and would solve the problem within a short time. For this reason, I am writing to suggest that any action to reclassify be deferred until it can be determined that these new varieties will be of commercial value to our growers and they can begin to switch over to these new varieties.

I will appreciate your placing this in the record of the meeting to be held in Memphis on February 14.

Yours very sincerely,

E. C. GATHINGS.

At the Memphis meeting, Mr. W. H. "Bill" Wyatt, of Blytheville, Ark., made a very fine statement relative to this reclassification, and for the information of the Congress, I wish to include Mr. Wyatt's full statement:

TESTIMONY AT MEMPHIS HEARING, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ON CHANGES IN OFFICIAL STANDARDS FOR SOYBEANS, FEBRUARY 14, 1955

I am W. H. "Bill" Wyatt, of Mississippi County, Ark. As a member of the board of directors, I'm representing the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation at this hearing.

Let's consider first the proposal to "define or reclassify soybeans with green seed coats, which in cross section are yellow, as green soybeans, instead of yellow soybeans as at present."

On the face of it, that seems to be all right since green soybeans and yellow soybeans now carry the same CCC loan value and both may be traded on the board. But on a closer analysis we find this to be entirely false as far as our Ogden soybean is concerned.

We called in C. A. Silas, of Woodson Tenant Laboratories, and asked for a description of the Ogden bean. This is what he said: "Ogdens are now classed as yellow beans. The proposed change would force them into the 'mixed bean' classification, because Ogdens are neither green nor yellow by seed coat analysis alone."

Keith Bilbrey, County Agent added, "The green pigment is variable and unstable depending on the age of bean and length of exposure to sun rays before harvest. So, because some of the Ogdens bleach out to yellow, they could no more be classed as green than as yellow. The dangerous consequence is that nearly all the highest pro-

ducing soybeans in the South would automatically be classed as 'mixed beans.'"

This is supported by the definition on page 69 of the Official Grain Standard section (g) "Mixed Soybeans—Mixed soybeans shall be any mixture of soybeans which does not meet the requirements for classes, yellow soybeans, green soybeans, brown soybeans, or black soybeans. Bicolored soybeans shall be classified as mixed soybeans."

What does this mean price-wise to the producer?

The 1954 CCC Grain Price Support Bulletin Supplement 2, Soybeans, said: "The support rates for soybeans of the classes, black soybeans, brown soybeans, and mixed soybeans shall be 25 cents per bushel less than the support rates for the classes, green soybeans and yellow soybeans."

Mixed beans may not be tendered on the board, could not be hedged, and could not be delivered.

The American and world markets have accepted the Ogden bean for 10 years, with no complaint that we have ever heard of before. Why the suggested change now? It would be a calamity to the South. A tremendously unfair and discriminatory act.

Southern production in 1951

	Acres	Bushels per acre	Total
Arkansas.....	607,000	20	12,140,000
Alabama.....	88,000	18	704,000
Georgia.....	21,000	10.5	211,500
Kentucky.....	130,000	19	2,470,000
Louisiana.....	38,000	17.5	665,000
Mississippi.....	425,000	13	5,525,000
North Carolina.....	309,000	16.5	5,098,500
South Carolina.....	83,000	12.5	1,037,500
Tennessee.....	183,000	17.5	3,202,500
Virginia.....	166,000	18	3,004,000
Missouri.....	420,000	20	8,400,000
1951 total.....	2,470,000	-----	42,458,000

¹ Assuming 1/4 of Missouri's production in the Ogden area.

(1951 figures were used because they are nearest to, but under anticipated production in 1955).

Surely it is fair to guess that 80 percent of all southern beans are Ogdens. Mississippi County Arkansas' percentage will run 90 percent Ogdens.

Eighty percent of the 1951 production would be 33,966,400 bushels.

If you force Ogdens into a "mixed-bean" class, then by 1954 loan standards, you would be saying to the world, "The South's 33,966,400 bushels of Ogden soybeans are worth \$8,491,600 less than the same number of yellow soybeans." And there would not be a word of truth in it.

And, by reclassification, the American market might start discrimination in price also, and for no reason, except promoted by Government classification.

We believe any foreign buyer can get strictly yellow soybeans from Northern areas for their limited needs without hurting them and without totally wrecking our economy. Then there is extra danger: We fear the idea would "snowball" and others would start demanding strictly yellow beans.

We are against the proposed change in classification of Ogden soybeans from the cross-section analysis to color of skin coats. If the United States Department of Agriculture can show us just cause why they should be changed, then time must be allowed to develop a comparable yielding yellow bean for the South. In other words, we want no change now.

Likely lowering of support price for 1955 crop from 80 percent down to 70 percent may be tragic enough: \$2.22 down to \$2.04 if the market follows.

The Soybean Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the soybean industry, and specifically the growers of soybeans in the Midsouth, are threatened by a proposal of the Department of Agriculture to reclassify certain varieties of beans.

This matter is rather complicated in its ramifications, and for the benefit of the Congress I would like to call to the attention of the Members several letters written on this proposal.

On February 14 the Department called a meeting of soybean growers in Memphis, Tenn. Herewith is a letter which I wrote to Mr. J. E. Barr, Chief of the Inspection Branch of the Agricultural Marketing Service Grain Division:

A conservative estimate of 4 or 5 million bushels crop in Mississippi County, Ark., alone in 1955, at 20 cents per bushel less would be nearly a million dollars to that county alone.

The United States survey shows 99 percent of Arkansas farmers sell less than \$25,000 gross annually. All our farmers grow soybeans with cotton controls on. This thing would affect all of us.

This proposed change would only concern the South as the Ogden bean is not grown in cooler climate and since the crushers find the oil content of the Ogden as high or even a little higher in some instances and since the cross-section the Ogden is as yellow as the purely yellow-coated beans, the 58,000 members of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation respectfully request that no change be made in the classification of the Ogden soybeans.

Concerning the proposed revision which would decrease the maximum limits of foreign material by 1 percent in each grade, we, as producers after much consideration, can not see that this will benefit us in any way.

Last year nearly all buyers bought the No. 1 grade, which as it now stands limits foreign material to 2 percent. If these buyers plan to return to a No. 2 grade for basis of purchase under the proposed change, they are still allowing the 2 percent foreign matter. What is to be gained?

Grading at its best, as far as foreign materials are concerned, is far from accurate. No two graders can probe the same load and come up with the same foreign matter percentage.

Going a little further into this, I checked the grades on two carloads shipped January 27, 1955, by Farmers Soybeans Corp., of Blytheville, Ark. Here are results of three different people grading.

	Woodson-Tenant Laboratories	Memphis Merchants Exchange	U.S.D.A. Federal appeal
T. W.	56	56.0	56.0
F. M.	4.0	2.5	2.7
Splits	18.0	19.0	20.0
Damage	3.9	2.9	4.0
Moisture	14.1	14.3	14.3
T. W.	56	56.0	55.5
F. M.	2.8	2.0	2.0
Splits	19.0	21.0	22.0
Damage	4.2	3.0	4.0
Moisture	14.0	13.9	13.9

You will note the difference in the grades especially, even in the last two when the car was in Memphis and did not move. Because of this inability to accurately determine the exact amount of foreign materials in a load of beans (and the difference is much greater on a farm truckload because the beans have not been blended) it is dangerous and injurious to producers for this grade schedule to be too strict.

Until a better means of grading is found or until the country elevators and local buyers will use their cleaners and weigh the foreign material, or until a premium is paid for better grades as in purchase of cottonseed, we would hesitate to approve any tightening of the United States soybean standards.

We do not want to be shortsighted and lose our export market.

We are interested in improving and delivering a quality product as are other interested groups such as the American Soybean Association. If a 5/64 round-hole bottom screen is put into use in order to remove the chipped beans from the foreign material count, we will support the proposed revision which would decrease the maximum limits of foreign materials by 1 percent in each grade.

As to the other proposed changes, they are minor as far as the farmer is concerned compared to the aforementioned proposals, but most of the argument of foreign matter will relate.

In addition to Mr. Wyatt's remarks, two other excellent statements should be presented to further emphasize the seriousness of this proposal. Mr. G. A. Hale, of the Hale Seed Farm of Burdette, Ark., has pointed out a very definite objection to this proposal, and his letter addressed to the Director of the Grain Division follows:

HALE SEED FARMS,
Burdette, Ark., February 15, 1955.
DIRECTOR, GRAIN DIVISION, AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After attending the very efficiently and fairly conducted hearing in Memphis yesterday, I wish to submit to you my comments on one of the proposed changes in the present classification of soybeans by your Division: namely, the classification of soybeans with green seed coats but yellow in cross section as green soybeans.

As a breeder, tester, and producer of soybean varieties for the Cotton Belt since 1942, I am of the opinion from the remarks made by your representative and others at this hearing that they do not fully appreciate the reasons why southern soybean growers are opposed to classifying the Ogden variety and its selections and possibly the new Lee variety, when grown under some conditions, as green soybeans.

Commercial, State, and Federal soybean breeders in the South have been cognizant of the desirability and the possibility of breeding a completely yellow, full-season soybean variety to replace the Ogden variety and its selection, which we realize have several undesirable characteristics. To date no breeder has succeeded in producing a widely adapted all-yellow variety with the maturity date and high yield of the Ogden-type soybean. All of the adapted, available yellow varieties, with the possible exception of the Lee variety—which has some green coloring when grown under some conditions—and which is not adapted to the northern part of the Cotton Belt, yield from 10 to 40 percent less than the Ogden and its selections according to tests made by our State experiment stations in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture.

It is the opinion of all the growers and buyers of soybeans that I have contacted in this section that, if the proposed change in the classification of the Ogden-type soybean is made, this change would likely result in southern growers getting lower prices for the bulk of their soybean crop. Our only recourse to this condition would be to switch to the growing of less productive all-yellow varieties. This change would be impossible until we have time to increase the present inadequate seed supply of these varieties to the volume required to plant most of our acreage.

As a soybean grower, I appreciate the clear and enlightening presentation of the reasons why the Department of Agriculture has proposed the change in the classification of the Ogden-type soybean. It is doubtful if all of your problems would be solved by changing your method of grading so that our Ogden-type soybean would be classed as a green soybean because of the fact that the green coloring in the Ogden seedcoat will fade and the coat will be yellow under some conditions. The seed analyst of the Arkansas State Plant Board, Little Rock, Ark., which is the official seed-certification agency of Arkansas, has difficulty in determining whether or not even our registered-grade Ogden-type soybeans are pure as to variety

because of the unstable color of the seed-coats.

Until soybean producers can develop and growers can increase an all-yellow soybean variety that is as good as the Ogden and its selections to replace it and until an accurate method of classifying soybeans with green seedcoats but yellow cotyledons such as the Ogden and its selections, which are very unstable in color, is devised, I am opposed to a change in the present classification because I do not think a change at this time would be to the best interest of any segment of the southern soybean industry.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to present my views.

Respectfully submitted,

G. A. HALE.

With this should also be included the letter written by Mr. Paul C. Hughes, of Blytheville, president of the Mid-South Soybean & Grain Shippers Association. Mr. Hughes points out the economic circumstances connected with this proposed change:

MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN & GRAIN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION,
February 17, 1955.
TO DIRECTOR, GRAIN DIVISION, AMA, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.:

VIEWS OF THE MIDSOUTH SOYBEAN & GRAIN SHIPPERS ASSOCIATION OF THE PROPOSED REVISIONS OF THE SOYBEAN STANDARDS

1. On the proposed revision that would reduce the maximum limits of foreign material 1 percent in each numerical grade. As country shippers we are in the middle on this question as we only buy on the grade that we have to sell but as the growers as presented by the American Soybean Association and the processors thought their present buying practices want 2 percent foreign material in No. 2 soybeans, we see no reason why the change cannot be made. We do, however, urge that a study be made to see if some simple method can be found to separate true foreign material from the small broken pieces of soybeans that fall through a 5/64 round hole screen. Maybe the use of a smaller hole size such as a 3/64 would let enough of the small weed seed through and leave enough broken pieces on the screen to reduce the buildup of foreign material we now have in soybeans through handling. If such a method can be found we urge its use.

2. On the reduction of moisture we see no reason why the moisture in No. 1 soybeans cannot be reduced to 12 percent. However, we feel that no change need be made in the moisture of No. 2 soybeans as we have found that even in our humid climate 14 percent moisture soybeans can be stored.

3. We can see no reason why the change in splits should not go through if you in the Department feel that it would improve the soybean grading system.

4. On the proposed special limits on heat damage in each numerical grade, we are against such limits as they would work a hardship on all shippers. Today inspectors are having enough trouble determining total damage or just how much total damage a sample contains. However, if the Department feels that such limits should be put into effect, then heat damage should be more clearly defined. We suggest that it means soybeans that have turned entirely black or brown from heat. The present methods of saying that a small brown spot in the middle of an otherwise sound soybean is heat damage leaves too much room for human error and judgment for such narrow limits of heat damage as have been proposed by the Department.

5. On the proposed reclassification of soybeans with green seed coats that are in cross section yellow from the yellow class to the green class. We cannot say too strongly that

we are opposed to this change. We have many reasons for being against the change. Here are just a few of them: 80 percent or more of the Midsouth soybean production would be affected by this change. No evidence was present at Memphis to disprove our conclusion that if the proposed change went through that 90 percent of our Ogden-type soybeans would grade as mixed. This was the case before the change in 1949. If they were classed as mixed in 1948 and before what new method has been developed to tell class by the variety predominate color and how could variety purity be proven? In other words how could an inspector tell the difference between a bleached Ogden and a pale S-100 to say that the sample was a mixture of green and yellow varieties or just a sample of Ogden-type soybean and therefore are classed green and just happen to have 10 percent or more that just happen to be faded yellow?

We recognized the Department's desire and the need to make a grade and class such that it will tell the buyer if he wants that certain quality or not. We agree that under the present standards for soybeans it is not always possible for the buyer to get just what he wants by buying a certain grade and class but as one of the speakers at Memphis pointed out No. 2 hard wheat does not always describe just what type of No. 2 hard wheat that a buyer wants. Therefore, a buyer will say that he wants Kansas or Texas No. 2 Hard Wheat and not Illinois No. 2 Hard Wheat. Today most buyers that need a yellow-coated soybean for their special products have found that they can get what they want by saying that they want a No. 2 yellow soybean from Illinois points or maybe Ohio. We feel that since the buyer can get yellow-coated soybeans by saying what he wants that it is not right to penalize the Midsouth that has no high yielding soybean that isn't mixed with green and yellow coats. We realize that you cannot sell a person for long something that he does not want so if it was not possible for a buyer to get yellow-coated soybeans without changing the standards we would not be opposed but as he can get yellow-coated soybeans leave the standards alone.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL C. HUGHES,
President.

Mr. Speaker, from this brief outline of the facts it should be readily seen that this proposed change will work a great hardship on the South.

However, Mr. Speaker, in discussions with Mr. Barr and with Mr. Clyde M. Jackson, of the Grain Division, I have been unable to find a basis for this proposal.

I trust that the Department will abandon the reclassification plan. If it is put into effect the Southern soybean grower will be forced to sell his commodity at an appreciable smaller return.

The order should not be put into effect as it would work a severe economic hardship on a large section of the country.

The Atomic Development Mutual Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the statement which follows

was submitted by Mr. Newton I. Steers, president of the Atomic Development Mutual Fund, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Atomic Development Mutual Fund is an organization which has been one of the prime movers in the field of developing atomic energy for industrial use. Mr. Steers' statement, therefore, is of great significance. Among the many men who are involved in furthering this vital effort is Mr. S. Chadwick Reed, of Plainfield, N. J. As the statement indicates, the fund has grown almost fifteenfold in 1 year, which is an index to its importance.

My name is Newton I. Steers, Jr. I am president of Atomic Development Mutual Fund, Inc. When I appeared before this committee on May 11, 1954, we were about 5 months old, and assets of our fund were about \$1 1/4 million. We are now a little over a year old, and assets are in excess of \$15 million. This growth constitutes a record in the branch of the securities business known as the mutual fund industry.

This rapid growth, which others have called even phenomenal, is of particular significance because it reflects the public's view of the financial future of atomic energy. Our fund has been presented as a vehicle for capital appreciation and not for income. The investing public evidently agrees with us that atomic stocks have a greater growth potential than any other group of stocks which could be assembled.

Some people feel that the public's enthusiasm has bid prices up beyond what earnings can support, that atomic prices are too high. The commonly used ratio of price earnings is, as a result, abnormally high, when based on present earnings. The question, of course, is whether future earnings will sufficiently increase in a short enough time to justify purchase at present prices. That is to say, whether increased future earnings will cause prices to rise over present levels by a sufficient amount, and soon enough, to provide justification for present purchase.

It is, of course, true that atomic stock prices cannot be expected forever to remain abnormally high relative to earnings. On the other hand, they may be expected to remain high in relation to other stock prices as long as the atomic industry is expected to grow more rapidly than other industries and, hence, permit higher earnings by the companies engaged in it than by other companies not so engaged. And particularly is this so if the rate of growth of the industry is itself growing. For those of you with a mathematical background, atomic stock prices may be said to be a more direct function of the first, or even the second derivative of earnings than of earnings themselves. To hold otherwise is to imply that prices cannot, or at least will not, rise until potential earnings have actually been realized. Those who hold to such a notion will inevitably find themselves lagging behind persons more willing to act on, not earnings, but prognostications of earnings; lagging behind, and buying at higher prices instead of selling at higher prices; lagging behind and, in effect, paying capital gains to earlier worms. We must not forget, of course, that a company which enters a new field and derives the benefits of extraordinary growth is not benefiting itself alone. It benefits its customers—the public. Economically speaking, the leaders of such a company have achieved a more efficient allocation of resources. Those who finance such a shift in resource allocation also contribute to the public benefit, as do those members of the public who, by their investment, release the money controlled by the primary sources of new capital for use on the next round.

But still, say more sophisticated critics, let us concede that atomic stock prices will

naturally be higher in relation to earnings than other classes of stocks. But what if they are too high, even on that basis? The answer to this question involves an attempt to appraise how rapidly the atomic industry is now growing, and how rapidly that rate of growth is itself growing.

Such an appraisal is made more difficult by the concealment, most of it no doubt necessary for security reasons, of many of the key figures. The problem is further complicated by the fact that many atomic companies are in other fields as well and the extent of their atomic involvement is not always easy to estimate. Nevertheless, let us outline the various segments of the private atomic-energy business and infer as much as we can as to its all-important growth. In the table below, minimum figures are given on the dollar size of various portions of the private atomic industry at the end of 1955. For comparison, the figures supplied this committee in May 1954 are also given.

TABLE 1

	May 1954	Rate by end of 1955
Uranium and other atomic minerals.....	325	600
Radioisotopes and radiation instruments.....	27	40
Specialized equipment supply.....	107	200
Total.....	459	840

You will note that these figures are minimum figures. By this I mean they represent minimums which can be supported with reasonable assurance on the basis of the data available. Larger figures may, therefore, merely imply the release of additional data, rather than an increase in activity. Nevertheless, we must draw our inferences from the best figures available. Indeed, to ignore figures showing increases is in itself to draw the inference that there has been no increase.

Mr. Jesse Johnson, AEC's Director of Raw Materials, stated a few months ago that the domestic uranium industry was at the \$100-million mark annually and that production should double within 18 months. (He also revealed that persons engaged in uranium mining had multiplied 8,000 percent since 1948.) On this basis, the \$200-million mark should be reached about the end of 1955. We also know that two other areas are about as important as the United States. These areas are Canada and the Belgian Congo. If one of these is less important now than the United States, it may well be the other is more important. On this basis, we can arrive at a figure of 3 times \$200 million, or \$600 million. To be sure that this figure is truly a minimum, we should remember that South African production is mounting rapidly and by the end of 1955 may well cause that area to be 1 of the 3 leading areas. We know that 1954 production from South Africa was in excess of \$25 million and was over 5 times that in 1953. Furthermore, our total figure is based on the inclusion of other minerals important to atomic energy, such as zirconium, beryllium, thorium, and lithium. The lithium industry in 1955 will be over \$20 million, based on the expected sales of the 2 leading producers alone.

Passing from uranium to radioactive materials and radiation instruments figures, we are dealing with smaller figures, but ones showing very rapid increases. Thus, AEC figures show that radioisotope shipments have multiplied nearly 5 times in the last 5 years and the dollar volume of radiation instruments manufactured has increased more than 5 times to over \$30 million. No one can foresee how large a market may develop for the class of radioactive materials which are left over after uranium fissions (fission products). Chairman Strauss has indicated that potatoes can be preserved

for 2 years without freezing by irradiation with fission products and that this irradiation can be accomplished for one-half cent per pound. It appears that a figure of \$40 million can be postulated for the end of 1955 to include materials artificially irradiated (radioisotopes), materials resulting from fission (fission products) and radiation instruments.

The last figure in table I is \$200 million for specialized equipment supply. There are various reasons for believing that the previous figure of \$107 million must have about doubled. First of all, the \$107 million figure was derived from a percentage of AEC purchasing, as between lumber, concrete, etc., which are not uniquely tied to atomic activity, and mechanical engineering equipment, electrical engineering equipment, and electronic equipment, etc., for which atomic energy has very pronounced implications. Since that time, there has been a decided shift away from construction expenditures toward expenditures for operation (e. g., operations were 41 percent of fiscal 1954 expenditures, but 77 percent of fiscal 1956 expenditures as budgeted). Operating expenditures are much less concerned with items like lumber and concrete. Further, the AEC has put increased emphasis on fixed price competitive bidding as its experience has accumulated. Operational expenditure again is much more susceptible to fixed price buying (on which the seller can make a profit). For these reasons it appears reasonable to believe that the portion of the \$2 billion annual expenditure budgeted for the AEC which will be bought on a basis allowing a profit (excluding items included previously) will be at least \$200 million.

In addition to the figures above totaling \$840 million, there are many additional millions which are subject to profitmaking. One increment results from the large and growing business of treating uranium oxide to produce uranium metal and uranium salts. Another increment results from non-governmental expenditures for research reactors which now run to several millions annually. In addition, it is known that the Navy has budgeted funds for at least five atomic submarines in addition to the *Nautilus*, and some of the reactor portion of these submarines will be bought on a basis allowing profit to the seller. If a billion dollar private atomic industry is not here by the end of 1955, it certainly should be here by the end of 1956. It may well be here now.

Finally, the recent competitive contract whereby the Army will purchase a 10,000-kilowatt reactor for about \$2 million means that atomic power is not so far away as many have supposed. Only a year ago the phrase ran "a megabuck for a megawatt." This may be translated to \$1,000 per kilowatt of capacity. The Army reactor will cost about \$200 per kilowatt, and it is known that larger reactors can be built at a lower cost per kilowatt. Since coal-burning capacity costs around \$80 per kilowatt of heat and the fuel cost of uranium fission is markedly less than in the case of combustion, it is apparent that very significant progress toward truly competitive atomic power has been made. A massive giant stirs and makes himself known though he is not fully visible. He is the multi-billion-dollar atomic-power industry intimately related to all that has been discussed above, but basically just one of the several atomic giants which may be seen in the years to come.

Let us return to the financial world and see how atomic companies have fared, without implying that they have so fared solely because of their atomic activity. In table 2 figures are given on companies which our company has given greatest emphasis to. It should be noted that these were not selected as the stocks undergoing the greatest appreciation, i. e., with the advantage of hindsight.

TABLE 2.—Capital appreciation of selected atomic companies

	1953		Feb. 3, 1955 price	Increase over 1953 high
	Low	High		
Climax molybdenum.....	33	43	62½	45
Vanadium Corp.....	15	23	37½	61
Gunnar Mines.....	2½	13¾	14	2
Poote Mineral.....	11	15¾	48½	230
Lindsay Chemical.....	15	19	44½	135
Lithium Corp.....	3½	6¼	29½	372
Homestake Mining.....	33	41	43½	6
Beckman Instruments.....	11	17	24	41
Consolidated Engineering.....	11	15	29½	90
General Dynamics.....	31	47	100½	111
Union Carbide.....	61	75	83	11
Vitro Corp.....	5½	7½	19½	144
Westinghouse Electric.....	30	52	79½	52
Average.....				90
Dow Jones Industrial average.....	205	204	400	38

In table 3 below more inclusive figures are given. These cover some 75 companies in the fields indicated and were computed as of October of 1954. Yields and price-earnings ratios vary widely as might be expected from the varying degree to which the companies involved are expected to benefit from atomic growth and from the varying periods of time before these companies will feel the impact of atomic growth.

TABLE 3.—Price-earnings ratios and yields of atomic companies

	Price-earnings ratio	Average yield
		Percent
Raw materials:		
Uranium mining:		
United States.....	14.1	4.3
Canada.....		
Africa.....	19.5	4.8
Uranium processing.....	20.0	2.6
Byproduct uranium.....	15.7	4.0
Lithium, thorium, zirconium, beryllium.....	30.9	2.2
Radioactive materials and radiation instruments.....	37.5	0.9
Suppliers of special equipment.....	9.3	5.0
Atomic Energy Commission contractors.....	17.0	3.3
Application of atomic power.....	10.7	6.0
Diversified atomic activities.....	24.6	2.3

It appears evident that very substantial financing of the atomic industry will be necessary in coming years. The usual sources of new capital will undoubtedly be made available as the situation further crystallizes and intermediate obstacles are overcome. In the meantime, the public has demonstrated its faith in the future of the atom. Both large and small investors have shown their willingness to back up the new capital sources with the huge amount of liquid savings they hold throughout this Nation.

Great emphasis should continue to be put on Government-sponsored technical development. However, as this development proceeds, and we may hope accelerates, the procedures to allow private industry to apply its energy and ingenuity must also be developed. Passage of the act and the newly established market for plutonium and U-233 are important milestones. The advance of the variegated atomic frontier will be proportional to the incentives stimulating that advance. The uranium industry has shown how private enterprise can perform an atomic job when it is allowed to. Subject always to the paramount controls necessary to the national security, the uranium industry should serve as a model for the other phases of the atomic industry. In this fashion, the infant giant will mature most rapidly and in a manner consonant with the American tradition of freedom. The fundamental basis for free enterprise in the atomic arena is

simply that the cost to the American public of atomic profits will pale into insignificance when compared with the savings to the American people which will arise from the energizing effect of these same profits.

For Better Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an editorial from the *Christian Science Monitor* of February 15, 1955, entitled "For Better Public Service":

FOR BETTER PUBLIC SERVICE

The Federal Government needs more and better managers. Of course, every voter considers himself a manager. But what the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government is talking about is the managerial talent engaged in the day-to-day conduct of departments and agencies.

Everybody knows there are relatively few Federal jobs paying more than \$10,000 a year. No business would dream of operating with such a thin sprinkling of top-level managers and administrators. No business would consider it economy to pay the men who make the big decisions so poorly. And almost any business would go bankrupt if it had a personnel turnover of 25 percent a year.

The Hoover Commission estimates that Federal costs could be cut \$50 million a year just by reducing turnover 5 percent. But its most vital recommendations have to do with strengthening the management of Government business. It wishes to add to the number of noncareer employees who have political functions in the sense of determining or defending policies. But it also wishes to create a senior civil service to give more secure status and better pay to selected career administrators.

Manifestly a lot of questions are going to be asked about these proposals, for just where an administrator becomes a policymaker or vice versa is not always easy to determine. The Eisenhower administration has insisted that it should have men and women in policymaking posts who were in sympathy with its aims. This is reasonable enough. Any shift of parties after 20 years may find some employees slow to accept a change in direction.

But manifestly the line must be drawn fairly tightly against political appointments or the civil service will be undermined. As the civil service tradition deepens the United States should be able to develop a corps of able professional administrators who will follow policy as laid down—as military commanders are supposed to follow policies set by civilian leaders. But in each case they will have to be adequately paid and isolated from politics.

This brings up a curious failure in the commission report. One of the more serious problems in recruiting and holding good public servants in the last few years has arisen from the uncertainties and harassments of the security system. The commission's task force, headed by President Dodds, of Princeton, recommended the naming of a distinguished body of citizens to study and clarify the security code. Why this proposal was not endorsed is hard to understand.

The commission has many useful ideas for improving the public service, including better training and recruitment procedures ending political clearance for rural mail carriers, and a plan for more equitable application of veterans' preference, which often now works a major distortion of civil service.

But the proposals for improvement at the managerial level are the most striking and potentially valuable. We trust Congress will study, adapt, and adopt them. Possibly with good prospects now for an increase in congressional salaries the lawmakers will be more ready to advance the pay of men and women in the executive departments who are also vital to effective government. Whether we like it or not, the Federal operation is a tremendous business; Americans cannot afford to have it poorly run.

Benefits to Little Taxpayers by Republican Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, by eliminating wasteful, duplicating spending, the Republican 83d Congress, with the backing of the Republican administration, has made possible the largest tax reduction in the history of the world. Since we took over as majority party in Congress in 1953, the tax savings to the American farmers, consumers, and businessmen have been at the rate of \$7.4 billion per year.

Today, however, I would like to talk not about the great accomplishment of the Republicans in the field of tax reduction, but about what we have done in the field of tax revision.

The bill which I introduced and which the President signed on August 16, 1954, is the most monumental legislative undertaking ever attempted in any legislature anywhere in the world.

This 600-page Republican law cuts away the overlapping, unfair, and useless provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which had grown up piecemeal under successive Democratic Congresses. It corrects countless inequities which had been permitted to work against some of the most deserving groups of our taxpayers, such as farmers, retired old people, widows, widowers, working mothers, and those burdened with high medical expenses. And it closes innumerable loopholes in the old tax laws under which unscrupulous taxpayers were able to avoid their fair share of tax burden.

Work on this bill started in 1951 when, in anticipation of a Republican victory in 1952, I instructed my staff to prepare a questionnaire to be sent out to representative farmers, consumers, workers, and businessmen, asking them for their suggestions as to how our tax laws could be improved. The response was astounding. Over 15,000 taxpayer suggestions for improvements in the Internal Revenue Code were received. In addition, groups of leading tax experts throughout the country were organized

to study specific problem areas in our Federal tax structure.

The Committee on Ways and Means conducted public hearings on 40 different topics of major importance in connection with general tax revision. In the course of these hearings the committee heard testimony from over 500 witnesses. The committee and its staff then gave intensive consideration and study to the vast material which it had thus obtained. President Eisenhower and the staff in the Treasury Department endorsed this great task. In fact, the President has referred to it as the cornerstone of his legislative program. It has been estimated that over 500,000 man-hours have been spent on the bill.

Of course, I cannot summarize, today, the over 3,000 independent tax-law changes which the bill makes in our tax laws. I would like to give you just a few examples of the kind of thing that it does.

First, it permits a parent to take a \$600 deduction for a child whom he supports, if the child is under 19, or it attending school, or is receiving on-the-farm training, or is going to college, regardless of the child's earnings. Number of taxpayers benefited, 1,300,000. Saving to these taxpayers, \$85 million.

Second, it permits farmers to deduct up to 25 percent of farm income for soil and water conservation. Number of farmers benefited, 500,000. Saving to these farmers, \$10 million. In addition, farmers are benefited by provisions which permit more rapid writeoff of the expense of farm machinery equipment and construction and which remove the tax on the sale of diseased cattle.

Third, retired persons 65 or over will be exempt on all retirement income up to \$1,200, with tax saving up to \$240 per person. In addition, of course, to their personal exemptions. Over one and one-half million of our retired schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants and other senior citizens will be benefited by this provision. Tax saving to them, \$141 million.

Fourth, under the bill medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under prior law. Thus under the new tax bill a family with \$3,000 of gross income, and medical expenses of \$150, will be able to deduct \$60. The same family would not be able to deduct anything under the old law. In addition, the bill doubles the present maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted for medical expenses. Eight and one-half million taxpayers will be saved \$80 million by this provision.

Fifth, the bill gives working widows, widowers, and mothers a tax deduction of up to \$600 for child care expense. Two and one-tenth million taxpayers in the low-income group will save \$130 million as a result of this provision.

Sixth, the bill exempts all death benefits up to \$5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of the employee.

Seventh, the bill gives some relief from the double taxation of dividend income. It does this by excluding from the taxpayer's income the first \$50 in dividends.

A 4-percent credit on the amount of dividend income over \$50 is allowed. This is an election year and the Democrats have seized on this provision in an attempt to claim that it is designed to benefit the rich. They neglect to point out that among Americans who own stock are 2,130,000 housewives; 20,000 sailors, soldiers, and marines; 210,000 semiskilled workers, 323,000 farmers, 410,000 factory workers, 590,000 clerical workers, 250,000 small shopkeepers, and 200,000 salesmen.

Of the 4,750,000 families who own stock in public corporations those with income of \$5,000 a year or less own about one-third of the stock. These include 200,000 families with incomes of \$2,000 or less.

The Democrats neglect to point out that even under the new tax bill the total income tax on the single man who has wages of \$3,000 per year would be \$300. If the same man had made this amount of money in a corporation and had received it in dividends instead of wages the total income tax paid thereon would have been \$1,568.

The Democrats also neglect to point out that almost all civilized countries provide relief from the double taxation of dividends far greater than that in the new law. Canada, for example, provides a 20-percent tax credit for dividend income—five times the credit in the new bill. Incidentally, one of the results of this Canadian tax credit is that new capital has been flowing into Canada at a tremendous rate, creating jobs in that country which otherwise might have been made available in the United States.

In addition to these benefits, the new law will save taxpayers \$25 million in increased allowable deductions for charitable contributions; \$10 million in deductions for interest on credit purchases and \$10 million in more equitable taxation of pensions and annuities.

In addition to removing countless inequities in the taxation of individuals, the new Republican tax bill removes tax shackles which have impeded the growth of our economy. Thus, the bill will permit the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment through the depreciation allowance. For example, in the first year of life of the new equipment the taxpayer will be able to write off twice the amount now allowed. This provision represents savings to taxpayers of \$375 million, of which seventy-five million represents savings to individuals, such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

Of course, in the long run there will be no net loss of revenue to the Government from this provision since by accelerating the depreciation deductions these deductions are simply shifted from later to earlier years. However, the provision will mean thousands of jobs and better products at less cost.

Other aids to business found in the new tax law are as follows: Tax accounting rules are brought into harmony with business accounting.

The law will ease for small business the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings which are retained for legiti-

mate business purposes in the corporation.

The law will give to small-business men favorable tax treatment in the deduction of expenditures for research and experiments designed to create new products and new jobs.

I have listed only a very few of the important changes in our tax laws made by the bill. All in all, the new law contains \$827 million of tax relief for individuals and \$536 million of tax relief for business. However, since the new law also extended the present 52-percent corporate income tax for 1 additional year, it will bring in an additional \$1.2 billion from corporations. This increased tax on corporations practically pays for all the tax relief granted so that the net cost of the bill to the revenue will be only \$163 million.

I hope I have said enough to show that the new Republican Internal Revenue Code will create more jobs, will help farmers and workers, as well as business, will promote the technological development needed for defense, and will provide more goods and services for all our people.

It is a blueprint for a better and more prosperous America.

Dedication of the Research Reactor Building at the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's second collegiate research reactor located on the campus of the Pennsylvania State University at University Park, Pa., was dedicated on Tuesday, February 22, 1955, as one of the many events in connection with the centennial celebration of the university. The dedicatory speech was delivered by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission. Chairman Strauss' speech follows:

Mr. President, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, a century of academic and architectural growth lies between the Farmers' High School of 1855 and the Pennsylvania State University of today. During those years your predecessors and you have dedicated many new structures to the education of the young men and women of our country. We are met for such a dedication this afternoon as standing on the threshold of the second century we look backward with pride and ahead with confidence. Although we still know very little compared to what there is yet to be learned, we have discovered many useful things since 1855. This increased knowledge has enriched our civilization, lengthened our lives, and reduced our hardship and bodily suffering. Through mechanization we have done away with many of the chores of living. But the search for more capable tools to aid us in our learning and in our living is never ending. Over the years these devices, each based on the latest technology, have been

produced and operated for every purpose for which man could conceive a need. The automobile, household appliances, the airplane, electric lighting, and this microphone—all are examples.

You know, I am sure, that our Government is engaged in a vast program, seeking out, testing, improving, and applying peaceful uses of atomic energy. Government laboratories, industrial organizations, and institutions of learning, such as this great university, are all contributing to this work.

Indeed, universities play a vital role in this research and development program, for in academic surroundings, projects are not evaluated solely by economic gain and immediate, purposeful application. Here, bold thoughts from keen minds can find a place for expression, discussion, and experimentation. Questions are answered because they are born of scientific curiosity and not necessarily because solutions are needed for a particular purpose.

Much is expected of universities in the development of the uses of atomic energy. When this new reactor, which we are dedicating today, reaches critically some months from now, you will be in possession of a truly magnificent and versatile research instrument. Agriculture, medicine, chemistry, physics, and metallurgy are but a few of the great areas to which it can contribute. The radioisotopes it produces will provide tracers for analytical procedures. Beams of its neutrons will reveal by diffraction the composition of matter. Experiments can be conducted in the sterilization and pasteurization of foods, and studies can be carried out to determine the effects of radiation on cell structure. It is now possible, by the same radiation, to give new and useful properties to materials such as plastics, and you will be in a position to amplify this knowledge and to discover ever newer applications.

But, beyond all of these and many more projects too numerous to catalog, this reactor is due to render a service which is best performed in universities. That service is the training of new scientists, technicians, and engineers to carry on and expand nuclear energy exploration. Skilled people are today a limiting factor in our program, and you are here accepting the responsibility for providing more of them.

These men and women will go out into laboratories and plants equipped with the vigor of youth and an understanding of the latest technology. Although we cannot foresee their farflung scientific horizons, we can help them toward ours. Theirs are infinitely farther reaching. This is a role in which universities have proved themselves in all fields. It will be the salvation of our country in nuclear science.

It is interesting to speculate as to who may stand in our places here and what will be dedicated by them 100 years from now. How many of our grandparents in 1855 would have even dreamed of a nuclear reactor or would have associated anything with those words if they had heard them spoken? Can we possibly imagine what will be the order of the day in the year 2055? Alas, we cannot see a hundred years ahead, nor even a score, but our actions each day between now and then will, in a large measure, set the pattern for our tomorrows, including that day when some group will gather to mark the 200th anniversary of this university. We do know this—that during the years ahead, we must teach those who follow us to be not only as good technically as we can make them, but also that we must set them an example of citizenship in the United States and of citizenship in the world. The President's atoms-for-peace program is such an example. Unless such precepts are successful, there may indeed be no second centenary for universities.

This morning you broke ground for an all-faith chapel building. It is fitting that this

nuclear research reactor should be dedicated on the day already so hallowed. I have great faith in our future, faith in the next generation, faith that they will understand our failings and, in consequence, have fewer of their own.

Prayer being not inappropriate to a dedication, may I say that it is my prayer that this atomic reactor will become the instrumentality by means of which the potential for good and benign use of a great force of nature may make contact with the perception and the intellect of men.

To this unselfish and noble aim and in keeping with the genius of America and the spirit of this university, we dedicate this reactor.

How To Count the Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH P. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mrs. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this Congress a bill to provide for the adoption of the perpetual calendar devised by Willard E. Edwards, of Honolulu. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Mr. Edwards which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin describing a method of correcting time recording by inserting a zero year in the transition from B. C. to A. D. years, and its relation to the perpetual calendar. I wish to include also a chart showing correct time recording and copy of the perpetual calendar.

The article follows:

HOW TO COUNT THE YEARS

(By Willard E. Edwards, originator of the perpetual calendar)

Most of us look at New Year's Day as the birth of the newly numbered year, and are thinking of this year as the 1955th. This is really a misconception. Of course, last New Year's Day was the start of a new year. Nevertheless, it was really the start of the 1956th year of the Christian era, not that of the 1955th.

January 1, 1955, marked the anniversary or end of the first 1955 years, exactly as a person's 55th birthday anniversary marks the completion of 55 years of life. Just as a truthful woman says she is 55 all during her 56th year (the year before her 56th birthday anniversary), so we are recording the events of this year as occurring in 1955. The Christian era will become 1,956 years old on New Year's Day 1956.

HOW THE CUSTOM STARTED

Let us see how the misconception of looking at New Year's Days as birthdays began. It happened away back in the 6th century. In A. D. 533 Dionysius Exiguus introduced the system of counting years from the birth of Jesus. He erroneously took December 25th in the Roman year 753 as the date of birth. Then he arbitrarily decided to call January 1, 754, the start of the first year of the Christian era. He also called this first year the year 1 (one), being handicapped by the fact that the concept of zero had not been introduced into mathematical notation at that time.

Dionysius thus showed A. D. 1 as following 1 B. C. and overlooked the first 12-months that must precede the attainment of a year. Perhaps he counted age as the Chinese do,

by calling a baby a year old on the day he is born. But a Christian baby's first anniversary comes after he has lived 1 year. If Jesus had been born on January 1, 753, A. U. C., the year 1 of the Christian era would in reality have begun on January 1, 754 A. U. C. (A. U. C. is from *anno urbis conditae*, or *ab urbe condita*, and means dating from the founding of the city of Rome.)

It may also be that Dionysius was trying to date back the Christian era as far as possible. If so, he made a great mistake. Historians have proved him incorrect by at least 4 years. King Herod, who ordered the Massacre of the Innocents, died in the Roman year 750. And since Jesus is reputed to have escaped this massacre, he was living before Herod died. His birth is therefore now placed at 4 B. C. under the Dionysius style of counting. And this became an anachronism since the calendar year was not changed after the error was noted.

ADJUSTING THE ERROR

However, English astronomers Maskelyne, Herschel, and others have reduced this error by 1 year. They accepted a zero year A. D. (the Roman year 753) as a necessary mathematical requirement. This is explained by referring to the accompanying chart. When we count the years backward, the correct number of any year is always one less than the number of the year which followed it in time. The year 1, less 1, is equal to zero. Therefore, our old year 1 B. C. has been correctly renumbered as zero A. D. Similarly, the old year 2 B. C. has been correctly renumbered as minus 1 (or 1 B. C.), the old year 3 B. C. as minus 2 (or 2 B. C.), the old year 4 B. C. as minus 3 (or 3 B. C.), etc.

This was done so that B. C. years may be directly subtracted algebraically from A. D. years in order to find the correct elapsed time. Subtracting a minus number is the same as adding a plus number. Thus the elapsed time from 3 B. C., the reputed year of the birth of Jesus under the corrected count, to our 1954 Christmas anniversary was (1954) minus (-3) or 1957 years. In algebra, a number is not defined unless both its absolute value and its sign are given. However, it is customary to omit the plus sign. Our A. D. years are plus years, and subtracting an early A. D. year from a later one gives us elapsed time directly.

The correct assignment of the zero year between 1 B. C. and A. D. 1 is not simply a convenience. It is a mathematical necessity. We must also have a zero degree on our thermometer scales to show that the rise in temperature from -3 to +54 is 57. If Fahrenheit had used the same counting sys-

tem as Dionysius, our thermometers would read -2, -1, +1, +2, etc. In that case, we could not correctly say that the rise in temperature from -2 to +2 is 4 degrees. It would then be only 3.

ZERO IS A NUMERAL IN RECKONING

To say that we had no actual year called the year zero does not prove anything. We had no actual year 1, 2, 3, nor any A. D. year at all, until about 533 years after the calculated birth of Jesus. But since we do go back into history to renumber our years, the renumbering should at least be mathematically correct.

Zero is a perfectly good number, even though at first glance it may seem somewhat confusing to those who have not studied mathematics. Some of us think of it simply as meaning nothing, or the absence of quantity. But zero is also a real number, 1 less than 1. It is correctly shown as the first numeral (0, 1, 2, 3, etc.). Zero is the point of departure in reckoning and has many common uses.

We use it in the measurement of elevations, bearings, and temperatures; and as the first figure on our balances, meters, and scales. The first or prime meridian is the zero meridian. We speak of the zero hour, the time set to begin an attack. Midnight is expressed as 0000 in the 24-hour system of recording time. The first hour of the day is also the zero hour. The first minute of the hour is the zero minute. The first second of the minute is the zero second.

Also, the first day of the year could be called the zero day, or January 0, a day apart. This holiday, followed by 52 even weeks, would allow our calendar to become fixed and perpetual, as in the Perpetual Calendar.

We went into a zero-ending year at the start of the 20th century in going from 1899 to 1900. Note also on the accompanying chart that we began the second half of the 20th century with a zero-ending year. Let us subtract 1950 from each of the years shown on the last line of this chart. We then get the B. C. and A. D. years at the start of the Christian Era, including the year zero A. D. This alone proves their correct numbering.

ORDINAL AND CARDINAL NUMBERS

We should not confuse the counting of units with our recording of time or measurements. Suppose we pick an apple from a tree and place it in an empty box. It is the "first" apple picked, as well as the quantity "one" in the apple box. But in measurements there is a decided difference between "first" (an ordinal number) and

"one" (a cardinal number). The ordinal numbers show the order in a series, whereas the cardinal numbers express how many. Thus the "first" inch on an engineer's scale is the inch of "zero" measurements; 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, etc. The "second" inch is the inch of "ones"; 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, etc. We count our centuries, length of time in business, wedding anniversaries and ages likewise.

The years of the 20th century are those of the nineteen hundreds (1900-1999); of the second century, those of the one hundreds (100-199). Likewise, the years of the first century are those of the zero or no hundreds (0-99). Nor should we confuse a part of the first year A. D. (the year zero) with the entire year itself (one year). Our year "one" could not have started until the 12th month of our year "zero" had been completed.

During its 55th year, a business is spoken of as being 54 years old. At the end of the 55th year it becomes 55 years old. It is then beginning its 56th year. Throughout the 56th year it is spoken of as being 55 years old. This year is our 1956th year. Throughout this year we'll call it "1955."

COUNTING ANNIVERSARIES

A baby born on January 1, 1900, was in his first or zero year until January 1, 1901. If recorded in tenths of a year, his age during this first year was 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, etc. We can't start to count whole years until the first year has actually elapsed. The baby was in his second year from January 1, 1901, to January 1, 1902. But throughout his second year he was called only 1 year old. During this second year his age in tenths was 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, etc.

Last New Year's Day (Jan. 1, 1955) was the 1955th anniversary of the Christian era. Since 1,955 years had then elapsed, we are not in the 1956th year. However, during the 12 months of this year we'll speak of it as "1955," since 1956 years will not have been accomplished until New Year's Day 1956. If we count New Year's days the same as we do wedding anniversaries, the past misconception will disappear.

Acceptance of the year preceding the year 1 A. D. as the year 0 A. D. is the accurate, consistent and uniform way of recording our past time. Instead of perpetuating an ancient error, let's correct it like intelligent people. Let's consider New Year's days for what they are, closely approximate anniversaries of the beginning of the Christian era. On New Year's Day 1956 we shall have our next anniversary. It should be thought of and recorded as the 1956th.

The chart and the perpetual calendar are as follows:

(Accompanying chart)

Correct time recording, as accepted by modern chronologists, is shown below:

B. C.			A. D.						
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Rom. yr. 750 -3 3rd yr. BC yr. 3 BC	Rom. yr. 751 -2 2nd yr. BC yr. 2 BC	Rom. yr. 752 -1 1st yr. BC yr. 1 BC	Rom. yr. 753 0 1st yr. AD yr. 0 AD	Rom. yr. 754 +1 2nd yr. AD yr. 1 AD	Rom. yr. 755 +2 3rd yr. AD yr. 2 AD	Rom. yr. 756 +3 4th yr. AD yr. 3 AD	Rom. yr. 757 +4 5th yr. AD yr. 4 AD	Rom. yr. 758 +5 6th yr. AD yr. 5 AD	
Start of Christian era									
Years of the 20th century are continuous from January 1st 1900 through December 31st 1999									
1st half of 20th century					2nd half of 20th century				
Jan. 1 1947	Jan. 1 1948	Jan. 1 1949	Jan. 1 1950	Jan. 1 1951	Jan. 1 1952	Jan. 1 1953	Jan. 1 1954	Jan. 1 1955	Jan. 1 1956
1948th yr. yr. 1947 AD	1949th yr. yr. 1948 AD	1950th yr. yr. 1949 AD	1951st yr. yr. 1950 AD	1952nd yr. yr. 1951 AD	1953rd yr. yr. 1952 AD	1954th yr. yr. 1953 AD	1955th yr. yr. 1954 AD	1956th yr. yr. 1955 AD	
Midpoint of 20th century									

NOTE.—Please place January 1, 1950, on lower half of chart directly under the zero between B. C. and A. D. years on the upper half of chart, as shown.

THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR

*New Year's Day (a day apart from any week or month) is the first day of each year, a holiday, followed by the 364-day fixed calendar shown below:

January							February							March						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30						29	30						25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*Leap-Year Day (a second day apart) is observed only during leap years between June 31 and July 1 as the first day of the second half-year, a holiday.

April							May							June						
M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30						29	30						25	26	27	28	29	30	31

*These two Year-Days are definitely named and have a definite purpose. When considered apart from any week, they allow the calendar to become fixed and perpetual.

America's Business Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered at Youngstown, Ohio, last night by the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BENDER) dealing with the subject of America's business future.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I am very happy to be here with you this evening after the most strenuous 2 weeks I have put in since the campaign. In the last 10 days I have been talking to men and women all over the State of Ohio and in Pennsylvania. People sometimes ask me why I accept so many invitations and why I work so hard at my job. I can tell you the truth—I enjoy it. The more I see the people the more I enjoy it.

There is a great alertness in our country today. People are better informed on public affairs than they have ever been. They are often skeptical, but they are ready to listen to reason, and I think they have a real understanding of our country's basic problems.

Talking to you business and professional people, I know that I reflect the thinking of the overwhelming majority of the American people in what I am going to say. We have changed our country's outlook tremendously in the last few years. When all of us were a little younger our country's position was vastly different from what it is today. A generation ago we were a creditor nation, to be sure, but we had not yet realized all the implications of the position. Today, we have discovered what the British learned in the 19th century. The country which provides

the world's financial foundations automatically assumes the responsibility of preserving these foundations.

This is, I think, the most important corollary of our new role in the world. Whether we like it or not, and many of us do not like it, a position of world leadership has been thrust upon us. I know that many of us would like nothing better than an opportunity to live our lives in peace and contentment. We have virtually all of the things we need upon this great North American Continent to provide for the needs of our country. If we were to stay at home, minding our own business, we would not require some of the raw materials which must be obtained from foreign sources for military forces.

If we could turn back the hands of time to the 19th century many of us would be far happier with our lot.

This is all a bygone dream. The world will not let us enjoy the luxuries of isolation. This last week a brigadier general of the Army told a group, over which I presided in Cleveland, that our entire system of military air defense is on a 24-hour 20-minute alert basis. Every military station in the country is prepared to go into action on 20 minutes' notice. This is a frightening prospect. But it illustrates the tension of the times in which we live. Today the expanding frontiers of science have compressed the world into a globe which is, figuratively, no bigger than a baseball. You can almost put your hands around it. Our means of communication can span the oceans in a matter of seconds. No one knows the exact speed of our potential guided missiles. Some of my scientific friends tell me that there is probably no theoretical limit which we can establish. Planes can already span our own country in a matter of 4 hours. If we can do these things, intelligence dictates the sobering knowledge that our possible enemies may do the same.

I say these things, not because I am fearful of the future, but because I believe sincerely that we sometimes think and react as if we could forget these facts of life. Often men and women who are confronted with the knowledge of something too frightening to contemplate, push it so far into the background that they lose all power of action. The Eisenhower administration has not made this mistake. Our President is a remarkable man. He has learned from long and bitter experience how to face a disturbing situation and how to live with it. When he relaxes it is only because he knows that he must do so in order to face the reality which he can never really escape.

There are people in our country who make a serious mistake of political judgment. Some of them have been writing me letters, declaring that they see no difference between the foreign policy of President Eisenhower and the foreign policy of President Truman. Nothing could be more erroneous. Truman and Acheson believed in waiting for the blow to strike. They did not anticipate. They did not plan. As a result, when the enemy did strike, in 1950, we were shockingly unprepared. Despite the fact that we had spent billions of dollars for defense purposes, our defenses in the Far East were grossly unprepared. Today that has been changed entirely. We are prepared for any emergency. We are not cocky. We have no chip on our shoulder. But, we are on the alert. More than this, our Secretary of State, acting under the President's direction, has taken the lead in organizing the free countries of Asia and the Pacific to meet any threat. For the first time in the history of the world, we are parties to an agreement in the Pacific. I want to call your attention to one of the specific terms of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. This provision declares that any of the countries involved may call for help from their allies to resist

not only external aggression, but also internal subversion. This is a most important development. In the past the Communist technique has been simple. They have infiltrated governments. They have used native Communists to stir up discontent and when they were challenged, they invariably said, "This is an internal problem, and it is none of your business." This is not going to happen again—thanks to the foresight of our President and his administration.

There is another vital distinction between the policies of President Eisenhower and his predecessors. Mr. Truman told American military leaders that they could go so far and no farther. He told our fliers that if they are attacked they could pursue their attackers up to point X. And then turn back. He told one of the greatest living military experts that he could not attack—he could only defend. President Eisenhower has reversed this entirely. If any one fires at an American plane, on an American ship, or on an American soldier, we are going to fire back. The prestige and dignity of the American people will no longer be ignored and trampled into the dust without retaliation. I think our people are sick and tired of playing the Communist game. We know that if we give them an inch they will take a yard. If we give them a yard—they will take a mile.

These are by no means the only differences that I can see in the administration's program. Right here at home, our President is doing his utmost to cut wasteful, meaningless spending of the taxpayers' money. We are reducing bloated Federal payrolls. We are trying to establish intelligent order inside the bureaucracy that has grown up over the years. This is not easy. It involves human beings and no public official enjoys the prospect of dismissing any employee. We can't help remembering that each one of them has a family—and a vote. But nothing that I have seen in public life comes closer to sheer downright political opium smoking than the latest stunt of the Democrats in Washington. For months they have been shouting to the high heavens about the reduction of military personnel by the Eisenhower administration. They have been crying for more public housing. They have been asking for Federal funds for everything they can think of. Now they want to cut Federal taxes by \$20 for every taxpayer and every dependent.

This is the best political mousetrap since Ralph Waldo Emerson's. No one in public life ever wants to raise taxes and cut spending. Everyone likes to cut taxes and increase spending, but unless somebody repeals the law of gravity and finds a way to keep going up higher and higher without ever coming down, it can't be done. I do not believe the American people will buy this kind of political goldbrick.

Just what is my conclusion from all of these observations? I am—you might not think it from what I have been saying—but I am an optimist. If I were not, I could not be a Republican. I was an active Republican when some of my colleagues were in hiding. But I have faith in America and its future. Our country shares that faith. Every 24 hours in the last year our population, throughout the country, has increased by 11,000 people. Every 30 days we have added to our population a city the size of Syracuse. This physical fact alone is going to create tremendous needs—more housing, more schools, more clothing, more automobiles, more savings, and more opportunities. More and more people reaching the age of retirement will be enjoying their years of rest. There will be more money to spend, more time to travel, and better health to enjoy it. The same technical skills which threaten the extermination of the world today can be used tomorrow to assure our country of an almost incredible future. The atomic science that can throw hydrogen ra-

diation to vast parts of the world can also fuel our factories, light our cities, and power every vehicle in the world. What we need is time—time to consolidate our knowledge—time to help mankind work out its destiny.

I am a man of faith. I do not believe that we are born into existence simply for our self-destruction. I believe that we have the intelligence and the judgment to prevent such a catastrophe. Certainly, here in America, we have the will to do so. With your help and with the help of the American people, I am sure that we will solve our problems, and that we will work together to create a world which will live and not die.

Public Power and the So-Called Partnership Program of the National Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, early in February I was asked by the North American Newspaper Alliance to present my support of public power and my opposition to the so-called partnership program of the national administration. At the same time, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay was invited to state an opposite viewpoint on these vital issues.

I ask, Mr. President, that both of these statements, in fairness to Mr. McKay and myself, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR NEUBERGER DEFENDS PUBLIC POWER, STAND THAT GAVE HIM UPSET OREGON VICTORY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The junior Senator from Oregon, a Democrat, won an upset victory over Senator Guy Cordon, the incumbent Republican, in the traditionally Republican, Northwestern State. That victory, last November, gave the Democrats control of the Senate. The big issue in the Oregon campaign was public power. In this exclusive article, Senator NEUBERGER explains his position on this issue.)

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—The ending of the public-power program can only mean economic stagnation in many key regions of the United States. The TVA and Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have brought electricity to American farms, strengthened industrial payrolls and during the war helped to make possible the production of atomic energy and 50,000 planes a year.

Why did the Eisenhower administration, through Secretary of the Interior McKay, abolish so beneficial a program for what it calls "partnership?"

Under partnership, the Government will put up half the cost of dams and private utilities generally the other half. When the dam is built, the Government gets the fish ladders and locks and floodgates, which yield no revenue. The utility acquires the kilowatts from the powerhouse for a period of at least 50 years.

What is the purpose of this? Under the Federal program, power receipts have been

pouring into the Treasury. The Government has invested \$128,549,822 in construction costs and operating expenses for Bonneville Dam. Yet, after only 11 years of full operation, this project has put \$48,825,958 in power revenues into public coffers. In fact, the whole Bonneville Power Administration, which markets energy from all Federal dams in the Northwest, has collected gross income of \$370,565,589 through the sale of kilowatts.

Why end this program for a vague partnership which could benefit only the private utilities and raise the cost of power needed for western industrial development? It is significant, I think, that the administration proposes partnership for the magnificent hydroelectric sites along the Columbia River, but at the same time recommends fully Federal dams for the far less valuable sites in the upper Colorado Basin where electric-power output is less profitable. In other words, the power companies get the cream, Uncle Sam the dregs.

I have compared the partnership proposed by the administration to the building of a department store by two men. Each partner puts up half the money. After the store is erected, one man receives as his share the drinking fountains, revolving doors, fire escapes, and escalators. The other partner gets the sales counters. That describes the partnership scheme under which the Government would get fish ladders while the utility corporations take over the power-plants.

Actually, partnership has proved to be the label for an empty package. In the 2 years that the administration has been pushing the idea partnership has failed to get a single Northwest power project underway. The only tangible accomplishment has been a 2-year moratorium on Federal construction of the Big Priest Rapids project while a local public utility explores the feasibility of construction. Meanwhile, the specter of a severe power shortage in the area—with inestimable economic repercussions—moves closer to reality.

As long ago as 1908 two great progressive Republicans—Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot—fought an historic battle to keep magnificent waterpower sites on mountain rivers away from what they then called the Power Trust. Contrast this with the desire of Secretary of the Interior McKay to give the great Hells Canyon site on the Snake River to the Idaho Power Co., a corporation which holds its annual meetings in Augusta, Maine, nearly 3,000 miles from Idaho.

The Idaho Power Co. would not develop the full power potential of Hells Canyon. Its rates are high, far higher than the Government charges through the Bonneville Administration. Long before this controversy began, the Corps of Army Engineers recommended in their famous 303 report the construction of a multipurpose Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Why reject this master plan for development of the Snake River?

The plan for full development of the Columbia River Basin, pioneered through the years by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, is an engineering masterpiece. The plan calls for operation of dams throughout the basin in a unified system for maximum power production, flood control, irrigation, navigation, and protection of wildlife. This integrated operation increases efficiency and total use of the region's water resources. As a result, benefits from the whole river system—as a unit—become greater than the sum of its parts.

From the standpoint of conservation, Hells Canyon is of major importance. If it is abandoned to partial development by a private company, as sought by the administration, the multipurpose possibilities of the entire river system will be greatly reduced. Specifically, this will mean the loss of 3 million acre-feet of storage for flood waters, loss of about 500,000 kilowatts of electricity,

loss of assistance to irrigation from power revenues, less navigation, and fewer recreation benefits. The shortsightedness of the administration in breaking up the river program can be measured in countless millions of dollars.

I was born and raised in a region, the Pacific Northwest, where there is no coal, no oil, no natural gas. Our sole industrial fuel is falling water, water which flows to the sea for "as long as the sun shall set in the sky and grass shall grow on the hills," to use a colorful Indian phrase. In the first decade that the Government tapped the swift reaches of the Columbia River, where lurks almost half of the Nation's potential hydro-electricity, industrial payrolls in Oregon and Washington soared 329 percent. Think of the private enterprise, the tax revenues, the self-supporting families made possible by that great gain in factory employment.

By any conceivable test, public power has been a success. It has brought comforts to farmers, jobs to workers, profits for businessmen. Equally important, it is paying for itself. Grand Coulee Dam has had its full quota of turbines in action only since 1951, and yet \$51,031,697 has been paid into the Treasury toward retiring an eventual power debt of \$221,462,229. Under partnership a large portion of this income, instead of going to the Federal Government, would be preempted by the private power companies.

ROOM FOR BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POWER IN UNITED STATES, SAYS SECRETARY MCKAY—AIM: MORE POWER FOR PEOPLE'S USE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Secretary of the Interior McKay, at the suggestion of North American Newspaper Alliance, gives here a blueprint of the Eisenhower administration's policy on development of United States power resources.)

(By Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior)

WASHINGTON, February 6.—The partnership power program of the Eisenhower administration is not a question of public power versus private power, but whether there is to be Federal power, and Federal power only.

The idea of partnership is very simple. It is based on the concept of all the things that made this country what it is today—the greatest in the world. It is based on the pride that people take in initiative, in doing things for themselves.

In the 1952 campaign, President Eisenhower said at Seattle:

"We need resource development, and we need it on a river-basin basis. We need resource development, not to the limit of the whim of any administration in power, but to the limit of the capacity of the region to benefit. And to do that we need partnership to the limit of everyone's ability."

There is the blueprint of the Eisenhower administration's power policy. First, we want to give local enterprise—either public or private—a chance to develop its power resources.

But when the time comes when these agencies are either unable or unwilling to do so, then the Federal Government should step in and develop the power for the benefit of the people of the region.

Public power is here and it is here to stay. There are some who insist there is no place in this Nation for it. I do not agree. There is room for both public and private power and the job is to see that both are developed in a working arrangement which has but one goal—more power for use of the people.

There is one fundamental difference between those who support the partnership power policy and those who oppose it.

We who support it do so to move toward a goal of more actual kilowatts, not conversation kilowatts. More electrical power, not political power.

Here is what we mean by partnership.

We want local agencies, either public or private, to develop as much energy as they can. In some instances flood control, navigation, recreation, fish and wildlife, and irrigation come into the picture. In these instances we want to become partners in the project.

Three big partnership programs were approved in the 83d Congress. All were supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. In two instances Democrats introduced the bills for the projects.

So partnership is not partisan. I repeat, the disagreement is between those who want Federal power and Federal power only.

Here is how the partnership policy works. Take, for instance, the big Priest Rapids Dam in the State of Washington, which will produce more than 1 million kilowatts. Here a public utility district, owned and controlled by the people in the area, wants to build the dam and have the Government build the navigation and flood-control features.

Congress approved the project and members of both parties joined. There are drillers now at work in that stretch of the Columbia River making test borings. It is a step toward the main goal—more power, not more conversation.

Take, now, the Cougar Dam in my home State. For years the Army engineers had approval of a flood-control dam on a fork of the McKenzie River. Then up came the city of Eugene, operating the oldest municipal power system in the State, and asked to become a partner in the project.

The city of Eugene wants to build the powerplant and pay for it and have the power available for the people in its area through the Northwest power pool.

A short distance away from Eugene is the Green Peter Dam site. Here the Government again has a flood-control project in which it plans to build a dam. A private power company offers to build the powerhouse and take the power through the Northwest power pool.

Senator KERR introduced and Congress approved a bill to permit a State-Federal partnership in the development of the Big Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma. That had been hanging fire for some time until the partnership idea led to its development.

Senators HILL and SPARKMAN, of Alabama, well known as public-power advocates, supported a proposal to deauthorize Federal development of the Coosa River in their State and Permit the Alabama Power Co. to join in a partnership to get this project started. So, you see that Democrats and Republicans alike in the Congress have joined in getting projects started. Power is needed all over the country and this is just a faster way to get it.

Just last month in my home State the Partnership policy came up in the State house of representatives. It was in the form of a memorial to Congress supporting the Cougar Dam and Green Peter proposals. The vote was 44 to 16 for the memorial.

Mrs. Richard L. Neuberger led the fight against the partnership. There are 25 Democrats in the Oregon house but 11 of them supported the partnership. Three of the 11 were recently elected from the Hells Canyon area. So, you see partnership meets with approval.

On the main stem of the Columbia between the Dalles Dam and the McNary Dam is the proposed John Day Dam. Here a group of private power companies want to join with public agencies to build the powerhouse and then take the power. They will simply be paying for their future power supplies in advance.

Now, the argument that here the Government surrenders its revenue-producing fea-

ture is fallacious. The Federal Government has always borne the cost of flood control and navigation. So the Government will not assume any more costs than it would if it built the dam alone.

In Oregon the house of representatives asked Congress to approve the project, either as a partnership or an all-out Federal project. The Federal Government is not withdrawing from the power field.

The President's budget includes \$20 million to enable the Federal Government to participate in 1956 in partnership developments. The President has also recommended legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin developments. These projects are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private. Both are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado and the Fryngan-Arkansas projects. They are vitally needed to conserve the water supply in the Intermountain States.

These projects are beyond the ability of the local enterprise, either public or private, because they covered large areas in several States and require amounts of money beyond the capacity of anyone to raise except the Government. They meet the administration's standards and are being supported.

But to say that all power development must be Federal—all dams, all river development—is to ask the impossible from the money standpoint. To federalize completely all electric power and have control from Washington of all water supplies and the land which depends on these supplies is such a program of bureaucratic control of America or of any region to which the people will never subscribe.

Accomplishments of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration in encouraging initiative and enterprise have not made headlines because they do not involve controversy and crises. But these unspectacular achievements of the past 2 years have been very important to every American. The quiet, undramatic progressive developments the Eisenhower administration is helping in America—without making sensational news—are important for the present and future of our people.

This point was made very clearly by Treasury Secretary Humphrey in an address at Philadelphia last Wednesday, February 16. I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, so that all Senators may have a chance to read this accounting of the fiscal management of the first 2 Eisenhower years.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY TREASURY SECRETARY HUMPHREY, FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF THE 1954 WILLIAM PENN AWARD OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF GREATER PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY 16, 1955, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I am deeply honored to receive the 1954 William Penn Award of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia. It is a great privilege for me to receive this honor as a member of President Eisenhower's administration.

I am going to talk to you tonight not as Secretary of the Treasury, not as a Cabinet officer, or even as a businessman who is now a bureaucrat. I will talk rather as a friend and fellow citizen and a taxpayer who shares with you the responsibility of good government, of keeping America the land of opportunity—the land where the economy of today must build for the economy of tomorrow by its wisdom, its soundness, and its farsightedness. We must build a world with more and better opportunities for our children and our children's children and not a world that will take opportunity away from them.

The problems and accomplishments I speak of tonight are the problems of every citizen, and the accomplishments are the work of all who, by their own efforts, have helped to build soundness and opportunity by hard work and honest endeavor.

I am going to talk to you tonight not of headlines, controversy, and crises, but of the quiet, undramatic, progressive developments that are going on all around us in America. There have been no headlines to tell you that more than 60 million Americans are working at jobs of their own choosing—jobs that they are free to leave or change if and whenever they so desire. There are no headlines to tell you that about 55 percent of the 47 million families in America own their own homes, that Americans have savings of \$80 billion in life-insurance policies; almost \$50 billion in United States savings bonds; and \$25 billion in retirement pension funds. There are no headlines to remind you that stringent wartime Government controls no longer hamper or restrict the individual or the businessman. And there are no headlines to herald the stirring return of confidence of Americans in their Government, in each other, and in our ability and strength to do whatever may be required of us in any emergency.

I am even more encouraged to talk about these simple principles that have made our country great when I read over the list of names of those who have been previous recipients of the William Penn Award, showing that the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce over the years has been honoring men who stand for the same principles of free, competitive enterprise and initiative which we now believe are basic to our American way of life—the way of life which has yet to be surpassed anywhere in this world of ours.

It has been a dedicated goal of the Eisenhower administration to keep alive and vigorous the priceless principles of free, competitive enterprise and initiative. But we must do more than keep them alive and vigorous. We must keep them growing and always developing the new things and the better ways of doing things which have made this Nation great.

What has been done in encouraging initiative and enterprise has not been sensational or dramatic. But it has been important to every American in his daily life. It is important to the standard of living of every American worker and his loved ones. And it is vitally important to the defense of all Americans against any possible enemy attack, for the power and strength of American

industrial capacity is the very foundation of our security.

It is often true that "good news" is "no news" to attract public attention in the daily news outlets of press, radio, and TV. Yet the quiet, undramatic, progressive developments that are going on in America—without making sensational news—are important for the present and future of our people.

I have no quarrel with what makes news. I make these observations only as a reason for talking a little tonight about some of the constructive things that have been done during the past 2 years—important things which are worth mentioning because they do not draw the attention that controversy and violence do.

What are some of these unspectacular things that this administration has been helping to accomplish during the past 2 years?

The undramatic but steady and healthy progress which has been going on in this country has increased the confidence of all Americans in the possibilities of our future. This increasing confidence is the most important stimulant to the development of the strength of our Nation's economy, with the careful and quiet assistance of an administration which knows that Government can do relatively little except to help to properly set a stage upon which free vigorous Americans can perform.

Our Nation has made the transition from a wartime high to a lower level of Government spending without a major economic upset. This transition was helped substantially by heavy tax cuts and other moves stimulating confidence.

While there is still high tension in many places, there is no armed warfare between major powers at any point on the globe as of this moment. There is peace, uneasy as it is, as far as American fighting men are concerned. War in Korea has halted. War in Indochina has ceased.

The present improved relationships in many places throughout the world have been achieved by ceaseless and dedicated pursuit of solutions for the vexing and serious widespread international problems. It is a treacherous path. Bold risks must sometimes be taken, but success to date is high proof of the competence and wisdom of the policies which have been adopted in wrestling with this problem of preserving the peace and making it more secure.

Inflation has been stopped. In the past 2 years the value of the dollar has changed only one-fifth of 1 cent. This compares with a drop in the value of the dollar from 100 cents in 1939 to only 52 cents in January 1953. All departments and many people in Government have been working hard for, and insisting upon getting, our Federal spending under control. Deficits, which lead to more borrowing and so to inflation, have been cut substantially.

The Federal Reserve System has acted promptly, courageously, and wisely to adopt monetary and credit policies which have met the needs of the economy while walking the fine line between deflation and inflation. And the Treasury has done its bit in halting inflation, and avoiding deflation, by doing its borrowing so as to be as careful as possible concerning its effect upon the constructive course of the economy.

This is well illustrated by the issue and highly successful placement only a few days ago of nearly \$2 billion in 40-year 3-percent bonds. They are the longest bonds that have been sold by the Government since an issue to help pay for the Panama Canal in 1911.

There is nothing academic about the importance of keeping inflation locked out. The value of earnings and savings can be protected in no other way. Just realize that 55 out of every 100 families in America now

earn more than \$4,000 a year as compared with only 10 out of 100 earning \$4,000 a year early in the century in terms of today's prices. And recall the millions of owners of their homes, accounts in savings banks, savings bonds, insurance policies, and pensions, of which I spoke just a moment ago. Because this Nation has quietly become a nation of haves rather than have-nots, inflation must stay checked to protect the earnings and savings of millions of Americans.

We had a cash balance between money collected from the public and money paid out by the Government last year. Although we will not have a cash balance this year, we are estimating a small surplus in the fiscal year ahead. The total debt has continued to grow because of the large deficit we inherited in our first year in office and the subsequent deficits, even though they have been much smaller. But the inflationary effect of deficit financing has been almost wholly eliminated now that most of the increase in debt is being financed by securities issued to Government trust funds rather than borrowing from the public.

In fiscal 1956, spending will be almost \$12 billion less than in 1953. We have not yet balanced the budget. We could have done so in 1954, but a big tax cut was more stimulating to a growing economy and we believed that it was better for the people to have more of their own money left with them to spend, as they thought best, rather than to have the Government spending it for them. We have cut the deficit from more than \$9 billion in fiscal 1953 to what we estimate will be less than \$2½ billion in 1956. We are still a year and a half away from the end of that period, and we have every hope of cutting this deficit even further if some development elsewhere in the world does not upset our plans.

There is nothing in the Formosa situation or elsewhere in the world which up to this moment has altered our budget program for reduced expenditures in the year to come. And reduced expenditures we make do not mean reduced defenses.

As the President has said, the United States is in a stronger position to defend itself against aggression than it was 2 years ago. The Defense Department has developed a better balanced, more mobile and flexible and effective defense establishment at lower cost to the taxpayers.

Progress has been made in reducing waste and extravagance. Obsolete equipment and supplies are being eliminated. There is much left to be done, but that does not alter the fact that much has already been accomplished. We have a far better balanced program. We are making progress in real unification in the armed services, so that competition between them is less likely to duplicate efforts and expenditures that squander both tax money and our national resources. Greater unity adds strength to our defense position.

We can and we must spend whatever is needed for our security; that is our first concern. But we know that real security does not result simply from spending huge amounts of money. The worth of our defense must be measured not by its costs but by its wisdom.

The President's decisions on our defense forces are recognition of the fact that in this age of almost unbelievable developments in science and production techniques, we cannot have a static defense committed to old-fashioned strategy and weapons. Real security for our Nation over an extended period must also rest upon a sound and growing economy.

As cuts in future expenditures all through the Government's operations come clearly into sight, and if at the same time our expanding economy promises greater income with lesser rates of tax, we will look forward

to further reductions in our tax structure, distributed as fairly as possible among all taxpayers.

The expectation of further tax reduction and the maintenance of sound fiscal policies are firm foundation stones creating greater confidence in our future prosperity.

These, then, have been fine, worthwhile accomplishments for the good of the Nation, its economy, and its future. They have been accomplished without fanfare or sensational controversy. In the Cabinet and in the agency heads in this administration, there exists a wonderful team spirit which has resulted in real accomplishment with few headline battles.

The role which the Government can play in the economic affairs of the Nation should be limited. Government manipulation is the antithesis of a free America, and encroachment by government in restricting the freedom of its citizens should be limited to doing, as Lincoln said, "for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves—in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

The future of free America lies in the initiative, the resourcefulness, the tenacity, daring, and courage of 160 million Americans, each free to choose how best he can promote his own interest and the interest and future of his loved ones in whatever way he can best devise only so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others. It is the cumulative power of this great effort which has made America great in the past and which I am convinced will drive us ahead in the future at an accelerated pace in excess of anything we have ever known before.

You and I as citizens must participate in this great drive toward a better America. As such a citizen, I am pleased and proud to accept this fine award from the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia, and to receive it in recognition of the contributions which President Eisenhower's administration has made to the advancement of the economy of this Nation.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the address by a very distinguished citizen of New York, Mr. Charles H. Silver, which was delivered on Sunday, February 20, at Temple B'nai Jeshurun in New York City. Mr. Silver at that time was the recipient of the annual Brotherhood Day award by Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, and his address is one of acceptance. It is most appropriate and inspiring, and I commend it to the multitude of Americans who are interested in the significance of Brotherhood Week.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS OF CHARLES H. SILVER

It is with a feeling of deep gratitude that I give to you my thanks for this distin-

gushed honor that you have conferred upon me. I count it a very high privilege to be named as this year's recipient of your brotherhood award. This award is the symbol of your high regard for me, and I accept it in the spirit of brotherhood which has prompted you to take this action. I am grateful to you.

At the same time, I am impelled to point out that the bestowal of this great honor represents in a very large sense a tribute to all of us who are striving to weld together the relations of men of good will and to take another step in the direction of making this ideal an actual reality. This objective was born centuries ago, and while we have moved slowly toward its attainment, we have yet a great distance to travel, for the world today is in the clutch of opposing forces that cannot be reconciled in a brief period.

This is indeed unfortunate, but we must accept conditions as they exist and unite to alter them for the benefit of all mankind. I think that is one thing we are trying to do through the medium of Brotherhood Week. We do not seek to destroy the beliefs of those not in our own faith, but we believe that there can be created a genuine spirit of brotherhood among Catholics, Protestants, and Jews if we have but the will and patience to bring it about.

These exercises are being held under the auspices of the Men's Club identified with a Jewish synagogue that is more than 130 years old. There are present men of other faiths, which is a clear indication that brotherly love is a vital part of the teachings of every faith and that we can meet on a common ground and live in a spirit of harmony, understanding, and affection.

I think that we who are members of the Jewish faith may well be proud of the fact that the principle of brotherhood was proclaimed centuries ago by our teachers, rabbis, and national leaders. We read in Leviticus the command "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." One of the great religious teachers of his time, and indeed of all time, said that this was a fundamental principle of the Torah. Universal love is here proclaimed, not merely as an ideal advocated in the Torah but as the only true standard of human relationships. Those who have studied the writings of hundreds of rabbis believe that this rabbinic outlook in the area of morals was universal and not national. Some of these rabbis made definite reference to non-Jews and Hillel, the great teacher, said "Be a lover of your fellow creatures," and when an ancient rabbi was asked, "Why were all men descended from one couple, Adam and Eve?" he replied, "So that no one may say that he is in any way superior to his neighbor since all men have a common origin."

Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, a minister of the Marble Collegiate Church, in an article which he wrote on the subject of "Understand—A Source of Strength," had this to say: "One of the most profound functions of religion after that of relating man to God is to relate man to his neighbor. Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself. Indeed the hallmark of the Christian is the depth and quality of his love for all God's children regardless of their race, religion, or their place in life."

A distinguished prelate of the Catholic church, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, recently wrote, "If we are real Americans we must cooperate in checking the spread of bigotry which is a contagious and virulent disease. However, it is not only patriotic to cure this disease, it is essential to do so if America is to remain America. And how can we check the spread of this disease? The first step that each one of us must take to eliminate bigotry, selfishness, harshness, injustice, and contempt from the

minds and hearts of others is to make sure that they have no place in our own."

Here we have the expression of great theologians and spiritual leaders of the three religions. They are in complete agreement that if the human race is to survive there must be established firmly a foundation of understanding and brotherhood and that is the challenge of our time.

It seems to me that we may make the greatest contribution in the history of mankind if we can create an atmosphere of love and decency that will no more be marred by petty hates and dislikes and the evil forces of bigotry. The scientific advances that have been made, especially in the field of what may be called the destructive arts, have placed a great handicap on those who would substitute love for hate. What does it avail to build atomic weapons, to develop dozens of electrical appliances, to conquer the stubborn forces of nature, if we continue to live in a climate of apprehension and suspicion. Material progress takes us not a single step from a life that is harried by suspicion and the hard edges of hate.

Words of understanding and compassion are more powerful than the most deadly bomb. It has been said that a soft answer turneth away wrath. How much pleasanter it is to speak softly and kindly even to those who disagree with us than to wield a deadly weapon. The kind word helps to create a climate of friendship, the destructive weapon destroys without rhyme or reason and rarely leaves anything to take the place of its object of destruction.

And so, today my friends, while I speak to you with full appreciation of the tribute which you have seen fit to pay me, I want to express the fervent hope that this brotherhood week will be another link that will eventually become part of a powerful chain, not only in this country but throughout the whole world that will embrace men and women of every racial strain and religious faith who will live side by side in a spirit of mutual respect.

It has been a long, hard road through the centuries, but it is a comfort to know that we have moved slowly in the right direction. As the years follow each other, we have sought and succeeded to some extent in getting a little nearer to our goal. To us, this is a great challenge, just as it was to those of other generations. We can make a worthwhile contribution to human happiness if we only reject the theory that it cannot be done and that there is evil among mankind that cannot be wiped out.

I am absolutely optimistic about the future. We of the Men's Brotherhood of B'nai B'rith will march in that procession which leads to ultimate victory over the forces of disruption, bigotry, and intolerance. I pray to God that he should give us the strength to carry on and to uphold those who will follow us in the pursuit of universal happiness and decent living. Thank you again for this great honor.

What Is an American?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this week we have been celebrating Brotherhood Week throughout our Nation. The Methodist church has many wellknown preachers. One of them, Dr. Harold W.

Ruopp, formerly pastor of Hennepin Avenue Methodist Church, and now minister-at-large of the Minnesota Council of Churches, has written an excellent statement on What Is an American? This was printed in the national Methodist weekly, the Christian Advocate, on July 1, 1954. It is so appropriate for this week that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

(By Harold W. Ruopp)

An American is one who believes in the right of men and women—of whatever creed, class, color, or ancestry—to live as human beings with the dignity becoming the children of God.

An American is one who believes in the right to be free; free not only from crushing coercions and dictatorships and regimentation, but free for that way of life where men may think and speak as they choose and worship God as they see fit.

An American is one who believes in the right to vote, the right to work, the right to learn, the right to live, and—what is equally important—the right to be different; for he knows, that if we ever lose our right to be different, we lose our right to be free.

An American is one who believes in democracy, not only for himself, but for all his fellow-Americans, and by democracy he means not simply the rule of the majority, but the rights of minorities—and those minorities have rights, not because they are minorities, but because they are human beings.

An American is one who believes in the responsibility of privilege. What he asks for himself, he is willing to grant to others; what he demands from others, he is willing to give himself. His creed is not alone, "live and let live," but, "live and help live."

An American is one who acts from faith in others, not fear of others; from understanding, not prejudice; from good will, not hatred. To bigotry he gives no sanction; to intolerance, no support.

The only question the true American ever asks is not, "Are you a Protestant or Catholic, gentile or Jew, white or colored?" but "Are you an American? If you are, then give me your hand, for I am an American too."

Regulation of the Gas Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a revealing analysis by the reliable columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, from the San Francisco News of February 8, 1955, entitled "Heart and Spirit Have Been Reorganized Out of FPC," which reports the shocking degree to which the Federal Power Commission seems to be turning itself into an instrument of the gas industry rather than an instrument of Congress, as it was intended to be, for the protection of consumers. If the Commission's subservience to the

industry is as complete as indicated by its recent efforts (a) to limit its own jurisdiction and permit nontransporting gas producers to charge what the traffic will bear, (b) to rewrite its rate-making procedures to escape the fair requirements of the prudent investment or cost method, and (c) to reorganize the heart of the Commission's regulatory power out of existence and exile or send to Siberia any personnel that still wants to protect the public interest, then I fear that the time for major surgery is at hand.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco News, February 8, 1955]

HEART AND SPIRIT HAVE BEEN REORGANIZED OUT OF FPC

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Something has been said here recently about the way Federal regulatory commissions have come under the dominant influence of business and financial interests, which the commissions are supposed to regulate—and how their function, ordained by Congress, to protect the public interest has been submerged.

A revealing case study is offered in the Federal Power Commission, which was created as an independent commission by Congress in 1930 during the Herbert Hoover administration to have jurisdiction over hydro-electric-power development and to which subsequently was assigned authority over natural gas in the 1938 Natural Gas Act.

The FPC emerged finally from a "reorganization" instituted by the Eisenhower administration. The result is that the "guts," heart, and spirit were possessed by this agency in behalf of protecting public and consumer interests have been nearly reorganized out of it.

OLD STORY

It's the old story. Things were made uncomfortable for key members of the expert staff whose conception of regulation does not coincide with that of the now prevailing business-minded element on the FPC. Some have been demoted and shunted aside to make way for more amenable personnel. Some have quit, including a number of lawyers on the staff as well as technical experts.

Morale is low. Apathy has supplanted a once-high esprit de corps.

The expert staff now finds itself frequently without support from the Commission, its recommendations and findings disregarded in vital issues with utilities, gas, and electric.

TWO STEPS

Instead there is developing a situation where the top officers of powerful utilities deal directly with the front offices of the FPC to negotiate for what they want.

Two steps achieved the transformation of the Commission, both familiar to anyone who has watched the same thing happen before.

First was a change in the Commission itself, which consists of five members. That began even before this administration. The offensive opened during the Truman administration when the Senate, under pressure from powerful oil-and-gas interests that were influential with leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in Congress, defeated confirmation for another term of Leland Olds, for 10 years a stalwart defender of the public interest.

INDUSTRY VIEWPOINT

That started a shift in the very delicate balance on the FPC until, with three appointments during the Eisenhower administration, it now is weighted definitely toward what might be called the industry viewpoint.

But something more is required. That is the second step. That is to carry the treatment down below the Commissioners themselves, and intimidate or weed out in one way or another those on the permanent, civil service, expert staff whom the utilities, electric and gas, consider troublemakers because they seek to carry out the law in their recommendations without fear or favor.

Several months ago, as reported here at the time, the new chairman, Jerome K. Kuykendall, ordered a reorganization of the Commission which he announced at a staff meeting. Called in to make a survey was a New York management-engineering firm employed by the Budget Bureau, Cresap, McCormick, and Paget, which had no previous experience with regulatory agencies.

TOP EXECUTIVES

It called in the top executives of natural gas and electric utilities, at the suggestion of Chairman Kuykendall, but seemed to pay much less attention to the consumer so directly affected by everything the Commission does.

Though not adopting all of the firm's recommendations, the FPC has followed them fairly closely. It has abolished some bureaus, consolidated others, created some new ones—a technical process which it is not the intention to explore here, except for the effect.

The heart of the FPC was its Bureau of Accounts, Finances, and Rates, which passed on matters so vital to the public. Its head since 1936 has been Charles W. Smith, who has won a national reputation among men in his field for his knowledge of rainmaking. He was relied upon heavily by the Commission because of his experience and his fairness of judgment. His judgments were often counter to those of powerful utility interests, naturally.

DIVISION ABOLISHED

In the reorganization his division has been abolished and replaced with a new Bureau of Rates and Gas Certificates and a new office of chief accountant. Mr. Smith was fully aware of the purpose of the reorganization, opposed that aim, but knew he could not stop it. He has now been relegated to the newly created post of chief accountant, a position which his friends say he has taken until eligible for retirement a few months hence.

Thus a valuable public servant has been sidetracked. Everyone who has worked with him and under his direction is fully conscious of the meaning of his shuffling, and knows that it puts an end to the kind of regulation in the public interest for which Charles Smith always stood.

There's another clue to what is happening in the case of another veteran who has been with the FPC since 1933. This is Edgar S. Coffman, Chief since 1945 of the Division of Rates which was under Mr. Smith.

NEW BUREAU

This, too, was abolished. Its functions are being taken over by the new Bureau of Rates and Gas Certificates, of which not Mr. Coffman, but another man, Carl T. Kallina, formerly head of the Gas Certificates Division, was made Chief.

The purpose of this was clear enough to Mr. Coffman. He asked for another assignment and chose to leave here and become regional engineer of the Fort Worth, Tex., regional office.

That tells more of the story. Another clue, too, may be found in the single dissent to the whole shakeup in these various key divisions. It came from the one member of the FPC today who has been on it since its creation in 1930. Claude T. Draper, a Republican, who from his long experience can see just what is going on today. It does not fool him.

But his was a voice in the wilderness.

Escapees View United States as Their Haven, but Few Are Able To Get Visas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article, written by Mr. Don Cook, and entitled "Escapees view United States as their haven but few are able to get visas." The article appeared on February 17 in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKFURT, February 16.—The most important and vital problem an escapee faces when he comes through the Iron Curtain is that of getting a visa to settle down in a new land.

Needless to say, the United States is the promised land to which most escapees look with hope and confidence. Yet the fact is that as of January 1 only 43 United States visas had been issued under the Refugee Relief Act to escapees who have come across from the Soviet satellite countries since the escapee program began in the spring of 1952. Approximately 5,000 have escaped to freedom in that time.

The official figure of 17,050 visas recently given out in Washington by Scott McCleod, director of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, includes over 16,000 visas-issued to Greeks and Italians who had been processed in years past but for whom there were no quotas under normal immigration law or the Displaced Persons Act. They were therefore declared eligible under the Refugee Relief Act—under which 209,000 new immigrants are supposed to be allowed into the United States by the end of 1956.

Thus there is a vast discrepancy between the generosity of the United States in assisting refugees through the escapee program and the performance in the vital final matter of stamping passports.

Under the old 1946 Displaced Persons Act, the United States opened its doors to some 400,000 refugees, and since the escapee program replaced the DP program, another 9,000 have gone to America with visas from the DP Act or normal quota visas.

The performance under the Refugee Relief Act has been far from what Congress appeared to have intended it should be when it voted the target figure of 209,000. This lagging has put a serious crimp in American propaganda efforts. Both the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe have soft-pedaled efforts to encourage satellite citizens to try to escape because an escapee finds things pretty discouraging on this side of the Iron Curtain.

The psychological situation has not been helped much by the occasional cases of spectacular United States speed in granting visas—as, for example, the engineer of the Czechoslovak "freedom train" who was immediately promised a job and house and everything he needed by a toy manufacturer who managed to get him to the United States in about 3 months.

Another such case was that of a Polish ballerina who deserted her ballet company in Western Europe and soon after got to the

States—but only because she had applied for a regular immigration visa in Moscow back in 1948 and her case could be speeded through the official machinery on the basis of the earlier application.

The escapee who comes through the Iron Curtain today must wait and wait and wait—and then his chances of going somewhere other than the United States are speedier and better. As of the first of 1955, there were 9,600 refugees living in camps in Germany and Austria waiting for visas to somewhere and another 16,300 living out of camps. With refugees coming in at the rate of barely 150 per month, it is clear that the United States program alone, if it ever gets going, could just about solve the escapee problem with a good many thousands of visas to spare.

The main stumbling block in the administration of the American legislation is not—oddly enough—the security check on an escapee. The Counter Intelligence Corps thinks it can do a pretty effective job of deciding in a few weeks or months who might be an agent and who is a genuine refugee.

The big problems are that the law requires a 2-year history on each case, and requires that every visa application must have an individual sponsor in the United States who guarantees a job, a house and financial responsibility for the person coming to America.

If a refugee comes through the Iron Curtain with very little known about him or his home town, then obviously the safest way to build up a 2-year history on the individual is to let him sit in a camp for 2 years. The Canadian Government, in fact, requires that the refugee be at least 1 year in the West before he can be admitted to Canada.

The American "sponsorship" problem is even more difficult. It requires some generous employer to give assurances of a job to a man whom he has never seen before and won't see for perhaps a year. The job must be approved by the Labor Department. Under the circumstances, obtaining a sponsorship is not an easy thing.

In this session of Congress, an effort is expected to be made to change the law to permit "blanket assurances" as was the case under the old Displaced Persons Act. Thus, the Tolstoy Foundation could, for example, give "blanket sponsorship" to so many Russian refugees without the difficulties of individual-to-individual sponsorship.

It is because of this complicated, cumbersome machinery that only 43 Iron Curtain escapees have gotten Refugee Relief Act visas.

American Knit Handwear Industry Seriously Injured by Low-Wage Import Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a serious crisis faces the American knit handwear industry as a result of ever-increasing imports of gloves, mittens, and glove linings from low-wage countries. In this regard I call attention to the following statement by Harry A. Moss, Jr., secretary of the American Knit Handwear Association, before the House Committee on Ways and Means on February 2, 1955, concerning H. R. 1, the trade-

agreements extension bill recently passed by the House:

Honorable chairman and members of the committee, the American Knit Handwear Association, Inc., represents the manufacturers of gloves, mittens, and glove linings which are knit directly from yarn.

To understand our interest in this bill, one must first examine the conditions wrought in this industry by import competition.

Mortality: In 1953 there were 30 firms in the industry. Today there are 22—a business mortality of roughly one-third.

Unemployment: In 1952 the industry had over 4,000 employees. In 1954 there were less than 1,500—comparative unemployment of 63 percent.

Financial loss: The ratio of net operating profit to net sales among the 15 leading firms in the industry dropped from 6.1 percent in 1952 to 2.9 percent in 1953, while that of the textile industry as a whole increased from 4.6 percent to 5.2 percent in the same period.

Total net operating profits of the same firms declined from \$1,210,000 in 1950 to \$863,000 in 1952, and to only \$273,000 in 1953.

But the full picture is more serious. Six out of 20 firms had net operating losses. An additional 3 had profits of less than 1 percent of net sales in 1953. An additional seven firms went out of business, and presumably each of them suffered a loss in its last operating year, which was 1953 for most of them. Were it possible to include the financial data of those firms which have gone out of business, the result would probably show a net loss for the entire industry in 1953, and unquestionably in 1954.

Lost market: Such corporate mortality, unemployment, and financial loss indicates the loss of a market. Production of the industry's principal product, wool handwear, dropped from 1,900,000 dozen pairs in 1949 down to 575,000 dozen pairs in 1954.

Import prosperity: As the American industry declined, importers enjoyed ever-increasing prosperity. Wool handwear imports jumped steadily each year, from 32,000 dozen pairs in 1946-48 to an estimated 1,200,000 in 1954, a constantly ascending increase from 1 percent to 68 percent of the total market in that period.

No mystery: The staggering success of imports at the expense of the American industry should pose no mystery. It is compounded from a single formula. The high percentage of labor in producing a glove makes its manufacture vulnerable to low-wage competition. Wages in this American industry average \$1.13 an hour. In our Japanese counterpart, wages average 11.6 cents an hour. This is the differential which the Tariff Act is supposed to offset, but it is the very factor which H. R. 1 would exploit. The provisions of the proposed bill would foster further tariff rate cuts and give the executive branch even greater latitude in exercising powers which were originally meant for Congress, under Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution.

Significance: This industry has unwittingly served as a pilot plant for the rest of the textile and clothing industry. A study of our case history proves that those industries producing the hundreds of products on the Japanese trade agreement bargaining list may validly fear the effects of H. R. 1.

Recommendation: That H. R. 1 not be enacted, because it bestows on the executive branch unprecedented authority and broader powers than Congress has heretofore seen fit to delegate; because it invites a wholesale reduction of our tariffs, with even greater risk of injury to American workers, farmers, and producers; and because the hurry to push this bill through Congress prevents a careful study of its relationship to many pending proposals yet unrevealed.

World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago there was much propaganda afloat in this country advocating a world government of which the United States is to be merely one of the states, surrendering its national sovereignty to the overall organization. That idea was apparently rejected by the people of the United States, and for a time the propaganda died out. Since January of this year, however, it has been revived and is now going full blast.

This is the most important issue before the American people today. The question is: Shall the United States give up its national sovereignty and become only a member of a world government?

Some of the people in high places startle us with their statements. Owen J. Roberts, former member of the Supreme Court of the United States is quoted as saying: "National sovereignty is a silly shibboleth." Justice Roberts is president of the Atlantic Union Committee. How he could hold up his right hand and swear to defend and protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and then head a committee seeking to build a world government which would eliminate our own sovereignty is hard to understand.

Here is the text of the resolution introduced in the Senate on February 9 of this year:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a Federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

Here again is the knockout blow against the Constitution:

This called meeting for next year . . . is to explore the possibility of relinquishing our sovereignty.

How can we support the Constitution and defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic, if we are to contemplate relinquishing our sovereignty? The author of this resolution in the Senate just got through swearing to defend our Constitution, and in the next breath he proposes the possibility of surrendering it. This last resolution does not propose to surrender our sovereignty, but proposes the possibility of doing so. It is a new coat of sugar—but the same doughnut.

It is a curious fact that Rhodes scholars are quite generally in line with the philosophy of world government, not all, however. I wondered why and

looked into the matter. Here is the announced purpose of this school. From the American Oxonian, the official publication of the Association for American Rhodes Scholars, January 1945, we read:

This is not an educational endowment as ordinarily understood. Its purpose is not to give anyone an education he could not otherwise afford; not to promote learning; but to encourage in the rising generation . . . a particular outlook on problems of the world: To give them in fact a political bias.

And a booklet issued by the Chicago Tribune in 1951 says:

Rhodes scholarships were established for the primary purpose of instilling political bias in the minds of young Americans in favor of world federation, involving the surrender of American sovereignty.

I would be unalterably opposed to the appointment of John Marshall Harlan as a member of the Supreme Court, because he is a Rhodes scholar and if indoctrinated with the philosophy above quoted, I would not be sure he would support and defend the Constitution of the United States if it conflicted with the Charter of the United Nations. Some members of the Supreme Court have taken this position already, and I refer to the steel-seizure case under the Truman administration. We already have on the Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who is a vice president of the United World Federalists. In a recent test case before that body it is reported that the vote was a tie, 4 to 4, on the question of which is the supreme law of the land—the United States Constitution or the United Nations Charter.

Judge Harlan, if appointed, might turn against the doctrine of his own school, but the chances are that he would not. We cannot afford to take chances on a matter as important as this.

Assistance to the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as medical techniques improve, greater numbers of people are living longer. This is a fortunate and happy circumstance. Yet, it also makes essential a higher standard of economic security in old age. The United States, in this urgent respect, unfortunately, has lagged behind other nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a most informative and revealing article by Edith Evans Asbury, from the New York Times of February 25, 1955, which shows how our own country could expand and improve its services and attention to the problems of our elderly people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPE LEADS UNITED STATES IN ASSISTING AGED—OBSERVERS FIND THIS COUNTRY SUFFERS BY A COMPARISON WITH AID GIVEN ABROAD—RESPECT FOR OLD CITED—BUT RISING PROPORTION OF THE ELDERLY IS CAUSING A BIG PROBLEM IN SOME AREAS

(By Edith Evans Asbury)

The proportion of the aged in the population is rising in Europe as well as in the United States.

In Great Britain 10.83 percent of the population are 65 years or older. In Germany 9.28 percent are over 65. The percentage in the United States is 8.18.

Both Germany and Britain had about the same percentage of over 65 population as this country in 1900. In Germany it was 4.88. Britain had 4.69 and the United States 4.05.

France, Sweden, and Norway had large numbers of aged in 1900, their percentages being 8.2, 8.37, and 7.9, respectively. Today in France 11.80 percent of the population are over 65, in Sweden 10.31, and in Norway 9.7.

The Europeans began planning for the welfare of the aged long before we did. That was partly because their populations have been aging gradually over a longer period. Also they showed concern earlier because older persons in those countries receive more deference from their families and the public.

UNITED STATES SUFFERS IN CONTRAST

A report on a tour made last summer to observe how the aged are cared for in Europe and Scandinavia has been made by Miss Ollie A. Randall, national president of the American Gerontological Society. She said: "We sensed above everything else a feeling that nothing was too good for the old people. It is something that we in this country have not acquired to the same degree."

Miss Flora Fox, director of the Central Bureau for the Jewish Aged, who also made the tour, said she was "deeply impressed by the acceptance of the aged as people and entitled to special housing. It puts to shame the meager efforts in this country," she added.

Government-sponsored retirement systems were well established in Germany and the Scandinavian countries when we established ours, largely patterned after theirs, in 1935.

Bismarck introduced social security in Germany in 1873. Britain established a non-contributory pension plan, involving a means test, in 1908. A contributory plan, without means test, was started in 1925.

In early times the Swedes, or rather their Viking forebears, solved the old-age problem by pushing their old folks over the nearest precipice. Today, their old-age pension system is so inclusive it covers every Swede at his 67th birthday, irrespective of financial status.

The King is excepted, but the Queen is not. She, being 67 this year, will receive the pension.

Government subsidized low-rent housing planned especially for older couples, or for unmarried men and women, has also been constructed on a large scale in Germany and in the Scandinavian countries.

OTHER GRANTS BESIDES MONEY

Besides money payments, some European countries provide other benefits for the retired aged. In France, some cities grant coal, milk, sugar, and other food allocations as well as hospitalization.

Denmark, in addition to subsidizing low-rent apartments that house 5 percent of the country's pensioners, pays rent subsidies to those living in other housing.

Sweden, too, either provides specially built low-rent housing, or rent subsidy to the aged pensioners.

With their entrenched systems and their experience in administering them, it might have been expected that those far-sighted countries would be better prepared than the

United States to handle today's aging population.

The European countries are, however, as perplexed and bedeviled as the United States by the mounting costs of chronic illness among the aging. They are learning, as we are, that pensions are not the final answer for the aged. And in many of the countries the retirement insurance structures have suffered from devaluations, war devastation and other blows to national economies.

As rapidly as possible, the European countries are making adjustments. There is a trend toward changing from fixed pensions to flexible ones tied to the cost of living. The Scandinavian countries already pay cost-of-living pensions. That system is being considered by the Governments of England and Germany.

DOUBTS ON MANDATORY RETIRING

The medically increased span of life, with its lengthened period of retirement, and the higher incidence of chronic illness have resulted in Europe as here in a trend away from institutionalization. It is also raising doubts about the desirability of mandatory retirement.

In some of the European countries older men and women who prefer to continue working are spared the hardship of enforced idleness and reduced income that is suffered by many American men and women past the mandatory retirement age.

Older persons are encouraged to stay on the job in England and Denmark. They receive larger pensions as a reward for delaying retirement, because in those countries there are more jobs than there are workers to fill them.

A third of the men and women over 70 in Sweden are still working. In Germany those retired on social security are permitted to earn money, and the majority do.

In France, on the other hand, it is reported that it is the lifetime dream of nearly every state employee to retire on a pension as soon as possible—at 50 or 55. Frenchmen, perhaps, feel less of a call to prove their worth to society by continuing to work. Older men and women are an integral part of the family in France, commanding respect and often obedience.

In Europe, as here, strenuous efforts are being made to keep ailing older persons in their own homes as long as possible, both for their own morale and to avoid higher cost of hospitalization.

Since Britain has socialized medicine, the aged are entitled to free medical care, including drugs and hospitalization. Homes for the aged are available, but about 95 percent of the aged maintain their own households or live with their children. This is approximately the same percentage as in the United States.

Officers of the National Assistance Board visit pensioners who need help, and the board contributes financially to voluntary agencies providing recreation, meals, or other services for the elderly in their own homes.

CLUBS ALSO OFFER SERVICES

More than 2,300 clubs, providing recreation, handicraft classes, and, above all, companionship, are run by local groups affiliated with the National Old People's Welfare Committee, in which voluntary and statutory bodies are represented.

Mobile food services provide many old persons with hot meals in their homes.

Prosperous Sweden, which has not engaged in a war since 1814, provides handsomely for the aged. That country's national health program, effective this year, supplies hospital and medical care and free medicine for everyone, including the aged.

In addition, there are many State and municipal services for ailing older persons. Visiting nurses and homemakers are sent without charge.

About 23,000 low-priced apartments and 210 modern houses for the aged with 8,800 beds, the bulk in single rooms, also have been built for Sweden's aged.

Less blessed with prosperity, Germany and France face a more severe problem. West Germany's own people have aged earlier, physiologically, because of the rigors of war. And the country has been flooded with large numbers of aging refugees from East Germany and the Balkans. Medical care, drugs, and hospitalization are free for Germans receiving pensions under the compulsory insurance system.

PROBLEM ACUTE IN FRANCE

France's problem is acute, because it has the oldest population in the world. The average age of the French is 35, compared with 30 in the United States. The percentage of men and women over 60 in France is 16.2 as against 9.9 in the United States. Many of France's aged are war widows.

As France also has had a high increase in the birth rate, she has a disproportionate number of persons either over 60 or recently born. This places a heavy burden upon persons in the producing years, whose numbers have been cut by the casualties of two wars.

So far the problem of an aging population has not arisen in the under-developed countries of Asia, but it is expected to develop there, too, within the next 20 years. The benefits of medical science that extend the life span are easily exportable. Already mortality rates in some of those countries have fallen sharply.

It may be that by the time their aged populations assumes larger proportions, the underdeveloped countries will be better prepared to grapple with the problem than were the United States and Europe.

For one thing, larger numbers of children in their traditionally larger families will also survive, thanks to medical science. Secondly, their predominantly agrarian society provides more space and opportunity for older men and women in the family.

And last, but not least, the Asian family pattern protects older men and women from the demoralization so often at the root of their dilemma in our modern, industrialized society.

Many of the so-called under-developed countries have preserved, along with other antiquated customs, the belief that a family includes not only parents and children, but grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins to the second and third generation.

These older members remain in the household, sharing in its work, its play, its poverty, or prosperity, and its love.

Outlook for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on the outlook for Lithuania which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader under date of February 16, 1955:

This is Lithuanian Independence Day. As it cannot be observed in Lithuania, enslaved by the Soviet Union since 1940, it is fitting that attention be called to the occasion in America, custodian of what freedom there is left in the world today.

It was at Vilna on February 16, 1918, that the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its independence. After 23 years, Lithuania was engulfed by the Red tidal wave, although the United States has not recognized the absorption of the country into Communist Russia. So, officially, Lithuania lives on despite its fate at the hands of a brutal oppressor.

The Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—no longer carry on the uneven struggle alone. Today their hopes for liberation from the Communist yoke are brighter than ever, for the crisis, of which they have been a part so long, is approaching a climax.

The future of Lithuania is linked now with the United States, for our country has had the leadership of the crusaders of freedom thrust upon it. It is generally agreed a showdown is coming eventually between the forces allied with communism and with liberty. Then will Lithuania's fate be decided along with our own.

The world cannot go on indefinitely, half slave and half free. Even though we were satisfied, which we are not, to maintain the status quo, the Reds would not be, for their aim is world conquest. They will not be content with less. They hope to put the United States, above all, in bondage like Lithuania.

So in saving ourselves we shall rescue millions of Lithuanians and other nationals now behind the Iron Curtain. Nobody can say when the day of deliverance will come but it is getting closer all the time. During the past month it looked as though Formosa would supply the spark for the conflagration. The fact that open hostilities did not break out means only a postponement of a day that is inevitable.

Lithuania has suffered much but its spirit is unquenchable and its joy on the day of resurrection will be all the greater by reason of the hardships it has undergone during the past 15 years it has been held in subjugation.

Butter Over Guns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today the Washington Daily News carried a most provocative suggestion and constructive proposal. It is well worth serious study by the State Department and the Congress.

Mr. Samuel Lubell's article, entitled "Butter Over Guns—A Peace Plan for the Free World," poses an enlightened approach toward solving our ever-present, most pressing problem—world peace.

The article follows:

BUTTER OVER GUNS—A PEACE PLAN FOR THE FREE WORLD

(By Samuel Lubell)

The peaceful nations of the world can seize the initiative—now—in the long struggle for peace by striking at all that is most vulnerable in the Soviet system.

That opportunity was put there by the Kremlin itself in the bitter struggle which brought the recent downfall of Premier Georgi Malenkov. In the course of that upheaval the soft underbelly of Soviet communism was flung over and exposed. Un-

wittingly, Russia's own ruler pointed where to strike the blow that could change the whole course of the cold war.

They showed the world the way to mobilize every measure short of war to halt aggression before it takes place.

How can that be done?

By taking these steps:

The United States should sponsor before the United Nations a bold new plan of economic and military disarmament which would: Limit the proportion of any nation's resources that could be devoted to "guns"—that is to war industries and all other direct and indirect military expenditures—as against "butter," meaning what goes to lifting levels of the people.

The debate touched off by this proposal should be used as a dramatic moral offensive to make clear to the world why high living standards are a built-in reassurance of peace, and any industrial nation which deliberately depresses the living of its people to build military power is a threat to peace.

If the Soviets accept the proposal, a basis for lasting peace might move into sight. Trade could flow freely, since products would be exchanged with Russia for mutual advantage.

But if the Soviets refuse to reverse their present guns-over-butter policy, the free nations should agree to treat her as a potential aggressor.

In support of that, every measure short of war should be invoked until the Soviets do reduce defense expenditures appreciably, and better the living conditions of the Russian people.

Among those short-of-war measures would be the full force of world opinion, the strengthening of other nations' defenses; also the breaking off of all economic relations—aid, credit or trade—which might strengthen a potential aggressor.

The basic idea of emphasizing living standards as a war deterrent was touched on by President Eisenhower in his speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington in 1953. But there was no follow through. Now there is opportunity to act.

This entire program stems from the nature of modern warfare. As Hitler taught only too well, wars do not start when one country crosses another's frontier.

War begins when a would-be aggressor shifts his resources from peaceful to war-like processes, when tractor assembly lines are replaced by tank assemblies, when building materials are diverted from constructing homes to rearing munitions plants.

In short, war starts when a would-be aggressor makes the ominous choice of putting guns over butter.

Malenkov's ouster stripped away the last illusion that the Soviet Union has become anything more than a perpetual war economy.

Although our own defense budget has been cut for three successive years, Soviet arming has been raised at least to what it was when Russia was supplying Red China with equipment to fight in Korea.

The Soviet proposal announced a week ago to freeze defense budgets at present levels still would leave Russia mobilized for aggression, while preventing peaceful nations from strengthening their own defenses.

It seems to have been brought forward largely to delude the Russian people into thinking that the new sacrifices being imposed on them are made necessary by some threat from the West rather than by the Kremlin's aggressive commitments.

In ousting Malenkov the dominant faction in the Kremlin cracked down on efforts to increase civilian production so as to expand Russia's arms and war industry. In essence this was the same decision Hitler made when he boastfully chose "guns over butter."

The challenge is clear.

If war is to be prevented, Hitler taught, the time to act is when the bombs are being made rather than when they are falling.

The "butter over guns" disarmament proposal would furnish the basis for such action. By setting ceilings on the use of certain key resources, "butter over guns" disarmament would lock up enough of every country's production in peaceful purposes so no nation could mobilize its economy for a blitzkrieg without giving the world at least 3 years' warning.

No country's economic expansion would be curbed, since the proportion of resources allocated to guns, not the quantities, would be limited. The butter-guns ceilings also would vary with the special needs of individual countries—underdeveloped nations would not have the same ceilings as highly industrialized ones—and they could be reviewed periodically, say, every 5 years.

The net effect would be like drawing a new internal frontier inside each nation's economy—the butter-guns line—which, if crossed, would be an open confession that a government had passed from peaceful to aggressive intention.

If the men in the Kremlin really want peace, they should welcome such disarmament and cooperate to set up the system of inspection and control that would be required to enforce it.

If they do not, the peaceful nations still can draw this frontier against aggression by declaring they will use Russia's division of her resources as a yardstick for judging Soviet intentions.

Going further, the free nations could bring forward their own "butter over guns" standard of how Russia's resources should be divided to insure a minimum level of decent living for the Russian people.

Soviet propagandists, of course, would try to make the world believe that Russian living standards were rising. But the outside world would have little difficulty in judging the truth of the matter.

If Russia's resources actually were directed from war to peace, it would become readily apparent in the new homes that would be built, the new factories for consumer goods, the general abundance of things to buy.

In debating this "butter over guns" disarmament proposal we could call on the world to judge which of the two economic systems, ours or Russia's, makes for peace.

Last year, for example, the United States produced 5.5 million autos, 7.3 million television sets, and 9 million washing machines, refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners.

The steel used to manufacture these articles obviously could not be used for war.

In Russia, with roughly half of our steel supply, only 45,000 passenger autos were produced in 1954, only 365,000 TV sets, and hardly 600,000 washing machines, refrigerators, and vacuum cleaners. Most of the rest of Russia's steel went into expanding her military potential.

Shortly after he became premier, Malenkov revealed that more than two-thirds of Russia's industrial resources were being directed into heavy industry, and scarcely one-third to consumer goods.

Every possible means should be utilized to make known to the Russian people that satisfying their yearning for better living is our peace aim.

Within the Kremlin may be some men who will understand how other Soviet leaders are destroying any basis for peace by denying their own people a decent living.

Moscow has always sought to justify the harsh exactions inflicted on the Russian people as being necessary to strengthen Russia against outside attack. The "butter over guns" proposal would challenge this propaganda. The ceilings would be applicable to all major powers, including a revived Germany.

The peace offensive proposed here is not intended to settle every cold-war issue. It does not cover such problems as subversion, which could be considered another form of aggression. Nor would it take the place of efforts to control atomic and other weapons.

Essentially, it seeks to give new life to the possibility of curbing military aggression with measures short of war by gaining worldwide recognition for a simple principle:

That the intentions of even the most secretive dictators can be judged by how they divide the resources they command between war preparation and bettering living standards.

It may be argued that other countries will not go along with so forthright a program. Even if we knew that to be true, simply to proclaim this principle before the United Nations would be a considerable victory for the cause of peace.

WHAT ABOUT ENFORCEMENT?

(By Samuel Lubell)

Enforcing butter over guns disarmament would be no more—nor less—difficult than policing other systems of arms control.

The plan aims at padlocking enough of every nation's resources in peaceful production so no country can mobilize its economy for military aggression without warning the rest of the world. A variety of inspection controls could be employed to achieve that objective.

Every phase of economic activity need not be policed. We know enough of the interrelated processes of mobilizing for war to be able to select a relatively small number of economic choke points—which would show readily how a nation is dividing its resources between war and peaceful uses. In Russia, because nearly all her industries rely on railroad transportation, inspection would be easier.

Obviously it would be easier to make sure that tractor plants were not producing tanks than to check on the number of troops or weapons a country might be permitted.

In any case, these industrial and economic controls could be reinforced by and meshed with the usual controls on weapons and armed forces.

The big question mark, of course, is whether the Soviets would agree to the tamper-proof system of inspection and control which all disarmament plans require. This requirement cannot be compromised.

Where butter over guns differs from other disarmament plans is that if it breaks down, the violation comes early enough in the mobilization process to give every other nation time to rearm.

Also by drawing a guns-butter frontier inside every nation's economy it provides the free world with a moral basis for employing measures short of war to halt aggression while it is being prepared.

Willis W. Bradley: Naval Officer and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the splendid eulogies on our late colleague, the Honorable Willis W. Bradley, of California, so far published portray not only a rich personality but also a career notable for its record of constructive achievements. Of his many impor-

tant contributions none are of more lasting value than those for the Panama Canal while he was a Member of Congress, 1947-49. These merit special emphasis.

At the time he was elected to the 80th Congress Captain Bradley had just completed a long and distinguished career as a line officer of the Navy with early specialization in ordnance engineering. In later years, he had important administrative assignments, served as Governor of Guam, held responsible positions afloat, and navigated in many parts of the world. This background of experience combined to qualify him eminently for leadership in the 80th Congress, in which he was assigned to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. On that assignment he quickly became a recognized authority on interoceanic canal problems, for which he had been prepared by a lifetime of naval experience and years of study of the Isthmian problem.

When the question of the sea-level project for the Panama Canal was presented to the Congress in 1947, his definite views, vigorously expressed, served to prevent hasty action. Thus, the committees of the Congress were able to delve more deeply into that controversial proposal and its far-reaching implications.

On that committee one of his ablest colleagues was the late Representative Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, who was then the senior minority member of the committee and its former chairman. He and Captain Bradley recognized each other's great abilities and formed an effective team, particularly as to canal matters.

When leaving the Congress in 1949, Captain Bradley passed on to Judge Bland and others the results of his canal studies. Thus, the 81st Congress, under the guidance of Judge Bland, who then resumed his chairmanship of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was able to carry on its work on the Panama Canal without discontinuity. As the member of that committee designated by Judge Bland to be chairman of a special subcommittee to investigate the operations of the Panama Canal, I was one of the principal recipients of Captain Bradley's teachings. We had many consultations.

The highlight of these was a presentation on the subject of the Panama Canal in the Navy Department, arranged at the suggestion of Captain Bradley by the Secretary of the Navy. By means of canal operational exhibits and terrain models, Captain Bradley explained the problems of ship transit and what is required for their solution. A distinguished engineer with Panama Canal experience, who was also present, described the principal engineering questions, which are fundamental in its consideration.

The lessons derived from those particular discussions were of immeasurable value to the subcommittee. They helped to clarify much of the fog of confusion that has featured so much canal debates, and helped to start the investigation along a path that overcame obstacles.

Captain Bradley made two notable addresses on the Isthmian question. The first, delivered on April 19, 1948, before the Cosmos Club, of Washington, is entitled "What of the Panama Canal?" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, April 21, 1948, page A2449. The second, made on February 24, 1949, before the Engineers Club of Washington, is entitled "The Whys of the Panama Canal," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 12, March 4, 1949, page A1303.

These two addresses are among the finest pronouncements on the canal question in the records of the Congress. As such, they are must reading for all who wish to go deeply into the canal subject, and are especially commended for study by the committees of the Congress.

Why George Washington Remained Unique

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting article entitled "Why George Washington Has Remained Unique," written by John Harris and appearing in the Boston Globe of February 20, 1955:

WHY GEORGE WASHINGTON HAS REMAINED UNIQUE

(By John Harris)

WASHINGTON, February 19.—For generations Americans have sighed as they make their annual preparations to honor the birth date of George Washington, that in his lifetime Washington had no Boswell.

We can only wish we knew more about Washington the man, majestic father of our country, for of all the stars in our armament of national heroes his is the brightest and yet the most remote.

How just a few intimate anecdotes, authentic and heart warming, would cut the distance that grows greater with the passage of the years:

Curiously, it is right here in the Nation's Capital, named after him, that we feel this lack the most keenly.

Lincoln, by contrast, is an ever lifelike memory, in the treasury of tales which he told or which were told about him.

It is surprising how little has come down to us about George Washington's association with the Capital, whose site he himself selected. We can picture him at Suter's Tavern in Georgetown arranging to buy the land; settling the dispute over Major L'Enfant, the city planner, or laying the cornerstone of the Capitol. There is little else. Indeed, at his death in 1799 just as the 19th century was about to dawn, the White House and Capitol were still incomplete.

AWE—LITTLE WARMTH

The Washington Monument, an obelisk greater in size than any raised in ancient Egypt or built elsewhere in the world, we do have.

It is an awesome memorial. Those who gaze upon it are impressed deeply with its dignity, austere simplicity, and, as well, with an inseparable sense of exalted aloofness and grandeur.

Some see this as a happy expression of the reserve that characterized Washington throughout his life. We all admire it; yet we cannot, in all reverence, be unconscious of a very human desire that the mere sight of the memorial, combined with a greater familiarity with the life of Washington than we can now possess, would touch more tender feelings.

Parson Weems did no service for the youngsters of the land when he told his improbable story about the cherry tree. Young bloods who avidly follow the Lone Ranger on TV and—at play—are equipped to shoot down Indians or cattle rustlers, are not likely to accept the goody two-shoes tale about young George and the hatchet.

Nor did another biographer, priggish Jared Sparks, do adults a service when he made his straitlaced revisions of Washington's own writings. A Hollywood director would say that Sparks, whose word picture of Washington was the inadequate model of Washington for decades, left the human side on the cutting-room floor.

YET, FIRST IN THE HEARTS

The anniversary at hand is, however, not so much a time for wishing as for reviewing, for reminding ourselves why it is that Washington, just as in the era when Col. Henry Lee first said it, "Is first in the hearts of his countrymen."

A succession of incidents in Washington's life comes quickly to mind.

Our young TV viewers would certainly thrill to the actions of the 23-year-old head of the Virginia militia as he fought beside the ill-fated General Braddock in the wilderness. Twice horses were shot from under young Colonel Washington and 4 times his coat was pierced by bullets. Washington, who expected and demanded a display of courage in others, displayed it fearlessly, almost recklessly, an earnest of the resoluteness that was to win freedom for a new nation.

There was this same resolution when young Washington journeyed to Boston to demand that Governor Shirley recognize a colonial commission as the equal of one granted by the British monarch.

HE RISKED ALL

No one can visit Mount Vernon without admiring the patriotism that impelled Washington to risk all his possessions and his head in the fight for liberty.

Here he lived the leisurely, aristocratic life of the Potomac gentry. He was owner of 55,000 acres and one of the biggest fortunes in the land.

He, a soldier, knew better than most colonials the might of the British imperium, but he never hesitated. In the depths of the struggle at Valley Forge his faith and fortitude remained constant.

When we scan history and count the conquering generals who put crowns on their heads, or observe the current world scene in which generals glide into the role of dictators, the patriotism of Washington shines in the supreme moment of military success. He rebuked and scorned officers who suggested he make himself a king. True idealist and man of democracy, Washington bade farewell to his army, laid aside his command, and headed back to Mount Vernon. He was, in the exulting phrase of Byron, "the Cincinnatus of the West."

When the States fell to wrangling and disaster loomed, disaster that would have offered a personally ambitious man another chance for a crown, Washington met with governors in the blue room of the now neglected Carlyle House in Alexandria, and initiated action that gave the Nation the Constitution. He accepted the Presidency only as a duty. And strictly from that same sense of obligation to his country did he accept a second term, in which he patiently endured a martyrdom of abuse.

HAVING A COUNTRY TO LOVE

It is at Mount Vernon and in nearby Alexandria, where Washington in 1798 joined in the first public celebration of his birthday at Gadsby's Tavern, still standing near the waterfront, we get the best appreciation of Washington the man. He loved the tidelands life of a planter.

He never left there, for war or the Presidency, without steadily missing it and yearning to return. He chose this as his burial place rather than the crypt prepared in the Capitol. His sincerely felt personal loss in long absences from Mount Vernon is a measure of his sacrifice. But in this devotion to duty, for which all Americans cherish him, Washington, too, had an abiding compensation, best expressed in words of James Russell Lowell, words Washington would have appreciated:

"There is something magnificent in having a country to love."

Eleven Useful Facts Concerning the World in Which We Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the following summary by George Hardin of a speech given by Leonard S. Kenworthy at a conference of the Friends' Peace Committee in Philadelphia appeared in the February 17, 1955, edition of the Chisholm (Minn.) Free Press. I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the Congress and citizens of our great country:

ELEVEN USEFUL FACTS CONCERNING THE WORLD IN WHICH WE LIVE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Reprinted herewith is a summary by George Hardin of a speech given by Leonard S. Kenworthy at a conference of the Friends' Peace Committee in Philadelphia.)

Because our world is so much bigger, or smaller, today, here are certain facts we need to remember in order to read newspapers, work on peace committees, rear children, work in schools, live in communities, and to live.

Most of the world lives in Asia. The sooner we recognize this, the better.

Most of the world is nonwhite. We must learn to live as a minority group.

Most of the world is abysmally, abjectly poor.

Most of the world is underdeveloped; it lacks tools and methods of production.

Most of the world is ill fed, ill housed, ill clothed, illiterate, and ill.

Most of the world is non-Christian. We must learn to think in terms of Hindus, Moslems, Communists, and others.

Most of the world is non-English speaking. We need new tools of communication.

Most of the world is either in revolution or has recently attained independence.

Most of the world differs from us. We must learn to associate differences with friendliness rather than hostility.

Most of the world is closely interdependent.

Most of the world is now working together in the United Nations; we must support it, and strengthen worldmindedness.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, in asking unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the young man who wrote the following essay entitled "I Speak for Democracy," is 1 of the 4 winners in a contest, sponsored by the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, and participated in by over a million and one-half school children in the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. It is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I call attention to the fact that the young man, Avron Joseph Maletzky, is a senior in the Nott Terrace High School, Schenectady, N. Y., 16 years of age, and a resident of my district, the 32d District of New York. It is with a great deal of pride that I submit his essay:

I speak for democracy—a force that means life, liberty, and freedom for millions of human beings—a force that elevates the dignity of man toward the divine—but a force that defies definition.

Scores of interpretations do not embrace the meaning of democracy, and none of us know where to find the words to express our belief in it. Perhaps the fact that we have not yet achieved democracy is the key to the whole situation—for true democracy is a quality toward which one strives, rather than a concrete object which one encloses in a glass case. Then how is it possible to defend something that is as basic as the world we live in, but must be thought of as a goal never quite attained?

It was not until we faced the possibility of its loss that we began to visualize the meaning of this precious inheritance. It was not until we saw other democratic countries filled with people, not unlike ourselves, submerged and conquered, that we began to appreciate democracy as both a moral ideal and an historical institution.

The theme of democracy goes back much farther historically than the great documents of the American, French, and English Revolutions. The idea goes back to the Hebrews with their theories of divine justice; to the early Christians with their ideal of brotherhood; to the Romans with their stress on equality and justice. Those who feel that democracy is young, and thus is an unstable force, forget what a long history it has, and how deeply it is imbedded in the culture of nations.

Today, we are beginning to think of democracy not as a political institution, but as a moral ideal, and a way of living together. The early Christians had an appropriate saying—"We are all," as they put it, "members of one another." We must, if our democracy is to succeed, believe as they did. We must realize that no one can stand alone. True, society recognizes a person as an individual with his individual liberties and freedoms, but only if the person recognizes society as a brotherhood of individuals. To be part of a democracy, one must fight the natural tendency to demand equality and freedom for oneself, and not for others.

Of course, there are those who say that because it opposes, or conflicts with man's nat-

ural desire for personal gain, democracy will defeat itself. But democracy has its own peculiar strength. This strength lies in the fact that democracy tends to bring men together into agreement—it satisfies and reconciles all involved. Its strength thus lies in the justice, humanity, and loyalty which are evolved from this agreement between men.

To be sure, as long as democracy exists, there will always be a mild state of confusion and conflict. But what are these conflicts? Conflicts are the instruments of change and progress—they are the propelling force behind democracy.

For democracy there is always a future, and a bright one, too. Its potentialities have never been fully realized, and it would take a person gifted with a fertile imagination to think of all the many possibilities that democracy has in store for a nation of the 21st century.

As the well-known philosopher, Irwin Edman, has written: "It is by the fire of this dream (democracy), that the future is lighted, rather than by the flames of destruction that now, as often in the past, have violated—but never for very long—the faith in the human dignity of each man in a society of brotherhood and freedom."

Democracy is a powerful force. It represents a gigantic struggle toward some unattainable goal. But even if this struggle never succeeds entirely, out of it can come the courage and the faith that will maintain democracy as a dynamic force for eternity.

Business-Managed Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the Record the following editorial from the Denver Post of December 9, 1954, entitled "Business-Managed Ruin":

BUSINESS-MANAGED RUIN

This country is spending \$35 billion to \$40 billion a year for defense. That's where most of the people's money is going. Figure out a way to cut defense spending, and you've got a way to cut taxes—really cut 'em.

Meanwhile, the politicians talk about economy. A balanced budget. President Eisenhower and his team have worked hard to reduce spending. They have not been entirely unsuccessful. But the costs of an Army, a Navy, and Air Force, and the fantastic gismos they use or will use, still levy a disheartening tithe on the taxpayer.

Looking ahead a few years, there's little relief, real relief, in sight. The best hope for sustaining the keep-home pay of the average guy, after taxes, is that there will be more taxpayers and more taxable wealth to carry the load. Nobody foresees a fire sale on arms or a deflation in their cost. Would that we could.

In view of the foregoing, is it good business to economize on Federal functions that add wealth—agricultural, industrial, taxable wealth—to the United States?

That's what Members of Congress are, in effect, doing when they wield their hatchets on western reclamation. They simply see no difference between operating expense and capital outlay. A business thus managed would be a runt, no less. They're saving pennies today that will cost dollars tomorrow,

while retarding the growth of a country that may, some day, need every ounce of its strength to survive.

That's good business? Hah! That's business-managed ruin.

Stimulation of Economic Growth in the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a statement on import-export policy, made on February 8, 1955, by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The President in his special message to Congress on January 10, 1955, stated: "The Nation's enlightened self-interest and sense of responsibility as a leader among the free nations require a foreign economic program that will stimulate economic growth in the free world through enlarging opportunities for the fuller operation of the forces of free enterprise and competitive markets."

He added that "our own self-interest requires such a program because (1) economic strength among our allies is essential to our security; (2) economic growth in underdeveloped areas is necessary to lessen international instability growing out of the vulnerability of such areas to Communist penetration and subversion; and (3) an increasing volume of world production and trade will help assure our own economic growth and a rising standard of living among our own people."

Thereafter the message contained, among other things, specific legislative recommendations that had 5 days earlier made their appearance in H. R. 1 or the trade agreements extension bill of 1955 introduced by Mr. JERE COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

The statements above quoted are acceptable as generalities, but the extent to which the attainment of the stated goals or objectives rests upon the provisions of H. R. 1, it is based upon certain false assumptions and erroneous deductions from past achievements and failures. The message, to repeat a part of it, says:

"An increasing volume of world production and trade will help assure our own economic growth and a rising standard of living among our own people."

Of course, it would not necessarily do anything of the kind. Increasing world production and trade could just as easily take place at our expense and to our detriment.

The sublime or naive faith in foreign trade as the great cure-all for the world's economic ills or as a sure road to the peace of the world, reflected in the message, is a curse and an affliction. It has prevented a clear-headed assessment of the facts for too many years and has reached the ridiculous stage. It is like a spell or a hypnosis under which the victim merely repeats uncritically what the hypnotist says. Or, differently stated, it ranks as a nostrum with the no-

tion that if 1 spoonful of medicine is good, 2 spoonfuls are twice as good.

Trade is not and never was a good thing in and of itself. It can be evil and harmful, as the trade in opium. It may be thoroughly immoral as is prostitution. The slave trade was lucrative; but was it good? The trade in ivory created exchange and added to the income of the people who engaged in it; but was it in the national interest of the African tribes where it was carried on?

The halo must be torn from international trade before we can reason soberly about it. Am I then saying that the President is naive or that those who participated in shaping the part of the message relating to trade are naive or unthinking?

A whole people can be blind. A whole national leadership can be led along by a false idea until it explodes in their face. We do not have to strain our memories for examples.

One notion held not so many years ago was that Russia would quickly crumble under the Hitler onslaught. The fallacy of that judgment was amply demonstrated by events. Another notion was that the German people would throw up their arms and surrender once the war went against them. That also was a false estimate, very widely accepted. There are enough of such false notions and fads floating around in other fields, such as medicine, diet, child psychology, etc., to give us pause. Ordinarily, it is necessary only to wait a few years for the upset or for knowledge to catch up. In the field of trade we cling to a used-up idea because we do not seem to know how, when, or where to stop.

It is understandable why certain export interests wish to perpetuate the idea that increased trade, meaning, of course, increased exports, is an unmixed blessing. On the other hand, the support of this idea by economists and private organizations of voters who cut across the economic spectrum merely suggests a bankruptcy of ideas. This in turn may be the result of immersion in a constant flow of inspired comment that itself has taken on the dangerous aspect of unreflecting acceptance of what is fed to it.

After 20 years of tariff reductions, carried out in 29 bilateral agreements, followed by three multilateral agreements; after a reduction of 75 percent in the protection afforded by our tariff and after witnessing the great number of nontariff restrictions on trade imposed by other countries, it is about time that we turned away from this broken-down vehicle to carry us to the promised land. Many of these nontariff restrictions were justified and justifiable and were symptomatic of the economic disruption of war; but that does not change the fact of their existence or obliterate their cause.

We would do far better to study the great shifts that have taken place in the basic foundations of trade in the past 15 years; the distortions in the world economy caused by the great upheavals of World War II and the effects of the political and military realignments of the world. We should ponder the meaning of a policy that would subordinate the strongest economy in the world to the vicissitudes of a necessarily shifting diplomacy in an unsettled world.

We have in the past 10 years contributed heavily to the righting of the war-upset world. We have greatly liberalized our trade. We have greatly increased our imports. They are more than half again as high per capita in physical volume as in 1938-39.

Our diplomacy has been profoundly at fault in not saying these things to the world about our trade. On the contrary, our diplomats and various officials traveling about overseas have aided and abetted the idea that it was our stiff-necked policy about tariffs and trade that caused and sustained the dollar gap. They converted the protests of other countries thus incited into instru-

ments of political pressure on the home front in behalf of more tariff cuts. Only very recently has there been some evidence of a change.

We have actually reached the point in our tariff reductions where a halt is urgent. We have cut to the quick and in some instances well into the living nerves of many of our producers. However, no great reversal is involved; no general rise in tariff rates.

Our producers who are asked to absorb the foreign competition uncovered by 20 years of tariff-cutting are entitled to a remedy against errors of judgment committed in the wholesale approach to tariff cuts or against adverse changes in competitive conditions. There is no demand for undoing such good as may have come from the liberalized trade policy; only for a means of rooting out the evils. This remedy is not in hand. An escape clause that is more responsive to the needs of the case than the present one is called for.

All the minimizing of the losses caused or threatened by lower tariffs, so eagerly practiced by those interested in import profits or export markets or in upholding an intellectual position cannot overcome the very widespread and legitimate concern of the exposed industries and their workers. Final success in this campaign of belittlement would in any case succeed in depriving the very propagators of any real reason for advocating their own program.

In a nutshell, the trade-agreements program has run out of magic. Its constant elevation to the position of arbiter of world economic questions is not justified. As a measure that may be looked to for the attainment and maintenance of full domestic employment, the further general lowering of tariffs would bring us greater liabilities than assets. There is much more employment at stake, directly and indirectly, in the industries and agricultural pursuits that are vulnerable to import competition than exists in manufacturing or producing for export.

The fact that some of these producers are already highly protected by import quotas, such as wheat, wheat flour, and cotton, does not remove them from the list of exposed producers or from the list of beneficiaries of protection. That these groups themselves heavily support freer trade for others is only a measure of the high degree of consistency of which man is capable.

As for investment in foreign countries as a means of developing and strengthening them, the idea has merit; but again it is not foreign investment as such that is important. The kind of investment and the conditions under which it is made are more important. Investment in economically unsound projects will not only not accomplish what is sought, but will go sour. The same may be said of investment where expropriation, nationalization, or refusal to allow profit transfers may sooner or later confront the investors.

Inasmuch as tax incentives would tend to overcome the prudence and caution that should be exercised in such investments, their long-term value may be questioned. Also as inducements to industry to seek low-wage areas for location of new plants, tax incentives on foreign investments might do more harm than good. If our capital cannot find foreign outlets that are sound enough or free enough from state control or confiscation to make them attractive without special tax incentives, it certainly is not clear that the granting of such incentives would remove their obstacles to investment; but they might cause the taking of unjustifiable risk.

From present trends of world population it does not appear that our point 4 and similar elements of assistance will accomplish much more than to demonstrate the continuing validity of the Malthusian theory of population.

Justice in a New State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

JUSTICE IN A NEW STATE

(By the Honorable Shneur Zalman Cheshin, deputy president of the Supreme Court of Israel)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This paper is an adaptation of lectures delivered by Judge Cheshin before the association, the American-Israel Society and the Foreign Law Association.)

Four cases involving points of constitutional law of the greatest importance have recently come before the Supreme Court of Israel. The facts of the first case were briefly as follows:

According to our press law, the Minister of the Interior is authorized to suspend publication of a newspaper which publishes material likely to undermine the security of the state or endanger the peace of the inhabitants, but he must specify in his order the term of suspension.

Not so very long ago two newspapers, one Arabic and one Hebrew, severely criticized the foreign policy of our Government. The Minister of the Interior used his authority to suspend the publication of these two newspapers for a number of weeks.

They then applied to the supreme court sitting as a high court of justice for an order nisi in the nature of a writ of mandamus directing the Minister of the Interior to appear before the court and show cause why he should not cancel his order of suspension. Thus arose the issue of the freedom of the press involving, as it does, human rights and civil liberties.

Case No. 2 involved an Israeli Arab who was apprehended by a military commander and kept in prison. His whereabouts were not made known either to his family or to the civil authorities. Attorneys tried in vain to see him, to locate him, and to get information from him as to the reason of his apprehension. All their attempts were unsuccessful. His family therefore applied to the Supreme Court of Israel sitting as a high court of justice for a writ of habeas corpus—an order directing the jailers to appear in court and to show cause why they kept him without warrant of arrest and without bringing him to trial, and why he should not be released forthwith.

Case No. 3 also involves an Israeli Arab who, at the age of 62, although he was already married and the father of five children, fell in love with a girl of 20 and wanted to marry her. He appeared before the Kadi, who is the religious dignitary, or priest, of the Moslems, and asked him to perform the wedding ceremony, offering proof that he had purchased the girl from her father and paid a high price, and was, therefore, entitled to marry her. He also pointed out that Moslem religious law provides that a man may marry more than one wife.

The Kadi, however, refused to perform the ceremony, saying that the days have passed when a man may marry as many wives as he wishes. Israel, he explained, now has a law providing equal rights for man and woman and, in view of the fact that a woman may not have more than one husband, it follows that a man should have only one wife. And so the Kadi refused to perform the ceremony.

The elderly suitor then appealed to the supreme court of Israel sitting as a high court of justice. He complained that his right to freedom of worship was being infringed and he asked for an order directing the Kadi to perform the ceremony.

Case No. 4 had to do with a teacher who was discharged from his job, because of his political inclinations, by the director of education on the command of the minister of defense. It had transpired that before the establishment of the State of Israel this teacher had been the leading spirit in one of the underground movements and that he had not abandoned his revolutionary tenets and inclinations.

He, too, resorted to the supreme court sitting as a high court of justice, asking for an order directing the director of education to cancel his dismissal and to reinstate him in his position.

THE STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT

Before revealing what the decisions of the court were in these four cases, I think it worthwhile to explain, at least sketchily, the structure of the Government of Israel, including that of the judicial system, so as to make clear why these cases were brought to the supreme court sitting as a high court of justice.

As nearly everyone knows, Israel is a part of an area long known as Palestine. Up to the end of World War I, Palestine itself was part of the Turkish Empire and consequently lived under Turkish law. Then, for a period of 30 years, the British, under a mandate from the League of Nations to administer the area and to establish in it a Jewish national home, carried on the governmental functions.

On the 14th of May, 1948, when Israel was established as a State in accordance with a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations some 6 months before, Israelis faced a very interesting and vital practical problem, a problem such as the Americans faced soon after they declared the independence of the Colonies from Great Britain, namely, what law should be administered in the new State? Should it be entirely new law? Should it continue to be the law administered in Palestine theretofore, a law mainly based on English law and jurisprudence?

The mandatory regime, during its 30 years of existence, did indeed do a remarkable job in the field of legislation whatever may have been the record in other aspects of governmental action. It must be admitted that a large body of law was enacted which not only was appropriate to the development of a progressive community in Palestine but was, in large part, adapted to its needs at the time. Should this body of law be thrown overboard or should it be kept intact and acted upon?

We have adopted the very same solution that the ancestors of Americans of today adopted after they severed political, economic and, to a degree, intellectual ties with the mother country.

Immediately upon the establishment of the State of Israel, there was created a Council of State of 37 members and from these 13 were selected to form a provisional government. They enacted the first fundamental law of the new nation only a few days after the signing of the declaration of independence. To understand the spirit of this very important act, it will help to refer to a few sentences of that declaration, part of the articles of faith of the founders of the State of Israel and its inhabitants.

The proclamation of independence says that "the State of Israel . . . will be based on freedom, justice, and peace as envisaged by the prophets of Israel; it will ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants, irrespective of religion,

race or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education, and culture; it will safeguard the holy places of all religions; and it will be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

These were the articles of faith of the founders of the State of Israel. It was contemplated to have them implemented in a constitution, in a basic law of the land or in subsidiary legislation. Yet the full flowering of these precepts could not occur in a moment. Israel has been engaged, during the past 6 years, in a struggle for survival, and a struggle to make a home for hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrants who have come from all parts of the world—the remnants of the Nazi victims who are living witnesses to the denial of every human right in so many countries.

SOURCES OF THE LAW

A few days after the establishment of the State of Israel and the proclamation of our independence, a law, called the law and administration ordinance, was enacted. This law prescribes how the government shall be carried on. It says, most importantly, that the law of Palestine, as it existed on the eve of the termination of the mandate—the 14th of May, 1948—shall remain the law of Israel, insofar as there is nothing therein repugnant to the said ordinance or to the other laws which may be enacted by the Provisional Council of State, and subject to such modifications as may result from the establishment of the state.

Now, what was this law that we inherited at the outset? It had a number of sources and these are worth examining, for they help to give us an understanding of many of the problems which members of the bench and bar, litigants and legislators, have encountered and still meet.

There are, of course, the remnants of the Turkish law that was administered in Palestine, including what is now Israel, before the British occupation. This law is far from modern or suited to a progressive and intellectual community. Yet parts of it were and still are in force in Israel.

Much of the Turkish law was based on Moslem religious rules. These do not recognize locomotives, steam trolleys, or electrically driven vehicles but they do have a good deal to say about donkeys, camels, cows, and horses. The entire law of torts, moreover, is concerned with damage done by these animals. A few examples are illuminating:

"If dirt and mud are scattered about by the hoofs of an animal and another person's clothes are splashed therewith; or if such animal kicks with his hind legs or swishes his tail and inflicts injury thereby, there is no need to make good the loss. But a person riding an animal is responsible for collision or for blows inflicted by the front feet or by the head."

(Of course this point of view is nothing to joke about or laugh at. This was the law of a community of yesterday. It was appropriate for its time. It is no longer appropriate for the State of Israel or for any other modern society. I cite it to illustrate the problems with which our first legislators were faced in the new state. The intricate problems of the collisions of cars were unknown in such rules because the prophet Mohammed didn't know about automobiles; they had not yet been invented in his day.)

"If any person drags the clothes of another person and tears them, he must make good the loss and pay the full value thereof. If a person, however, takes hold of the clothes of another, and the owner of such clothes draws them away and, by so doing tears them, such person is liable to make good only one-half the value of the garment. Similarly, if any person sits upon the skirt of an-

other, and the owner, unaware thereof, gets up, and tears his clothes, such person must make good one-half the value of the clothes."

This is the notion of sharing the loss. "The owner of a pearl worth 50 piastres drops it and it is swallowed by a hen worth 5 piastres. The owner of the pearl may take the hen upon the payment of 5 piastres."

Let us see 1 or 2 examples of the law providing for neighborly relations.

"If a person climbs up the fruit trees in his garden, and thereby overlooks the women's quarters of his neighbor, such a person must give information every time he intends to climb such trees in order that the women may cover themselves. Should he fail to give such information, the court may forthwith prohibit him from climbing such tree. . . ."

(This stems, of course, from the Moslem requirement that women must cover their faces. A violation of the above rule is considered to amount to injury. The old Turkish law even went so far as to require a householder to build a wall before a newly constructed window, overlooking a place where women of an adjoining neighbor foregather with uncovered faces.)

The regard for women can also be seen from the following provision in the law of evidence: "In civil cases evidence is only valid when given by 2 males, or by 1 male and 2 females."

(Here is reflected the social status of women under the old Turkish rule in provisions that have now become obsolete under the women's equal rights law of 1951.)

It would be possible to cite many other examples of the rules of law that arose out of social conditions of another age. Those I have mentioned, however, serve to show something of the provisions of the Turkish law with which we have had to deal.

The law and administration ordinance, mentioned earlier, provided as a source of law also the many important enactments, dealing with all areas of human endeavor, that were made by the British during their 30 years of administration as the mandatory power.

A third source of law is the provision enacted at the time by the mandatory government that any gap which may be found in the laws taken over from the Turkish administration shall be filled by the common law of England and the principles of equity. This is important to keep in mind, for much of the common law is still applied in Israel in spite of the fact that we have severed all ties with Great Britain.

The courts in Israel function, of course, against the background of the other organs of government, as well as against that of the sources of law. Our Knesseth, or Parliament, is composed of a single chamber of 120 members elected according to a system of proportional representation. The presiding officer, or the speaker, is elected by the members from among their number. Bills are handled by committees and are enacted only after three readings with ample opportunity for argument, debate, and amendment.

The President of Israel also is elected by secret ballot of the members of the Knesseth. In his selection there are no limitations as to sex or religion. He may be a man or woman, a Moslem, a Christian, or a Jew. The duties and the powers of the President of the state, however, are restricted; he charges one of the members of the Knesseth to form a government, appoints foreign representatives, receives foreign diplomats, and accepts the reports of the Prime Minister as occasion demands.

The Prime Minister is the focal point of governmental structure as he is in Great Britain. He presides over meetings of the cabinet, acts as the Government's chief

spokesman, and, in effect, is the chief executive officer of the state.

Certainly one of the most distinctive aspects of the governmental structure of Israel is its judicial system because of the novel method that has been adopted for the selection of judges from the lowest bench to the highest. This method has been devised to remove the pressures of politics from their selection and yet to obtain the benefit of the best-qualified opinion.

Under the Israel plan judges are appointed by the President of the State on the recommendation of a 9-member appointments committee made up of 3 judges of the supreme court (including its president), the Minister of Justice, and another member of the Cabinet, 2 members of the Knesseth who are chosen by the full membership, and 2 members of the bar, designated by the council of the Israel Bar Association to serve on the committee for a period of 3 years. The President of the State must honor the recommendation of this committee. All judges are appointed for life or until reaching the pensionable age of 70, when they must retire. They can be removed from office only for misbehavior after a hearing by a specially constituted committee.

As might be expected, the magistrates' courts have the most limited jurisdiction, both in civil and criminal cases. They number about 20 in all and are established in nearly every town and village of importance so as to be accessible to the people.

Appeals from the magistrates' courts go to the district courts, the second level of our judicial system. There are 3 district courts, 1 in Jerusalem, 1 in Tel Aviv, and 1 in Haifa. The one in Haifa goes on circuit to Safad and Nazareth in Galilee; the one in Jerusalem to Beersheba.

On the highest level, of course, is the supreme court. It holds its sessions in Jerusalem, the capital of Israel. The supreme court has 9 judges who sit in groups of at least 3. It hears appeals, both civil and criminal, from judgments of the district courts in the exercise of appellate jurisdiction. The supreme court also has original jurisdiction, and as a high court of justice hears applications that come from various quarters, often from the minority groups in Israel or from individuals who feel that their civil liberties or rights have been infringed by the Government or one of its departments. The supreme court as a high court of justice sits in cases involving habeas corpus, mandamus, quo warrant, and certiorari—the four prerogative writs.

When the Supreme Court of Israel sits as a high court of justice it does so to safeguard the interests and rights of the individual. That is why, in one of the cases mentioned earlier, a writ of habeas corpus was required, and, in another, a writ of mandamus. The court had to consider in those cases whether the civil liberties of the individuals concerned had been infringed.

THE SUPREME COURT DECIDES

We have now come, by a rather circuitous route but perhaps a useful one, to an appropriate point to examine the opinions laid down by the Supreme Court in our 4 cases.

In the first case, that of the newspaper publisher, who came alleging infringement of the freedom of the press, the Court said: "The principle of free expression is a principle closely connected with the process of a democratic government. Under an autocratic regime the ruler is regarded as a superman and as one who knows best what is good and what is bad for his subjects. It is, therefore, prohibited to criticize in public the political actions of such ruler. In a democratic country, on the other hand, the rulers are only the representatives of the people who elected them. Every individual may, therefore, criticize the political actions of the elected representatives at any time,

whether with a view to having them amend their action or in order to cause their immediate resignation and their replacement at election time."

The gist of this is clear, but here the Court also relied upon 3 authorities, 1 British and 2 American.

The British authority, Scrutton, J., in a famous opinion of his said that, "You really believe in freedom of speech, if you are willing to allow it to men whose opinions seem to you wrong or even dangerous." Otherwise there is no freedom of the press and no freedom of speech.

In a very famous case *Schenk v. The United States*, Justice Holmes said:

"When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured so long as men fight, and no court could regard them as protected by any constitutional right."

Meaning thereby that in time of peace everyone may criticize the Government even though his criticism may be severe and harsh.

The following are the words of Justice Brandeis, also from a very famous case, the case of *Whitney v. People of the State of California*:

"Those who won our independence believe that * * * freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile * * *. Only an emergency can justify repression (of free expression). Such must be the rule if authority is to be reconciled to freedom."

These were the words that Justice Brandeis used, and these were the very words upon which the Supreme Court of Israel based its decision, not because it was bound by this authority but because of its persuasive argument.

After analyzing the two articles that were published in the two newspapers in the Hebrew and Arab press, the court came to the conclusion that even though they may be subversive, they did not tend to undermine the security of the country and did not endanger the peace of the public. Therefore, the court ordered the Minister of Interior to cancel his order of suspension and to allow these newspapers to resume their publication.

Mind you, the State of Israel is still in a state of emergency at the present time. There are border incidents every day and every night. Some claim that technically we are still in a state of war, and the Supreme Court of Israel dares at such a time to say that, in spite of all of that, human rights must be protected and the civil liberties cannot be infringed even in time of emergency.

In the second case, that of the Arab who was detained without trial, without the chance of being able to see an advocate, I should now like to say that we did not have enough time to enshrine all of the articles of faith of our proclamation of independence into positive law. Our statutes have not been revised entirely and, therefore, we still have remnants of the British Emergency Regulations. These emergency regulations say, in a notable section, known as section 111, that the Military Commander may detain any person without trial if he thinks that his activities are dangerous and detrimental to the State. However, the very same regulation provides that there shall be a committee appointed by the Minister of Defense to which such a detainee may bring his objections. This committee sits in a quasi-judicial capacity. It has no great powers but, nevertheless, it at least gives the detainee somebody to resort to.

The Supreme Court, after hearing both sides of the story, found that this man had been detained without trial and without

warrant of arrest and that no committee had been set up before he was detained, but only after the event. Thus a very important question arose as to the legality of the order of detention because at the time it was made, the detainee had no remedy. This is what the court had to say:

"In time of war authorities may deem it expedient in certain cases not to announce the reason for detention or the place of detention. However, in the absence of an explanation shedding light on the subject, one cannot avoid the impression that there are officials who do not yet grasp the idea that the attorney who defends the interests of his client is also rendering a valuable service to the State by helping to preserve the most fundamental rights of the subject; and it is the duty of the authorities to give him all possible help, and not to hinder him or thwart his efforts by repeatedly telling him, 'Go and come back.'"

That was as to the question why no advocates were permitted to see the man under detention. As to the merits of the case, the court said:

"Regulation 111 makes provisions which must be accepted so long as the state of emergency requires them and which ordinarily would have been declared unreasonable because they are incompatible with the ordinary rights of the individual. * * * Some slight relief was afforded to a subject who has been so detained by imposing upon the authorities the duty to establish, for the purpose of that regulation, a committee the functions of which shall be to consider any objection that a detainee might find it necessary to raise and to make its recommendations to the Military Commander. * * * It is entirely immaterial that this right of the detainee is so slender. On the contrary, if as against the immense power vested in the Military Commander, the detainee is granted so small a protection, it must be assumed that the intention of the legislature was that at least this right should be closely and carefully guarded. * * * This right is vested in the detainee from the very minute an order of detention was made against him and when a Military Commander makes use of this extraordinary power he is in duty bound to notify the detainee at once that he is being detained by virtue of regulation 111 in order to enable him to exercise forthwith his right to appeal to the committee. But in order that he may do so there must be a committee in existence at the time of his detention. It follows, therefore, that the Military Commander may exercise his power to make the order only if and when there is a committee in existence, and since the order in this case was made before the committee was established, the court holds that the very exercise of the powers under the regulations was illegal."

Consequently an immediate order was issued for the release of the detainee. The court further observed that the authorities are amenable to the law just as is an individual.

From the two decisions examined so far, it might be supposed that the Supreme Court, sitting as a high court of justice, always renders decisions against the Government, but that would be leaping at conclusions indeed.

When the elderly and married Arab suitor appealed to the Supreme Court sitting as a high court of justice, he contended that his right of freedom to worship had been infringed by the refusal of the Kadi to perform the marriage ceremony.

The Supreme Court looked into the matter and found a case that had been adjudicated in the United States and which appeared almost analogous to this one. This case, *Reynolds v. The United States*, involved a Mormon who was convicted of multiple marriage when Utah was a Territory under an act of Congress of 1862, prohibiting plurality marriages in the Territories of the

United States. He appealed to the United States Supreme Court on the contention that the said act of Congress was unconstitutional and that he was being deprived of his rights under the first amendment which guarantees freedom of worship. Furthermore, he argued that, according to the Mormon faith, it was mandatory upon him to marry more than one wife. The United States Supreme Court did not accept his contention.

In the case of the elderly suitor we decided that had the Moslem religion actually commanded a man to marry more than one wife, then any act by the State of Israel preventing him from doing so would have been an infringement of his constitutional or religious rights. All the Moslem religion says, however, is, "we permit you, we will not interfere." That is only permissive and not mandatory. A law that runs counter merely to permission does not infringe the rights of the individual. Therefore, we threw the case out of court.

Finally, in the case of the teacher who was discharged because of his political inclinations and tendencies, on the recommendation of the Minister of Defense to the Director of Education, this is what the Supreme Court said:

"Without in any way disparaging the honor and dignity of the Minister of Defense, and no one in this country treats lightly the heavy burden and the great responsibilities that are cast upon him, matters of education do no come within his jurisdiction. For these purposes a Director of Education has been appointed, and, although he may consult with other officials and departments as to the course to be pursued by him, he may not act as an instrument in the hands of others in matters falling within the purview of his office. Whenever the authorities act in a manner affecting the rights of the individual it is incumbent upon them to show that the law authorizes them so to do.

"No evidence has been adduced that applicant advocates the use of force or revolutionary force. The instruction or order issued by the Minister of Defense to the Director of Education not to engage the applicant as a teacher was illegal, and, therefore, of no effect."

The Director of Education, the Court added, did have the authority to dismiss the teacher but he acted, in this case, not upon his own judgment but upon the recommendation and command of some other officer. In other words his judgment was arbitrary, for he did not have the proper state of mind in which to exercise his own best judgment. The Supreme Court therefore ordered the cancellation of the order of the discharge.

THE LAW STRENGTHENS CIVIL RIGHTS

I have tried to explain that the evolution of the law in Israel has tended toward the strengthening of civil rights for all, even under the most adverse, precarious, and serious circumstances resulting from a state of war.

This is the trend and we hope it will continue. For the law of Israel is not a dead letter; it is a living law. It does not stand still. The supremacy of the law, the rule of law, is by no means a novel doctrine in the United States of America. Even children in the home know of it. Unfortunately, it is not generally so in our part of the world.

I have tried to explain the workings of the various organs of state, more particularly the judiciary. In our neighboring states the judiciary is a servant of some other organ of the state. The judiciary is in the hands of a cabinet and the cabinet is in the hands of an army.

In the State of Israel it is the other way around. The army is controlled by the government and the government complies with the law as interpreted when necessary by the supreme court sitting as a high court of justice. These are fundamentals of a free democracy.

Israel is a bastion of democracy in the Middle East. There is no reason why it should ever cease to be so. We hope that with the help of the free democracies of the world we shall be able to implement all the articles of faith that were laid down in our declaration of independence.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a resolution pertaining to Lithuanian Independent Day, which was adopted at a gathering of Wyoming Valley, Pa., Lithuanians held Sunday, February 13, 1955:

Unanimously adopted, after due deliberation, by the Lithuanian Americans of Wyoming Valley, gathered for the commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania.

Whereas for almost 15 years, Lithuania, one of the Baltic nations, has borne the yoke of slavery as a result of the brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Soviet Union;

Whereas a campaign of physically exterminating the Lithuanian entity has been conducted by the Kremlin masters on a scale unheard of heretofore;

Whereas no nation, great or small, can today feel protected from the claim of international communism supported, as it is, by all the destructive weapons that modern civilization has devised for mankind;

Whereas because of the global and totalistic nature of the Kremlin's peaceful coexistence line is designed primarily to gain time in order to divide and destroy free-world alliances and pave the way for world conquest: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this gathering of American citizens of Lithuanian descent of Wyoming Valley pledge their wholehearted support of this great country's efforts to achieve lasting peace and justice in the world, and urge the Federal Government of the United States to respond to the demands of this crucial time by initiating a positive and dynamic political program against the international Communist conspiracy; be it further

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Lithuanian Americans of this valley, the following steps should be undertaken as a part of such a program and with respect to the enslaved nations:

1. That in advancement of the program for world peace and freedom a special stress be laid upon the necessity to hasten liberation of the captive peoples, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected.

2. That the resistance movements of the enslaved nations be encouraged and supported through the funds already authorized by Congress for such purposes.

3. That a new committee to investigate the facts and techniques of Communist aggression be appointed by the 84th Congress, in order to continue and complete the work splendidly done, during the last Congress, by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression headed by former Representative Charles Kersten.

4. That the United States Government sponsor a resolution in the United Nations based upon findings and conclusions of said

investigation, denouncing the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all the nations now enslaved by communism.

5. Be it finally resolved that this gathering voice its deepest gratitude to the Federal Government and the Congress of the United States for their sympathy with and unchanging favorable attitude toward the eventual restoration of independence of Lithuania.

THOMAS E. MACK, Esq.,
Committee Chairman.
GENEVIEVE B. NATTUS,
Committee Secretary.

Our New Federal Interstate Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OTTO KRUEGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the text of the following two resolutions passed by North Dakota's 34th Legislative Assembly; one—House Resolution 9, the other Senate Resolution 6, both relating to a vital problem before us—that of extending an adequate interstate highway system over the Nation; and requesting that Highway No. 2 crossing our State be designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways:

House Resolution 9

Resolution to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from the State of North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from the State of North Dakota; requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway Two to the National Interstate Highway System

Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that "There shall be designated in the Continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico"; and

Whereas the act further provided that "the routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States," and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of

the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated the second day of August, 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States; and

Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the State of North Dakota as well as the several other boundary States; and

Whereas said United States Highway No. 2 plays an ever-increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

Whereas the said United States Highway No. 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's Highway No. 9, from New York to Montreal, and Highway No. 17, from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air-defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

Whereas under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of the United States Highway No. 2, to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the Bureau, this could call for a 2-lane highway with a 100-foot right-of-way; and

Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in 7 States, from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

Whereas while this is a petition from the State of North Dakota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to, and adjacent to United States Highway No. 2 because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

Whereas, this request that the designation of the United States Highway No. 2 be placed on the National System of Interstate Highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of North Dakota and in the other States served by the United States Highway No. 2; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, That the

House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota does hereby, most earnestly and respectfully, request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway No. 2, and through the proper Federal agencies, take immediate action to have United States Highway No. 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Honorable Norman Brunnsdale, governor of the State of North Dakota; and by the Honorable Ben Meier, secretary of state of North Dakota; to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, chief of administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from North Dakota.

*K. A. FITCH,
Speaker of the House,
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.*

Senate Resolution 6

Senate resolution to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from the State of North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressman from the State of North Dakota; requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway No. 2 to the National Interstate Highway System

Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that "there shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico"; and

Whereas the act further provided that "the routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States," and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated August 2, 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States; and

Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the State of North Dakota as well as the several other boundary States; and

Whereas said United States Highway No. 2 plays an ever increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

Whereas the said United States Highway No. 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's Highway No. 9 from New York to Montreal and Highway No. 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air-defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, and Department of Defense officials, along with the entire northern-defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

Whereas under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of the United States Highway No. 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the Bureau, this could call for a two-lane highway with 100-foot right-of-way; and

Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in 7 States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

Whereas, while this is a petition from the State of North Dakota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway No. 2 because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

Whereas this request that the designation of the United States Highway No. 2 be placed on the National System of Interstate Highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of North Dakota and in the other States served by the United States Highway No. 2; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That the senate does hereby, most earnestly and respectfully, request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway No. 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway No. 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the National System of Interstate Highways; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Honorable Norman Brunns-

dale, Governor of the State of North Dakota, and by the Honorable Ben Meter, Secretary of State of North Dakota, to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtis, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from North Dakota; and to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from North Dakota.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.

Address by Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr.,
Attorney General of the United States,
Before the Republican State Convention,
Detroit, Mich., February 19, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address delivered by the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, before the Republican State Convention held at Detroit, Michigan, on Saturday, February 19, 1955:

It's always a pleasure for me to get away from Washington for a few hours, to meet and talk with fellow Republicans. It's an opportunity to keep a true perspective on American's problems and America's dreams.

We had a lot of both 2 years ago when the members of the Republican administration moved to Washington. Thank goodness, I can report that many of the worst problems have been conquered and that many of America's dreams are closer to reality. Our Nation has gone a long way under the inspiring leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower. He has proven to political friend and foe alike that he is truly a great man, a great President.

Michigan has a wonderful squad working on President Eisenhower's team. You have given our President men of outstanding ability and integrity. Charley Wilson is doing a great job at Defense, and so is Governor Brucker. Joe Dodge put a lot of good old Michigan commonsense into the budget. Art Summerfield is putting the Post Office on a realistic, businesslike base. Senator PORTER has displayed the foresight so vital to sound legislation and decent legislative conduct.

Every one of them—and a lot of other Michigan people—are devoting long, long hours of unselfish work for the administration and for the Nation. I know you are as proud of them as those of us who are privileged to work with them.

I'm just as proud of the fine performance of Fred Kaess here in Detroit and Wendell Miles in western Michigan. They are two of the best of the Justice Department's group of outstanding United States Attorneys.

Your personal interest in government and world affairs is heightened, too, as work progresses on the St. Lawrence seaway. Here is a project which was just a fond

dream since George Washington first envisioned it. And the seaway, as you know, has been advocated by every President since McKinley. Yet, when Dwight Eisenhower presented the facts and the needs fully—and then went to bat for it—a Republican Congress passed the legislation to make that dream a reality. The seaway will bring deep-draft oceangoing vessels to the Lakes, letting your industry compete equitably for foreign trade. It will mean new factories, new jobs, and new prosperity for Michigan and for the entire Nation. History shows that any major advance in transportation benefits the entire Nation's economy—not just that of the immediate area served.

And let's talk realistically about prosperity for just a moment.

It was a big issue up here last fall. You still were making the transition from a wartime boom, based on blood and bullets, to a peacetime economy, based on the needs of our growing population and our rising standard of living. Also, campaign time was change-over time in the auto industry and a lot of people were temporarily out of work.

There was a lot of political talk of gloom and doom in the past 2 years. Yet, today, no one challenges the fact that your Republican administration has guided the Nation successfully from a wartime to a peacetime economy without the great depression so many predicted. No one challenges the fact that your Republican administration has helped bring our Nation instead its two most prosperous years in history in terms of wages, in terms of jobs, and in terms of earnings. We're well on our way right now to a third fine year.

This all was done without mirrors and without controls on the economy—on the prices a businessman could ask or the wages a worker could seek. Even more important, both can now plan realistically on the buying power of the dollar they will earn later this month, or next summer, or next winter, because inflation has been halted. The retired couple no longer find 10 or 20 dollars being taken out of each hard won hundred dollars every year by unchecked inflation. Neither do the parents trying to save money to give their children an education, nor the young couple saving for a decent home of their own, nor the farmer saving for new machinery or new stock.

All this is to the benefit of all Americans. So is the sense of security and faith that came from the end of that inflation, the end of the fighting in Korea, the end of loose security in Government, the end of corruption in Washington. It is such matters of the common good I wish to discuss primarily today because President Eisenhower's entire aim is to be a President for all Americans.

We all recall proudly that Republican Abraham Lincoln declared repeatedly he was for that "which will give the greatest good to the greatest number." Republican Dwight Eisenhower said in his recent state of the Union message, "Let the general good be our yardstick on every great issue."

The philosophy of Lincoln has returned to Washington.

President Eisenhower summed it up well for us when he said:

"This administration is committed to a program of progressive moderation."

He said that program must be "liberal in its human concerns, conservative in its economic proposals, constructively dynamic and optimistic in its appraisal of the future."

Progressive moderation is nothing new to the Nation or to the Republican Party. In a speech generally credited with uniting factions within the party just 2 years after its founding, Lincoln asked his fellow Republicans to "appeal to the moderation" of the people. He declared that "we will grow strong by calmness and moderation."

I think you will agree that all forward-looking Americans can support a program of

progressive moderation, especially when we consider what President Eisenhower said in applying it to the individuals and what the administration seeks to do for those individuals. It was this, and I quote:

"We seek increase in their opportunity to enjoy good health, good schools, good homes; we seek a lessening in their fear of personal disaster and in the impact of hardships beyond their control. In this endeavor, we reject Federal domination over State and community, for we seek to strengthen—not weaken—the historic self-reliance of our people."

What does all this mean in specific terms? Well, I think we should first review quickly the first 2 years of the Republican administration and the steps to carry out this program of making this a better Nation for all to live in and to enjoy.

Most necessary, of course, in pursuit of this goal is a strong, growing economy. By keeping it vigorous and free, we create more and more opportunities and an ever-widening share in prosperity for our people.

What has your administration already done to help? Several things. For instance, I've discussed how controls were removed from wages, prices, and materials. Then, through reducing Federal spending, an unprecedented tax cut was possible, and Americans as individuals were the beneficiaries. The tax cuts also encouraged increased spending, which in turn brought about greater production and more job opportunities. Couple these moves with the flexible monetary and debt management policies of the administration and this is the result: a halt to inflation and stabilization of the value of the dollar.

Meantime, the administration created an atmosphere conducive to good labor-management relations. An unprecedented low of work stoppages due to strikes was reached. Man-days of idleness due to strikes in 1954 were the fewest in any year since the end of World War II. This resulted from the administration's belief that Government has no place at the bargaining table—that labor and management can settle their problems over that table without the Government sitting with either side.

And there's another helping hand which is being extended to the unionman, as part of a drive against the evil elements of organized crime. Extortion and bribery by labor racketeers had become a flourishing and lucrative business. This not only impeded commerce and industry. More important, it reflected unfairly on the millions of honest workingmen who were caught up as pawns of these labor racketeers.

A special section on Organized Crime and Racketeering was created in the Department of Justice last year. With the cooperation and assistance of the FBI, this section has been vigorously investigating labor racketeering. At present, it is initiating about 50 investigations every month. The effort is paying off.

During 1954, 65 of these racketeers were indicted in 37 cases and there were 28 convictions. So far this year, there have been nine more convictions or pleas of guilty. Contrast that, if you will, with a complete absence of any convictions under the anti-racketeering laws in 1951, 1952, and 1953.

Among those convicted was a racketeer who sought to extort more than \$1 million from contractors for a powerplant for the Atomic Energy Commission. His actions cost the Government millions of dollars because of delays in construction. An Illinois man was sentenced to 4 years for extortion in a 700-mile pipeline project needed to serve the Chicago and Indiana area. A man tabbed the Duke of Indiana for the power he wielded for his own selfish gains pleaded guilty to attempting extortion in connection with road construction. And a longshoreman's leader in New York was convicted recently for taking gratuities from a trucking concern.

with which he supposedly was dealing on behalf of his union. Ample warning has been served that the Government will not stand idly by while the unionman and the businessman are being victimized by the ruthless and greedy use of power by labor racketeers.

That is a matter of the common good. So are the tax reductions which have totaled more than \$7 billion a year. More than half goes directly to the individual taxpayer, the consumer. And indirectly they benefit from the rest. It now looks, barring unusual developments, that a further tax cut will be possible next year.

Let's look at what was done in the social security field. Carrying out the 1952 pledge, Republicans improved many of the ills of the program. They added 10 million Americans to the eligibility rolls. They increased benefits for more than 6 million now entitled to and drawing benefits. On the unemployment compensation side of the picture, the President recommended to the States increased weekly benefits, while coverage was extended to an additional 4 million persons, including Federal employees who previously were not entitled to protection.

Here in Michigan a major industry is production of automotive vehicles. You will benefit from the record Federal-aid highway program allotting \$875 million a year to the States. And while making it easier for our people generally who use the roads, it also will increase the market for vehicles. Hence your State will have both direct and indirect benefits.

One of the most important things in life is health. Over the years hospital facilities particularly have failed to keep up with the demand. We now have a 3-year hospital construction program embracing grants totaling \$182 million.

What about homes? Well, the administration and Congress worked out a housing program permitting longer mortgages, thereby stimulating home ownership. It also speeded up slum clearance and encouraged remodeling, modernization, and repair of homes.

What about the future? President Eisenhower said that the wise course for Government in 1955 is to direct its program principally toward fostering long-term economic growth rather than toward imparting an immediate upward thrust to economic activity.

What did he suggest to Congress? Simply stated, he suggested a program which you and I naturally support and which, I know, all people of Michigan want. Here are the major recommendations:

1. Extension of personal security against the hazards of unemployment.
2. Strengthened minimum wage legislation.
3. Protection of savings in credit unions.
4. Increased Presidential discretionary authority to vary the terms of insured mortgage loans in the interest of economic stability.
5. Authorization of a great 10-year program to modernize the interstate highway system—this on top of what already has been done.
6. Meeting the nationwide need for school construction.
7. Creation of a coordinator of public-works planning and a revolving fund for advances to States and municipalities for public-works planning.

All of these proposals, plus the others now pending or to be sent to Congress, will create a favorable atmosphere for economic activity. They will encourage private initiative. The Federal Government would be in a position to help State and local governments in providing needed public facilities. They would provide greater opportunities for the less fortunate of our population and help all to cope with the hazards of unemployment, illness, old age.

In the field of health, the Nation is failing to exert proper efforts to reduce the impact of disease. This administration, under leadership of President Eisenhower, is urging steps which will alleviate the situation.

Establishment of a Federal health reinsurance service to encourage private health-insurance organizations in offering broadened benefits to those insured and to provide coverage to more people has been recommended.

I noted enthusiastically as I entered this hall the youthfulness of all of you. The youngest of you, I know, are beginning to understand, as oldsters do already, the economic strain on a family that comes in time of illness or injury.

Now, any one of us could become what the medical profession is now calling the medically indigent. They are referring to that time when any one of us could be faced with medical bills which we just could not afford to pay. Group hospitalization programs and the prepaid surgical plans available in some communities have done some good in meeting this problem. This is true also in the case of aid toward medical, therapeutic, hospital and similar bills by such organizations as the Tuberculosis Association, the Infantile Paralysis Fund, Heart Fund, and others. But more is needed.

The reinsurance proposal of the President would furnish a system for broad sharing among health-insurance organizations of the risks of experimentation. It would be the incentive for improvement in existing insurance plans, and encourage better protection, particularly against expensive illnesses. And it would mean extension of these private voluntary health-insurance plans to millions of additional people. It contemplates a reasonable capital fund, using it as necessary to reinsure programs which would meet the needs which I have outlined.

We also hope Congress will authorize separate Federal matching of State and local expenditures for the medical care needed by public-assistance recipients. As proposed by the President, it would provide better care for the aged, the permanently and totally disabled, the blind, and children deprived of parental care.

Also recommended to Congress is a program to further stimulate construction of more health facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, and technical establishments. As proposed by the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized by Congress to insure, for a small premium, mortgage loans made by private lending institutions for the construction of such facilities. This program, I am sure, would go a long way to help the many communities which today lack some, if not all, of these things needed for the protection of the health of our people.

Another part of the health program is designed to end the shortage of nurses. Recommended are a 5-year program of grants to State agencies for training practical nurses; and an expansion of Public Health Service operations to establish traineeships for graduate nurses in specialties such as administration, teaching, and research. In addition, Mr. Eisenhower has proposed revision of the present public health grant programs to include authority for training in all public health specialties, including mental health.

These are well-formulated plans. These, plus other elements of the health program proposed by your administration, represent a real attack against problems standing in the way of a stronger and healthier United States.

One other program the President has proposed means something to all of us. It is the proposal for Federal cooperation with the States to give our children as quickly as possible the classrooms they must have. As you know, there is a deficit of 300,000 class-

rooms, and with mounting enrollments at least 50,000 new classrooms must be completed each year just to care for this new crop of youngsters. What is happening is that the present construction rate is barely keeping up to the mounting enrollment, so the deficit of 300,000 classrooms is being cut only slightly.

Viewing this as an emergency and for purposes of meeting it on that basis only pending results of nationwide conferences, the administration has proposed to widen accepted channels of financing, without interfering with the responsibilities of State and local school systems.

Congress has been asked to authorize the Federal Government to purchase school bonds issued by local communities which are handicapped in selling bonds at reasonable interest rates. This would be possible if Congress authorizes appropriation of \$750 million for use in the next 3 years. It is also proposed that the Federal Government be authorized to participate with the States in establishing and maintaining for State school-building agencies an initial reserve fund. Thus, we would help those communities which are unable to build schools because of restrictive debt limits and which now depend on State agencies. With such a program, \$6 billion worth of building would be possible in the next 3 years.

Other elements of the proposed program would provide for grants to school districts with proved need, and lack of local income; and grants to States for administrative costs of State programs.

These are some of the things now planned to make this a better America, by protecting our most precious asset—our people.

What do this year and next will continue to merit the support of the great majority of our citizens.

They already have seen a Republican Party devoted to serving needs of all people.

It will continue to serve the people well.

Under the inspiring and courageous leadership of President Eisenhower, we cannot fail.

Revenue Act of 1955

SPEECH
OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a \$20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I did not really intend to get into this debate, because I did not think there was going to be a fight on it. But, when there is a fight going on, I do like to get into it. The reason I did not think there would be a fight is because I thought that this bill was doing what the President of the United States asked this Congress to do on this floor in his state of the Union message. If you will recall, he told us at that time that they anticipated cutting taxes in 1956. Now, that is exactly what this bill does. And, what has been done by this Congress is very simple. We have taken the suggestion of the President, and we are putting it into law so that he will not have

an opportunity to be talked out of what he wants to do for the American people. When he said that he wanted to cut taxes in 1956 he was doing 1 or 2 things: he was either playing politics or he was sincere. I prefer to think that he was sincere. I prefer to think that any President of the United States is sincere in what he does.

Now what happens? Immediately after this bill was prepared and brought to the floor—really before that—the newspapers were filled with all kinds of castigating remarks—including some of those by the President—saying that it was fiscal irresponsibility. Well, who suggested it in the first place? He is the man who suggested it. And do you know why it was necessary for Congress to act? If it had not been for some past experiences, this bill probably would not even be on the floor. But you know what happened when the opportunity presented itself to carry out some campaign promises concerning 100 percent of parity that was promised to the American farmer in Minnesota, and several other places. The American people remembered that. They also remembered this, that there was some small print in there that said "At the market place." Of course, the farmers have not found that market place yet. The market place that they have had to go to has very low prices.

But the point that I am making is simply this, that what they wanted to do was to pinpoint this because they did not want to turn up here in 1956 and be told when they thought this was the year they were getting a tax reduction that what the President meant all the time was to give another tax reduction to the coupon clippers who got it last year.

The little people in this country want some relief. They want it on the books so that somebody can understand it. And when you talk to me about fiscal irresponsibility I want to say this: that if it is fiscal irresponsibility to give some tax relief to the overburdened little people of this country, this country could use a lot of it. The truth is it is not fiscal irresponsibility, but on the contrary absolute fiscal and intellectual responsibility.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does not the coupon clipper get \$20 under this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. He gets \$20 under this bill, he certainly does. And we do not begrudge it to him one minute. I think it is fine that he gets it. What we want to do is to be fair with everybody but we do not want the little people to believe that we are going to do something for them and then later on have them learn that we are doing it only for a few and that we are saying, "Well, you just did not understand what we meant when we said taxes would be reduced. We were talking about the big boys not you little fellows."

If there has been any irresponsibility concerning this measure, it has not been fiscal, it has been vocal if not mental. When anybody says—and I do not care what office he holds or where he is from—when anybody says to me that I am fiscally irresponsible because I want to help a man to buy some shoes for his children's feet and some bread for their stomachs, I do not think he is being honest with himself or anyone else.

I shall never subscribe to the policy that substantial tax relief for a privileged few is "statesmanship" while meager tax relief for the many is fiscal responsibility.

The Glorification of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in 1938 at the age of 22, the people of Greenwood County, S. C., kindly elected me to the State house of representatives at the head of the ticket in a field of 10 highly regarded aspirants. It was no easy decision for me to decide to enter that race. Many people told me that I was too young and should wait until I was more mature. While burdened with indecision, I read an article by Dr. T. F. Callaway, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Thomasville, Ga., entitled "The Glorification of Youth." This article appeared in the April issue of the Baptist Training Union magazine in 1938. After reading Dr. Callaway's article, I no longer had any doubt about the place of youth in our American political life.

I am happy to report that Dr. Callaway is still living a very useful life in Thomasville, Ga., and is still encouraging the youth of that fine city. I commend to this House and to youth everywhere in America this splendid article written in 1938 by the beloved Dr. Callaway.

THE GLORIFICATION OF YOUTH

(By T. F. Callaway, pastor, First Baptist Church, Thomasville, Ga.)

"Let no man despise thy youth." (1 Timothy 4: 12.)

In the glorification of youth there is a threefold secret.

First, there must be a clear realization that youth can be glorified. No inferiority complex need possess the souls of the young today because they are afflicted with that malady we all wish we had and could keep. Youth. This has ever been a young man's world, and never more than today. The pages of history have been largely written by young fingers. In every realm of life we find that youth has ever made a mighty impact.

Alexander the Great battled his way to world supremacy and died at the age of 33. Napoleon was a second lieutenant at 16, commander of the French Army in Italy at 25, dictator of France at 30, and the Emperor of France at 35. George Washington wrote his One Hundred and Ten Maxims of Be-

havior at 13, he was a surveyor in the wilds of Virginia at 18, and adjutant general in the British Army, with rank of major, at 19.

The halls of music and art are replete with pictures of men who early refused to allow the world to despise them because of their youth. Liszt began picking out tunes on the piano when he was 3. Mozart showed signs of genius when he was 4. Handel and Rubinstein were considered prodigies at 8. Mendelssohn was attracting wide attention at 10. Beethoven began composing his symphonies at 11. Michelangelo and Raphael began sketching while playing around their mothers' knees. Benjamin West was painting pictures at 6.

In the realms of science and invention Robert Fulton was a veteran of 14 summers when he first designed the steamboat. George Stephenson had arrived at the commanding age of 15 when the very first blueprint of a locomotive was drawn by him. Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin in Georgia while in his early twenties. Cyrus McCormick was 22 when he gave his reaper to the farmers of America. Elias Howe was 26 when he proved himself good enough to give the sewing machine to the housewives of the Nation. Thomas A. Edison conceived the electric light while a news butcher on a passenger train.

Embryo statesmen of our country might well be inspired by men like Wilberforce, who began his monumental work on slavery at 16 and was a member of Parliament at 21; or by men like William E. Gladstone, who was a member of the House of Commons at 23 and Lord Treasurer of the empire at 26. Alexander Hamilton was Washington's most trusted adviser at 20 and a member of the Continental Congress at 25, yet he never weighed over 110 pounds. When Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence he was too young to have been elected President of the United States. John Quincy Adams was secretary to the Russian Legation at 14 and United States Minister to Holland at 27. In recent years many men in the Southland under 40 have been elected governors of great States. Among these are Moody of Texas, Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of South Carolina, and Russell and Rivers of Georgia.

In the business world today we see men who were born since the turn of the century serving as presidents and executive officers of gigantic banks, commercial corporations, and industrial concerns. A few years ago a graduate of the Georgia School of Technology was elected when 32 years of age to the presidency of the Otis Elevator Co., at a reputed salary of \$150,000 a year.

In the realm of education we behold such things as Benjamin Franklin opening a publishing house at Philadelphia at the age of 14 and founding the public library of Philadelphia at the age of 26. Daniel Webster was the outstanding scholar at Dartmouth at 15 and at 18 was the Fourth of July orator at Andover. That son of the South, Robert Maynard Hutchins, when barely 30 became the boy president of the University of Chicago.

In the area of religion we likewise see many who refused to let the world despise them because they were guilty of the crime of being young. For there we behold John Wesley preaching at the age of 11. John Calvin was pastor at 17. Jeremy Taylor was preaching at the famous St. Paul's Cathedral in London at 18. Charles Haddon Spurgeon was pastor of the great London Tabernacle at 20. Francis E. Clark founded the Christian Endeavor movement when barely 20. When 22 years of age George Williams started the first YMCA. The Lord Jesus Christ had completely finished the Father's work on earth and gone to the cross as the Redeemer of the world at the youthful age of 33.

Truly, then, the first step in the life of him who would glorify his youth is the realization that it can become a thing glorified rather than despised in the eyes of the world.

The second secret in the glorification of youth is the firm determination that one's youth shall not be despised by the children of men. To realize the possibilities of youth is a mocking specter unless there is a corresponding purpose to translate those possibilities into realities. Success in life is not incidental, it is not accidental; it is the result of a will to win. Young people go to the top in life in direct ratio to the power of their purpose to succeed. The difference between the success and failure of youth is the difference between the power of a purpose and the lack of a purpose.

A few years ago I sat on my front porch one unusually balmy Christmas Day. Across the street were twin boys, about 8 years of age, dressed in Indian suits which old Santa had brought them the night before. Along with the Indian suits came bows and arrows and they were engaged in shooting the arrows as high as they could. I noticed that one of the little fellows shot his arrow high in the air, while the arrow of the other boy went little higher than his head. The second little fellow was handicapped by a bow which had been broken and was tied together by a cotton string. One arrow went high because the bow was strong; the other did not because the bow was weak.

It was impossible not to moralize a little over the picture. The arrows going into the air represent the degree of success that two boys, maybe in the same home, achieve in life. The bows represent the power of purpose in life. One boy will go high toward the goal of success because the power of purpose is strong, while his brother will never rise above the average plane because the purpose in his life is broken or weak.

Theodore Roosevelt was right in his moral geometry when he said that the circumference of a man's influence in life is determined by the radius of his purpose in life. The longer and stronger the radius of purpose, the wider the scope of one's influence in life. Truly the secret of success is the power of purpose.

Every school child recalls the story of Napoleon, who told his field marshal that the French army must be carried into Italy. "You cannot do it; the Alps are between you and Italy," replied the field marshal. "There will be no Alps before the army of Napoleon," rejoined the great commander. And verily there were no Alps before the army of Napoleon, for through sheer power of an indomitable will Napoleon's army of 300,000 men, horses, and cannon was carried over the Alps into Italy.

We southern people love Horace Greeley. Although a northern man, he was a true friend of the South. It was he who signed the bond of Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, when it was a very unpopular thing in the North to do. We delight in a story that comes from his college days. When Horace Greeley entered Princeton University he pasted on the door of his dormitory room the letter "V." The boys wanted to know what that letter "V" stood for. Greeley told them to wait 4 years, and they would find out. Four years later young Greeley stood up during commencement exercises to deliver an address before an audience that taxed to capacity the largest building on the campus. He began by saying: "When I came to Princeton 4 years ago I placed upon the door of my room in the dormitory the letter 'V.' I told the boys who inquired as to its meaning that I would tell them in 4 years. The 4 years have now rolled around, and I wish to let everyone interested know that that letter 'V' stood for 'valedictory.' My mind was firmly made the day I entered college to graduate as valedictorian." And he did. It was no pull or

bootlicking that caused Horace Greeley to graduate at the head of his class. It was purpose.

Who, as a youth, has not thrilled over the story of Daniel Webster? When he announced that he was going to practice law his friends tried to dissuade him, telling him that the legal profession was already overcrowded. With a twinkle in his eye he said, "There is always room at the top." And to the top he went. With the possible exception of John Marshall this country has never known a greater constitutional lawyer than was Daniel Webster. He succeeded on purpose.

It is this same power of purpose that has proved the secret of spiritual success in the lives that have glorified God and blessed humanity. We see a young Hebrew in a den of lions. A heathen king has passed a law that the king, himself, is the one to whom all prayers should be addressed and that any one daring to pray to any other should be cast into the den of lions. Daniel, although an exile in a foreign land, pays no attention to that law of the king, but goes to the open window where every one could see him and three times a day gets upon his knees and with his face towards Jerusalem prays to the God of Israel. Before he would compromise his convictions or sacrifice his sense of loyalty to his God, he goes to the den of lions. Why? Because when a mere boy, doubtless in his middle teens, he sat down in the palace of the king and deliberately made up his mind to stand true at all times and in all places, as revealed in those words that flash and flame: "Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself." How we of today need to sing and pray and live over and over again the hymn of our youth:

"Dare to be a Daniel, dare to stand alone;
Dare to have a purpose firm, dare to make it known."

We look at Paul. We see him rising like a mountain above the average plane of humanity. We make bold to say to him, "Brother Paul, you have blessed this world as no other man who has ever lived in it outside of the Lord Jesus. Your words and works have influenced more lives than any mere man who ever lived. Will you please give us the secret of it all?"

With all modesty we can hear Paul as he replies: "If my life has been a blessing to the world; if I have been true to my Lord; if my example has counted for his glory, you can catch the spirit of my purpose in life in my words in Phil. 3:14: 'This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus'." Paul was the product of his own purpose. There is nothing mysterious about spiritual success. We are as holy, as influential and as useful as we will to be. God can ever be counted on to empower the purpose to glorify Him and bless the world. Christian lives are so powerless today because they are so purposeless. Purpose in every realm is the secret of success.

Then, there is the third secret in the glorification of youth. There must be a preparation adequate for the success to be achieved in life. Realization and determination can only become actual through a preparation that is sufficient.

There should be preparation of body. The body is the vehicle of the mind. Many are the tragedies of men whose brilliant intellects have been handicapped by broken bodies. Alexander H. Stephens, the vice president of the Confederacy, had a mind that scintillated like a diamond. His body was thin, sickly, and emaciated. He and Abraham Lincoln were close personal friends. One day Lincoln heard Stephens in the halls of the United States Senate as this gifted

orator from Georgia sat in his rolling chair and charmed and awayed the throng that listened. As the crowd quietly left the room Lincoln was heard to say, "If I had the mind of Alexander Stephens in the body of Abraham Lincoln I could move the world." No price is too great to keep the body clean and strong. Especially should the Christian remember that his body is the temple of the Holy Spirit. Let the body be a fit temple for the habitation of the Lord.

There must be a preparation of mind. This preparation of mind must be commensurate with the ambitions in life. A young carpenter is said to have been taking much time and unusual pains in finishing the judgment bench in the supreme court room of a middle western State. The foreman of the job reproved him for the time he was taking. The young man replied that he was building that bench against the day when he would sit behind it as the chief justice of the supreme court. Little did the foreman realize that this young man then was saving his money for college and dreaming dreams of a successful legal career and that the day would come when that young man would sit as chief justice behind that very bench. That young man could have remained a good carpenter without more preparation but he never could have achieved the heights of the legal profession without it. We remember the young lawyer in The Honorable Peter Stirling, which is said to be the biography of Grover Cleveland, who used ever hour of the many clientless days in careful study and was ready when the chance came to have part in a successful lawsuit which not only carried him to legal success but to the Presidency of the United States. As perhaps never before we are in a day when the man who goes is the man who knows.

There must be preparation of heart. Knowledge is power but it is power for evil unless directed by character that is good. An educated mind minus a cultivated heart equals a moral menace. The Federal prisons of our land are filled with men whose bodies are strong and whose intellects are keen from modern education and contacts, but whose minds have never been guided by the moral power of Christian character.

Some 2 years ago Robert E. Speer delivered a series of addresses in Atlanta. How he inspired those of us who heard him. Although then 70 years of age, he stood erect, his body strong. His eyes were keen, his mind was fresh and strong, his faith was simple and the force of his character was impelling. We could easily understand how he is regarded as one of the outstanding Christian statesmen of the world today. We thought of the price he had paid. At Princeton he made a national reputation as an athlete, especially in football. He stood in the forefront in his classes. He accepted Christ as his Saviour and Lord. He dreamed a career of Christian conquest. He dedicated his life to Christ and his service. The world rises today to call him blessed. He refused to let the world despise him in his young days. He achieved the glorification of youth.

Strictly Political

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein an editorial entitled "Strictly

Political." which appeared in the Grand Rapids Press of February 21, 1955:

The announced plan of House Democrats to cut the Federal income tax by \$20 per person is an out-and-out political move. For one thing, they know it is almost certain that if such a measure should get through the House—and that is extremely doubtful—it would founder in the Senate, where Senator HARRY BYRD leads a strong Democratic bloc opposed to tax cuts this year.

However, sponsors of the idea probably figure that they can't lose by proposing a tax reduction of this kind. Even if the measure should go down to defeat, they would be able in next year's congressional campaigns to say that they had fought for tax cuts. And that always goes well with voters.

It just happens that this particular tax slash would affect everyone who pays the personal income tax. From a politician's standpoint, that's the best kind of tax reduction. And this one has an especially glittering appeal for the politician for the reason that it reportedly would remove from the tax rolls and estimated 4 million families. That's 4 million heads of families. With their spouses they represent roughly 8 million voters—enough to swing a national election.

Aside from the purely political angle, this tax-cut plan is to be condemned for still another reason. It flies in the face of the sound principle that the tax base ought to be as wide as possible. Everyone has a stake in the Government. Therefore, everyone ought to pay a little something toward its upkeep. Not everyone does at present, it is true. But that is no reason for taking a step backward, toward narrowing still more the tax foundation on which the Government rests. That principle now is accepted widely enough in Congress to guarantee that there will be no tax-forgiving scheme of this flagrant type this year—a year in which the Treasury stands, without tax cuts, to run behind again.

Nickels for Our Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Columnist Robert C. Ruark which appeared in a recent issue of the Detroit Free Press. The article focuses attention upon a matter which is a blight upon the American scene and which every decent thinking citizen should desire to eradicate:

I have noticed recently big, double-columned ads for an organization called Arrow, Inc., which is collecting funds to aid the American Indians. The headline of the ads says: "Being Sorry for Ira Hayes Is Not Enough."

Hayes was 1 of the 6 men who composed that classic photo of the American flag being raised on Iwo Jima. He was a full-blooded Pima Indian. He was found dead at 32 on the reservation, dead of exposure. Like so many other people, he had not been able to handle the bottle very well.

Hayes had tried to make it off the reservation, but had returned in despair. "I want to be out on my own," he said, "but out in Arizona the white man looks down on the Indian, and I don't stand a chance anywhere off the reservation."

Many Indians, largely of mixed blood, have been able to make it off the reservation, and are proud today of their Indian admixture. But there are about a half million fullbloods in the country today, mostly on reserves, and they have had a pretty dirty shake.

It is not particularly news that they are ravaged by disease, or that they have not been extensively educated, or that their annual income is tiny. These facts have been hammered at a long time.

My point is that this column should not have been written at all, because Arrow, Inc., for the relief of the benighted redskin should not be necessary.

We have been pushing the noble Indian around now ever since we came over and appropriated his country.

We are mightily concerned all over the globe today mixing in other peoples' business and scattering money like chaff to the four winds.

We advise the rest of the world how to live, and we send aid all over the globe to the poor in resource, and we finance the construction of nightclubs in Rome.

But we still have done very little—the last time I was in Indian country—to change the blanket Indian gradually from a stone age aboriginal to a fit victim for the modern world.

The changing of any aboriginal from old ways to new is difficult, needing much time and gradual elimination of the old ways while substituting transitional aid and arriving eventually at the aim.

That sort of progress has been very swift for the American Negro in this country, but it has needed many, many years to effect, and is only partially complete.

But practically nothing has been done about our own aboriginals. The least we can do today, it seems to me, is to pause briefly in our vast international spending, divert a few funds from global do-good, and start improving the lot of the people who owned the real estate first.

AMA Statement on Health Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a press release issued by the American Medical Association with reference to the President's health message:

CHICAGO.—The American Medical Association commended President Eisenhower today for his January 31 health message to Congress and pledged continued support to improve the health of the Nation by strengthening medical efforts at the State and local levels.

Through its board of trustees, the AMA congratulated Mr. Eisenhower on his statement that health proposals to the 84th Congress "recognize the primacy of local and State responsibility" and would "encourage private efforts with private funds."

In support of many of Mr. Eisenhower's specific proposals the AMA noted that most areas touched upon in his message are those in which the medical profession as a whole has been concentrating much of its activity. It applauded the administration's recognition and support of what Mr. Eisenhower called important progress in bettering health and reducing the threat of leading diseases.

Specifically, the AMA said it supports or agrees in principle with these recommendations by Mr. Eisenhower:

1. An intensified attack on mental illness, which has been termed "the Nation's No. 1 health problem" by the AMA Council on Mental Health. The AMA, through this council which was established in 1952, and the American Psychiatric Association, are jointly sponsoring a national survey and report on all aspects of mental health and illness. This project, cosponsored by 16 national organizations, expects to evolve some fundamental departure from traditional concepts of dealing with mental illness which will lead to a far more effective attack on the problem than has thus far been realized.

2. Proposals aimed at relieving the shortage of nurses. The AMA has for years not only worked closely with the American Nurses Association, the League for Nursing, and the Committee on Careers in Nursing on this problem, but on several occasions has urged that Federal funds be made available to help support a nurse recruitment program.

3. Continued efforts in restoring to useful lives most persons who become disabled and who can be rehabilitated and returned to employment. The AMA agrees that reaching the President's goal will be a heartwarming achievement.

4. Permitting greater flexibility in the use by States of Federal grants-in-aid for public health services. The AMA has supported this theory in previous legislatures and agrees with the President's aim of unifying the grant-in-aid structure. Dr. George F. Lull, secretary-general manager of the AMA, has stated the organization considers it "eminently desirable for local health officials to have greater responsibility and discretion for solving public health problems" and approves of "sound proposals to meet these objectives."

5. Establishing traineeships in public health and strengthening the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps by improving its status and survivor benefits. The AMA is in agreement with actions designed to better the service.

6. Stepping up research on air and water pollution. The AMA has supported Federal research grants for this work and also recognizes the need for intensification of study.

The association said it is not prepared to comment on Mr. Eisenhower's proposals to improve arrangements for health service to public assistance recipients, until it can study the legislation recommended. The AMA has long supported and worked for better care for those unable to pay for it, and considers worth while the fundamental purpose of proposals intended to better this care.

The AMA also said it has no opinion yet on Mr. Eisenhower's new recommendation for mortgage loans to provide construction of health facilities but will study the legislation introduced.

The AMA has been "in complete accord" with the stated purpose of legislation designed to promote voluntary health insurance and commends Mr. Eisenhower for his beliefs and efforts in encouraging its expansion. The medical profession has been reassured to find that the official position of the Government is one of trust and confidence in the ability of private initiative to solve existing problems in the field of medical care. However, the AMA still believes that the proposed reinsurance system will not achieve the desired results.

"The AMA's interest has been and remains that of working for the best health for all the Nation," Dr. Lull said, adding: "In practically every instance of recognized deficiency, the AMA has been the first to undertake a positive, constructive program of action, and continues to be determined in its efforts and its cooperation with those working toward the same goals."

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware, I am sure, of the fact that we are now in the midst of an annual observance of Brotherhood Week. America has a great number of observances during the year commemorating occasions, personages, and ideals—all of which have a special significance in their link to certain basic principles inherent in our democratic form of government and our concepts concerning man and his human rights. In these many observances, I think it well that we be reminded that Brotherhood Week, in the essential meaning of the observance and without regard to point of time in which the celebration was established, is the basic premise from which all of these observances stem. Brotherhood Week embodies the very roots of our religious faith and the very roots of the faith upon which our Nation was founded.

Whatever our religious creed, we who are Christians hold the common faith that the one Father made of one blood all the races of the world; that fundamentally all men are brothers. Whatever our political party affiliations, we who are American philosophically—in truth—hold the common faith that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Brotherhood Week is not then an observance pointing up the human rights of any particular people; rather it is an observance meant to keep in the fore of all men's mind that our basic religious and democratic tenets are the protection to your human rights, to my human rights, and to the human rights of all the peoples of the world who hold our common faith.

Human rights was the underlying issue behind extension of the universal military program, which involves the sons of all races, colors, creeds; human rights was the issue behind the Formosa resolution, involving protection of rights of our Nation and of brother nations. The right to life and the pursuit of happiness, through promotion of general welfare—as set forth in the opening of our Constitution—is the issue behind our concern in the economic well-being of our Federal workers and our Nation's workers in general.

"Your faith shall be known by your works"—if as an individual, regardless of race, creed, or national origin, we truly believe that we hold inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; if as an individual, we truly believe that through one God in whom we live and move and have our being, we, having a spark of His divine nature, have dignity and stature before all men, it must follow that all men have such equal

rights and stature and to uphold and promote our individual human rights, we must uphold and promote the human rights of all men.

Brotherhood week is not a time to be viewed with lightness. It is a time for rededication to democratic principles and, above all, a time of rededication to the principles of our Christian faith. I call it to your attention, urging its practice, not for a week, but for each day of daily life, knowing that in its principles is the hope and salvation of this world in which we live.

Neuromuscular Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, Federal legislation is not the solution to all the problems uncovered by the comprehensive health inquiry made by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during 1953 and 1954. As in the past, most of the responsibility must be assumed by private individuals and institutions. As chairman of the committee, I call attention to a particular need in the field of research that was developed partly by the recent hearings. In order to avoid any partisan approach to this critical human situation, the Honorable CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman of the committee during the 1953-54 hearings, joins me in inviting comment and constructive suggestions. Our joint comment follows:

In the health inquiry directed by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during 1953 and 1954, it was found that about 20 million persons are affected by neurological and sensory disorders for most of which medical science has discovered neither causes nor means of specific treatment, and that the deaths from these diseases are exceeded only by the number of persons dying from cancer and heart disease.

It was even more startling to learn that public and Federal Government expenditures from 1951 to 1952 for research and treatment for each victim of a neurological or sensory disorder averaged only 3 cents, while \$29 was spent for each victim of cancer and \$1.75 for each victim of heart disease.

Because the spending of this 3-cent-per-victim money is shared by the Government and by many individual national organizations concerned with multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, cerebral palsy, the crippled, epilepsy, and neurology, it is apparent that very little can be allotted to fundamental research, without which progress toward finding causes and cures will proceed at a snail's pace.

This need for basic research is of special concern to the families of victims of certain neuromuscular disorders that baffle medical science and that have not been the specific concern of a national organization supported by public funds. This neglected group includes amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (the disease which ended Lou Gehrig's life when he seemed at the peak of physical health), progressive muscular atrophy, and

peroneal muscular atrophy. In 1950, 1,006 Americans died from these diseases, compared to 1904 for poliomyelitis. One tragic aspect of the situation is that a man who contracts the disease from which Gehrig died cannot expect to live more than 3 years. Doctors are helpless; they do not even like to talk about this visitation of death to about 667 Americans each year.

Basic research in nerve fibers and muscle tissues offers the means of determining the causes of neuro-muscular disease and developing methods for treatment and prevention. Such research has been initiated in a small way by public and private groups. The National Institutes of Health, for instance, is carrying on a study of amyotrophic lateral sclerosis in Guam in an effort to find a clue as to why there are from 50 to 100 times as many deaths there per 1,000 of population as in the United States. Scientists such as Nobel Prize Winner A. Szent-Györgi, of the Institute for Muscle Research, are concentrating on basic research. The Neuro-Muscular Research Foundation has just been formed to promote basic research which will be directed toward amyotrophic lateral sclerosis and other neglected diseases as well as the neuro-muscular disorders which have received greater public attention. We commend an intensification of such activities and greater coordination of public and private efforts in this field.

On the probable cost of such a research program, we quote Dr. Cornelius Traeger, speaking for the National Committee on Research in Neurological Disorders at the House inquiry: "If we could get, not 3 cents per patient, but \$2 a patient, I think that we could do a job that the Atomic Energy Commission did, or what preceded the Atomic Energy Commission did, in nuclear fission, and in about the same time."

J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
Chairman during 1952-54.

The Medway Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, a great humanitarian and American by the name of William Montgomery Bennett has submitted to me for my perusal a foundation plan known as the Medway Plan Foundation.

The aim and purpose of the foundation is for the relief of the needy and mobilizes individual American citizens to adopt aged, sick, and permanently disabled refugees abroad. It is also carrying abroad an understanding of what our free way of life means to body and spirit of every human being.

I wholeheartedly recommend the Medway Plan Foundation to our American public and seek their support for such a worthy cause.

THE MEDWAY PLAN

"Giving money to good causes—churches, hospitals, universities, Boy Scouts, refugees, the blind, the crippled, the starving—is a commonplace of American life, a glorious commonplace that astonishes people, the world over, but a commonplace. We accept it as a matter of course.

Giving yourself is something else.

The Medway Plan Foundation didn't invent the idea. It goes back a good many centuries, back to the Good Samaritan and, back of him, probably thousands of years, to some cave man or cave woman bending over some stricken stranger. What Medway has done is to give the idea focus, emphasis, and potentiality on a world scale.

Is there a person in need in a little Austrian or Korean village that you never heard of, in need of money or food or medicine or clothes, or, perhaps, only of human fellowship to mitigate the sense of utter aloneness in a hostile world? Medway sends you his or her authenticated name and address and you do the rest. You find the money (among your neighbors or in your own bank account); you find the food at the chain store, the medicine at the pharmacy (perhaps both as gifts); you find the clothes in your attic or a friend's; you write the unknown, show an interest in his troubles, make him your friend, give him hope and a reason for living: you do just this at first, perhaps, only to get your next letter; after a while, perhaps, to pass on to others the saving touch of the concerned heart. What you have given in time, money, energy, has all, every bit of it, gone to your unknown correspondent. There has been no leakage, no waste; or overhead of rent, salaries, heat, light, and janitor service that drains off up to 60 percent of each dollar you send even to the most respected and thoroughly worthy charity organizations.

There are no salaries in Medway, no offices, no secretaries, stenographers, and office boys; no overhead at all. Medway's headquarters, books, and files are established in a single room in a New England house, where Medway's president, William Montgomery Bennett, at 76, is his own secretary, himself typing the letter asking you to take on this unfortunate or that. The stationary, stamps, telephone, and telegraph, freight charges and gifts of funds for special activities abroad? Bennett himself and some of his associates take care of those things. Every cent of every dollar you give (and you spend it yourself in your own town, as I have indicated) goes to the person who so desperately needs it.

What you get in return is something away beyond the momentary sense of an obligation met, when you send a check to a charity. You get an appreciation of the potentialities of human caring in the solution of the world's problems. You learn how you, in a little American community, the other end of nowhere, can, and indeed, have become one with the forces rehabilitating the victims of a tragic time; and you acquire a friend.

That, in a nutshell, is Medway. The human touch. The spark, jumping across thousands of miles of ocean, plains and forest, lighting a light in a dark room, starting a dynamo, long inert; waking blinded eyes to new visions and tortured hearts to new hopes. Not charity but compassion. Not an organization playing Lady Bountiful; but a person being human.

The idea works out wherever it is applied. Sometimes a whole town in America takes on a town in Europe or Asia, but, within the town, it is still the individual, giving service and fellowship, rather than the \$5 bill or \$10 check. The Medway idea has worked and is working in the hard-core cases that the International Refugee Organization, disbanding, dumped in Medway's capacious lap. It has worked and is working to get the story of freedom and democracy to men and women in Iron Curtain countries; not by leaflet from the sky (though that is a fine idea, too), but person to person, through the underground.

Person to person. Always person to person. Nonsectarian, nonprofit, nonpolitical, backed by leading figures in the church, the

professions, banking, industry and government, officially thanked and bemedaled by Presidents and Prime Ministers, Medway works with all the great organizations in the field of relief and rehabilitation, the Medical and Surgical Relief Committee, Operation Town Affiliations, and the International Rescue Committee; with the Friends' Service Committee, the Church World Service, the International Friendship League, the National Catholic Welfare Conference and many other agencies. The major problem of all these organizations is people—people displaced, people starving, people in trouble of any sort. These organizations see them in the mass and are appalled. Where in the world is the money coming from, the personnel, the leadership? Medway isn't appalled. Medway knows that for every person in need, in Europe or Asia, there is a person in America, ready to help. Medway's problem is to find that person.

It is the genius of Medway, which means the genius of its sparkplug and president, Mr. Bennett, that it generally finds him or her and, having found him, puts him in touch with the person in need. It takes time. There is no national directory of Good Samaritans. But Bennett is building one. Perhaps, my name and address should be in it, could it be? And, perhaps, gentle reader, yours?

HERMANN HAGEDORN.

Gains of Technology and Displacement of Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, to remind us of the unbelievable speed of present-day industrial advances and of the serious questions that the growing displacement of workers raises for the American people and of their government, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a thought-provoking article entitled "Automation Is Here" from the March issue of the Democratic Digest. We cannot afford to forget basic human values in our self-congratulation over the gains of technology.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Automation Is Here—A New Chapter in the Story of Mankind and Machines

Nobody in the administration is talking about automation, whether they call it by its bright new name, or whether they call it pushbutton production, the robot revolution, or the age of electronic machines.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell isn't talking about it.

Secretary of Commerce Weeks isn't talking about it.

President Eisenhower isn't talking about it. (A check of the President's speech and statement index kept by the White House staff does not even show a listing for the word.)

There is so little Government interest in automation that the Government Printing Office does not have a single pamphlet about it among the thousands of documents it sells on every subject from dishwashing to atomic energy.

But whether Washington has heard of automation or not, many plant workers have, and they are concerned. Walter Reuther, the president of the United Auto Workers, is also concerned. He says that because of pushbutton production, 200,000 auto workers may soon be able to do the work of the present 1 million. His apprehension on this score is shared by many other union leaders who see automation making strides in their industries. Even a few responsible employers admit privately they are disturbed by the immediate outlook.

For automation is changing America—and fast. Yet it has developed so recently that even the word "automation" is in few dictionaries. It is unfamiliar to many opinion makers; it is a mystery to the man in the street—unless it has cost him his job. Yet it is causing basic changes all around us.

Just what is automation?

At its highest stage of development it is the completely automatic factory where machines untouched by human hands can turn out a product untouched by human hands.

The Wall Street Journal has defined automation as "doing a job by machines with a minimum of human assistance. It usually implies also the use of electronic controls to automatically schedule and guide the production process."

This then is the beginning of an era when machines, not men, run other machines. It is the second industrial revolution. The first one replaced man's muscle with machines. This revolution is replacing his judgment with machines.

Specifically, we are entering an age when a machine can dig a hole, measure it, decide the hole is wrong, and correct its own mistake.

This is completely different from the garden variety of increased productivity which America has customarily enjoyed. Since 1930, for example, output per man-hour has increased more than an average 2 percent a year. This has come about as a machine took over a job a man was doing or helped him do it faster—a conveyor belt or a fork-lift truck moved merchandise a man used to push or carry; a pneumatic drill replaced a pick. Over the last 25 years such changes have resulted in an enormous growth in conventional productivity through wartime, peacetime, depression and prosperity.

From where we stand today this is all to the good. We have long since lost track of the telephone operator who went out when the dial system came in. Indeed, thanks to the expanding telephone industry, there are actually more telephone operators now than there were when the change-over to the dial system began over 30 years ago.

Through the years, we have lost track of other people who were displaced by machines. Most of them have been absorbed by the expanding economy and share now in the 50 percent more purchasing power enjoyed by the average American, along with 15 percent shorter working hours. But this does not mean there were not cases of bitter hardship when the conversions took place.

Today we are entering a new era that dwarfs the past rate of increased productivity. In the long run, again, we will be bound to enjoy shorter hours and higher living standards, but prospects for short-run displacement are disturbing. At a Chevrolet plant where these new machines carburize camshafts, productivity has gone up not a mere 2 percent in 1 year but 3,300 percent almost overnight. For where 250 camshafts used to be carburized in 34 man-hours they are now done in a single man-hour.

Equally astonishing strides have been made in the manufacture of radios, light bulbs, airplanes, television sets, and chemicals, in coal mines, bakeries, and tanneries, in the

handling of paperwork by utility companies, insurance companies, and railroads.

Here are some developments in industry by industry.

Radios: In 1 Chicago plant, 2 men assemble 1,000 radios a day. Before automation, 200 workers were employed.

Light bulbs: One electrical-equipment company now turns out 80,000 light bulbs an hour with 230 employees. Automation magazine has estimated that this output by old-fashioned methods would require 75,000 workers.

Utility and insurance companies: Officials have told the Wall Street Journal that electronic brains now available will replace from 170 to 200 clerks each.

Airplanes: Convair now has 2 men with automatic riveters doing a job on wing panels that previously required 18 to 20 workers. At Solar Aircraft Co.'s Des Moines plant, machining time has been reduced 25 to 50 percent by automatic innovations. Boeing Aircraft, Seattle, with automation, can now bend tubes, which formerly were made in separate halves and then laboriously welded together. An official places savings at \$14,000 on each airplane.

Television: Admiral Corp., with equipment it calls Robot I, can now assemble half a TV receiver chassis in a matter of seconds. Machines now on the designing board would be able to insert tube sockets and tubes. (Admiral announced it has lowered its price, and employed more women to complete the assembly of the sets.)

Coal mining: At the United States Steel's Karen mine, 14 machines are taking care of all coal output. They run with a crew of 3 or 4, produce 15 tons per shift for each man in the mine. The national production average with conventional methods is 6 to 7 tons.

Chemicals: Du Pont has used MIT's big electronic brain to solve a chemical industry production problem. One man working 40 hours a week would have taken 20 years to do the arithmetic the "brain" did in 30 hours. Du Pont figures savings at \$450,000 as the brain eliminated need for large-scale high-cost test equipment.

Bakeries: Baker Process Co. is working on an automatic machine which would make bread untouched by human hands, will do an hour and half's work in 2 minutes.

Tanneries: Eagle Ottawa Leather Co. in Grand Haven, Mich., has bought a machine that will process leather in a few minutes instead of the weeks or months of conventional methods. Three or four men will do the work of 12 to 15. Pickled hides are put into a 25-foot long machine at one end and usually come out as leather in 4 minutes or less, already dyed, if desired.

The benefits from these changes promise to be enormous eventually. Indeed, we can look forward to a day of astonishing living standards achieved by nominal working hours. But the penalty in the short run threatens to be mass displacement, as man gives way to the machine.

What are these robots that can do the work of a man's mind? Basically they are electronic brains that run on the principle of feedback or self-regulation. Once they are set, or taped they can regulate a producing machine. The familiar household thermostat gives some idea of how they work. Once it is set to a certain temperature, it measures the temperature in the surrounding room and regulates a furnace so that the desired degree of heat can be achieved.

Automation machinery works on this same principle. But since it regulates far more complicated machines, the regulator itself is infinitely more complex. A typical machine may be from 70 to 100 feet long, with several rows of automobile-sized motors, joined together by a maze of wires, tubes, and pipes, while a couple of panels resembling switch-

boards are placed off on the side. The machine must be taped with the specifications of the product, a relatively unskilled job. Then electronic gadgets do all the work ordinarily done by the machine operator, controlling speeds and feeds, and even inspecting parts being machined.

Such a machine sounds too expensive for any but giant corporations, but this is not so. Walter P. Hill, Inc., Detroit machine-tool builder, has recently introduced a machine to assemble evaporating coils for air-conditioning equipment that sells for \$7,000 to \$11,000. Since 1 man with the machine can do the work of 12 men without the machine, labor savings may well pay for the new equipment in a few months.

This raises the question as to what products lend themselves to automation.

Machine-tool manufacturers are enthusiastic about the potentialities generally. "There isn't a product made which can't be automated," says C. F. Hautau, of Hautau Engineering Co., a leader in this field. "As long as a small manufacturer has a substantial volume in any one item, that item probably can be produced much cheaper through automation."

Richard L. Meier, of the University of Chicago, has classified the prospects for automation industry by industry. Advanced designs indicate that these industries will be fully automatic in the foreseeable future: Chemicals, liquid fuels, cement and brick, fermentation products, synthetic fertilizer, paper products, soap, and telecommunications.

A second group of industries will become largely automatic, but will still need some manual skills. Meier lists these as fiber and textile, glass and ceramics, iron and steel, machine tools, mining, and processed foods.

Today there seems little chance of dispensing with traditional skilled operators in transport, forestry and wood products, the garment trades, or in shipbuilding.

How long has it taken to make this astonishing progress, and how fast is this revolution advancing?

The basic research and developments came about during the war as part of the atomic and guided missiles programs. Today's machines are the peacetime result of this work. The first suggestion that these wartime regulators could be applied to industry seems to have come from a Massachusetts Institute of Technology mathematician and former child prodigy, Norbert Wiener. In 1948, he published his book, *Cybernetics*, which has led to the astonishing developments we see around us today.

Progress is so rapid that by now the manufacture of machine tools is a \$3 billion industry. Another indication of the fast changeover comes from the Federal Reserve Board. In November 1953, their index figure for the output of mining and manufacturing industries was 129. One year later in November 1954, the index figure was still 129. Production, then, was at a constant rate.

Yet employment in mining and manufacturing had declined by almost 1 million workers. In other words, productivity per man-hour rose so sharply in 1 year that the same output was achieved with 989,000 fewer workers. This has implications which are hard to ignore.

Yet at this stage automation is so new that it is hard to know what should be done. What seems to be most needed is some sort of fact finding study which can appraise possible courses of action and come up with answers to such questions as:

Should we extend the time limit on unemployment compensation?

What are the possibilities for retraining workers?

How can we be sure to educate enough technicians to take care of the machines that run machines?

How can push-button production be translated into higher living standards for all of us?

We do not have forever to answer these questions. As the 19th century orator, Wendell Phillips, once said, "revolutions never go backwards."

Progress in 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the American Dairy Association made real progress in selling dairy products last year. This progress was made possible through the cooperative effort of the dairy farmer and the dairy industry in establishing the year-around set-aside. This year-around set-aside has added real muscles to the framework of merchandising, advertising, research, and planning that ADA has been building over the years.

The American Dairy Association is entering 1955 far better equipped to initiate and support real dairy promotion which will have significant effects upon the sale of milk products for years to come.

I am indeed proud and pleased to be able to present to the Congress the report of the American Dairy Association for 1954. This report is a splendid report on the activities of the American Dairy Association in 1954. After reading over this report, I am sure that you will all agree that it is too bad indeed that this great work of the American Dairy Association was not started on the same scale that it was carried out in 1954 several years ago.

The report is as follows:

PROGRESS IN 1954—A YEAR-END REPORT ON THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

The following report on the dairy industry in 1954 is presented in an effort to bring you up to date on important changes. The report relies upon United States Department of Agriculture estimates on production and consumption of dairy products. These figures are, of course, subject to correction at later dates.

An attempt has been made in the report to tell you how the dairy industry has moved forward to meet the problem of bringing production of milk and consumption of milk into balance.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY MOVES AHEAD

The dairy industry is in the news—active, dynamic, progressive. Farmer, processor, and distributor alike—working together—are making economic progress. There is new emphasis on the importance of sales, the building of markets, aggressive merchandising, and a positive outlook, looking forward to growing service to the American people by this large, dynamic industry. This year-end report on the dairy industry gives background facts and a look toward the future of this key American industry.

MILK CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION HAVE INCREASED IN 1954

In the past 12 months dairy farmers set a new record for milk production. The

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) estimates total milk production in 1954 about 124 billion pounds, 2.8 billion pounds more than was produced in 1953. However, the Department also estimates that consumption of milk, and the products made from milk, increased in 1954 more than the additional supply of milk.

Additional population each year requires approximately $1\frac{1}{2}$ billion pounds more milk. Based on current production and per capita consumption, this population factor alone would bring production and consumption of milk into balance in the year 1956.

The dairy industry, however, is not waiting for population to overtake production. The industry sold, according to USDA estimates, 9 pounds more milk, in the form of fluid milk or other dairy products, on an average, to each of the Nation's more than 162 million people in 1954, thus moving another $1\frac{1}{2}$ billion pounds of milk into consumption.

PRICE SUPPORT OPERATIONS ARE STILL AN IMPORTANT FACTOR

The Department of Agriculture estimates that consumption of milk, in all forms, in 1954, totaled 118.5 billion pounds, leaving approximately 5.5 billion pounds of 1954 milk production which will be accounted for in Government purchases of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids.

The USDA reported that Commodity Credit Corporation dairy purchases for April-September 1954 decreased more than 13 percent from purchases during the same period in 1953. For over 6 weeks in September and October 1954 there were no Government purchases of butter, and there were much lower purchases of all dairy products during the final months of 1954 as compared with 1953.

It should also be kept in mind that the dollar investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in dairy products has declined since April 1, 1954, not only because of smaller purchases but also because of lower support prices. The purchase price was set, as of April 1, 1954, to attempt to assure dairy farmers 75 percent of parity for their milk. Prior to this time the support level had been at 90 percent of parity.

GOVERNMENT DAIRY STOCKS ARE MOVING INTO CONSUMPTION

Government holdings of butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids, at the end of 1954, will represent a larger carryover than at the end of 1953. The stocks now on hand have been accumulated over a 22-month period.

It is significant, however, that in September 1954, the dairy trade repurchased dairy products from the Government stocks. In September the Commodity Credit Corporation sold more butter back to distributors than was purchased for price-support activities.

Disposal programs have also been developed and are now moving dairy products into consumption. In November, while making almost no purchases of butter, the Government made contracts for disposal of some 200 million pounds of its supply. USDA officials have predicted that in 1955 they will dispose of more butter than they purchase under the price-support program.

By 1956 the dairy experts in the Department estimate the Government may be out of the dairy storage business. Unfavorable weather conditions in the next 2 years, which could cut production, could bring about this change much sooner.

GOVERNMENT STOCKS ARE USED TO CARRY OUT OTHER GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Government-owned butter, cheese and dried milk are moving into consumption through various channels. The butter is not being destroyed, as was the case with some price support operations in other commodities in past years.

The butter is being distributed through the school lunch program, an increase in armed services use, through sales of butter at world prices to other nations, through conversion of butter into butter oil for reconstituting whole milk in several Asiatic countries which are short of milk, through donations to welfare agencies such as CARE. In most of these cases Commodity Credit Corporation stocks are being used to carry out other programs approved by the Congress, including the school lunch and foreign aid programs.

THERE ARE CHANGES IN MILK CONSUMPTION

The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that consumption of dairy products, on a milk equivalent basis, in 1954 increased 9 pounds over 1953, to reach a total of 697 pounds. This compares with a 1935-39 average of 791 pounds.

There have been changes in consumption patterns. In the 1935-39 period, per capita consumption of fluid milk was 264 pounds. This increased to a maximum of 335 pounds in the wartime year of 1945 when consumers spent a larger share of their income for non-rationed items such as milk. In 1954 the estimate is that fluid milk consumption was 299 pounds. Fluid milk and fluid cream consumption together in 1954 totaled 352 pounds, according to the USDA estimate, this being a 2-pound increase over 1953.

BUTTER CONSUMPTION UP FOR YEAR

Official estimates are that butter consumption for the year 1954 will be up four-tenths of a pound per capita for a level of 9 pounds per capita. This is a significant gain. A 1-pound increase in per capita consumption of butter would use the equivalent of $3\frac{1}{4}$ billion pounds of milk annually.

Less milk goes into butter now than in the abnormal, wartime years. In 1954 consumers used a total of 697 pounds of milk per capita, down 94 pounds from the 1935-39 average. A large portion of this drop has been because of smaller butter consumption.

Comparing more normal peace-time years, and leaving out the war-time years when food was one of the few consumer items available to the public, the per capita consumption of dairy products, with the exception of butter and evaporated milk, has shown a steady increase. Dairy foods have been among the groups of which have gained in consumption because of a general trend towards foods high in protein, vitamins, and essential minerals and away from the starchy, high calorie foods.

PEOPLE EAT MORE CHEESE AND ICE CREAM

Cheese and ice cream consumption, measured on a milk equivalent basis, have shown fairly steady increases in per capita consumption. In the 1935-39 period cheese consumption was equal to 55 pounds of milk equivalent, and this had increased to a record of 76 pounds of milk in 1954. Milk used for ice cream had moved from 25 pounds in 1935-39 to 46 pounds in 1954. Although the USDA estimated a slight decline in milk used for ice cream in 1954, as compared with 1953, there were increases in the low-fat iced milks, sherbets, and other dairy desserts which more than made up for the lower use of milk for ice cream itself.

Fluid cream on a milk equivalent basis, showed a 1 pound increase in 1954 over 1953, but the 1954 total of 53 pounds of milk was a drop from 66 pounds of milk in 1935-39. Evaporated and condensed milk usage has dropped from the peak wartime years, but in 1954 the 36 pounds of milk per person used in these products was the same as in 1935-39.

DAIRY FARMERS HAVE PROPOSED NEW PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Dairy farmers, through their various organizations, have indicated their willingness to work with the Department of Agriculture and the Congress to develop programs that

will eliminate the need for the Government to purchase and store those dairy products which are not immediately consumed.

The Secretary of Agriculture, under congressional mandate, must report to Congress in January 1955 on various dairy plans and make recommendations for a new dairy price support program if the Secretary feels a better plan has been suggested.

A self-help proposal, originally approved by the National Milk Producers Federation over a year ago, with proposals for modification offered by other groups, is certain to receive considerable attention in the next session of Congress. This plan would assess a stabilization fee against milk producers, or use a base-surplus type of payment for milk, with dairy farmers themselves assuming the full cost of disposing of that milk which is not used in domestic channels.

Unless weather conditions should bring about a serious drought in the next year or two, it would appear that the major factor affecting the stabilization of production and consumption of milk will be the success of the Commodity Credit Corporation in drastically reducing present Government stocks of dairy products. These large supplies on hand have the same effect on dairy marketing as an oversupply in any other industry. Any self-help proposal for dairying would depend upon Government policy in disposing of current Government holdings.

THE IMPORT-EXPORT QUESTION IS UP AGAIN

Because of the excess supply situation existing in the dairy industry in the past several years, the Congress has authorized limitations on imports of various dairy products. This program will be reviewed in 1955.

It appears doubtful that, under present conditions, there will be any important changes in current import restrictions. Exports of dairy products are not likely to show any major increases, except under special Government aid programs. Prices of dairy products in the United States remain substantially above those of the world market, and other dairy-producing countries are attempting to market dairy foods through exports.

The competition from lower priced dairy products, produced under different economic conditions in other countries, is not a problem unique to the dairy industry. Other American industries are finding themselves underbid in domestic and foreign markets by foreign manufacturers. United States manufacturers are, in fact, subsidized, or protected, in such competition within this country through the laws which require that foreign bids on Government-financed projects must be lower, by a congressionally set limit, than American bids before they may be accepted.

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1955 IS FOR MORE PROGRESS IN THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

If present USDA estimates for 1955 are fairly accurate, there will be little change in milk production rates in the next 12 months. At the present rate of consumption, the Department of Agriculture forecasts that the Nation will consume at least 120 billion pounds of milk in the next year, allowing for the anticipated increase in population. This, then, would leave production about 4 billion pounds higher than consumption, the equivalent of slightly over 1 pound of butter per person for a year, or about one-half pint of milk per person per week.

There are reasons to believe that per capita consumption of milk and milk products will show further increases in 1955.

The Agricultural Act of 1954 provides \$50 million per year to expand milk consumption in schools. This amount of money, which has been allocated and is now being used in most of the 48 States, could mean the purchase and use of about 1,200,000,000 pounds of milk in addition to the amount already being used in the schools. The program is

educational, in that it aids schools in developing more nutritious lunch programs for pupils.

There is another rapidly developing trend in milk distribution and sales which is helping to increase consumption of milk. The automatic vending of milk in factories, transportation centers, office buildings, schools, and other places where there are sufficiently large numbers of people concentrated is helping to expand per capita sales of fluid milk.

Vending machine sales are usually additional sales of milk because the machines are installed in places where milk often-times has not been available in the past. The USDA reported, in November 1954 that surveys made in the vending field indicated a 25-percent increase in the number of machines vending milk in 1954.

The activities of the dairy industry in greater sales promotion for milk have produced results in 1954 and certainly should play an increasingly important role in dairy sales in 1955.

PRODUCING MILK IS LONG-TERM BUSINESS

It has sometimes been difficult for people not fully acquainted with the dairy industry to understand why dairy farmers have not been able to bring their production of milk into balance with current consumption demands.

First, it should be realized that the dairy industry is actually a collection of many separate industries, unlike the automobile industry for example, which is a matter of four major producers who maintain, through their own dealer systems a close check on sales of their cars. In dairying there are approximately 2 million individual dairy farmer-businessmen producing the raw material milk for sale. There are more than 25,000 firms which bottle or manufacture the milk. There are no producers or manufacturers who alone can exert enough influence on the industry to affect production of dairy products.

It requires 3 years for the dairy farmer to bring a cow into milk production. The dairy farmer, like any other patriotic citizen, has always responded to the calls from his country to increase production during wartime periods. He has been able to add to his herd in order to produce more milk, but he has not been able to cut production by the flip of a switch.

MILK PRODUCTION INCREASE BEGAN IN 1952

The current increase in milk production began in late 1952. In the fall of that year many economists were urging dairy farmers to increase their production of milk to meet what those economists felt were going to be larger demands for milk. Economists were also urging farmers who were producing crops then in surplus to go into dairying which in 1952 was providing a fairly stable income for farmers.

Good weather in the winter of 1952 and throughout most of 1953 in the heavy milk producing areas enabled dairy farmers to increase the production of milk at a rate never before attained. Dairy farmers put into practice the better breeding, better feeding, and better herd management programs advocated through the years. Their cows produced more milk.

There were other changes going on during this period. More milk was being produced in the eastern and southern market areas. In the meantime the Midwestern dairy States were also increasing their production.

Because each individual dairy farmer operates his own business enterprise, and because most dairy farms are comparatively small enterprises, operated by the farm owner and his family, income must be maintained at a level which produces a profit for that individual farm. Thus, historically, the dairy farmer has increased production

of milk when prices paid for milk declined in order to earn approximately the same gross income. Milk production has not responded to price changes in the same way that some other products do. Each dairy farmer is his own production manager and responds according to his own income calculations.

THE INFLUENCE OF SUBSTITUTE PRODUCTS ON THE DAIRY MARKET

The dairy situation has been further complicated in the postwar years by sales of substitute products, those products which use the skim-milk portion of milk in combination with cheaper vegetable fats substituted for butterfat. The butterfat displaced by other fats has been manufactured into butter because churning butter is the traditional way to store butterfat.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IS BUSY SELLING MORE DAIRY FOODS

For many years the emphasis in agriculture has been on efficient production, and American farmers have become very efficient. In April 1954 the United States Census Bureau estimated that only 13 1/4 percent of the Nation's total people live on farms, as compared with 35 percent in 1910 and 75 percent or more not too many decades before the turn of the century. Today each American farmer produces enough food for 17 other people.

American farmers have been willing to take greater risks than almost any other businessmen. They have invested in land, buildings, livestock, and machinery to produce more and better food. They have each spring purchased fertilizer and seed, plowed and planted, cultivated and hoped that the weather would cooperate to produce crops. They have been successful, and today the United States, unlike most of the rest of the world, faces the problem of handling too much food instead of not enough food. Political and diplomatic situations, not any desire on the part of the farmers, are responsible for the inability to move excess American food to other areas of the world where food is needed.

FARMERS LOOK TO THEIR MARKETS

The American farmer has become the most efficient producer of food and fiber in the world. Even though some small groups of farmers, with specialized crops, learned the value of carrying on their own sales programs in past years, it has been only in the more recent postwar years that farmers, in general, have directed their attention to building markets for their products.

In 1954, the dairy farmers of America gave more attention to market building than ever before. In their local communities, dairy farmers have worked with civic groups, food retailers, dairy processors, and others to call to the attention of consumers the values of dairy foods. They have organized local dairy days and dairy promotion groups. They have set up dairy bars at fairs and other large gatherings of people to introduce their products to the public. They have helped to spread the use of milk vending machines. It is not uncommon these days to attend meetings of dairy farmers and find them discussing the intricacies of advertising and merchandising, public relations, and market research.

DAIRY FARMERS HAVE EXPANDED THEIR NATIONAL SALES PROGRAM

Perhaps the best indication of the new interest which dairy farmers are showing in selling milk and milk products is their rapid expansion of their own national sales promotion activities through the American Dairy Association. In 1954, approximately 1 1/2 million dairy farmers in 44 States invested over \$4 million in a national program of research, public relations, advertising, and merchandising. They have set up a budget

of \$5 million for 1955 to intensify further their sales campaign.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson issued a challenge to the dairy industry at the 1953 annual meeting of the American Dairy Association to sell more milk and milk products to the American public. Even before he had spoken, dairy farmers in several States had voted to increase their investment in the association from a 2-month program to a year-around program at the rate of 2 cents for each 100 pounds of milk they produced. This year-around plan was adopted as a national policy at the meeting addressed by the Secretary.

By January 1, 1954, most of the major dairy producing States, and many of the States where dairying is not a major enterprise, had either started on the new year-around investment program or had made definite plans to start sometime during the year.

Because dairy farmers themselves wanted a bigger sales promotion program and because they provided the funds for this program, they now have a voice that is being heard in an estimated 45 million homes every week, a voice telling consumers a strong sales story about dairy foods.

RESEARCH PAVES THE WAY

The dairy farmers have adopted and are using the same selling methods employed by other successful business enterprises. One of their first steps in their expanded sales program was to employ the services of an outstanding market research organization (Alfred Politz Research, Inc., of New York City).

Through the American Dairy Association, dairy farmers had been carrying out a research program to learn more facts about their products, nutrition facts, and processing facts. They continue to sponsor these studies in colleges and universities throughout the country, but they have added market research to learn consumer attitudes toward dairy products and toward the dairy industry itself.

These consumer studies have produced information which makes it possible to develop more effective advertising and merchandising programs and to direct public-relations efforts in the most productive channels. Sales messages are directed toward capitalizing on favorable attitudes toward dairy foods or toward correcting misconceptions which have developed.

NEW PRODUCTS AND PROCESSES SALES

During 1954 there were two major developments in one branch of the dairy industry. Instantly dissolving nonfat dry milk was placed on the market for the first time. A new bread-baking process, known as the stable ferment process, was introduced to the baking industry by the American Dry Milk Institute.

The stable ferment process for baking bread holds promise for reducing baking costs and increasing the use of nonfat dry milk in bread. Bakers who adopt the process will be able to reduce space and equipment requirements and eliminate the need for all-night baking crews.

Other developments in products and processing techniques are on the way. Efforts are being made to produce a powdered whole milk which will not require refrigeration. A completely new type of cheese has been developed at the University of Wisconsin and is now being manufactured (Dairiworld). The dairy industry is making progress, from the farm to consumers' tables, through research.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE IMPORTANT FOOD ADVERTISERS

In 1954 dairy farmers have become important in the total food sales promotion field. Through the American Dairy Association dairymen are sponsoring national radio and television shows. Their advertisements appear regularly in leading magazines and

newspapers. They have developed a fluid milk sales program that, market research shows, is leading adults into the healthy habit of drinking at least three glasses of milk every day.

In 1955 the dairy farmers will launch a million dollar campaign to convince housewives that "even more than your guests, your family deserves butter." The dairymen are capitalizing on the prestige which butter still maintains among homemakers. They will be telling a powerful sales story on the use of butter in cooking and baking.

The dairy farmers, through the American Dairy Association, have developed a comprehensive sales program for milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, evaporated milk, cottage cheese, and nonfat dry milk. The sales plans are based on the market research. They include not only the biggest dairy advertising program ever conducted on a nonbrand basis, but also very complete merchandising ideas which are made available to brand distributors for use at the point of sale.

In 1954 milk dealers throughout the Nation were using the American Dairy Association's milk sales campaign. Local dealer advertising was in many cases tuned-in to supplement the association's national campaign. The dealers used bottle collars and a host of other merchandising tools to carry the story of milk drinking benefits into more homes. Where this milk sales story was used intensively by brand dealers, increased milk sales were easy to measure. Adult attitudes toward milk drinking showed important changes.

WHY DAIRY FARMERS ARE PROMOTING SALES

It is not customary for producers of raw materials to be spending the money they receive for those raw materials to promote sales of the finished products. Dairy farmers have not let customary practices stop them from going into dairy sales promotion full-scale.

Dairy farmers, fundamentally, are in dairy food sales promotion because they are interested in increasing consumption of milk rather than to cut production. They are not taking over all promotion for dairy products but instead have developed an overall campaign for everyone in the industry.

Brand distributors in the dairy industry are local or regional, except for several companies which do have national distribution of one or two of the major dairy products. Through the years there have been few national campaigns covering all of the dairy foods.

Dairy farmers have stepped in and filled a big void for the dairy industry. They have developed comprehensive sales programs for each of the dairy products. Brand distributors are kept informed about these sales campaigns in advance. Today even the smallest brand dealer can take advantage of a well-planned national promotion for milk or butter or cheese or any other dairy food. New packaging and merchandising ideas are available to the smallest processor as well as to the largest. Brand distributors are using the American Dairy Association campaigns to sell more dairy foods to present customers.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE PROVIDING SALES LEADERSHIP

Through the leadership which dairy farmers are giving to the dairy industry in sales promotion, it is now possible for the entire industry to have effective national sales programs. In 1954 processors and distributors of dairy products accepted and joined with the American Dairy Association program more than they have in the past, and 1955 will see more brand dairy products being sold through the sales appeals developed by the dairy farmers.

The year 1954 saw some improvement in per capita sales of various dairy foods. Prices on some of these products were at lower

levels than in 1953. There is no accurate way to measure the relative effects of lower prices and sales promotion efforts on sales. It does seem logical to assume, however, that higher per capita butter sales in 1954 were the result of increased sales promotion as much or more than lower prices, since butter, even at the lower prices, was still more than twice the price of substitute products.

NUTRITIONISTS SUPPORT THE DAIRY FARMERS

Dairy farmers are convinced that their sales promotion, now that it is in high gear, can do a great deal to move more dairy foods into consumption. Nutritionists are strong supporters of the dairy farmer in that they are urging greater consumption of high-protein dairy foods. Some nutritionists have stated that the current population of the United States should be consuming 145 billion pounds of milk annually to reach a minimum level of good diet.

The dairy farmers are selling their products for both health reasons and for good eating. The dairy foods family includes America's favorite dessert, ice cream. Milk is consumed by almost 50 percent of all adults at least once each day. Cheese is found in over 90 percent of the homes as a staple food. Studies show that dairy foods provide approximately 30 percent of the average person's nutritional requirements at a cost of only 15 cents out of each food dollar. On a nutritional basis, dairy foods are rated as among the top buys in the food market.

It would take only a small increase in per capita milk consumption, about one-half pint of milk per person per week, to move all current production into consumption. The dairy farmers are intent upon selling that additional amount of milk so that they can turn their attention to increasing production to meet growing population needs instead of worrying about storing dairy foods in warehouses.

DAIRY FARMERS TELL THEIR STORY TO THE PUBLIC

Dairy farmers are in the public-relations business because they have not been happy about the unfavorable attitude toward them on the part of some segments of the public. The amount of money which the Government has invested in dairy products since the beginning of price-support activities in 1933 has been relatively minor in comparison with other branches of agriculture and with non-agricultural industries.

The dairy farmer would much prefer to sell his products directly to consumers, and through his sales-promotion program he is making an effort to do that. In the meantime it is not easy for him to cut production by turning a switch. The products which the Government has bought have gone into consumption and are going into consumption through various channels; they have not been wasted or destroyed. The dairy farmer, unlike other segments of the economy, has taken a drastic cut in his income. The Government price-support operations do not guarantee a high income for the dairy farmer but rather serve to keep the dairy farmer from becoming insolvent.

The dairy farmer's market research bears out the studies made by various public-opinion analysts. The public is not especially well acquainted with Government price-support programs. Those people who are familiar with such programs are not particularly upset about these operations. A majority of the people who indicated, in the Politz studies, that they were acquainted with price supports also indicated that they thought such programs were a good idea.

Price-support operations, which keep the dairy industry from going into a depression period which might eventually result in shortages of milk, are, dairy farmers feel, as justifiable as Government subsidies for shipbuilding in order to keep American shipyards from going out of business. Food, as

well as ships, is essential to the Nation's defense.

Dairy farmers are working every day to increase their efficiency of production in order to cut their costs. They are investing in new equipment which helps to improve even more the sanitary standards under which milk is produced. They are engaged in a sales program to help move their products into consumption.

The dairy industry has made substantial progress in 1954, perhaps more progress than in any previous year. The industry is moving into 1955 with confidence that the new year will end with the industry closer to the goal of expansion rather than contraction.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the People of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following resolution:

LAWRENCE, MASS., February 20, 1955.

Resolution unanimously voted by the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Lawrence, at the observance of the 37th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Citizens Club and the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., at the Lyra Hall on the 20th day of February 1955:

"Whereas the intolerable conditions which now prevail in Eastern and Central Europe, including Lithuania and her two neighbors of Latvia and Estonia, should be of gravest concern to Western democracies, and first of all to the United States, as no peace and stability in the world is possible without participation of that area which comprises a force of over 100 million people separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain;

"Whereas the United States Government sponsor a resolution in the United Nations based upon findings and conclusions of said investigation, denouncing the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all the nations now enslaved by communism; also that the genocide convention which represents the most powerful legal means to save the Soviet-slaved peoples from total destruction be immediately ratified by the United States Senate so that the Communist crimes perpetrated against humanity may be fully recorded and officially noted for prosecution:

"Resolved, That this gathering voice its deepest gratitude to the Federal Government and Congress of the United States for their sympathy with and unchanging favorable attitude toward the eventual restoration of independence of Lithuania."

JOHN URBONAS,

President Lithuanian Citizens Club.

JOHN A. STUNDZA,

President,

Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

JULIUS PIESLOK,

Vice President,

Lithuanian American Council.

MATTHEW STONIE,

Secretary, Lithuanian American Council.

ANNA T. JEVNESKY,

Treasurer, Lithuanian American Council.

Intellectual Freedom, Oppenheimer, and National Security—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, under unanimous consent, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first part of an article entitled "Intellectual Freedom, Oppenheimer, and National Security" written by my good friend, Mr. Glenn A. McLain, a professor at Eastern Kentucky State College who is serving as director of the university's center of international relations.

The second part of the article follows:

Within a short time after the release of the findings of the Gray Board, the official hearings titled "Transcript of Hearings Before Personnel Security Board in the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer" were released to the general public. There was something less than a rush on the part of the American people to read this rather formidable and closely printed document. However, the makers of public opinion in America owed it to their reading and listening public to read this remarkable record in its entirety. But almost as one, our newspaper reporters and newscasters ignored the documentary story except for the parts where the Board admitted any doubts as to whether Oppenheimer was guilty of actually submitting security information to Soviet agents. As in the case of the findings, the scientific brotherhood rushed into print with bulletins, and brochures claiming Oppenheimer was "humiliated because he failed to conform." It was this same kind of "conformity" that developed the idea in Klaus Fuchs' mind to give our atomic secrets to Russia in the cause of world peace. Oppenheimer probably would do none of these things, but what are average citizens, who run our Government and operate our democracy, to think of these "nonconformist" activities? If we had a platonic republic in America under the rule of philosopher kings, such activity would be acceptable. But not in a democracy.

Newspaper comment concerning the decision of the Atomic Energy Commission was something less than enlightening for American readers. The Alsop brothers led the parade of outright misinformed or deliberately partisan writers who complained that "the facts did not support either the Gray report or the AEC report." The Alsop brothers were given the original letter exchange between Oppenheimer and the AEC and tried to build up public opinion in favor of Oppenheimer before any official material was released. After the AEC report, the silence of the Alsop brothers was deafening. Apparently, these columnists who are capable in some fields of foreign policy but obtuse in matters of liberty and those concerning most congressional investigations had finally read some of the AEC report. Otherwise, their usual scathing journalistic comments would have been in order.

Various magazines and journals of opinion such as the New Republic commented that the whole unsavory incident should be blamed on the FBI. This is the usual type of hackneyed argument one might expect from these magazines which have a long history of following the unpopular causes in American life. We need all sorts of opinion

on such matters whatever the ideological stripe of the writers. However, it would be more in the interests of scientific analysis if the facts were considered first before opinions are delivered with editorial bombast. This is the same type of ill-considered opinion that is often offered by such writers as Alan Barth who considers the FBI as a police state organization and all congressional committees as a threat to intellectual freedom in America.

With a very few exceptions, the only newspaper in America which seemed to consider the case on its actual evidence was the Christian Science Monitor. The Monitor, the New York Times, and a handful of other papers which consider the actual news as reportable and not some editor's opinion based on preconceived ideas, said that "the hard language of the documents in the case . . . was conditioned by the political and emotional climate in the United States, which likewise is hard." Roland Sawyer, one of the best Monitor correspondents, pointed out that "it is difficult to compel men who live almost entirely in the free and uninhibited world of the intellect to work with other men who must live entirely in the disciplined, almost semiauthoritarian world of the military." Both the Oppenheimer ivory tower and the tight security-conscious steel tower of the Pentagon official are necessary in this Orwellian world of ours. However, like the Ashram of Ghandi, Oppenheimer's ivory tower is in this world when he attempts to make decisions which influence political matters of importance. It is his right and the right of every citizen, scientist, or bootblack to give his considered opinion on political matters. But in exercising these rights both Oppenheimer and the bootblack must be bound by the conventions of national security. If Oppenheimer or any other individual is above and beyond the regular security standards perhaps our laws should be changed. Until the nature of our ideological struggle with international communism changes, this does not seem possible.

The opinion of the scientists in America was almost 100 percent against the first 2 to 1 decision of the Gray board and the 4 to 1 decision of the AEC Board against Oppenheimer. The Alsop brothers diligently reported that the scientists regarded "these charges as fundamentally irrelevant to a security proceeding." They further reported that a hornet's nest of scientific unrest had been stirred up by this decision and that petition signers at Los Alamos and other plants would be likely to lose their enthusiasm when contracts came up for renewal. This is fantastic nonsense. It is the same type of hysterical, fear-ridden thinking that characterizes the Wendell Furies and Corliss Lamonts who decry any attempt to search out the meaning of the Communist danger.

No one has to lose their liberty under the careful scientific analysis of such committees as the Gray or the AEC Boards. If such opinions are true, perhaps a little required reading in the actual history of the Communist movement in the world and as an organized conspiracy in America since 1921 are in order. Such studies are available free from the United States Superintendent of Documents in Washington. Perhaps this type of mental activity would be anti-intellectual. Perhaps we need some more hardheaded realism to temper our intellectual climate in America today. Most of the so-called "scientific hornets" do not feel that they lose their intellectual stingers by being required to stop associating with Communists. Or so the informed opinion of such scientists as Vannevar Bush and a host of others maintain. Let us believe the true savants in this matter and not those who

would let us rob our Nation of its national security.

The issues at stake in the Oppenheimer case go far beyond the two rulings made by the Gray and the AEC Boards. Briefly stated, the issues are the validity of the security system of the United States, the right of individuals to be nonconformists under our existing laws, and the role of technical advisers in policy decisions. The shadow of fear and the uncertainty of the cold-war struggle loom over the atomic horizon which can bring plenty into a needy world or doom it to a hydrogen-blasted planet.

Let us explain these issues in the light of the findings, the hearings, and the actual facts. The formation and determination of public opinion depends upon a reasoned analysis of the facts and not emotionally charged ideas. The issue is not one between practical men of affairs and the scientists or professors. Rather the issue is one that cuts across all psychological, professional, and ideological boundaries. That is, it should if citizens of this Republic actually believe in the democracy we profess. How valid is a security system which penalizes the genius who was greatly responsible for the development of the A-bomb? Does the decision of the AEC Board set an unrealistic security standard? These are fundamental questions, and they deserve clearcut, unequivocal answers. No American seriously would wish to kill the goose that laid the golden egg of atomic and hydrogen power. This has not been done in the Oppenheimer case. His contract as a special consultant was merely not renewed when it expired on June 30, 1954. He is free to work on any scientific problem which might be in accord with his professional inclination. He has been told firmly by the AEC Board that "the record shows Dr. Oppenheimer has consistently placed himself outside the rules which govern others. He has falsified wherein he was charged with grave responsibilities in the national interest. In his associations he has repeatedly exhibited a willful disregard of the normal and proper obligations of security."

It would seem that this statement by the AEC members is self-explanatory. One can well imagine the political hue and cry that would ensue if Oppenheimer would be judged clear, securitywise, after such judgment had been developed from voluminous evidence and personal testimony of the involved person himself.

The right of the individual in our society to be a nonconformist is one of basic importance. Those who think otherwise misunderstand both the nature of our democratic system and the long historical tradition of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. Liberty for individuals does not mean license to transgress against the laws of our society which protect all citizens. Like a 20th century Hamlet, the position of Oppenheimer is one of infinite tragedy for the nonconformist who lives in an intellectual world of his own choosing. Our colleges and universities are staffed with such individuals who, like remnants of a golden age in America, are honored because of their humility and inherent greatness but who somehow are not capable of understanding this Machiavellian world of 1954, which is rushing toward Orwell's 1984. We need the anachronistic in political life. If they work for the Government, they should confine their activities to theory and not the application of theory in public affairs. Their intellectual skill is needed and need not be confined, as the free mind knows no bounds or it will atrophy. Practical decisions concerning the nature of the enemy are sometimes disregarded by this type of individual. Oppenheimer is obviously of this type, and as his work is a combined effort in scientific

fields and public affairs, he is not constitutionally or morally able to fulfill this dual function. There is no threat to the liberty of any scientist or any public figure because of this considered decision on the part of the AEC.

The final question to be considered is the role of the scientist in our national defense effort. The scientists are asking: "Does the Oppenheimer decision mean that the loyal scientist called upon to advise his Government does so at his own peril?" This is a vital question. If errors in judgment are to be punished by banishment like the Athenians were centuries ago, national security needs have created a Frankenstein monster. The AEC decision does not suggest any such movement. The carefully considered, well reasoned, and judicious analysis of the Gray and the AEC Board carry with them no overtones of such fear and danger. There is such a climate of opinion in American life today, but it has nothing to do with the Oppenheimer case. As Americans, let us consider each issue of national security on its own merits. If any citizen will take the trouble to actually study the excerpts from the findings or the the hearings as published in our national newspapers, in the U. S. News & World Report, Time magazine, or in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or the special reports, the decision would have to be in favor of the two Boards. Oppenheimer has made great contributions to America. His value as a scientist has been impaired by his lofty personal view of what the security needs of America were in 1954. If he and other Americans who fought fascism with such vigor and patriotism in the thirties and early forties apply that same vibrant energy to the understanding of the true nature of communism, their positions will be unimpaired under our security system. Such has not been the case. The decision could, therefore, hardly have been otherwise.

All Americans pride themselves on their acceptance of the law to regulate affairs and responsibilities of citizens. Our national security laws are clearly identified as being in conformity with the needs of our Nation in 1954. There is a difference in loyalty to abstractions in contrast to that same loyalty to human beings. Communism recognizes no abstractions. The law is no respecter of persons. Whether the individual be the President of the United States or an atomic genius, the issue is clear. The national interest is the duty of the individual. This is not chauvinism, super patriotism, or hysterical nationalism—it is solid respectable Americanism based upon the hard realities of our modern world.

(NOTE.—Since this paper was written in late summer 1954 some of the reporters and writers who are criticized here have written further articles concerning the Oppenheimer case. These same writers formed their opinions before reading the complete findings and the hearings so my evaluation concerning their inadequate reporting still stands. For a consideration of the views of those who disagree with the findings of the AEC in the Oppenheimer case see: We Accuse, Harpers, October, 1954 and The Oppenheimer Case, Atlantic Monthly, October, 1954. For the texts of the report and the findings see U. S. News & World Report, Gray Board Findings, June 11, 1954; excerpts from important testimony in the case, June 25, 1954, and AEC final decision in the Oppenheimer case, July 9, 1954. A debate between Roger Robb, AEC council and the Alsop brothers appears in the December 24, 1954 U. S. News & World Report.)

Address of Hon. Leroy Johnson, of California, Delivered to the New York Chapter, Atlantic Union Committee, February 18, 1955

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a group of us in both branches of the Congress have introduced concurrent resolutions asking the President to invite the other democracies who sponsored and signed the North Atlantic Treaty to meet in a convention to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form a Federal Union for our mutual protection. Last Saturday night I had the honor of making a speech on this proposal to the New York Chapter of the North Atlantic Union Committee.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am including that speech, which follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I warmly appreciate the courtesy of your kind reception. Especially I am grateful for the high honor paid me by your invitation to address your chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

I rather imagine that any ideas I bring you on the North Atlantic Federal Union proposal will be neither novel nor startling. But what is lacking in originality I hope will be made up at least in part by my genuine, abiding interest and also by my true sincerity in respect to this challenging, vital proposition so important to every civilized person on earth.

Last week was a possible turning point in the long history of this movement.

In the United States Congress a group of Senators and a group of Representatives, including myself, introduced highly important resolutions. They contain this key provision:

"The President is requested to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, including members of their principal political parties, to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates from the United States and from such other democracies as the convention may invite, to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union."

I am profoundly convinced that the formation of a Federal union with free nations of Europe for defense purposes would open vast possibilities for advancing and stabilizing the world peace for which all of us hope so prayerfully today. If the proposition is sound, repetition of its supporting arguments may be useful, even though I suspect that most of you are more conversant with them than am I.

This fundamental approach to mankind's most critical problem—that of building a solid foundation for unity and peace in this divided world—first came into my consciousness through a lecture delivered by

Clarence Strett in the 1930's in Stockton, Calif. I was deeply stirred by the concept. Today its appeal to me is as fresh and as powerful as it was two decades ago.

Little did I think as I listened to Clarence Strett that I would soon be witness to a global conflict far more destructive than the gigantic struggle in which I participated in 1917 and 1918. Nor had I the faintest premonition that I would become a member of the House of Representatives, or that for seven Congresses I would serve on a Congressional committee charged with drafting laws pertaining to the security of our Nation. In both the Senate and House of Representatives these laws are handled by the Committee on Armed Services. Senator KEFAUVER and I are members of these committees.

For the past several days, the House committee has had before it the top military experts of America. They have described with candor and in detail the dangerous situation confronting our country. They have set forth the steps we must take for our protection in this nuclear age. I shall quote a few of their statements made in public hearings. From them you may gain a clear appreciation of the deadly menace confronting us and of the character and scope of our defense needs.

Let us hear first from Adm. Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He says:

"In my opinion a personnel strength of 2,850,000 men is the size of forces we must maintain for as long as the Communist threat hangs over our head. This may be 10 years or it may be 50."

Next, let's listen to the Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson. He says:

"The security of the United States and the security of our allies are in reality one and the same. This concept of collective security is reflected in our military arrangements around the world."

"In the development of our military programs now and in the future we must reckon with the Communist capabilities as well as with their possible intentions. Because their military power has continued to grow and now includes the ability to produce and deliver nuclear weapons, the United States for the first time in its history has reason to be deeply concerned over the serious effects which a sudden attack could conceivably inflict upon us."

"As a Nation we reject the concept of preventive war. However, a sudden nuclear attack aimed at our population, industrial and military centers, could be a threat to our survival as a Nation. Therefore, our primary objective must be to maintain the capability, first to deter an enemy from such an attack; and second, to blunt any such attack if it comes. Both purposes require a combination of effective retaliatory power and a continental defense system of steadily increasing effectiveness."

"The forces envisaged in the long-range program of the Department of Defense constitutes by far the largest Military Establishment that this country has ever undertaken to maintain for an indefinite period of time."

"The maintenance of these forces and their qualitative improvement will require expenditures over an indefinite period of years of many billions of dollars."

Since the A-bombs were dropped in Japan, a decade ago, there has been a rapidly rising crescendo of frightfulness in the construction and development of weapons.

From a low-flying plane, about a year after atomic bombs had fallen on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, I looked at the ruins of these two

cities. The sight of the carnage wrought by those two small bombs actually made me ill for several days. It was an incredibly ghastly, horrible, shocking sight. I kept saying to myself, "Has humanity gone stark, raving mad; is man so stupid, so inherently evil, so savage and untamed, that in the end he will destroy himself?"

And yet, today we face a situation far more staggering in its implications.

Today, we know, though we can scarcely comprehend the awesome fact, that the hydrogen bomb can wreck 1,000 times the damage inflicted upon Japan. Other weapons are still more hideous. Noted scientists have written that a few properly placed cobalt bombs could exterminate most of the human race. Weapons of such boundless destructive power may soon be in the hands of our own and hostile military forces.

In the face of such momentous developments, it is indeed understandable that during the past 10 years apprehension that these new weapons might be used against us has steadily heightened among our people. There is, in truth, no escaping this grim fact: We live in an age in which cruelly ambitious, unprincipled, atheistic men could destroy the civilized world—not only its people but also its institutions, its public and private works, its most hallowed traditions, its very will to survive. This dread capability rests both with the Communists and the free world.

As I look back over these 10 years, I can see that more and more, year by year, our country and its allies are relying on the power to destroy an enemy in an effort to find protection against sudden attack. We are, perforce, chained to a military treadmill; feverishly we labor, lavishly we expend our resources, in our effort to increase the deadly power of our military force. Our antagonists are ensnared in the same fantastic spiral; day and night they are striving to surpass us in building stronger, ever stronger, weapons of destruction.

And yet, here is the pathetic paradox:

Every person, in America and abroad, with whom I have seriously discussed this problem, longs ardently for peace. On every continent in the past decade I have talked of this terrible dilemma with public officials, businessmen, teachers, the poor and the rich. All give voice to the same deep yearning: "We want peace," they say with almost pathetic earnestness. "We do not want war." Yet, the pages of history are filled with the message that a race in arms ultimately explodes into war.

The Secretary of Defense says we may have to fight for our survival; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says our tense situation may last from 10 to 50 years. The Secretary of Defense further advises us that our costly weapons rapidly become obsolete due to technological advances. Thus we are in an economic vise; we are also in a military position which will remain eternally precarious.

I must, of course, make this clear; I have have strongly supported all of our efforts to strengthen our Armed Forces. I have voted to draft our young men. I have voted to have American youth trained so they may be skillful warriors, able and read to defend not only their country but also themselves on the field of battle. I have supported our Nation's efforts to buttress our friends throughout the world. These steps and others I, as a Congressman, feel we must take to protect our country and to neutralize the terrible, imminent threat to our survival.

All of these things we reluctantly do for one reason alone: Ungodly men are at large in this world, implacably bent upon communism and enslavement of all humanity. At any time they may strike with atomic or hydrogen bombs, hoping to destroy our industrial system or, in one massive blow, wound us so mortally that domination of our country would surely follow.

Our ready military power, our national resolution, our patient firmness, the certainty of our devastating counterblow will, we pray, deter them from war.

But, in all candor, it is somewhat less than inspiring to contemplate nerve-racking tension and deadly threat year after year, for decades to come, even though war may never be our lot.

I repeat that we cannot minimize the imperative necessity for a strong military posture. Our strength is our insurance against annihilation in today's world. But it is comparable to a fire-insurance policy: Comforting, of course, to have, but no guaranty that there will be no fire. We must stay alert to the danger of our situation; we must keep the threat in the forefront of our minds as we look hopefully and enthusiastically upon the promise held out to mankind by a North Atlantic Union Federation.

With these caveats behind us, let us now explore our route toward peace which provides an alternative to military force. It requires no coercion, no intimidation, no exploitation. In my deepest belief, this peaceful method of building strength against communism and aggression holds the key to the present world dilemma; it contains the seed from which can grow enduring world peace.

With my colleagues in the Congress, I am eager to explore the possibility of Americans joining with other peoples who have representative government, combining their ingenuity, their skill in government, their belief in a peaceful society, their boundless resource and strength, that ultimately, by the sheer majesty of their aggregate power, we shall neutralize and finally eliminate the threat that looms today over much of the world.

The federation we visualize would make common rules and establish legal machinery to compel the obedience of all member nations thereto. Those failing to comply could be brought to do so through judicial decree, backed by the combined force of the federated nations.

The obvious parallel is right at hand. We Americans have grown up with it.

In our country we have 48 States, each sovereign, yet each joined permanently in common cause for the common good. Controversies among our States are settled in the Supreme Court of the United States whose decrees are binding upon and respected by the losing parties.

Forgive me for particularizing in a somewhat personal way, but this example may help make the point clear.

Right now a controversy is awaiting resolution between my State of California and the State of Arizona. The issue involves interpretation of a contract governing the allocation of certain waters of the Colorado River. The differences between the States have been bitter, acrimonious, and explosive, for water is critically needed in both States. It is easy to envision that two sovereign nations would resort to war to settle such a dispute; matters of far less importance and complexity have turned nations to the sword in the past. But here, in our Federal system, we avoid the ultimate test of power, reposing the issue, for the common good, in a disinterested, objective branch of the Government.

Many persons anxiously search for parallels to this process in the processes of the United Nations. Some persuade themselves that this great body has the power to enforce its own decisions and those of its related agencies. But this is wishful thinking; it is dangerous thinking which could lead us to tragic ends.

The United Nations, true enough, can issue decrees; it can enunciate principles; it can find a nation guilty of subversion or aggression; it can recommend remedies for injus-

tices committed by one member nation upon another. But it lacks the power to compel its members to obey its suggestions; it founders upon the rock of enforcement of its will.

This fatal weakness finally shattered the League of Nations; it tore the heart out of the Kellogg-Briand Pact which bound nine nations not to wage war on one another until every peaceful remedy had been exhausted. The insufficiency of both efforts is still painfully clear in our memory. We shall never forget that Japan struck us at Pearl Harbor at the very time their Foreign Minister was talking with our Secretary of State.

So it is that nations, in contrast to our States, in striving to adjust their differences, still tend to resort to that ancient and brutal institution—military force, which, applied today, amounts to mass murder and, conceivably, the obliteration of both sides.

In such a contest, victory is the goal. And what is its reward? The flower of our manhood decimated by slaughter; multitudes disabled for life; cities pulverized; a system of society sundered at its roots. Many among us today have seen three wars come and go, each more brutal than the one before. And yet, our experience is clear: military victory does not bring permanent peace.

I am convinced that man's inhumanity to man, that the endless, futile cruelty and bloodshed of modern warfare, can be avoided through a federal union of free nations. The federal system has proved both its efficiency and its stability in our own country and in the Swiss Republic. I remind you that in the latter nation four languages are in use; nevertheless, regardless of divergent, even antagonistic, national strains, the Swiss experience with federalism has been outstandingly successful.

I most earnestly hope, therefore, that our Nation will take the first halting step forward in the direction of which I speak. Let us move now toward creating the climate and the opportunity to build an alternative to Armageddon. Let us move toward joining with our friends throughout the world in exploration of a federal union which would bind the parties for mutual protection—and, if that should prove successful, moving toward an integration of a larger scope.

Now, of course, we have the jeremiads, the gloom-mongers, the it-can't-be-done type of people. In all ages, as in our own time, such people point with fear and trembling, obsessed with the problems, never inspired by the opportunities. These are the barnacles on the ship of mankind.

You know their doleful strain. It adds up, essentially, simply to, "It just can't be done."

Our own past shouts the denial to those who fearfully hold back.

Boldly our forefathers resolved a chaotic situation which resulted from the inability of the Articles of Confederation to bind the Colonies closely together.

After the Colonies had fought and won the Revolutionary War, they shattered into independent, even antagonistic, sovereign units. Economies of the several States disintegrated; traffic was impaired; the common defense was undermined; navigation and trade was fettered and harrassed to the point almost of extinction. Something had to be done. The common good dictated subordination of the primitive fetish, sovereignty which held the Colonies almost at swords' points.

The Articles of Confederation became the first rallying point—the first attempt at common government. This failed utterly to unite the Colonies into a strong cohesive nation, with an effective central government. For a time, unity seemed impossible. You know what then occurred.

On February 21, 1787, the Continental Congress decided to hold a convention in May of that year at Philadelphia. Its purpose

was sharp and clear: to revise the Articles of Confederation. Delegates were chosen. Through the bitter debate that ensued only the majestic personality of the beloved George Washington and the benign influence of wise, philosophic Benjamin Franklin saved the deliberations from ruin. And then, as you know, ultimately, rather than amending the Articles of Confederation, they wrote a new Constitution and laid an enduring foundation for a new nation.

And in this Constitution, precisely for the reasons which plague us today in this trembling world, they turned to a Federal system. They built a national government with the vitality and power to carry forward the common good; they retained, nevertheless, State and local responsibilities, reserving to the States and to the people all powers not specifically granted to the National Government.

And in the preamble, they used language which is the key to much of the problem of which we speak today: "We the people of the United States," is the way they began this immortal document. Not "We the States"—but "We the people" do ordain and establish the Constitution for the United States of America.

Thus government was brought through the governmental maze to the citizen; thus sovereignty was brought home to the individual; thus government was made of the people, for the people, and by the people. And therein is a powerful lesson for those of us who today aspire to a better order of things in this world. There, my friends, is the key to world peace.

And so you see that I am indeed a devotee of this concept—because, mainly, I so deeply revere our own system and the strength and the glory it has brought to our people. I cannot conceive of any supportable reason why a similar effort would, in our own time, fail to bring just as many rich dividends to ourselves and to our children.

Across the seas are nations in mortal fear of the Soviet Union. They live in daily dread that their life, their property, their liberty, and all that they love in life may be destroyed by the Communist advance. They know all too well of the agony and, even, the despair of their neighbors today behind the Iron Curtain. I cannot but believe that they would slowly, perhaps, but surely, inevitably, seize upon a federation such as I have discussed with all the ardor of a drowning man reaching for a helping hand.

I happen to believe that a juncture of the free nations of the North Atlantic, with still others who might wish to join, would be so potent an aggregation that the Soviet threat of aggression would dissipate and frustrate and consume itself futilely, finally dying out altogether. Freedom is a mighty force. I mention only that 95 percent of inventions in the world in the last 2 centuries have been made by persons living in nations with representative government and protected personal freedoms. Freedom is the seedbed of initiative and ingenuity.

The nations of which I speak also have a genius for government based upon the will of the people. In most of them, substantially the rights accorded an American citizen are accorded to their citizens. They have, moreover, the industrial skill, the industrial plant, the agricultural knowledge, and the richest resources, added to ours, of this world. Such an amalgam would soon have a massive impact upon the ambitions of the Soviet Union. That nation would, in my judgment, recognize swiftly that only defeat would be the outgrowth of their continued assault on the free world. And this above all else is true: dictators cannot stand defeat. I am convinced that the rock upon which international communism will surely founder is federation of all or part of the states in the North Atlantic area.

Just as our own country has developed under the Federal system of Government, so would this group of nations, these millions of people, develop in strength, in capacity, in genius, in a unified democratic forum. They would be assured of victory in this divided world; they would be assured of a better world.

My friends, how deeply I wish that we were blessed by having 10,000 Owen J. Roberts to speak to a hundred thousand groups of our people. His penetrating mind, his profound experience and knowledge in judicial and governmental affairs, his wise insight into the perils of our time, would bring light into the darkest places of opposition to federation. Would that we also could stimulate the sale of Union Now, bringing its vital, gripping message to millions more of our people, so that this cause could reach out and truly grasp the minds and hearts and the imagination of His Majesty, Mr. Average American. Surely this is one light that we must ever strive to keep from under a bushel.

There are so many more things I wish I could mention. I remember with pride our gift of freedom to the Philippines in 1946. For 48 years we governed these wonderful people. But instead of resorting to tyranny and oppression, we spent a good part of those years helping these people prepare themselves for self-government and independence. Truly this is one of the brightest stars in our firmament. In many ways, I believe that my vote for Philippine independence was one of the most significant votes I have cast in my 13 years in the Congress. Two years ago, for example, I found on a trip into the Asian region that almost all nations along the Indian Ocean were aspiring to achieve the same recognition, the same self-respecting position in the family of nations, that our Nation had accorded to the Philippines.

Such is the power and the glory and the opportunity of America. Such is the promise our people, our faith, our system, holds out to the suffering and the oppressed who people much of the globe.

And such is the America which, I hope and pray, will boldly rise to today's challenge and lead God's people from the wilderness of militarism and terror into the shining light of hope and opportunity and dependable, just peace. Federation, my friends—what better article could America hope to merchandise among mankind today. It is an imperishable, proud part of our own experience. Let us help others reap its rewards.

And, in the process, we shall help ourselves and assure our children and their children a decent chance to lead fruitful, happy lives.

Thank you very much for your courteous attention.

Commission for the Study of the Civil Defense Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter I have written to the President in which I respectfully urge that prompt action be taken to establish a commission for a study of the civil-defense problems which have been brought

about by the advent of nuclear weapons. The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1955.
The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Much has been said in the press this week concerning the possible establishment of a commission for a prompt study of the civil-defense problems brought about by the advent of nuclear weapons. In the light of the recent information released by various Federal agencies regarding the lethal affect of these nuclear weapons, I respectfully urge that immediate steps be taken to bring such a commission into reality.

Nearly 2 years ago, on July 22, 1953, I expressed my views on the civil-defense problem in a letter addressed to Mr. Shirley Ewing, director of the Maryland State Civil Defense Agency, a copy of which is enclosed. This letter, in which I expressed my belief that we have an obligation to make available to our citizens all information (within security limits) which will alert them to the peril created by these nuclear weapons, appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1953. At that time I urged that more effective civilian defense precautions be prepared and tested.

I do not believe that Members of Congress have been kept as well informed as security would permit concerning the horror flowing from the use of nuclear weapons, and certainly the average citizen has been kept even less informed.

As a result of the series of explosions now taking place in Nevada, I have been receiving quite a bit of mail from my constituents in which many of them express, for the first time, their great interest and alarm.

I believe that recent disclosures of information with regard to the hazards from fallout and other affects of nuclear explosions should be encouraged, and even expanded, within the limits of national security. I also believe that the Federal Government ought to make realistic appropriations for use at the Federal level and for grants to State and local governments on a matching basis, in order to bring our civil-defense preparations and activities to a level where, if and when needed, the citizenry will be protected.

I heartily endorse your recommendation to appoint a commission to study the problems of civilian defense. I again urge that this action be taken immediately.

Respectfully,

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Ambassador Brosio, New Envoy From Italy, Distinguished Lawyer, Statesman, and Diplomat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it gives me great pleasure to insert herewith an article which appeared in the February, 1955 issue of the America-Italy Newsletter:

NEW ENVOY FROM ITALY, A DISTINGUISHED LAWYER, STATESMAN, AND DIPLOMAT

His Excellency Manlio Brosio arrives at a juncture in world affairs as delicate as that

which existed when his distinguished predecessor Alberto Tarchiani came, in the midst of the last war, to represent his country in Washington.

To this difficult assignment Ambassador Brosio brings the rich experience of 5 years in Moscow and 3 in London as chief of mission. In both capitals he was respected for his perseverance, his graciousness, and his political wisdom. His fluency in Russian and English enabled him to obtain a remarkable insight into the problems of the western democracies; his scholarly dedication to learning is combined with a coolness of approach which was a subject of comment even in England.

Manlio Brosio's qualities of mind and conduct are inherent. Born in Turin in 1897, he was nurtured in the Piedmontese tradition of enlightened leadership which gave guidance to the Risorgimento and united Italy. Young Brosio's interest in the great problems of the day was stimulated by close relations with such noble figures of 20th century Italy as Benedetto Croce, the philosopher, and Luigi Einaudi, the eminent economist who is now President of the Republic of Italy.

Barely 20, Manlio Brosio was decorated in World War I for his conduct as an officer in the Alpine Corps. Following the close of hostilities, he took his degree in law and began practicing in Turin. His open participation in politics as a member of the Liberal Party and as a regular contributor to the most important Liberal magazine ceased with the advent of fascism, but his interest and his contacts with opposition groups continued.

During World War II and after the Armistice, he remained in northern Italy under German occupation; he was a member of the underground National Liberation Committee (1943-45) and general secretary of the Liberal Party (1944-45). He held ministerial posts in several postwar cabinets from 1945 through 1946, the last time under Signor Alcide de Gasperi as Minister of Defense. In January 1947, when the relations between Italy and the U. S. S. R. were extremely sensitive, Minister Brosio was selected as the first Ambassador to Moscow of the Italian Republic. He has remained in the diplomatic service ever since.

Despite the heavy demands of his position, the new Ambassador to Washington finds time to read widely and write on political and legal matters for leading Italian periodicals. Little wonder, then, that Manlio Brosio's record has been described as "the ideal one for the Washington Embassy."

The American-Italy Society will welcome the new Italian envoy, His Excellency Manlio Brosio, at a dinner to be given in honor of him and his wife on February 15 in New York at the Hotel Plaza. On this occasion the Ambassador will deliver his first major address in the United States.

Ellsworth Bunker, president of the AIS and former Ambassador to Italy, will introduce the members and guests of the society to the new Ambassador.

Ambassador Brosio arrived in the United States the last day of January, accompanied by his wife, Clotilde Brosio, and his sister, Signorina Emma Brosio.

portance of our greatest national resource, the youth of our country. But lipservice is not enough. American youth needs among other things schooling that is commensurate with our power, our wealth, and our importance in the world at large.

Miss Doris Fleeson, one of the ablest of Washington's correspondents, has written a column in comment on President Eisenhower's school-aid program that reveals its many and painful inadequacies.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Miss Fleeson's article, *The Worthy Poor*:

THE WORTHY POOR
(By Doris Fleeson)

WASHINGTON. — President Eisenhower's school aid program does not represent a serious attempt to deal with the national emergency in education.

It is little more than a letter of condolence to the localities and school authorities which are struggling against an enormous and growing shortage of classrooms.

The President's Commissioner of Education, Samuel Brownell, has placed the current need at 370,000 classrooms. Federal cost estimates indicate that the job, well done, would cost more than \$12 billion.

The President has suggested only \$200 million in direct aid over three years which is about \$65 million a year. Even if all went well and exactly as planned, it would build only a few thousand of the missing classrooms.

School authorities are equally skeptical about the proposed plans to help school districts and States. Twenty States are said to have constitutional debt limits which will prevent any new borrowing. In both Maine and Wisconsin, the courts have declared school construction authorities unconstitutional.

The school experts say also that it would be at least a year before any results would show from the Eisenhower plan. Meanwhile, school enrollment is going up at a rate of more than 1 million a year. This year it is 30,800,000—an increase of 22 percent since 1950.

The President's philosophical approach provokes as much gloom in school circles as his practical suggestions. As they see it, he has dealt with what they regard as the gravest internal crisis in this democracy in the spirit of a lady bountiful who restricts her gifts to the worthy poor.

The reference is to the President's restriction of outright grants to communities too poor to build their own schools. There will be no States and few communities willing to take the pauper's oath on this or any other proposition. Actually many of the wealthiest States which spend proportionately the largest share of their revenues on education are among the most hard pressed.

The idea that some portions of this country should publicly admit to their poverty and throw themselves on the mercy of richer States or the Federal Government seems to have appeal in many quarters. It emerges regularly at the annual governors' conferences and just as regularly the overwhelming majority of the governors turn the cold shoulder.

This quarrel is basic. The original architects of the welfare state—much of which the President has accepted, at least in the theory—believe in prompt and ample Federal action to meet national emergencies like that confronting the schools. From their point of view the President's approach in the new message looks back—way back.

Perhaps one trouble with the present special school problem is that Washington draws to it for the most part the successful, the well-to-do and the more mature citizens. Their children are not victims of the present

cruel classroom shortage and as a French philosopher said, one bears with equanimity the misfortunes of others.

Warning on Geology of Huge Upper Colorado River Dam—Rainbow Bridge Periled

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, under title of "Plans for Huge Upper Colorado Dam Uncertain, Says Secretary McKay," I revealed in this Record the contents of a letter written November 30, 1954, by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay to David R. Brower, executive secretary of the Sierra Club. The letter concerned the geology of the site of the proposed \$21 million gigantic power dam at Glen Canyon, Ariz.

I explained that this dam would be the key structure depended upon to raise power revenues to pay for a substantial portion of the cost of the multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project, H. R. 270, now before Congress. I quote a portion of Secretary McKay's letter with respect to this geology as follows:

The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet.

As a direct result of those remarks, I have just received a communication from Joseph Jensen, chairman of the board of directors of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, who is himself a trained geologist, born and educated in Utah, and personally familiar with the location. This communication points out that not only is the site on which the dam is proposed questionable, but that the area behind it, which is supposed to provide a reservoir, may be little more than a sieve. In short the whole project might turn out to be as useless as a waterpail without a bottom.

Mr. Jensen informs me that the rock in Glen Canyon are essentially sandstone. They have been drained of all underground water to the level of the Colorado River.

As a result they are dry. They do not contain underground water which would prevent the migration of stored water from the reservoir. It follows that when the reservoir is being filled, the water will seep out into these parched sandstones for miles. The seepage will be limited only by the dip of the sandstone formation and the effect of the pressure of the head of water which accumulates behind the dam.

No one can tell how long it would take to fill the porous sandstones nor how many millions of acre-feet of water might be thus consumed before any wa-

The Worthy Poor

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, everyone pays lip service to the paramount im-

ter could again flow down the river. The reservoir might never be filled, nor usable for major power development. The country might be stuck with the most enormous white elephant in history.

Any dam that is built in the canyon would extend only a short distance into the canyon walls. Therefore, the water migrating out into the sandstone from the reservoir will create an underground body of water vastly more extensive than the reservoir itself, which is calculated to store 26 million acre-feet of water, twice the average annual flow of the Colorado River at Glen Canyon. It is apparent that eventually, as these sandstones become filled with the vast volume of water, it will migrate around the ends of the dam and thus render it wholly or at least partially ineffective for power purposes.

Although Secretary McKay's letter promised more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions after congressional authorization of the project, suppose this more intensive study discloses that no power dam should be built? How then will Congress explain to itself the appropriation of large sums of money for uneconomic projects for which there will be no pay-out from Glen Canyon power?

Further, although the Secretary was quoted in my prior remarks as stating that "appropriate changes will be made in the designs"—of the dam—"prior to construction" if further geological studies warrant, no modifications in the dam or its height can cure the fact that a reservoir built entirely on porous sandstone rock will not hold water.

Certainly this Congress will be well advised not to authorize or appropriate any expenditure on the Upper Colorado project until the safety and certainty of building a dam in Glen Canyon has been fully determined.

The best way of having this determined is to have a committee of three of the best experts in the United States on dam construction, two of whom would be men who have successfully built concrete dams, and the third should be a geologist of national standing and reputation familiar with the texture and character of rocks.

This is precisely what was done before the dam site for Hoover Dam was chosen. Only after three of the best engineers in the country approved the dam site, was that construction authorized.

This committee of experts also should determine whether or not any steps proposed to protect Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir by a barrier dam would provide adequate protection.

There is more than a suspicion that this barrier dam also would be built on nothing other than porous sandstone. Just as the water would seep around the Glen Canyon Dam, so would it seep around the ends of the barrier dam. If the elevation of water in the reservoir is as high as that of Rainbow Bridge, then the water would encroach to the bridge itself. All of these natural bridges owe their lives to the dry climate

of the area. Moisture and water in any quantity would be fatal to their future life.

The Man Is Raising Sensible Cain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the need for security controls is generally recognized. What is perhaps not as widely known and accepted is the need for rigid safeguards and for procedures that will provide the American people with its fullest security, at the same time that there is an unflagging effort to preserve those fundamentals of our free democratic tradition which makes our security worthwhile.

Benjamin R. Epstein, the national director of the Antidefamation League, has written a comment on this subject that I urge my fellow Congressmen to read. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his comments:

THE MAN IS RAISING SENSIBLE CAIN

(By Benjamin R. Epstein)

Wolf Ladejinsky, through no particular effort of his own, has brought to a boiling point the mounting unhappiness of the country with the Government security program. It has, for instance, made Harry M. Cain unhappy—Harry Cain, former United States Senator from the State of Washington, who is mildly described as a conservative.

Mr. Cain is now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, a quasi-judicial governmental agency concerned with Communist activities and groups. In the 2 years since his defeat for reelection, he has had time to sit back and ponder the ways of men and government.

He had been set to thinking by the case of Lt. Milo Radulovich. ("It's time that we begin to worry when a young American, age 26, expresses surprise that he was dealt with justly by his Government.")

He was disturbed by the fate of an Air Force sergeant, Victor Harvis. ("Victor Harvis, at the age of 12, had been taken by his father, now dead, to some Communist Party meeting. . . . He was declared to be a security risk . . . and faced dismissal from the Air Force. In this country, the crimes of the father are not to be visited on the child.")

The Ladejinsky case made him boil over in a speech in Spokane. It is significant that the fate of "little men" in Government projected into the headlines of the Nation's press unsettled him.

Because Mr. Cain's words on this subject are projected from the far right corner of the political map, they have particular interest. The liberal would find them indistinguishable from some of the things he has said himself. To Cain, the country has been unnecessarily destroying individuals in the search for national security, and our security officials are not always well-trained for their jobs, failing to understand the difference between disloyalty and unconformity. On a frightened note, Cain said that the security program can snuff out the light of learning while making cowards and mental robots out of free men and women.

Sharpest criticism he reserved for that clause in the President's security Executive order which sets up the standard that a

man's employment by Government has to be clearly consistent with the interests of national security. This, Mr. Cain finds, "constitutes a burden which can hardly be borne by anyone. It almost makes the employee affirmatively prove that the national interest requires the retention or continuation of his services."

And he asks, "Who among us could do that?"

The term "clearly consistent," he finds, can be read to mean pure hearsay or malicious gossip or unsupported allegations as creating doubts which would make a man unemployable. To his knowledge, it has been so read.

It has been so read by enough American citizens to create the present uneasiness with the operation of security procedures. The part played by determined mischief-makers and those who do not hesitate to give vent to prejudice has long disturbed the Anti-Defamation League, beyond its concern as all Americans have for an effective and fair security system.

In the Ladejinsky case, the note of malicious mischief entered when a Department of Agriculture official released the now notorious Vitt letter with its smear against Jews of Russian origin as revolutionaries. In the Abraham Chasanow case, malicious gossip, paraded as evidence, almost deprived the Navy of a valued employee and Mr. Chasanow of justice. In the Fort Monmouth case, it has not been possible to prove beyond a doubt the widespread belief that anti-Semitism was a factor in the suspensions of scientists there, but it became quite clear that the established criteria for security evaluation are so without safeguards that malicious rumor and the most careless hearsay became the basis for suspensions and loss of security clearances.

We can no longer afford the luxury of giving encouragement to malice or sanction to gossip. To paraphrase an old cliché, the time is long past when Americans, on this issue, can safely "come to the aid of their party." In the security program, party politics are played at the Nation's peril. It is indeed time "to come to the aid" of the country with a thorough study at the proper levels of the entire security program, so that we cease sapping our national strength by misguided decisions that drive some of our best governmental servants out of the Nation's service and frighten others from entering it.

Resolution of the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. HASELTON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of a resolution adopted by the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District, Greenfield, Mass., as requested by the officers of that organization:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE GREENFIELD-MONTAGUE ZIONIST DISTRICT, FEBRUARY 15, 1955

Whereas the Egyptian Government in its attempt to strengthen its unsettled internal position as well as to gain stature abroad, has so recently resorted to the hasty execution of some of its Jewish citizens after a shockingly unfair trial by Egypt's Supreme Military Court;

Whereas the 11th-hour pleas for clemency by the American, French, and other governments fell upon deaf Egyptian ears;

Whereas by their haste in carrying out these inhuman executions in spite of the intervention of the American Government, the government of Premier Nasser has again demonstrated its contempt for American public opinion; and

Whereas, by the continuation of abuses, calculated to harm the state of Israel ever since its establishment, in spite of repeated gestures of conciliation and good will by the Israeli Government: Be it hereby

Resolved, That, the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District in meeting assembled this day goes on record as condemning the Egyptian Government in this their latest shedding of innocent Jewish blood; and be it further

Resolved, That the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District commends the Government of the United States for its effort in attempting to save the lives of the two Jews in Egypt; efforts which were so unsuccessful as to highlight the contempt of Egypt for American public opinion and democratic concepts.

Von Tresckow Claims Atomic Energy Commission Rejected Proposal of His Group Which Would Save Government \$125 Million to \$250 Million in Power Costs Over Dixon-Yates Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record I include herewith an address before the Massachusetts Municipal Electric Association in Boston, Mass., February 24, by Walter Von Tresckow, head of a group which offered to supply power to the Atomic Energy Commission at greatly reduced cost than Dixon-Yates. Despite the more favorable proposal from the Von Tresckow group, the AEC entered into negotiations with Dixon-Yates and rejected the Von Tresckow offer without serious consideration.

Testimony before the Senate Antimonopoly Committee, 83d Congress, showed that every obstacle within and without the Government was placed in the way of the Von Tresckow group and it was finally brushed off unceremoniously.

The Von Tresckow group claim their proposal would save the taxpayers millions of dollars and they charge that under the Dixon-Yates contract the Government will be paying from \$125 million to \$250 million more for power over the period of the contract than would be the case if AEC had accepted the Von Tresckow proposal.

Mr. Von Tresckow's address follows:

Is the Dixon-Yates Contract Also Creeping Socialism?

(Address before the Massachusetts Municipal Electric Association in Boston, Mass., February 24, 1955, by Walter von Tresckow)

The Dixon-Yates story begins in 1953 with a request by the TVA for 600,000 kilowatts

of additional capacity. This capacity was to be built in western Tennessee. The TVA stated that it required this added capacity in order to be able to meet the demand of the AEC at Paducah in 1957.

Congress, even in Democratic administrations, has not been too favorable in late years toward the further expansion of TVA generating facilities by the construction of steam plants.

With the advent of the Republican and businessman's administration, TVA adherents realized that the task of getting money from Congress for the rapidly expanding needs for power of the TVA area, through the construction of additional steam plants, would be even more difficult.

For some time, nearly everyone concerned had realized that a new pattern or philosophy would have to be worked out for a Federal power operation that had begun as a byproduct of a flood control project but had grown to be the largest power system in the world.

The TVA request for appropriations for 600,000 kilowatts of additional capacity was turned down by the Republican Congress in April 1954, even though it was tied to the needs of the AEC.

Finally, in July 1954, President Eisenhower ordered the AEC to sign a contract with Dixon-Yates to meet the needs of the TVA in the Memphis area.

The final contract, however, was not for what the TVA had asked for—600,000 kilowatts of additional capacity—but for 600,000 kilowatts of firm power. This had not been requested, nor was it needed. TVA had ample facilities in its own system to firm up the added 600,000 kilowatts of capacity.

A heavy price was paid for this unneeded and unwanted firm power under the Dixon-Yates contract. In addition to all operating expenses, including taxes, the AEC pays for the installation of 650,000 kilowatts, but only gets the power from 600,000 kilowatts. Further, Dixon-Yates has the right to sell all the power not needed by TVA to their wholly owned subsidiaries. The rate at which Dixon-Yates is permitted to sell this power is at the incremental rate of 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour.

In the contract, the fiction has been maintained that Dixon-Yates supplies the AEC 600,000 kilowatts at a 98-percent load factor, whereas the facts are that Dixon-Yates will supply the TVA needs in the Memphis area at about a 60-percent load factor. TVA will continue, as it is now doing, to supply the AEC at Paducah—225 miles away—the power it needs at a 98-percent load factor. This difference in the load factor between the two locations gives Dixon-Yates the difference between 650,000 kilowatts at a 98-percent load factor, and 600,000 kilowatts at a 60-percent load factor. It gives Dixon-Yates 2.4 billion kilowatt-hours annually, which they can dispose of to their wholly owned subsidiaries at 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour.

At the present time, the power production costs of these Dixon-Yates subsidiaries are between 5 and 6 mills per kilowatt-hour. Within 5 to 10 years these production costs will rise to between 7 and 8 mills per kilowatt-hour because of rising fuel costs.

It is safe to say for the minimum term of the Dixon-Yates contract—25 years—the difference between the incremental cost of 1.863 mills per kilowatt-hour, and what it would cost Dixon-Yates to produce this power without Government subsidy, will be about 5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

If Dixon-Yates used all of the 2.4 billion kilowatt-hours available, it would mean a profit of \$12 million per year, or \$300 million for the minimum contract period of 25 years.

Now we do not believe it is wrong for Dixon-Yates or anyone else to make a profit. We believe in profits. However—it is decidedly wrong for Dixon-Yates to state publicly

time and again that their profits are limited to \$495,000 per year; when, as a matter of fact, they can make \$12 million per year. Even under the worst circumstances they could not help but make \$5 million more per year than they publicly state.

It is doubly wrong for the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget to lend credence to these claims. These agencies of the Government either are not familiar with the facts, and therefore are unfit to make power contracts for the Government; or they are familiar with the facts, in which case much more serious questions arise.

Now to our own proposal. The group I head offered to supply the 600,000 of needed capacity; to produce water at a cost of about 25 percent less than Dixon-Yates; to limit all profits to \$133,000 per year; and at the end of 30 years, turn the facilities over to TVA, debt free, for \$1.

Our offer would save the Government the \$100 million that would be needed in the budget for TVA to build the facilities. Our offer would save the Government \$125 to \$250 million in power costs over the Dixon-Yates proposal. The Government would own a plant it had paid for, and would be able to make the profits from the sale of excess power.

Our group made its first attempt to get a hearing from the AEC in April 1954. It took more than a month to finally get a hearing and we had only the one. In August the first very sketchy cost comparisons between the TVA, Dixon-Yates, and our proposals were published. It was on this analysis that the President of the United States based his directive to the AEC to enter into a contract with Dixon-Yates. As soon as possible thereafter, we advised the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy that the cost comparisons contained 6 major errors, resulting in 98 wrong figures. All of the errors were in favor of Dixon-Yates. For several months we received no reply to our communication to the committee. Finally, in November we were told that we would get a hearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. Just as it became our turn to testify, the hearings were conveniently suspended.

The detail figures of the Dixon-Yates contract (how they arrived at power costs), which would permit an accurate comparison between their proposal and ours, were not released until after the contract had been signed.

The records of the Atomic Energy Commission and Bureau of the Budget, released in August 1954 by direction of the President, showed that the idea of making a firm power contract for 600,000 kilowatts—instead of supplying 600,000 kilowatts of additional capacity—originated only in April 1954. This is when we had made our proposal. No one had even mentioned it before. The main idea behind this change was to limit the bidding to Dixon-Yates.

The Senate Antimonopoly Committee came to the following conclusions in its report on the matter: "The testimony before this committee shows that every obstacle within and without the Government was placed in the way of the Von Tresckow group and it was finally brushed off unceremoniously."

In other words, every obstacle inside and outside the Government was placed in the way of saving the taxpayers between \$125 and \$250 millions; and in the way of pointing out that Dixon-Yates, under their contract, would be charging the Government \$125 to \$250 millions more for power than we would, in addition to their making a profit of \$125 to \$250 millions over and above the \$495,000 a year, which they did disclose.

From the record and the statements of President Eisenhower, the obvious conclusion can be drawn that the Republican administration believes no further Federal Gov-

ernment funds should be invested for the expansion of TVA power generating facilities. Probably this has grown to be the viewpoint of the majority of the country. The Dixon-Yates contract is the Republican administration's answer to the problem of meeting the expanding power needs of the TVA area.

In order to get the Dixon-Yates contract accepted over the violent objections of the people in the TVA area, and the Democratic Party, President Eisenhower adopted the propaganda of the private utilities for his own viewpoint. He called TVA creeping socialism because cheap power in that area is produced at the expense of all of the taxpayers of the Nation. If this is a true statement, then the Dixon-Yates contract is also creeping socialism, because under this contract, power is being purchased at a \$250 million higher cost than we offered to produce it, and this increased cost is also at the expense of all the taxpayers of the Nation. According to President Eisenhower, it is creeping socialism if the taxpayers of the country subsidize the TVA area, but it is not creeping socialism if the taxpayers of the country subsidize Dixon-Yates to the tune of \$250 million.

In their narrow zeal for their own answer to meet the expanding power needs of the TVA area, the administration has completely lost sight of a basic consideration which affects the Nation as a whole. They have put every obstacle in the way of preventing the competitive free-enterprise system from functioning to provide the consumer with the cheapest possible power.

We do not believe it is good policy on the part of the Government to prevent the effective functioning of the competitive free-enterprise system for the benefit of the consumer. Our country has grown to its present stature and standard of living because of the free and effective functioning of the competitive free-enterprise system. This system produces lower costs to the ultimate consumer; the Eisenhower policy produces higher costs to the ultimate consumer.

In the heat generated by the Dixon-Yates contract, involving one 650,000 kilowatt generating station, an important fact has been neglected altogether. In 1954 the TVA sold a total of 30 billion kilowatt-hours. Of this total only 12 billion kilowatt-hours (or 40 percent) were sold to the 148 municipalities and cooperatives which supply all power to the residences, farms, industrial and commercial establishments in the area. The other 18 billion kilowatt-hours are used by the United States Government and 24 very large industrial establishments.

This municipal and cooperative load is growing at the rate of 500,000 kilowatts per year. Beginning in 1958 new steam generating facilities of 500,000 kilowatts per year will have to be provided.

If the majority of the people in the country feel that no more Federal Government money should be used to supply these power plants, then it is much more logical to ask these communities to build these required facilities for the TVA or themselves, than to force a Dixon-Yates type of contract down their throats.

This kind of a solution would seem to be the best and most reasonable one and more likely to meet the approval of the majority of Americans. Unfortunately this reasonable kind of solution has not been proposed to the administration by the 148 distributors.

In the face of stubborn opposition on part of the administration to further spending of Government money for added steam plants, the TVA adherents have been just as stubborn in their insistence on continuation of past policies. Only the city of Memphis has stated that it will build its own plant, if the Dixon-Yates plant is to be built. In

our study of this situation we found that these plants can be financed and built and produce power at the same cost as Government financed TVA plants.

Under our proposal to the AEC and TVA we prove that we, as private enterprise, can produce power as cheaply as the TVA. In view of this fact, we have expanded our original proposal, which was to build 600,000 kilowatts for the AEC, to include supplying all the generating facilities required by the growth of the 148 municipalities and co-operatives now supplied by TVA. Our aim in these proposals has been to do away with the necessity of further Federal appropriations, and at the same time, retain for the consumer the advantage of the low cost power resulting from the operation of a large integrated power system. The cost of power will not be increased over present TVA rates.

Our proposals are based on the principles we developed right here in New England—in the contracts between the city of Burlington, Vt., and the Green Mountain Power Corp. The philosophy underlying those contracts is that power costs to the consumer can be substantially lowered by cooperation between private and public enterprise, and secondly, that this kind of cooperation produces higher profits for the private utility company.

The net result of those pioneering contracts has been that the city of Burlington is retaining the same rate for its power needs that it has enjoyed since 1919; and the stock of the Green Mountain Power Corp. rose from \$12 per share in 1952 to \$35 per share in 1955. We do not mean to imply that this rise in the value of Green Mountain stock is altogether due to the Burlington contracts, but it is fair to say that those agreements were a substantial factor in the rise.

These startling results are truly a New England achievement in which all of us have a right to take pride. I would like to pay rightful tribute to Mayor Moran and the officials of the city of Burlington, Mr. Hill, chairman of the board of Green Mountain Power Corp., and its other officers and directors; and the New England Electric System (largest private utility company in New England), for the contribution it made toward these results.

Perhaps the best illustration of how sincere were the efforts of all concerned is to tell you that when an apparently insurmountable legal roadblock threatened to defeat the whole project, it was Mr. Robert Davison, counsel for Green Mountain Power Corp., who provided the solution which permitted a completion of the contracts.

I would like to point to the Burlington-Green Mountain contracts as an example of opportunity for all of you, as well as the private utility companies in New England, to lower power costs in New England, and in that way help to improve the competitive position of New England with the rest of the country.

As to the TVA area, which is surrounded in the West and South by Dixon-Yates subsidiaries, how much more could be accomplished, not only for the benefit of the ultimate consumer, but also for the Dixon-Yates companies, if Dixon-Yates offered to sit down with these 148 TVA distributors and say, "Let's solve our problems together; we'll help you."

We have enough faith in private enterprise and Dixon-Yates to believe that they will see the advantage of this type of cooperation for the benefit of the ultimate consumer and their own companies. The war that they, and the private utility industry as a whole are waging now to destroy the TVA concept, is ultimately bound to be a losing one.

The same amount of money and effort used in a determined effort to lower power

costs on a countrywide basis, rather than raise them in the TVA area, would substantially benefit every American and raise his standard of living.

In our plans and proposals there always has been, and always will be room for cooperating with Dixon-Yates, because we feel that they will ultimately come to the conclusion that it will serve the best interests of their companies and their customers. It would make them statesmen in the realm of free enterprise.

The Springfield Daily News Celebrates 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, and have printed in the RECORD, the news story relating to the 75th anniversary of the Springfield Daily News' first publication on February 24, 1880. This story tells of the numerous and well-deserved tributes that have been paid to this outstanding Democratic newspaper, and includes the congratulatory resolution of the Massachusetts House of Representatives.

Also, Mr. Speaker, may I call to your attention the editorial entitled "Our Diamond Jubilee."

THE DAILY NEWS, 75 TODAY, RECEIVES MANY MESSAGES, HONORED BY LEGISLATURE—"No. 1, 75TH YEAR," GOES ON MASTHEAD AS THE PENNY NEWS OF 1880 CELEBRATES DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY IN WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS

Today is the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Springfield Daily News.

Readers may note that today's anniversary date involves a change in the volume number under the masthead at the top of page 1. The Daily News ended its 74th year with yesterday's edition, and changes the volume number today to "75th Year, No. 1."

The first edition of this newspaper was published February 24, 1880, as the triweekly Penny News. It became the Daily News on May 13, 1880, and by sticking to its pledge as the people's paper, quickly assumed its present position as the largest newspaper in western Massachusetts.

The story of the rise of the Daily News from a struggling infant nurtured by the Bellamy family to a 94,572-circulation newspaper perpetuated by the late Sherman H. Bowles was told Saturday in a special diamond-anniversary supplement.

Copies of this 16-page, tabloid issue are available at the Daily News office for anyone who may desire to keep a souvenir record in picture and story of the paper's first 75 years.

MANY MESSAGES

Since publication of the anniversary edition, the Daily News has received scores of congratulatory messages and salutes.

The Massachusetts House of Representatives adopted a special resolution. Wire services sent anniversary stories about the Daily News to all parts of the country.

Readers, from the average citizen to high-ranking governmental and industrial officials, sent "happy birthday" messages in the form of letters to the editor.

Many of these letters have already been published in the Mail Box column on the editorial page and others are being printed today. An anniversary editorial and a special Pepper Box column also appear in today's Daily News.

Next Wednesday, the Daily News will be saluted by the Springfield Chamber of Commerce Breakfast Club at its monthly breakfast at 8 a. m. in Hotel Highland.

HOUSE RESOLUTION

The State house of representatives' resolution congratulating the Daily News was offered by Representative John F. Thompson, Democrat, Ludlow, and Representative Raymond H. Beach, Republican, Wilbraham.

The text of the resolution:

"Whereas on February 24, 1955, the Springfield Daily News, published in Springfield, will celebrate its 75th anniversary as one of the outstanding newspapers in the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the Springfield Daily News, first named the Penny News, was the first successful penny newspaper published in New England and prospered as the people's paper to become the largest in western Massachusetts; and

"Whereas through the years the Springfield Daily News has contributed much to the newspaper industry by presenting the news to the public with an informal touch and has maintained the highest traditions of journalism and ideals of a free press; and

"Whereas recognition must be given to all of those, past and present, who have contributed to the success of an outstanding newspaper proudly published in the Commonwealth—the Springfield Daily News: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the house of representatives expresses its congratulations to the Springfield Daily News upon its 75th anniversary and to its publishers and editors and to all who have contributed to its accomplishments and extend its best wishes for continued service and success; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the State secretary to the Springfield Daily News."

OUR DIAMOND JUBILEE

It was 75 years ago today that Edward and Charles J. Bellamy produced the first edition of the Penny News which soon became the Daily News.

The editorial room was a painter's shop over the Bellamy law offices on Main Street, and a plank atop 2 barrels was the editor's desk. However, 2,000 persons paid their pennies for that first issue, and started the ever-growing family of readers. Soon, the Daily News became the largest newspaper in western Massachusetts, a distinction it still holds.

Since that day in 1880, the Daily News has counted many assets. We are indebted to the 2 publishers, to the 4 men who have served the newspapers as editors, and to the hundreds of men and women who have filled important reportorial, mechanical, and business positions.

We are grateful also to the ingenious technicians who developed the wireless, the typewriter, the high-speed press, the Linotype, wirephotography, photo facsimile, and the many other machines and processes which permit us to produce a better newspaper.

However, the greatest asset of any newspaper is its readers. In that regard, the Daily News has been richly blessed. Our huge family of readers includes stanch partisans and frequent critics, and it has sustained the Daily News through years of financial difficulties, keen competition, and newsprint shortages.

In Springfield, almost everyone reads the Daily News, and thousands of persons in

other western Massachusetts cities which have their own hometown dailies nevertheless buy the Daily News each day.

On our diamond jubilee, we gratefully acknowledge the well wishes of many friends, and we express our thanks to our many thousands of readers in the western Massachusetts and Connecticut communities which we earnestly seek to serve.

Analysis: World Trade, H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the problem to be discussed herein is simply whether H. R. 1 should be accepted as a sound measure in the national interest or rejected as an unsatisfactory solution to world-trade problems in light of its effect upon the United States economy.

For practical consideration the problem is divided into three basic elements: First, economic: What effect will the United States tariff policy have upon the economies of the free world nations? Second, world political: What effect will the United States tariff policy have upon the political and military unity of the free world nations? Third, domestic: What effect will United States tariff policy have upon the domestic economy and particularly upon industries affected by lower tariffs and international competition.

ECONOMIC

In terms of a long-run solution to the trade and payments problems of the world, the basic difficulty seems to be that of a continuing necessity for nations to adjust the allocation of their resources. This readjustment is necessary in order to keep pace with the constant increase in world production and reshuffling of world trade among the free nations. Three separate factors seem to be affecting the long-run distribution of national resources:

(a) The increasing integration of industries within each nation so as to gain the advantages of manufacturing their own basic raw material. Most important in underdeveloped areas although significant in Europe.

(b) The strong drive of all the free nations for strength and the highest degree of independence possible.

(c) The trading nations of the world have had a great tendency to develop into trading blocs with each bloc having somewhat divergent and competing interests and limited self-sufficiency. Sterling bloc, European Payments Union, dollar area.

Assuming the above facts to be sound and accurate we present the question of what effect the United States tariff policy will have upon the problems confronting nations with regard to trade and payments. The facts indicate that the current problems have had little connection with the United States tariff policy and therefore any change in this

policy will have a negligible effect upon the important problems of international trade and payments. The facts from which this view was formed are as follows:

(a) Import tariffs are only one factor to be considered in judging whether or not the American consumer will buy foreign goods.

(b) The factors of taste, technology, and new inventions, distance and shipping costs, competing price reductions by domestic producers as a result of import threat have been largely omitted in considering the issue.

(c) In actual fact most evidence points to the fact that in the event that United States tariffs were completely removed there would be little change in the trade throughout the world. Mr. Howard S. Piquet, Senior Economic Specialist in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in his book Trade Aid and Tariffs, expressed a well-founded opinion that in the absence of any tariffs, imports into the United States would rise no more than \$2.6 billion annually.

We are left with the conclusion that most of the foreign claims that a lowering of United States tariffs would remedy all the free world's economic and balance of payments difficulty simply are not true and that arguments in favor of freer trade based upon this concept of the international economic effects of such trade increases forthcoming through tariff reductions have been greatly overstated. A much more sound theory explaining the international trade and payments difficulties of the free world can be based on the three factors affecting the long-run distribution of national resources named in this discussion.

WORLD POLICY

The long-range United States foreign policy centers around one basic objective—a strong domestic economy in a peaceful community of nations. In order to fully realize this objective it is assumed that the United States must have strong, economically secure allies. This Nation has taken the dominant role in postwar politics and in the establishment of sound prosperous economies among the free nations. The free nations of the world now look to America as a leader and attach greater importance to United States action than is justified by fact. This exaggerated sensitivity is confirmed by almost every foreign reaction to United States policy. Thus, through the assumption of leadership in international affairs and through the natural internal economic strength of this country, the United States has become the leading actor on the free-world stage.

Coordinating the above statements and consideration of H. R. 1, we present the question of what effect United States tariff policy will have upon the political and military unity of the free world.

It is immediately apparent that the failure to accept the President's tariff proposal, H. R. 1, will cause violent objection among the free nations of the world, particularly the European trading nations who form the bulwark of our Western European defense perimeter.

In short, it is obvious that this kind of objection is economically completely unjustified, but it is nevertheless a political reality. It must be analyzed as a reality.

The basic question then becomes a very broad one involving United States strategic policy. Should this Nation disregard the opinions of other free world nations because we know that the opinions had little basis in fact? The answer to this is no. Because of the fact that most of our allies are keenly interested in United States tariff policy and regard it as a primary index as to whether or not we intend to practice on the economic front what we preach on the political front, we must attach considerable importance to this phase of the trade problem. We must weigh the political realities alongside economic fact in setting forth the trade policy of the United States.

DOMESTIC

The effect of lower tariffs upon the domestic economy of the United States has formed the battleline for both the proponents and opponents of H. R. 1. Basically, this factor in isolation from other considerations is an insufficient foundation for a final conclusion. However, because of the tremendous publicity given this phase of the problem many misconceptions have been formed and many opinions drawn upon this factor alone. Those proponents of H. R. 1 who believe that low tariffs will act as a veritable panacea to the domestic economy must ultimately face the same disillusionment as those friendly nations who have in the past made the United States tariff policy the whipping boy for all their economic problems. The various pressure groups who by necessity or by choice have selected their belief and are now trying to utilize every conceivable rationale in favor of their original opinion do not come to grips with the basic question of the effect of United States tariff policy upon the prosperity of the domestic economy.

In general it is recognized that some economic gains accrue to a nation from such tariff reductions. This tends to reduce the price to consumers of the products imported in greater quantity and to increase the financial ability of foreign nations to buy United States produce. However, to put the tariff question in proper perspective, it should be made clear that the proposed changes set forth in H. R. 1 will have an insignificant beneficial effect upon the overall national economy.

In recent years exports have averaged approximately \$15 billion and imports \$11 billion per year which amounts to roughly 4.5 and 3.3 percent of the gross national product during the same years. Approximately \$6 billion of the annual import figure enters the country free from duty. This means that a reduction in United States tariffs would affect only the goods presently being imported into this country at an annual rate of \$5 billion or less than 2 percent of the gross national product. Reliable estimates of the probable increase in imports in the absence of any duties place the range at \$1.2 billion to \$2.6 billion. Judging from this estimate, the maximum effect of

H. R. 1 upon the economy as a whole would be less than 1 percent of the gross national product.

The bare fact is that certain domestic industries have a long history of operation under tariff protection while other industries foresee a good possibility of expanding their sales and profits if tariffs are reduced. Just how much either group would be damaged or helped by the passage of H. R. 1 is impossible to determine since both sides constantly overstate their position. Nevertheless, herein lie the two sides of the argument.

Objective tests show that the industries which would be most affected by increased competition from foreign producers are the textile groups—wool and cotton manufacturers as well as textile fibers—and the machine and vehicle group—bicycles, autos, lawn mowers, sewing machines, and many types of other machinery. There would be a substantial rise in imports in the areas of animal fats and oils, vegetable products, and chemicals.

Is it in the national interest to continue tariff protection in industries where such protection now exists in order to prevent dislocation of production? This question must be answered on a case-by-case basis and not by a general policy as set forth in H. R. 1. Congressional action on this bill will merely set the trend for future changes.

There is no doubt that some controls are essential to prevent other nations from pushing the burden of worldwide economic adjustments onto the United States as world productivity capacity increases and changing factors force a reshuffling of resources throughout the world.

CONCLUSION

The tariff question boils down to this: We must weigh the effects of H. R. 1 upon, first, the free world economies; second, the political and military unity of the free nations; and, third, the domestic economy and protected industries.

Absolutely nothing the United States might do in the way of lowering tariffs can solve or even substantially aid the economic problems of the free world. The first step to be taken in solving national and international economic problems is a realistic insight into the actual difficulty by the countries involved. There can be no successful solutions to the problems so long as nations refuse to do this. It must be stressed that the role of this country should not be one of nurturing all the misconceptions which exist among the allied nations who continue to use United States tariff policy as a "scapegoat" for their own unsolved economic problems. We cannot make our laws and justify them on the basis of unsound opinions voiced by friendly nations.

The same basic principle of economic reality must be followed in coping with the strong foreign objections forthcoming from a United States policy to maintain tariffs at their present level. Legislation such as H. R. 1 must be based upon and justified by full considerations of domestic interests.

The full impact of further tariff reductions upon several of our domestic industries has not been stressed here. However, it is generally known that the textile, bicycle, lawnmower, and many other industries will be further depressed by a continuation of tariff reductions. Should we cease to protect these industries because of the good accruing to the consumer and the economy as a whole? The answer to this would be "Yes" if such general economic benefits were a probable result of a lower tariff policy. This is simply not the case. In fact, H. R. 1 will have the effect of helping one small group of producers at the expense of another small group of producers for the general benefit of no one, except the latter group.

Looking once more to the realities of the allover problem, it seems that a low-tariff policy has become the popular symbol of an economic cure-all. People and nations have attached themselves to this symbol in the hope of something better for themselves. The mysterious economic curing power attributed to a lower United States tariff policy is pure mythology. Sooner or later all nations must solve their economic problems through their own efforts and by facing up to the real problems. The time for this action is now and United States tariff policy is not the real problem.

The rational balance in the allocation of traded resources between nations cannot be expected to happen automatically. There must be tariffs and standby measures for the protection of all countries from dislocations in their internal economies. United States tariffs are now the eighth lowest in the world and the facts simply do not justify further reduction.

An Unworthy Political Trick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Indianapolis News of February 23, 1955:

AN UNWORTHY POLITICAL TRICK

The \$20-for-everybody tax cut which some Democrats are trying to push through the National House of Representatives is nothing but a piece of political chicanery designed to put President Eisenhower on the spot.

This newspaper said last month, when the tax-cut idea was first broached, that until the continuing Federal deficit has been halted, the budget balanced, and the way opened to reduce the enormous national debt, any overall slash in tax revenues would involve risk to the Nation's economic stability and military security. That sums up the President's position, which we support completely.

The measure approved by the House Ways and Means Committee is particularly reprehensible because it combines irresponsible and untimely individual tax cuts with the

Eisenhower-backed plan to extend corporate income taxes at their present high rates.

It is a take-it-all-or-leave-it political plot. It ought to be recognized and repudiated as such by the House as a whole. Responsible Democrats in the Senate, including HARRY F. BYRD and WALTER GEORGE, chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, have condemned the move as unwise and unfortunate. Their counsel should prevail in the Senate even should the House be so reckless as to push the \$20-handout trick to passage.

All economic indications point to the possibility of a balanced budget and some measure of tax relief, both for individuals and business, unless there is a downturn by mid-1956. However, the Government deficit for the 1956 fiscal year, which begins July 1, will total about \$2,400,000,000. It is utterly unrealistic, therefore, to schedule general tax cuts now, especially any which might begin in January of next year. The situation a year hence can provide the only safe basis for deciding.

President Eisenhower is keenly aware that the public is entitled to tax relief just as soon as that becomes feasible. But he is also keenly aware that no loss of revenue should be risked while the Government is running in the red and while military demands are so great.

We believe the people will understand his position. If certain Democrats in Congress are so foolish as to think otherwise, their whole plot may boomerang in votes against them in the 1956 election.

United States Surplus Wheat Gift to Russia Sheer Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion about the critical food shortage in the Soviet Union, and some speculation as to the effect this shortage might have upon the stability of the Russian autocrats sitting in the Kremlin. On the other hand, it has been suggested that since we have a wonderful bounty of foodstuffs accumulated as a surplus over a period of several years, that we should turn over a goodly part of this surplus to the Communist masters for distribution by them throughout their empire. The argument is advanced that this would be a great humanitarian act and that we would win many friends and stimulate better understanding between the Communist world and our free society.

Another point of view has been advanced that since one of the principal reasons for the critical food shortage within the U. S. S. R. has been the resistance of the farmers and their refusal to cooperate in the collectivist farming schemes of the Russians, there seems little doubt but that the farmers in the Soviet Union who despise the Russian Communists, have set out to create a crisis by creating a critical food shortage. It is reasoned, therefore, that we, a free people, should not upset the hard-earned gains of the farmers in the U. S. S. R.

who are engaged in a death struggle with the Russian tyrants.

On Wednesday, February 23, there appeared in the Cleveland News, an editorial entitled "United States Surplus Wheat Gift to Russia Sheer Folly." This editorial, in my considered judgment, is the most practical analysis I have yet seen on the question as to whether we should give or trade any of our surplus wheat to the Russian tyrants. It expresses a most refreshing point of view and I commended it to the reading of every Member of the House:

The United States Information Agency, which operates the Voice of America network, reports Russia's massive drive to step up farm output has failed so badly that the Soviet population has less grain per person than in 1926.

After more than a quarter of a century of collective farming under communism, says the USIA, the Russian people are still critically short of foodstuffs, and livestock production is 3 million less today than before the Bolshevik revolution of 1917.

Malenkov walked the Kremlin plank because he failed to improve Russia's agricultural output.

This brings us to the current suggestion of some Members of Congress to President Eisenhower that the United States make a gift of some 350,000 bushels of our surplus wheat to Russia as a "humanitarian act" which would improve relations between the Soviet and this country.

There is no question that there is a serious Russian food shortage, but not so grave but what Russia sold thousands of bushels of its wheat to Iran earlier this month.

The United States has a big wheat surplus, probably enough to supply this country's needs for 2 years. But to make a gift of 350,000 bushels of our surplus wheat to Russia seems to us a dubious proposition. If the Kremlin rulers would tell the Soviet population where the wheat came from, that it was a gift and why such a gift was necessary, then the proposal might possibly be in order.

Such knowledge, however, would never be given the Russian people by the Kremlin dictators. It would spoil their whole international act.

When the Marshall plan was inaugurated after the last war, Russia was responsible for those "Yankees go home" placards that appeared all over Western Europe, if you recall.

It would not pay now for the Kremlin to admit to their victims of terror within Russia that America is a humanitarian nation of people who have no quarrel with the Russian people.

Under the circumstances, it would be sheer folly and fantastic for us to turn over any surplus United States wheat to the Soviet bosses.

Once the gift was made, they'd laugh in our faces.

The Case for Mohawk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the consent granted me today, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle:

THE CASE FOR MOHAWK

In the absence of more clarification it seems to us Mohawk Airlines has a point in protesting the Civil Aeronautics Board's refusal to grant it a hearing on its petition for a permanent license.

Mohawk, whose feeder lines serve Rochester and other eastern cities, meets all 15 requirements used by the CAB to measure operating performance. It believes it has made "reasonable progress toward ultimate self-sufficiency in relation to the public convenience and necessity" set by the CAB as a standard for a permanent license. It cannot be sure since the CAB has never precisely defined the standard, according to Mohawk spokesmen. But the airline's progress toward increasing traffic and decreasing subsidies has averaged 27 percent or more a year, they point out, and the company in August through September showed a net profit exclusive of mail pay subsidies.

One CAB member is quoted as opposing a permanent license because it might take away from feeder lines the incentive of expanding. That may well be. But should a going company such as Mohawk progress reports indicate it to be, pay this price? A permanent license for this and other stable, going airlines would help attract more investment money, improve their equipment and maintain high quality service.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the substantial lines should have a permanent franchise.

A Critical Study of the New Proposals for Federal Aid to Schools—Editorial by the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., Archbishop of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial published in the Catholic Standard and Times of February 11, 1955, written by the archbishop of the diocese of Philadelphia, contains an interesting and informative discussion on some of the problems involved in meeting today's school needs. The editorial is entitled "A Critical Study of the New Proposals for Federal Aid to Schools," and was written by the Most Reverend John F. O'Hara, C. S. C.

As the archbishop points out in this editorial:

The Members of Congress, in the honest desire to serve the best interests of our Nation, should do all in their power to insure that prudence will prevail in the distribution of any aid granted by the Federal Government to assist local communities in their problems of education.

I was struck, Mr. Speaker, by the study and research which went into the preparation of this editorial and I commend it to all Members of Congress through these pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a means of bringing an informed and most interesting viewpoint to the attention of the Congress.

Archbishop O'Hara, in effect, urges the most careful study of all the facts and

the tremendous amount of available background information before any legislative action is taken on the matter of emergency Federal aid for school construction. The full text of the editorial is as follows:

Current proposals for an emergency program of Federal aid for school construction must have very careful study before any legislative action is taken.

Considerable material for such study is contained in two Government documents printed in 1954 for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The first of these is Federal Aid to School Construction, a report prepared in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress by Charles A. Quattlebaum; the other, Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor—House of Representatives.

The first thing that must be understood by the legislators is that the long-range problem of schoolroom shortage is, up to the present moment, largely one of obsolescence of buildings and mobility of population. The impact of increased births would hardly be noticed at the present moment were it not for the other two factors. The enrollment in public schools in the United States in October 1953 is reported by the Bureau of the Census (series P-20, No. 52, January 22, 1954) at 26,845,000. The enrollment in October 1934 (U. S. Office of Education) was 26,434,000. An increase of 400,000 in 20 years is not a notable increase (1.4 percent) in a total picture of more than 26 million pupils. The short-range view regards the increase of 3 million pupils since 1945.

The testimony of one witness on the mobility of the population in his State is illustrative of the general trend. This witness reported: "We are no different from any number of rural States in that we have a shifting population from farm to urban and suburban. We actually have some school buildings in our State that are in fairly good condition, that are no longer required because of their location and we cannot use them; yet in our urban centers we find we are underhoused, overcrowded, and we are at a loss to meet the situation." (Hearings, p. 225.)

Mobility looms large in the picture. The 1950 census showed that between March 1949 and March 1950, 18.7 percent of our population had moved from one house to another. A census report (series P-20, No. 49) showed that between April 1952 and April 1953, 20.1 percent of our population moved. Between April 1951 and April 1952, 19.8 percent of our population moved. From April 1950 to April 1951, 21 percent of our population moved.

Any congressional study of the present problems should include census data on the back-to-the-farm movement of the depression days of 20 years ago. Some of the local problems of overcrowded schools solved themselves 20 years ago when industrial workers who were unable to find employment in urban centers returned to the farms which they had abandoned in the 1920's.

Since mobility of the population is such a strong factor in the creation of school shortages, there would seem to be need for far more study than has been given at the present time to the question of whether a local population is transient or permanent. The construction of elaborate school facilities in what may be a ghost town 10 years from now would later be stigmatized as poor planning. The most skillful analysis is required to determine whether temporary or permanent buildings are advisable in a given situation.

In this connection a wise observation is offered in the general report of the Joint State Government Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in January of this year. Reporting on the distribution of funds

raised by the State Public School Building Authority, the Commission notes that on the basis of 1954 prices, construction cost per pupil for the authority-financed elementary buildings ranged from \$474 to \$2,166. . . . construction cost per pupil for secondary buildings constructed by Authorities ranged from \$750 to \$4,300. The report notes further that the most frequently occurring value is about \$1,000 per pupil for elementary schools and \$1,550 per pupil for secondary schools.

Since one proposal offered is based, in the main, on a nationwide expansion of the plan already in effect in Pennsylvania, the practical observations of this Commission should carry weight. The Commission recommends that in its future calculations it plan for construction costs of \$1,100 per pupil for new elementary schools and \$1,700 per pupil for new secondary schools.

Variations in construction cost per pupil just as great as those noted in Pennsylvania are to be found in the hearings mentioned above. Two other types of variation are reported in the hearings. Costs per square foot vary from \$5 to \$17 in estimates offered by various State school officers. Similarly costs per classroom vary from \$8,500 to \$45,000.

The hearings have also disclosed a great variation in the tax procedures of the respective States in the matter of raising funds for school construction. On pages 224 and 225 of the hearings the variation reported is rather striking—the State of Alabama is said to have a statutory prescription that the real estate assessment should be 60 percent of its reasonable market value, while in Arkansas the assessed valuation is supposed to be 20 percent of the real or fair value of the property. In the latter case it is further reported that there has been a considerable increase in the assessment ratio over the last several years.

The hearings reveal quite generally a hope that Federal aid will stimulate local activity where it has been lagging. A witness for one State school department, who stated that under present legislative restrictions only \$16 million could be borrowed in the State for school construction, said he felt that a Federal grant of \$150 million on a matching basis would stimulate the local and State authorities to remove whatever restrictions now exist so that the Federal grant could be accepted on a 50-50 basis.

An extreme example of the "pump-priming" concept is provided in the hearings (pages 129 and following). The witness cited one county with a bonding capacity of nearly \$5 million and with estimated needs of replacement and modernization of \$7 million. The voters of this county were reported to have rejected on five occasions proposals to issue bonds for needed school improvements. The witness expressed his conviction that an offer of the Federal Government to finance one-half the cost of improvements would induce the voters to approve a bond issue for the other half. The comment of one Congressman was: "You are giving me the best argument for no aid to construction I have heard yet. You are saying: 'We are going to sit back until we get some money from the Federal Government and are not going to raise a finger to help ourselves.'"

Another instance of loose thinking is offered by a State official who stated that in response to a telegram from the committee he had prepared a wire for the Governor of the State which reported the cost of needed classrooms as \$82 million. In his testimony he amended the telegram to add the "necessary facilities that go with the classrooms, such as library, study hall, recreation rooms, etc." and gave as his revised estimate a total of \$732,314,790.

President Eisenhower in his recent message to Congress has expressed a wholesome desire to safeguard "a fundamental element

of the American school system—local direction by Boards of Education immediately responsible to the parents of children and other citizens of the community." While we approve this objective, we must observe that the extension of Federal aid without scrutiny as to its ultimate destination can give rise to a situation worse than the one for which a remedy is sought.

Careful analysis of the hearings is definitely in order before any further appropriation is voted for assistance to local communities in solving the school problems. Those who make the analysis should keep before them a recent observation of Dr. John M. Lumley, Deputy Superintendent of the State Department of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania. Commenting on the growth of the movement for consolidated school districts and jointures in rural areas, he said: "School jointures are a monstrosity because they are complicated by conflicting authority that impedes the administration of school affairs. We got ourselves into the jointures because we thought they were the answer to our school problems, but now we know that they are not and we are seeking a way to get out."

Any factual study of Federal participation in school construction should have access to all available material on previous action by the Federal Government in this field. The report, "Federal Aid to School Construction" by Charles A. Quattlebaum, shows that between July 1933 and June 30, 1942, the Public Works Administration made allotments for 6,687 elementary and secondary school projects, while the Works Progress Administration took part in the construction of 5,900 new school buildings and the modernization, enlargement or improvement of 33,000 other school buildings. In the WPA operation the expenditure was over \$979,000,000, and in the WPA operation the estimated cost was \$466,700,000, of which the Federal Government provided about 71 percent. This study needs to be brought up to date by factual information on the present condition and the present use of those buildings. If any of them are now abandoned, if any of them fell apart or deteriorated more rapidly than schools constructed under complete local responsibility, the facts should be laid before Congress.

An important element in the appraisal of the entire picture is the number of pupils per teacher. In 1934 the ratio was 31 pupils to 1 teacher for the entire United States. In 1950 the ratio was 24.4. (These figures are furnished by the United States Office of Education.) Study of the recommendations made by witnesses as reported in the hearings reveals that in their appraisal of needs the State school officers generally estimate 30 pupils to a classroom. In 1950 only one State, Mississippi, had this ratio for an average, while 24 States showed an average below the 24.4 pupils per teacher reported for the entire country. It is obvious that an increase of 20 percent in the average teacher load would take care of a great many students without increased construction. The mobility of the population, of course, stands in the way of using, or using to capacity, existing schools in depopulated districts, but a critical survey of actual conditions may reveal the possibility of savings in construction.

The estimates of building costs reported in the hearings have in general disregarded the element of the interest cost on bonds. A pertinent paragraph on this is offered in the general report of the Joint State Government Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, page 2:

"Reimbursable project construction cost is necessarily smaller than the amount on which the Commonwealth subsidy is paid, which is the total of approved construction costs plus interest costs. For example, assuming that money is worth 3 percent and that all projects are amortized over a period

of 30 years, the total amount on which the Commonwealth would reimburse over time would be 1.53 times the project construction cost."

Revealed by the hearings is a general estimate of \$10 billion as the cost of needed school construction. This observation of the Pennsylvania joint commission indicates that if the cost of bonds is taken into consideration, the estimate should be revised to \$15,300,000,000.

A final observation. Much has been made of the reduction in the number of 1-room schools in the United States. This may or may not be a good thing. Certainly the local community should continue to determine its own needs. Those who love the 1-room school can point with pride to the young Governor of Pennsylvania, elected at the age of 37, who is a product of a 1-room school in York County. Certainly his preparation was adequate for his secondary education in York Collegiate Institute, his college education at Gettysburg, and his graduate work at the University of Pennsylvania.

The Members of Congress, in the honest desire to serve the best interests of our Nation, should do all in their power to insure that prudence will prevail in the distribution of any aid granted by the Federal Government to assist local communities in their problems of education.

Mohawk's Air Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the consent granted me today, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the *Utica (N. Y.) Observer-Dispatch* of February 14, 1955:

MOHAWK'S AIR STATUS

The increasing number of central New Yorkers who fly Mohawk to get to New York and other eastern cities, will be surprised that the airline is still fighting for its permanent license.

Of course, Mohawk has to live up to all the safety and operational requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Board but it, along with dozens of other smaller lines, is considered merely trying its wings, so to speak, by CAB.

Mohawk has appealed the CAB ruling that it cannot have a permanent license at this time. The argument in the Board is reported to involve fear if feeder lines have permanent status they will lose their incentive for expanding.

The catch is that as long as Mohawk and other feeders lack permanent certificates from CAB they will not so easily attract investment needed to expand as fast as they and their public might wish.

Mohawk is an operating, functioning airline living up to all standards of CAB. Its progress toward more traffic and less subsidy has averaged 27 percent or more a year, its officers say. Also, in August through September last year the line showed a net profit exclusive of the mail pay of the Government.

Central New York would like to see this record recognized by a permanent license from CAB. It could mean even better aeronautic facilities for our service and convenience.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the substantial lines should have a permanent franchise.

New England's Business Future Appears Bright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1955

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, frequently the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have contained important information on problems of the economy of New England.

However, it would be unjust to the spirit of New England's industry to present none of its brighter aspects to the Nation. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the *Boston Post of Sunday*, February 13, 1955:

NEW ENGLAND'S BUSINESS FUTURE APPEARS BRIGHT

A growing population, expanding incomes, and increasing productivity provide foundations on which New Englanders may base sound expectations for the region's continued progress and development.

These conclusions are reached in the report of the Federal Reserve bank for 1954, which has just been released. The bank states that New England is a "dynamic demonstration that a mature industrial civilization can contain the seeds of rebirth and revitalization."

Highlights of the report show:

More than 2 million people have been added to New England's population since 1920.

A growth of 780,000 in total employment in the same period, including a 70 percent expansion in number of service industry workers.

The average level of manufacturing employment in New England in 1953 was about the same as the 1920 level, the bank said. "Yet during these years, individual incomes of an expanding population increased by one-half, even after the adjustment for changes in price levels."

"Obviously, a fundamental change in the character of New England's manufacturing activity took place during that period to enable the same number of workers to support more people at higher income levels."

"This change, the most striking development in the region's manufacturing history, has been the shift in labor force to higher-paying, more productive industries—to industries in which New England's manufacturers hold a better position in relation to their competitors in other areas."

METALWORKING ACTIVE

The transition in New England's manufacturing activities has been marked by the significant increase in the relative importance of metalworking activities—up from 30 percent of the total manufacturing employment in 1919 to 41 percent of the total in 1954.

And between 1947 and 1953, 63 percent of all new manufacturing jobs added to the region's economy were in just 2 product categories—electrical machinery and transportation equipment.

New England is also making improved use of its most important resource—manpower. New England labor force is being steadily "up-graded." Output from an hour of labor in the durable goods industries now exceeds output from a comparable hour in the non-durables by 10 percent.

There is encouraging evidence, too, the bank continued, that New England is improving its competitive position in the na-

tional manufacturing economy. In those industries where New England is growing the fastest, the net product per man-hour is also advancing the most rapidly.

The rise in individual incomes in New England, in dollars of constant buying power, has consistently exceeded the United States average. In terms of 1954 dollars, per capita income in New England has grown by one-half since 1929, reflecting the expanded output from each man-hour of labor.

"It is the combination of a concentrated area and a large manufacturing population, with both high incomes and high savings, that makes the area so rich a market for both consumer and industrial products," the bank comments.

Particularly helpful are community industrial foundation programs, State development credit corporations, and venture capital organizations.

GROWING POPULATION

"One may expect the New Englander to continue indefinitely the adaptability he has demonstrated for three centuries," the bank said. "As new economic problems arise—and problems are inherent in change—he is certain to find new devices and processes for solving them."

As to the future, the bank thinks the next decade will add another million to the region's population.

"This growing population will demand still further expansion of public and private facilities, and will provide new markets for many of the region's producers."

"In this fact lie both the need and the opportunity for a continuing expansion of economic activity. Another million people by 1965 will necessitate New England's finding 400,000 new jobs, and of almost every imaginable variety."

The Man With Ultimate Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, there is hardly an American today who is not aware of the many problems that beset our Nation and our world. Whether our principal job is in factory, farm, or office, or whether it is as a homemaker, all Americans sense the difficulties of maintaining healthy communities, a strong Nation, and a peaceful world. But our individual share of the responsibility is limited—even for those of us who take a more direct role in governmental affairs—and there is a certain solace in knowing that many others share the ultimate responsibility with us.

But there is one man in this country who cannot avoid ultimate responsibility. One man who carries upon his shoulders the massive task of leadership—for all Americans and for many free nations in the world. He is the President of the United States.

Recently, when new hydrogen bomb statistics were released to the public, it moved the *Cleveland Press* to ponder upon the dreadful responsibility of President Eisenhower. I call it to the attention of the Members because of its thoughtful consideration of a man who

deserves our fullest admiration and trust:

IKK'S DREADFUL RESPONSIBILITY

Nothing in recent years has underlined so clearly the dreadful responsibilities of the Presidency as this week's official news of the vast killing power of the hydrogen bomb.

Nothing has given us more cause for dependence on the President, or more cause for prayers that the President may make his decisions wisely.

The Atomic Energy Commission's explanation of how the "fallout" from an H-bomb can contaminate an area of 7,000 square miles is, of course, one of the big news stories of our time.

But it is much more than that. It reduces from a nebulous generality to reality the danger that civilization as we know it can doom itself in a hydrogen war.

The President has known this for a year. He knows much more; about even greater bombs, about guided missiles with atomic warheads, about bacteriological warfare. He knows much more than the public knows, much more than the public may know for a long time, if ever.

It is on this kind of information, some of which must be highly secret for obvious reasons, that the President bases the awful decision it is his duty to make. On such inside information, President Eisenhower has made the decisions which led to our Formosa policy, our attitude toward the shift of power in Moscow, his proposal to reduce Army manpower.

How can citizens judge such decisions of the President, with his superior information?

They can't.

They only can have faith that the information is sound, that the President is using his very best judgment.

On questions of foreign policy and military action, the President cannot balance his judgment against the views of many others, or against public opinion generally. He must "go it alone," for the most part.

Despite this, we are a Nation in which a well-informed people is the greatest bulwark of peace.

The decisions of the President are, in the ultimate sense, the decisions of the people.

But it is only when the people promptly understand the urgency of the facts behind these decisions that they also can share in the responsibility for them.

The Late Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Pete Jarman, an illustrious Member of this body from 1937 until 1949, and my esteemed friend and valued colleague, died on February 17 at the age of 62.

Pete Jarman represented the Sixth District of Alabama with courage, charm, and political know-how. He has been called a Congressman's Congressman. We can point with pride to his confident support of our foreign policy and the ability he had to draw others to him.

He was born in Greensboro, Ala. After graduating from the University of Alabama he tutored under his father in the

probate office of Sumpter County. When World War I came he attended the first officers' candidate school at Fort McPherson, Ga., and went overseas as a first lieutenant. He returned February 2, 1919, having been wounded in France.

In 1931 Mr. Jarman became secretary of state for Alabama. Four years later he was named assistant State controller. Elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1937, he served until 1949.

President Truman named Pete Jarman as Ambassador to Australia in 1949. He left that post in 1953 and retired.

His interest and membership in worthwhile organizations reads like a cross section of American life. He was commander of the Department of Alabama, American Legion, in 1927-28. In 1947 he was elected president of the Jefferson Island Club, which drew its membership from members of the Democratic Party, and dedicated itself to the political principles of Thomas Jefferson.

Pete Jarman regarded his constituents as "the finest, the best, the kindest people of the world." He was one of them. He shared with distinction the responsibilities of our House Foreign Affairs Committee. His duties he regarded as a sacred trust.

I believe the finest tribute I can accord our deceased colleague is to repeat his own words, given in this Chamber during his years of service:

Congress is composed of men of common interests with the plain people as well as the mighty. . . . I have served all the counties of my district with regard for the advice and counsel of the citizens of them all, never having been controlled by any group. You also know I never will be . . . To serve my country, my district, my State, my Nation to the best of my ability has ever been my keen desire.

I rejoice that I was privileged to serve with Pete Jarman and welcome this opportunity to express my great admiration for him. I am certain you join with me in acknowledging a deep sense of personal loss in his passing.

The family life of our late friend and Mrs. Jarman was beautiful, an inspiration for all to follow. They were always together, always sweethearts.

I extend to Mrs. Jarman my deep sympathy in her great loss and sorrow.

"I Wuz Robbed," Cried the Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, from New York there comes a plea for the underpaid workers of this country—that they should be relieved of at least a small amount of their taxes.

This is an appeal in behalf of those people, and I am sure the editors of the New York Post are close enough to these people in the low-income bracket to testify to their needs.

I am pleased, therefore, to extend my remarks in the Record to include the following editorial appearing in the New York Post of Wednesday, February 23:

"I Wuz Robbed," Cried the Elephant

About a month ago a Times headline said: "Eisenhower Sets 1956 for Tax Cut." The headline was based on a clear declaration in the President's Economic Report that next year will be the year for a "general, though modest" tax cut for everybody.

It was thereupon noted in a few places that 1956 happens to be the year of a great national election, but nobody got very indignant about the coincidence.

Now come the House Democrats with a proposal for a \$20-a-person income-tax cut starting next January 1. The cries of Republican protest are deafening. In nearly all the gazettes it is charged that the Democrats are guilty of irresponsible fiscal misconduct bordering on subversion.

The charge is badly stated. What the Democrats are guilty of is attempted robbery: they are trying to steal a campaign issue in broad daylight. If, in the process, they seek to insure that tax relief is not loaded in favor of the wealthy (as it was in the 1954 Republican tax bill), the theft must be deemed even more outrageous by the Republican press agents.

The offense of the Democrats is not that they are playing politics, but that they have beaten the Republicans to the playing field. Relax, folks; that noise in the distance is a wounded elephant groan, not to be confused with the death-rattle of the Republic.

One Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, a well-deserved tribute has just been paid by the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge to Millard C. Browne, editorial writer of the Buffalo Evening News. The foundation has given one of its coveted awards to Mr. Browne for his thoughtful and moving editorial of June 16, 1954, concerning the addition of the words "under God" to our Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Browne, in his editorial, notes that the addition of these words was spurred by the rise of atheistic Communism, but adds this thoughtful and incisive comment:

Our gravest danger as a Nation lies not in the possibility that significant numbers of Americans ever will fall for the evil doctrine of communism, but in the fact that too many Americans serve freedom with their lips and not with their hearts. The strong and active faith that motivated the founding of this republic and united its people behind a dream of liberty and justice for all God's creatures, has paled into a discussion of rights and duties that too often takes place in a vacuum, so far as it concerns any recognition of the authority whence those rights and duties derive.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of Mr. Browne's editorial:

ONE NATION UNDER GOD

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." (By act of Congress, June 14, 1954.)

Something new has been added to the symbolism of our nationhood—something as new as this year's Flag Day, yet as old as the Declaration of Independence.

The Pledge of Allegiance, memorized and recited by two whole generations of Americans, will have to be relearned with two vital words added. The very fact that they are new and unfamiliar will underscore them in the reciting and give a richer meaning to the whole.

The change is a simple one, saying no more than has been implicit all along; after "one Nation" is added the phrase "under God." Yet the addition to these two words speaks volumes about our national history and, for that matter, about the whole conception of "liberty and justice" on which America is founded.

Some traditionalists may wonder why it was necessary to tinker with the pledge—why, if it was good enough for grandpa, it couldn't be left as is for us. But traditionalists with a deeper understanding of America—its past and present—will not need to ask. They will know why these words—assumed, and thus omitted when the pledge was written—are needed now to complete an affirmation intended to encompass the vital things for which our flag stands.

The pledge we recite is not a dead tribute to the past, but a living testament of present day Americanism. The Founding Fathers could not have written it all, for the very accent on "one nation indivisible" is a reminder not of the Revolution but of the Civil War. The Declaration of Independence speaks not of an "indivisible" nation but of united colonies which "are, and of right ought to be free and independent States."

The other parts of the pledge would sound much more familiar to the founders of the Republic—especially its reference to "liberty and justice for all." That phrase goes to the core of their faith. Their very justification for our kind of government was rooted explicitly in the premise of a Divine Power which, guiding the affairs of men, held each one equal in His sight, and thus gave an inalienable dignity and status to every human personality.

Throughout our history, the basic testimonials to our national creed have been filled with recognition of the ultimate authority of a Divine Creator. The Declaration of Independence rests its case for national independence on "the laws of nature and of nature's god"—and it rests its case for the rights of men on the assertion that "they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." It closes with an assertion of "firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

Lincoln, in his immortal restatement of the American creed at Gettysburg many years later, voiced that same dependence, in words identical to those now added to the Pledge of Allegiance: " * * * that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

The Pledge of Allegiance, without explicit reference to God, came later. But its very author was a man of God, the Reverend Francis Bellamy, of Rome, N. Y. What he could not have anticipated in 1892 is that a nation which then accepted divine authority as a self-evident truth would soon fall into an era of skepticism, cynicism, and materialism—an era, moreover, in which our entire American creed would be pitted in mortal ideological combat against two godless tyrannies each dedicated to an inconceivable evil view of human beings not as creatures of God but as pawns of the state and its power-crazed rulers.

Even as we wage this struggle today, we see the American creed—the "last best hope of earth"—weakened rather than strengthened by the failure of so many of our own people to grasp and thrill to its revolutionary meaning. Just when the spirit of the American Revolution most needs rekindling to defeat the challenge of a tyrannous counter-revolution, that spirit falters for want of faith.

Our gravest danger as a nation lies not in the possibility that significant numbers of Americans ever will fall for the evil doctrines of communism, but in the fact that too many Americans serve freedom with their lips and not with their hearts. The strong and active faith that motivated the founding of this Republic and united its people behind a dream of liberty and justice for all God's creatures has faded into a discussion of rights and duties that too often takes place in a vacuum so far as it concerns any recognition of the Authority whence those rights and duties derive.

If our schoolchildren and their elders stumble a bit as they learn the new version of the pledge of allegiance, maybe they will also think. If they think enough about that phrase "one Nation under God," they will know how vital it is to the whole American creed. If they ponder on that, the spirit of freedom may yet regain the dynamic force to make it the most revolutionary idea of our time, as it was in 1776.

Postal and Federal Pay Increase Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of our colleagues to my statement in support of the Federal and postal pay adjustment bills presently being considered by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very appreciative of this opportunity to present my views in support of a pay increase for Federal and postal workers. My mail and personal contacts with those in a position to know indicate to me that now, more than ever, Congress owes the employees of the Government a fair and living wage.

You are all familiar with the steady rise in the cost of living and the difficulty the average wage earner has in making ends meet. I will not quote the numerous figures that conclusively prove this fact, since I am sure that your committee is already familiar with them.

The last time Federal and postal workers received a pay adjustment was July 1951. It was, in my opinion, inadequate in amount even when granted. The continuing rise in the cost of living has made the condition of Government workers more serious, and makes the need for another pay adjustment obvious.

I have been urging increases of pay for Federal employees of all grades and classes from the lowest to the highest ever since I came to Congress. Regardless of whether or not a campaign was approaching, I have done my best to gain the passage of bills that would close the gap between the cost of living and the inadequate salaries of Federal employees. Increased morale and con-

sequently increased efficiency, in addition to the right of all workers to a fair wage, far outweigh any misplaced demands for Government economy in this field.

In fact, a salary adjustment for Federal and postal employees is one sure method to economize in Government. Such an adjustment generates esprit de corps and higher morale in the jobs affected and would thus improve the quality of the service rendered. It makes for longer tenure and smaller turnover, thus saving millions of dollars for training new personnel.

I urge support for appropriate legislation increasing the pay of Federal and postal employees.

Thank you for this opportunity to express my views.

A Modest Proposal on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are some newspapers in this country that are actually on the side of the low-income people. The editorial below is from one of the papers that is close to these people. It is from Labor's Daily which is published in West Virginia.

Living in touch with these people, the editors know their financial condition.

The situation in West Virginia applies to many areas in Pennsylvania, where the coal industry has been injured.

With permission to extend my remarks, I am therefore including this editorial which appeared in Labor's Daily on Wednesday, February 23:

A MODEST PROPOSAL ON TAXES (By Willard Shelton)

The party line of Mr. Eisenhower's supporters, expressed most emphatically by Treasury Secretary Humphrey, is that it would be unwise, inexpedient, and unjustified for Democrats to push a proposal to cut everyone's Federal income taxes, beginning next January 1, by \$20 a year for himself and for each dependent. This department disagrees, and the modest proposal may be advanced that it is time for Humphrey to yield somewhat and show a little statesmanship.

The Humphrey argument is that the Treasury simply can't afford to lose the revenue involved in the \$20 tax cut. He suggests, further, that we can't foresee economic conditions, and that maybe the next year we shall be in such inflationary conditions that a tax cut would not be justified.

The newspapers supporting the Humphrey viewpoint say the Democrats are simply playing politics.

Well, to some extent they are. What were the Republicans doing in 1952 when they promised to balance the budget with lower taxes?

What is Mr. Eisenhower doing now in holding forth the pledge that maybe next year, which is an election year, he will feel able to recommend tax cuts?

What did the Republican 80th Congress do in passing a tax-cut bill and insisting that the income-tax form show taxpayers specifically what they had saved as a result of the new law?

There are certain issues on which the people have a right to demand that legislators rise above their own political interests.

Revenue for the Government in a time of necessary heavy expenditures is one of these issues.

There is, however, a perfectly respectable professional economic viewpoint that considers relatively small Federal deficits, in our present situation, to be no threat to stability. It is the belief of some professional economists that the Humphrey emphasis on balancing the books right now is completely unrealistic.

Give the economy space to breathe, they say, and the increase of purchasing power and the rise in productivity will balance the books without a substantial cut in expenditures. The tax yields will be so much greater at lower rate that the books will be balanced automatically.

Humphrey's complaints that a tax cut for low-wage families may not be sound clashes logically with his refusal to tolerate a tax cut last year when the economy was definitely slipping and an increase of consuming power would have helped.

The only tax relief we got last year was special favoritism for corporation stockholders, plus a huge volume of technical changes in the revenue laws that had the practical effect of relieving business of substantial tax liabilities.

Let Humphrey advocate a repealer of the tax favoritism to stockholders, let him suggest a plugging up of loopholes that subsidize certain groups, and he would be on sounder ground in complaining that the Treasury can't afford to lose any more money.

There are good grounds for believing that a cut in personal income taxes, of greatest proportional help to low-wage and middle-income families, is appropriate economically and desirable as a matter of equity. All the equities, previously, have been the equities of the already rich.

Marie A. Connery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which is a most praiseworthy eulogy that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, of Lynn, Mass., concerning Mrs. Marie A. Connery, wife of our late Congressman William P. Connery.

Mrs. Connery will be remembered by our colleagues who served in the Congress in the years 1923-37, as one who devoted much of her time and efforts assisting her husband in his duties on Capitol Hill. She was a kindly person, a sincere and conscientious and faithful wife, a loving mother and one who by her modest and gentle approach to people won countless friends both for herself and her respected and admired husband—Billery Connery. May both of them be blessed with eternal happiness for valuable services and charitable endeavors well done:

MARIE A. CONNERY

The death of Mrs. Marie Antoinette (Manseau) Connery this past week brought to the mind the many years she spent in the limelight as one of Lynn's most gracious and compelling personalities.

As the wife of the late Congressman William P. Connery, Jr., Mrs. Connery was a familiar figure at multiple social functions as she sought to try and make as many appearances as possible with her famous helpmeet. She made appearances because she knew the people of Lynn by the warmth and cordiality of their reception of her were sincerely interested in seeing and greeting her.

Mrs. Connery was a tremendous asset to her nationally renowned husband. She was not only wife and best friend but a careful and competent adviser. He leaned on her heavily and made no secret of the fact.

In those post World War I and depression days of the early 30's, the Connery household was a warm and happy one. Pictures taken in the household often depicted the happy couple with their only daughter, Marie Therese, seated between them at the piano. All had a flare for music and their friends could be assured of a song by way of greeting once they arrived.

The Connery family was to suffer a crushing and devastating blow in June of 1937 as the beloved Congressman was cut down suddenly by death. With the entire North Shore stunned by grief, no person could accurately compound the measure of the grief that was the wife's and daughter's.

In the years that ensued, Mrs. Connery did what every responsible American wife would do. She went to work to bring up her small daughter and give her the education and background she felt was so necessary. Then some years later she herself was stricken and confined to her bed.

During the long years of her suffering, Mrs. Connery was saintly and uncomplaining. And she had the love and devotion of a beautiful young lady, her daughter, Marie Therese, to assuage and comfort her. When she died and was reunited with her husband this week it could be truly said that God was good in that he at last had released her from her worldly yoke and made her life happy and beautiful again.

Today the people of Lynn salute the daughter of Billy and Marie Connery and offer her their sympathies in her own individual hour of sorrow upon the loss of her mother. She can be sure that by her constant ministering and devotion to her mother she measured up to the fullest traditions of an unforgettable family. What more can be said?

Permanent License Earned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the consent granted me today, I submit for the RECORD an editorial from the Ithaca Journal of February 2, 1955:

PERMANENT LICENSE EARNED

Mohawk Airlines has asked the Civil Aeronautics Board for a hearing on its petition for a permanent license.

Legislation is also being sponsored in the House by Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Democrat, of Mississippi, to bring about permanent certification of all established airlines. This legislation will affect 14 air carriers, including Mohawk, serving some 260 communities out of a total of 440 now provided with airline service.

CAB officials have indicated that Mohawk's request for a hearing will not be granted

because the question of permanent operating authority for feeder airlines is pending in Congress.

The Board has set up 15 requirements to measure operating performance. Mohawk, operating under a 7-year certificate which has 3½ years to run, meets each one of these requirements.

The Board also has a standard under which it will grant a permanent license. This standard is reasonable progress toward ultimate self-sufficiency in relation to the public convenience and necessity.

Mohawk's president, Robert E. Peach, argues that the CAB has never defined this standard. He points out that Mohawk's progress in increasing traffic and decreasing subsidies has averaged more than 27 percent a year and asserts the airline showed a net profit in August through September, 1954, without regard to mail pay subsidy. In Mohawk's view, these facts constitute "reasonable progress toward ultimate self-sufficiency."

Josh Lee, CAB member, opposes permanent certification on the ground it would take away the incentive the feeder lines now have to drum up traffic, replacing this incentive with a Government guaranty of continued existence. Granting permanent licenses, he says, would reverse the trend of feeder lines away from Government subsidies.

The temporary operating rule was understandable in the early days, but the smaller airlines have now been carrying passengers and payloads, most of them, for several years.

Permanent operating certificates will enable these airlines to attract more investment money and to improve their equipment and services. This means the communities they serve will be given better air transport.

Certainly Mohawk is a permanent fixture in New York State. It, and the other feeder airlines, have earned a permanent rating.

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the substantial lines should have a permanent franchise.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodte is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Abraham Lincoln Address by C. A. Bottolfsen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by former Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen, of Idaho, entitled "Lincoln: The Man Who Belongs to Everyone."

As Senators will remember, Governor Bottolfsen served the Senate during the past 2 years as Deputy Sergeant at Arms, and made many friends in the Senate. I commend a reading of Governor Bottolfsen's address to every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LINCOLN: THE MAN WHO BELONGS TO EVERYONE

(By C. A. Bottolfsen)

I should like to preface by remarks about Lincoln, by quoting an editorial which appeared in the Miami Herald on February 12, 1953, and which has been selected by The Lincoln Foundation advisory group as the most timely editorial published in American newspapers for that date:

"This is Abraham Lincoln's birthday. It is one of the most significant anniversaries not only in the history of the United States but of human kind.

"One-hundred-forty-four years ago today, destiny was at work in the one-door, one-window, dirt-floor Kentucky log cabin that housed the birth of the immortal Abe.

"Out of these primitive surroundings came the gaunt-faced, raw-boned man whose genius was safely to guide the country through the tempest of internal strife, forever to eradicate human bondage from the land in recognition and acceptance of the worth and dignity of all men.

"The story of Lincoln has been told often and at length. Its interest does not lessen through the years.

"In fact, in the last year there had been a great outpouring of scholarly studies of this immortal.

"He is the humanitarian symbol to free-men everywhere. He is the embodiment of the principle that a democracy can think and that there is a right-mindedness in the common people out of whom is woven the fabric of America.

"Lincoln came to the head of this Government at a time of great stress.

"He was the stabilizing influence in a period of national flux which threatened the permanence of this 'new Nation' conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

"It is no present-day purpose to assess Lincoln's greatness against the causes that led to the War Between the States.

"The American people are not internally embroiled today. We do, however, face a menacing world turbulence. It has put us to the test, as a people, against an ideology of totalitarianism that would destroy us.

"Lincolns are not commonplace of any time or people. They are the great and rare lights in a man's quest for human decency in democracy.

"Lincoln was raised up not just for his time but as an enduring inspiration for all of us to live and work for the heritage of our fathers—the right to govern ourselves.

"His homely virtues, his courage, his abiding faith in the right, and his determination to follow it—if adhered to by our Government heads and practiced by all of us in our daily living—are the basic and essential guarantees that 'government of, by, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.'"

While the editorial I have just quoted is indeed a sermon in itself, it would be impossible to sketch even hastily the outlines of the life of Lincoln without omitting volumes of important events that bear constant repetition and grow closer to us with each telling.

Today Lincoln stands firmly enshrined as the American who, above all others, best represents the American faith. So it seems appropriate that in this history-making period of 1955, we should seek some lesson, some new guiding force to point the pathway to clearer, saner thinking. Surely, the life of Lincoln gives us a pattern of nobility of purpose and simplicity of faith that has no equal in the history of American public life.

Someone said of Lincoln: "When he speaks it seems as if the people were listening to their own thinking aloud." Albert J. Beveridge, a resident of the Hoosier State, where Lincoln lived for 13 years, commented: "In a sense, Lincoln may be said to have been the child of a people. All that was best in this great middlestream of that mighty American folk movement was combined in his person, character, and intellect."

From President Wilson came this analysis of the brotherhood of man: "Mr. Lincoln we describe as 'a man of the people,' and he was a man of the people essentially . . . who had his roots deep in the experience and consciousness of the ordinary mass of his fellowmen. . . . A man of the people is a man who has felt that unspoken, that intense, that almost terrifying struggle whose object is . . . simply to live and be free."

President Eisenhower made this appraisal of his greatness: "The true values of America he understood as enduring, and they hold us together. And so he was patient. He was forbearing. He was understanding. And he lives today in our hearts as one of the greatest that the English-speaking race has produced, as a great leader. Yet never did he fall into the false habit of striking a Napoleonic attitude at any time and under any provocation."

He was the shepherd of his people at a time when our Nation was torn asunder. An unseen power must have had a very deep interest in Mr. Lincoln and this Nation, for it seems inconceivable that any one could have faced the multitude of personal dangers which he faced long before an assassin's bullet claimed his life, without protection from Him who rules the universe.

Lincoln enjoyed politics. It was the one activity throughout his entire somber life,

in which he found genuine pleasure and enthusiastic enjoyment.

Lincoln was a man of great commonsense. His simple election statement proved that beyond a doubt. His homely simplicity, his quiet, penetrating humor, his feeling of equality with ordinary people and his unswerving faith in their integrity, bulwarked firmly his political future.

Lincoln stood in awe of the Constitution of the United States of America. He believed that the Constitution was sufficiently all-embracing to demand his complete adherence to it, as a pledge in support of which he was willing, even glad if need be, to lay down his life. Nor was his reverence merely a blind loyalty to an historic document. It was well said of him in an address by the late Congressman Chipperfield, of Illinois: "The things for which he stood and which he attempted to do were in the name of the Constitution, and to this instrument, as he construed it, he was wholly devoted. The reckless and hairbrained experiment in government possessed no attraction for him, nor was he inclined to adopt a plan merely because it was new and untried, but going hand-in-hand with his conservatism was the ever-present desire to so adapt the Constitution that it would respond to the changing needs and requirements of the people."

If we who are assembled here today would honor Lincoln, we can render no greater service than to work for simplification of government; no greater achievement than elimination of rule by men and thus return to a rule of law, administered not for classes of society, but for all Americans.

Thus we may honor Lincoln in a living, powerful, permanent memorial to his name, a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Even as Lincoln, we may at times see many of our efforts go down to defeat, as we already have, but even as Lincoln's experience, it is an honorable defeat.

"I am not bound to win," he said, "but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right; stand with him when he is right and part with him when he is wrong."

Could there be a more simple yet moving expression of a moral code than this which has so indelibly been stamped on the history of American statesmanship?

He had scarcely assumed the duties of the Presidency before he was called upon to shoulder a multitude of additional burdens. He found extreme difficulty in selecting his cabinet, and it was in most instances complete submission to the ideals of those chosen, that he won for himself the personnel he insisted upon having. And even then, every member of his cabinet considered himself far above his master in intellect, in knowledge of national affairs—all of them believed themselves in full possession of greater ability to guide the Nation.

Lincoln was a man overburdened with sadness almost from his boyhood. His life was made up of one disappointment after another but not once did he flinch under the terrible strain. Researchers have come to the conclusion that his domestic life was not as trying as some historians would have us believe. Mary Todd came to Springfield from Lexington, Kentucky, and was one of

the most cultured women of that age. It is doubtful, according to present-day historians, if Abraham Lincoln ever met a more highly cultured woman than the one he was to marry within three years after they first met.

While she possessed a finished education, she lacked the ability to say in simple and beautiful language what her Saint-like husband was capable of expressing. No man in our early history, had the extraordinary talent for saying things so beautifully, so expressively and so inspiringly as Mr. Lincoln. Self-educated, and under most trying circumstances, he had a gift of expression and culture that few have ever equaled.

Lincoln had few intimate friends, but they brought him a degree of happiness, and it was the understanding and loyalty they displayed which strengthened him in his years of turbulent leadership.

"Now he is with the ages," said Secretary of War Stanton when Lincoln's life had ebbed away. Mad John Wilkes Booth, in a moment of infuriated hate, inflamed through months of chicanery by political enemies and powerful interests opposed to Lincoln's method of handling the slave question, committed the act which took the life of this great man. If Lincoln had lived, historians agree, there would have been less bitterness during the era of reconstruction. Lincoln's leadership would have brought victor and vanquished together in a peaceful and united effort to heal the scars.

The first official commemoration of Lincoln's birthday was in reality a memorial service arranged by Congress "to express the deep sensibility of the Nation to the event of the decease of their late President." Although nearly 10 months had passed since his demise, the fact that Congress was not in session at the time of the tragedy, had postponed, until the Members returned to Washington, the formal expression of grief.

Upon learning of the assassination of the President on April 14, 1865, several Congressmen hurried to Washington and met in the Senate reception room at the Capitol at noon on April 17. A committee of 4 Members of each House was appointed to report at 4 p. m. the same day and recommendations were adopted with respect to funeral arrangements and resolutions of sympathy.

Today there is no North, no South. We are welded together in a common cause for the advancement of the United States behind the stars and stripes. "One Nation under God indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

On January 30, 1919, President Calvin Coolidge issued a Lincoln Day proclamation that seems appropriate to repeat on this occasion. It is entitled "Lest We Forget":

"Fivescore and ten years ago that divine providence which infinite repetition has made only the more a miracle sent into the world a new life, destined to save a nation.

"No star, no sign, foretold his coming. About his cradle all was poor and mean save only the source of all great men, the love of a wonderful woman. When she faded away in his tender years, from her deathbed in humble poverty she endowed her son with greatness.

"His presence filled the Nation. He broke the might of oppression. He restored a race its birthright. His mortal frame has vanished, but his spirit increases with the succeeding years, the richest legacy of the great century.

"Men show by what they worship what they are. It is no accident that before the great example of American manhood our people stand with respect and reverence."

In our Nation's Capital City stands a beautiful memorial to the everlasting fame of this inspired man. I have stood with awe and reverence before this great work of art on numerous never-to-be-forgotten occasions. As I looked upon the lifelike and somber countenance of the Great Emanci-

pator, he seemed to breathe life; he seemed to plead for continued faith in our beloved country.

A most impressive sight is to view this beautiful creation of man's genius at night, when subdued lights behind the colossal work of sculpture present a scene that will live long in the memory of everyone who views it.

The memorial of Abraham Lincoln, was not built until the generation that knew the man had passed. In 1922, the memorial, which had been erected by Congress, was formally presented to the Nation. It was designed by Henry Bacon and is regarded by many as the outstanding attraction of Washington. It is a beautiful rectangular temple of white marble with a colonnade of 36 Doric columns, 1 for each State existing at the time of Lincoln's death. Within the central hall is a colossal statue of the President—the work of Daniel Chester French. On opposite walls are two memorial tablets, one containing Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and the other his second inaugural address. Above the tablets are two large mural paintings, Emancipation and Reunion, by Jules Guerin. The Memorial stands, most fittingly, in a setting of dignified grandeur on the banks of the Potomac River, at the western end of the Mall. It has an impressive approach on broad steps and wide terraces. A pool lying between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument faithfully reflects the classic outlines of both, with the dome of the Nation's beautiful Capitol Building reflected against the horizon beyond. It presents a picture that will live in the minds of the visitors as long as life shall last.

Certainly if we seek inspiration for an attack upon the problems of government which face us today, it is to be found in the immortal memory of Abraham Lincoln.

If we fail to preserve for ourselves and our posterity this Union for which Lincoln gave all, he will have lived and died in vain, and the lives of over a million Americans will have been sacrificed and hundreds of blood-stained battlefields will have been war-torn for no good purpose.

All the benefits and glories earned by us through the ages, now appear to be the envy of much of the world. One hideous ideology of government is especially active in a ravenous ambition to destroy everything that free men have striven and given their lives to perpetuate, through nearly two centuries of government that has advanced the pattern for which men patriotically gave their lives at Valley Forge; for the ideals Lincoln championed and which he set forth imperishably at Gettysburg; for the noble hopes for which Americans gave their all at San Juan Hill, in the Argonne Forest, Iwo Jima, Korea, and are now facing added perils at Formosa. The ideals for which they gave their all were good in those instances; they are worth fighting and dying for today.

Slavery was wrong in Lincoln's time; communism is wrong in our time. If we are to perpetuate the ideals which this Nation has championed for the past 2 centuries, it is timely to rededicate ourselves to the American Creed, the last paragraph of which reads: "I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies." If we rededicate ourselves to that principle, we will overcome much of that terrible ideology of government which is our sworn enemy; we will fully realize that those who are unwilling to stand up and speak for and defend America, but invoke the so-called fifth amendment to the Constitution, are enemies of our philosophy of government, and they shall be so recorded in our minds.

Lincoln said: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty

as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere."

Let us face the future with new enthusiasm. Let us determine to preserve our Republic at all costs, so "that this Nation of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Never in the history of our wonderful Nation has there been such a need for unity and patriotism and understanding and a willingness to fight for these principles as the need which faces us today. Undaunted, Lincoln fought for the principles he espoused after a long series of defeats and disappointments. Are we to be charged with being less patriotic and less inspired?

Lincoln also said: "Men will pass away—die; but the principle of democracy will live forever." To which I should like to add: "Providing we are alert to and subdue dangers which now are gnawing at our foundation."

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

The Continuing Problem of Communist-Front Groups in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night it was my pleasure to address the Knights of Columbus in Kenosha, Wis. I referred to numerous problems, notable among which is the antisubversive issue. I send to the desk the text of the address I delivered at that time. I append to it a most interesting article written by the nationwide syndicated columnist, Mr. Victor Riesel, and carried in the February 18 issue of the New York Daily Mirror and other newspapers coast to coast. It refers to the continuing problem in our Nation of Communist-front groups which solicit the names of the unwary and the gullible, and misuse the names of others.

I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGES WE FACE AT HOME AND ABROAD

(Address by Senator WILEY before Kenosha Knights of Columbus 50th anniversary banquet, in Kenosha, Wis., Sunday night, February 27, 1955)

I consider it a real honor to have been invited to join you on this occasion of your 50th anniversary.

I value this opportunity to rejoice with you on this half-century landmark, as well as the opportunity to learn your views, and to share with you my convictions concerning the challenges we face, as individuals and as a Nation.

THE K. OF C.'S GREAT RECORD

I am honored by your invitation for other reasons. Although I am not one of the million loyal members of your distinguished organization, I admire and respect you for the things for which you stand.

No one could read an issue of Columbia without sensing at once your deep convic-

tions on matters of national concern, your keen sense of civic responsibility, your abiding faith that right makes might, your grim determination that America shall remain free, that her enemies abroad shall not prevail, and that communism at home must not be tolerated.

I salute you for your record—for the constructive deeds of Father McGivney down to the present day—of charitable concern for needy widows and children.

I salute you for your firm stand against juvenile delinquency and against harmful literature.

I salute your loyalty to country, to you who have sent a higher percentage of your sons to defend our country than virtually any other group in America.

Yours is indeed an organization of which America rightfully can be proud, and to which all of us owe a great deal.

LEGISLATION AGAINST COMMUNISM

Since the Knights of Columbus are dedicated to the service of God and country, it is only natural that I submit to you some observations particularly on the foremost menace both to God and to country. I refer, of course, to the menace of international communism.

If time permitted, I would be happy to set forth for you now some of the things which I, for one, have tried to do down through the years in opposing the atheistic, international Communist menace—for example, some of the bills which I have introduced.

I should like to point out now, however, that for one thing, in the present Congress, I have introduced legislation to stiffen the penalties against seditious conspiracy either advocating to overthrow the United States Government by force or violence or conspiring to do so.

I SUPPORT ANTI-RED INVESTIGATIONS

I have given my support to the various vital investigating committees which are hard at work on this problem.

From time to time, as you know, there have been arbitrary proposals to force all of these congressional investigating groups into one.

I, for one, oppose such an effort. I believe that an important service can be performed by having the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, each fulfill their respective responsibilities in this important field.

This can and should, of course, be done without duplication of effort, with maximum of coordination, so that there is no waste in either manpower or resources.

I have seen, however, occasions when the individual interests and background of some committee chairman or members of one of the committees have made each of these groups, in turn, especially qualified to work on some particular phase of the complex Communist problem.

On the other hand, if all these investigations were centralized into 1 source, there might be a committee chairman of that 1 group whose interest might be so specialized that he might pass over some of the important aspects of the Communist problem.

SMACK DOWN ON RED FINANCES

I want to state that one phase which has hardly been studied is the matter of cracking the Communist conspiracy in the one place that it will hurt most; namely, the pocketbook. Vast sums of money have been collected by the Communist conspiracy in our country, most of it through Communist fronts. Large, inordinant sums have come from some wealthy people. Other large, in the aggregate, sums have come through smaller donations by considerable numbers of dupes.

There are indisputable evidences that the Communists have been guilty of financial

trickery, in keeping the books, both on their own party organization and on their Communist fronts, as in the instance of the misnamed National Committee for Justice in the Rosenberg case, in so-called defense of the atom traitors.

However, ex-Communists have testified how, time and again, large sums of money have been transferred secretly from group to group, including to and from Red-dominated unions, by all sorts of bookkeeping juggling.

In addition to these sums from American origins, there are the considerable top-secret sums made available by the Soviet Union and its intelligence networks.

So I, for one, believe that the Internal Revenue Bureau should crack down on Communist finances. The Internal Revenue Bureau should assign a sufficient number of skilled agents to make sure that income taxes, social-security taxes, and all other taxes are actually being paid by the Red groups just as law-abiding, patriotic Americans must pay such taxes.

I believe that a careful study of Communist-front books would provide many leads for tracing down numerous secret phases of the Communist conspiracy. And so, I have corresponded with T. Coleman Andrews, the able Commissioner of Internal Revenue, for this purpose. I intend to follow up, because I cannot say as yet that he has given me the sort of complete assurances of an all-out effort such as I seek.

I do not believe that the Internal Revenue Bureau can sit back and wait for evidence to show up. The Communists are too sly to permit obviously phoney bookkeeping to be readily noted.

Unless you assign crack squads of agents to this task and for a long enough period of time—agents not only trained in detecting financial trickery, but agents who really know something about the Communist conspiracy, who can recognize the names of individuals and groups, then the full story of the Red financial network will not come out.

THE DISGRACEFUL MATUSOW EPISODE

Now, I want to say just a word about one particular anti-Red phase which has recently been giving serious concern to all of us who have fought against the Communist menace. I refer, of course, to the disgraceful situation involving the self-admitted liar, Harvey Matusow.

I do not purport to have any final observations as to the overall meaning of the current activity of this contemptible individual.

It seems quite clear, however, that he is trying deliberately and maliciously to cast a cloud over as many as possible former Communists who have confessed.

The fact of the matter is that, as John Edgar Hoover has often stated, the genuine defector from Communism is one of the greatest assets which we have in the fight against the Red menace. How else can we ever find out the secrets of the Communist conspiracy?

We really only have two means: (1) by placing patriotic agents inside that conspiracy, and (2) by encouraging defection by those who have had their stomach full of communism and who want to return to the American fold.

A great many former Reds have confessed their sins. They have confessed—in full and in truth—to the FBI. They have cooperated with the FBI. The Bureau has checked, double checked, and triple checked their stories in order to make sure that the ex-Communists were not lying or exaggerating or casting a cloud over any possible innocent individual.

This process of cross-checking must be intensified, particularly now, in view of the disgraceful Matusow episode.

Matusow's current allegations must be analyzed with greatest care and skepticism. Perjury charges must be carefully weighed. The Communists are capable of such trickery that we should not be surprised at almost any tactic they, or Matusow, may adopt. We must not permit them or their accomplices to prevent genuine defectors from deserting the party and telling all to the FBI. We must maintain our confidence in the Bureau.

SUPPORTING J. EDGAR HOOVER

And on this latter point, recently I noted that an educator from one of the New England universities conducted a vicious personal attack upon Mr. Hoover.

I do not have the full absurd text of what he said, but I can say this: There are few individuals who have been more intensely and effectively devoted to trapping the guilty and protecting the innocent (whether it is in connection with communism or general crime) than has John Edgar Hoover.

For more than three decades, he has been a faithful public servant. This untarnished, uninterrupted service in highest public office—under both Democratic and Republican administrations—proves the universal esteem with which he is rightly held.

I wonder if that educator stopped to think that one of the highest priority aims of the Communist Party in the United States has always been to smear and destroy John Edgar Hoover.

I am not accusing the educator personally of anything. I am simply pointing out the facts.

A man has a right to speak his opinions and to have those opinions weighed on their merits. But no man should shoot off his mouth before checking the facts, particularly on so important a subject as this, and involving so faithful a public servant as Mr. Hoover. And no man should open his mouth before he figures out whether he is unwittingly serving ends which are contrary to the best interests of our beloved country.

COMBATING RED MENACE ABROAD

Now, just as we must be adequate to meet the Communist menace at home, we must be adequate to meet it head on abroad.

Fortunately, the United States has taken a strong stand against aggression in the western Pacific Ocean. And by our very firm policy in relation to protecting Formosa, the Pescadores, and related areas, we have lessened the danger of war.

Our strength increases the possibilities of peace; weakness before communism, appeasement of communism, increase the danger of war.

The very fact that the Peiping radio is full of continued angry threats and vicious denunciations is proof of the fact that the Communists know that we are not bluffing.

We are determined to keep the Formosa bastion as a vital link in our chain of security in the western Pacific. The northern tip of Formosa is but 500 miles from Japan. The southern tip is but 100 miles from the Philippines. We must defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and such related islands as the Joint Chiefs of Staff determine are necessary in order to make sure that our Pacific security chain is not broken.

It has been estimated that if we were to lose Formosa we might have to retreat in effect far back across the Pacific. That would bring Soviet bombers still closer in range to American shores.

MODERN MILITARY PREPAREDNESS ESSENTIAL

As we view this Communist problem, we know that here at home we must be prepared against any military emergency.

The Knights of Columbus have contributed so many men to the uniform of our country that I need hardly remind you of the admonition of the Father of Our Country, whose birthday we celebrated last Tuesday:

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving the peace."

I know that none of you are fooled by so-called apostles of peace—false apostles, who preach unilateral disarmament—apostles who often are inspired by those who would destroy us. Nor, for that matter, are we fooled by those who seek to hide behind our Constitution, especially when their own sinister purpose is its ultimate destruction.

I am not one who believes that storm clouds on the horizon will cause us to panic. Nor am I one of those few who fear that Americans are not equal to the task.

You and your organization are but a symbol of the answer that America can and will provide. You, who stand for the dynamic principles of your organization; you, who have stood by your country before; you, who have demonstrated your loyalty to country and your determination to keep her free; you can provide the answer yourselves.

One of these answers is, of course, modern-type, military preparation. Just as the Boy Scout says, "Let us be prepared," so must we be alert to the dangers which threaten us—be prepared for any eventuality—be equal to any occasion.

We must guard the far-flung ramparts of the free world. We must taken every step necessary to maintain our own military preparedness.

Our giant industries must be maintained in a position for instant mobilization. Our people must be psychologically prepared for any emergency.

This is particularly important in the new jet-atomic age when time and space have been dwarfed by intercontinental guided missiles.

Enemy bases may exist only 3,300 miles from Milwaukee. Projectiles may someday soon be launched at a velocity of 10,000 miles per hour.

Yes, the need for up-to-the-minute military preparation is evident.

I need not remind you of the obligation of every American boy who may be called upon to defend his country. He is entitled to receive the type of modern military training (especially under field conditions) from his Government which will enable him to defend himself adequately and perform his duty with honor.

At the same time, we know that any system of universal military preparation must be scrutinized most carefully. The dangers of militarism that have enslaved other nations must be avoided. A tragic pattern of human bondage must never leave its scar across this beloved land of ours. Preparations for war, which are necessary to preserve the peace, must always be accompanied by adequate safeguards of our democratic principles.

PREVENTING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Of course, interwoven with the problems of youth, is that of juvenile delinquency. The stand of your organization against this dreaded social malady among our youth is well known. It deserves the merit it has won.

In Congress, as a member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency and as a former member of the Senate Crime Committee, I have sponsored the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act. I am deeply convinced that the moral standards of our youth are more than an indication of the level of our civilization. They are a direct indicator of the world of tomorrow.

For each of you know that the thoughts in the minds of our young people today will be the actions of our leaders of tomorrow. And, by safeguarding the moral climate of our youth, we are preserving for them the heritage they deserve.

The work your organization has done in this field is outstanding. I can think of no single contribution to the American way of life more beneficial. I congratulate you and urge you never to cease your vigilance.

Yet, there is a caution we must observe. As serious as this problem is, we must not lose our perspective. We must not forget that last year, some 18 million boys between the ages of 10 and 17 were not picked up by the police for any crime whatsoever. This vital statistic somehow escapes attention in our eagerness to solve the problems of juvenile delinquency.

By all odds, the great majority of our youth—over 95 percent—are law-abiding youngsters, living and learning and eager to take our place in the building of tomorrow. Our confidence in our youth must not be shaken by the bad example of a few.

DELINQUENCY AND THE MASS MEDIA

There is one particular phase of this juvenile delinquency problem which I want to mention.

It is the matter of the strong influences through public media of communications—on our Nation's youngsters. I refer to the printed word, the spoken word, and the visual scene: namely, books, magazines, motion pictures, radio, and television.

I am not one of those who believes that there is any one single cause of the present wave of juvenile delinquency.

You cannot, for example, trace it alone or even principally, to programs full of violence on radio or television. I would oppose any overstatement to that effect by our Senate subcommittee, or by any other source, were such overstatement submitted. Obviously, juvenile delinquency is a complex problem. It arises from a great many causes: from broken, divorced, or separated homes, and neglected children; from slum conditions, where the children don't have facilities for wholesome play, recreation, and growth; from lack of constructive influence by the schools; from physical and mental handicaps that are untended by society; from inadequate spiritual education and a preoccupation with material acquisitions; from inadequate police forces and improper rehabilitation by courts or by juvenile homes, and from other sources.

Fortunately, here in our own State, we have set a comparatively good example of combatting the problem, both of adult and of youthful crime. Fortunately, our Badger facilities are among the finest in the Nation. And, yet, we know they can be improved.

We know, too, that by and large American books, magazines, radio, and television are sound. But there is a small minority among books and magazines which are definitely of salacious, indeed, pornographic content. These must absolutely be cleaned from the Nation's newstands and from the mails. That is why time and time again, I have taken up this problem with the Postmaster General. That is why I will continue to support legislation in accordance with sound judicial process—to eliminate such pornographic literature.

Then, with relation to radio and television, I have urged a greater concentration on wholesome programs. This problem can be met, in part, by American parents insisting upon wholesome radio and TV fare for their children. Voluntary patronage or nonpatronage of sponsors' products is just about the most powerful lever for assuring good programs and curbing unwholesome ones. Government censorship as such is not the answer, except in programs clearly beyond the border of good taste.

I have stated publicly, too, that this country could use a topnotch regular radio-TV program, or programs, dedicated to the problem of combating juvenile delinquency, as such. The story of youthful waywardness can be and should be told without sensationalism, without exaggeration, without phony melodramatics, without still more suggested violence. It can be told simply, yes, even entertainingly.

It can be shown that juvenile delinquency is not something totally offset that hap-

pens to the abnormal child or the abnormal situation; it can happen in or out of the so-called normal home, with parents of fine background who are not vigilant to protect average youngsters.

What I want are down-to-earth, realistic radio-TV programs that tell the story of the average American home, the many wholesome influences in it that prevent delinquency, and yes, the all too common conditions in it, like parental neglect, which contribute to juvenile delinquency.

CONCLUSION

Now, my friends, this has been a gratifying experience for me. It has been a real pleasure to visit with you about a few of the problems which confront us daily in Washington. The pleasure of meeting with a group of dedicated and concerned citizens is always a stimulating and challenging experience.

I have passed along to you a few of the ideas and problems that have occupied my attention in recent days. In turn, I trust that you will give me the benefit of your advice and counsel—that you will not hesitate to tell me your problems, your views, and your considered opinions on issues affecting Wisconsin and our Nation.

Your problems are my problems. Thank you and God bless you.

SCIENTIST EASY PREY FOR PROPAGANDIST OUTSIDE LAB

(By Victor Rieser)

Explanation, please.

Prize-winning nuclear scientist Dr. Harold C. Urey has just written that the greatest danger to this country is a powerful revolutionary country, namely the U. S. S. R.

Yet, in the same message, soon to be made public, this atomic expert defends convicted spies and the perjurer, Alger Hiss, who helped make the Soviet Union the greatest danger to this country.

The atomic spies slipped to Russian intelligence the blueprint for the atomic trigger, the sky platform, and the famed proximity fuse. Alger Hiss delivered the inner secrets of our diplomacy.

Yet, Professor Urey, writing in the forthcoming Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, asks: "What is it that Alger Hiss . . . did that profoundly or even moderately put the United States in a less favorable position? How much damage have all the arrested and convicted agents actually done to the political and military position of the United States?"

Would it be too emotional to suggest that the answers come from the mothers of GI's dead in Korea?

In the same message from Dr. Urey, we see that he says that the "way we handled the Rosenberg (atomic spy—VR) trial" makes him "feel less secure for myself and my family."

We respect Dr. Urey's right to express himself so freely in words which would be howled down in the market place were they not written by one whose profession is viewed with awe by so many of us. But we do not respect his judgment in reflecting on men who are as skilled in their field as he is in his; namely, the jurists of the United States Supreme Court who upheld the convictions of Hiss and the spies.

We do not respect his taking the platform offered last week by a subsidiary of a pro-Communist agency devoted to a fight for the release of an Alcatraz prisoner by the name of Morton Sobell, a man who stole secrets from our Nation for the benefit of what Dr. Urey himself describes as our greatest menace.

But most important is the unscientific approach to all this by scientist Harold Urey. He agreed to accept a testimonial dinner on February 12 from something called the Chicago Sobell Committee, 20 West Jackson Boulevard, Room 1301, Chicago, Ill. Phone: Webster 9-5992.

Why did not Dr. Urey use his research skill to learn that this committee is a subsidiary of the National Committee To Secure Justice for Morton Sobell.

These committees were set up to smear the United States. They use the same techniques, down even to the same exploitation of spies' innocent children.

Did not Professor Urey know that some of those who signed the imitation parchment paper scroll given him by the subsidiary of the National Rosenberg-Sobell Committee (headquarters, 1050 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; phone, LO 4-9585) are now bitter over being deceived into sponsoring what turned out to be a rally for a convicted spy and not merely a testimonial dinner?

We have spoken to one who signed such a scroll thinking he was adding his name merely to a list of persons honoring scientist Urey. This signer is the great fighter for human rights, A. Philip Randolph, head of the AFL's Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Randolph is greatly disturbed over the emphasis on the spies at the dinner to Urey. He points out that he received an innocuous letter asking him to join in hailing Urey as a scholar.

"I signed a tribute to Dr. Urey as a distinguished scientist and scholar. I signed in good faith," Randolph told us.

"If any group then attempts to use my name and the name of my union for ulterior purposes—and especially pro-Communist purposes—they are doing something reprehensible. My union and I have been in the forefront of the fight against Communists." Surely now Dr. Urey will use his great talents as a scientist to investigate and expose all this.

Or will he?

The Salt River Valley Water Users Association and the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, several weeks ago there appeared in the Arizona Daily Star an editorial concerning remarks I had made about the TVA and the Dixon-Yates contract. In the editorial there was a discussion of the workings of the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, in my home State. That was not factual in every aspect, particularly when the editorial tried to compare the association with TVA. Because the editorial was published in the Appendix of the RECORD, and has subsequently appeared in newspapers, I now ask unanimous consent that an answer which I wrote to the editor of the Star, Mr. William R. Mathews, also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 21, 1955.

Mr. WILLIAM R. MATHEWS,
The Arizona Daily Star,
Tucson, Ariz.

DEAR BILL: Once before it was necessary for me to answer an editorial of yours that touched upon some basic thinking of mine. That was the occasion when you asked me, "What kind of a Republican are you?" and, if you will recall, that answer required far

more words than I like to burden anyone with, particularly a busy editor.

Now you have questioned my stand on TVA because I say it is socialistic, and you evidently do not agree with me, and, in the saying, you try to compare TVA with the Salt River projects, and I find it necessary to resort to a lengthy explanation, which I feel will explain to you why I do not like this approach that has been used under false colors in the State of Tennessee.

I do not consider the Salt River Valley Water Users Association in any way comparable to the Tennessee Valley Authority. I quoted Mr. Norman Thomas as an authority on TVA being socialistic. If he thought for one minute that the Salt River Valley Water Users Association was socialistic, I am sure he would have eulogized it as such years ago. I accept him as an expert on this subject.

I heartily endorse Federal assistance in the development of our streams for irrigation, flood prevention, navigation, and other beneficial uses, including the production of hydroelectric power. Had it not been for Federal assistance, the Salt River project would not have been developed to its present status or, let me say, developed to that status as expeditiously. I still believe a project as sound as it is would have been completely developed by local interests in time. Federal assistance was necessary to the development of many other fine reclamation projects in the West and it will be required in the future for many other fine developments such as the central Arizona project.

Congress, in its wisdom, decided to encourage reclamation development in the West, and in particular that of Government lands. It not only authorized loans for this purpose but offered further assistance, or subsidy, if you please, by making the loan interest free for a certain number of years. I am proud to say that a Republican administration, under the dynamic leadership of that great President, Theodore Roosevelt, made this possible by passing the Reclamation Act of 1902. I am happy to say that succeeding Democratic and Republican administrations have recognized the wisdom of the act and have not only continued it but have improved it. This is to the credit of both parties. The present administration has recommended the most ambitious of all reclamation programs, including the upper Colorado River development, which I was happy to cosponsor.

I feel confident that it will support our central Arizona project as soon as the court settles the question of water rights between our State and California.

In addition to irrigation this administration has initiated a farsighted policy—the partnership approach—for furthering flood prevention, navigation, and other benefits including hydroelectric power that come from the development of our river basins. This program I heartily endorse. It will result in more extensive development than could be accomplished by the Federal Government trying to go it alone.

The purpose of the above statement is to let you know how I stand on development of our water resources. I have no quarrel with Tennessee over the fact that the Tennessee River Basin has been developed. In fact, I am very happy that Tennessee or any other area can benefit from development of its water resources. However, I would not want what has happened in that State to happen to my State. Under the guise of flood control and navigation, the river has actually been developed for production of hydroelectric power. Their greatest irreplaceable resource—land—the best land in the State, has been inundated and lost to production forever. Better flood control could have been provided without losing this land. But if that is the way Tennessee wants it, I certainly offer no objections.

My criticism of TVA is that it has not done exactly what the Salt River Valley Water Users Association has done. The water

users got some help from the Government to build a storage dam, some canals and to install a powerplant at the dam. The cost of this work was beyond the ability of the water users at the time. The Salt River Valley Water Users Association is a true cooperative of farmers. The electric power it produced was primarily intended to operate its facilities and provide electric service for its members. It sold excess power and used the money to reduce water costs to its members. When it needed additional power it financed the additional dams and steam plants through the private investment money market and pledged the land of its members as security. It did not run to Uncle Sam for another handout. When its facilities were completed, it took over the operation and management and has run them on a businesslike basis. It has paid interest—sometimes high interest up to 6 percent—on its borrowed capital. It has assessed its members sufficient money to meet all of its costs including repayment of the money advanced by the Federal Government ahead of schedule. It got no gifts from the Government for flood control and other benefits provided by its facilities as did TVA. No, it is paying back all the Federal and private money and has never defaulted on a single obligation.

The Salt River Valley Water Users Association-Government arrangement is a true partnership that has worked out to the everlasting good of the State. The Government loaned a helping hand when it was necessary, but the people have retained their own independence and initiative and are beholden unto no Federal bureau or bureaucrat.

It is true that Salt River Valley Water Users Association pays no taxes, but you will remember that the Internal Revenue Department contended from 1936 on that it did owe Federal income tax on the profits it made from the sale of electric power. It was only after it organized the power operations into a separate and distinct public power district and made a cash settlement with the Revenue Department that it was relieved of further Federal income tax liabilities.

Public power districts, municipalities, etc., are tax exempt on the theory that they are subdivisions of the State and operate on a nonprofit basis. A true cooperative is tax exempt on the theory that at least 85 percent of its service, and therefore its income, is derived from its own members. The original concept of tax exemption for States and their political subdivisions was based on services normally performed by Government or segments thereof for the people, such as schools, roads, public buildings, etc. I am sure it was not originally thought of or contemplated to carry over these tax exempt privileges to the operation of proprietary businesses, otherwise through Government tax-exempt competition all such businesses will some day of necessity come under Government ownership. It must also be remembered that at the time these tax-exemption laws were set up, taxes, and in particular Federal income taxes, were not much of a business problem.

In the operation of a tax-exempt proprietary business it is not the state or segment thereof that gets out of paying the tax; it is the individual, the business or industry using the service that gets out of the taxes. Why should an industry located in a public power area escape paying taxes on the electricity it uses and an industry located in a private utility area, maybe right across the street, pay as much as 24 percent on its power bill for tax purposes? I am not suggesting the Salt River Project Power District pay taxes on its power operations so long as similar operations are exempt over the United States. And I am not suggesting that true farm cooperatives pay taxes on their power operations so long as they serve their members on a nonprofit basis, but when either starts serving business establishments and industries, I see no reason why such

businesses or industries should be exempt from taxes on power that other businesses have to pay.

We have discussed the Salt River Valley Water Users Association; now let us see wherein TVA differs. Let me tell you that I have made quite a study of TVA since the Dixon-Yates controversy came up and now realize for the first time what it is all about. Let me also tell you that the propaganda this country has been fed on TVA at public expense, could hardly have been excelled under a dictatorship and a controlled press.

TVA was originally sold as a flood control and navigation development with hydroelectric power incidental thereto. It had not been underway long before a public power clique decided to take over. The first step was to kick out Dr. Arthur Morgan, the Board's first Chairman, and put Dave Lilienthal in. After that the main emphasis was put on power development. I will not dwell on flood control and navigation except to say that instead of providing flood control to protect valley lands, TVA has permanently flooded with lakes more land than the Army engineers estimated would be flooded by the undeveloped river once in 500 years. The interest on the money invested in navigation facilities and the cost of operating and maintaining them alone costs almost as much as the all-rail rate on the same volume of freight. Besides that, the big percentage of water traffic results from TVA's own use.

Instead of providing reasonable flood protection, saving as much valuable land as was possible and improving navigation within economic limits and producing all of the hydroelectric power that could be economically developed from the primary undertakings, and turning this power over to the people to be distributed through existing facilities, either private or public, the TVA operators planned a Federal power monopoly. They schemed with a public power advocate, Harold Ickes, to use Public Works Administration funds for loans and grants to compete with the private electric companies and in this way forced them to sell their properties to the Government. The cities of Tennessee, under the persuasion and guidance of TVA, bought the electric distribution systems within their city limits. The cities operate the municipal electric systems and purchase their power from TVA at wholesale. These cities are now under captive contracts with TVA. They cannot build their own generating plants and produce their own power if they want to. TVA tells them what they shall charge for power and what to do with the money they take in. The local people not only have no voice in running TVA but are not allowed a free hand to run their own distribution systems. The situation is even worse than described above. TVA runs Tennessee. It has such a grip on the State, including its politics, that no candidate for political office, regardless of party, has a chance of election if he does not follow the TVA line. A farmer loses his free fertilizer and can no longer be a TVA cooperator if he supports a candidate that TVA objects to. This political and economic power is in the hands of a three-man Board of Directors appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The people of Tennessee have no say in the selection.

TVA claims it has averaged earnings of 4 percent on the power investment over the years. Yet it pays no interest on the money it gets from the Federal Treasury but the people, through taxes, have to pay an average of 2.6-percent interest on this long-term financing. We taxpayers have had to pay out in interest alone over \$240 million on money advanced to TVA for expenditures other than those connected with flood control and navigation. TVA has returned to the Treasury through fiscal 1954 only \$37 million, about one-third of the interest

the rest of us have had to advance on this venture. It is not the Authority or the State of Tennessee that is getting out of paying this interest, it is the power consumers, individuals, businesses, and industries, many of them competing with other sections of the country.

TVA pays no Federal taxes and only token payments in lieu of State and local taxes. Once again, it is not the Authority or the State of Tennessee that dodges these taxes but the individuals, businesses, and industries consuming the power. If these TVA customers were paying their fair share of taxes it would mean just that much less the rest of us would have to pay. As it is we lose both ways. We are being taxed to support TVA and the TVA consumers get out of taxes the rest of us pay on power we buy.

TVA conducts special forestry and soil-conservation programs. Arizona and the other 26 States depend on the Department of Agriculture for such programs. Why should one State be singled out for a special program through some separate Government authority?

TVA operates a fertilizer program but the great development programs in this country, aside from atomic energy, have been through the initiative of private industry, not Government. Why do we have to turn to some Government authority for this work in one section of the country?

Salt River Valley Water Users Association by good business management, running its own affairs, paying its own way, financing its own expansion after an initial start, in other words through initiative of its own members, has contributed greatly to the growth and prosperity of Arizona. What has TVA, an all-powerful Federal authority done for Tennessee? After the expenditure of over \$4 billion of Federal funds on TVA and atomic energy installations in Tennessee, that State has shown less advancement in those things indicative of prosperity than its neighboring States. I gave the Senate statistics supporting this statement last year and they have not been disputed. It is not because the State lacks the natural advantages of its neighbors. It is my opinion that the people have become so dependent on a Federal authority they have lost their own initiative.

TVA already has cost the people of Arizona \$3,595,000 and the annual subsidy to TVA from Arizona is \$175,000. If the Dixon-Yates contract does not go through and TVA is allowed to build another steam plant, it will cost Arizona at least another \$235,000. I do not object and am sure the good people of Arizona have no objection to lending a helping hand to any section of the country, but we certainly have a right to expect those receiving help to put their operations on a sound businesslike basis as Salt River Valley Water Users Association has done and not be the continuing drain on us that TVA has been for over 20 years.

Sincerely,

BARRY GOLDWATER.

Can Communism and Capitalism Coexist in the Same World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address

entitled "Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World?" delivered by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and longtime business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, at Fort Lauderdale, Fla., on January 14, 1955, before the Temple Emanu-El, together with certain statements indicating the reaction to this address on the part of prominent Americans.

There being no objection, the address and statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM COEXIST IN THE SAME WORLD?

(Remarks by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and long-time business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the Temple Emanu-El, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., January 14, 1955)

Ladies and gentlemen, when Rabbi Marius Ranson invited me to address your Friday evening religious service, he paid me a great compliment and I want to express my gratitude to him and to you for this unusual opportunity.

I am honored to take part in any program with which Rabbi Ranson is associated. This meeting brings to my mind our many associations when he was with us up North. We in New Jersey miss Rabbi Ranson. He was a friend and a spiritual adviser. He served our community with honor and distinction in our many civic, social, and philanthropic endeavors. He left a void in our midst which no one has filled. I am sure he brought to Temple Emanu-El's congregation and to your neighbors the benefits of his rich scholarship, his clear and far-reaching vision, and his devotion to duty.

I am particularly honored to speak to you tonight. As a Christian I am conscious of the contribution the Jewish religion has made to our spiritual philosophy and to our general way of life. And, it is about our way of life that I shall speak to you tonight.

Many people today are concerned about the welfare of our country and the preservation of our way of life. Millions are asking, "Can capitalism and communism coexist in the same world?"

This question has been on my mind for a long time and although I am not an expert or an oracle on capitalism or communism, I believe the answer is obvious.

The nature of communism has stumped many an expert. "I cannot forecast the action of Soviet Russia," said Winston Churchill in 1939. "It is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma," concluded the great British statesman.

I will not undertake to do what Churchill couldn't do—predict Russia's actions—but I will state without fear of contradiction that one of the two major systems that now divide the world will survive the other. That is not a very astute analysis, as no system of government has ever achieved immortality. In fact, no political, economic, or social system in written history, or even prehistory, has ever survived unchanged.

Human systems of organization, like every other living thing on this small planet, are the subject of inevitable change either by orderly evolution or by revolution. Neither communism nor capitalism will be an exception.

The Communists recognize this basic concept of changing life and, convinced that capitalism has passed its peak and is ready to decline, hope to achieve their dream of world domination by hurrying the process. If they can't attain that goal by peaceful process such as the cold war, they are doubtless prepared to grab by means of revolution what they can't win peacefully.

COMMUNISM

Before we go further, let us make sure we agree on our definitions. By "communism" I refer to the communistic system of government now in control in Soviet Russia and her satellites and in Red China. Under their regimes, man is regarded as a soulless, animated machine to be enslaved, used, and consumed by the state for its own glorification.

CAPITALISM

By "capitalism" I mean the economic-political system that now prevails in the United States. I distinguish our capitalism from the imperialistic capitalist systems now in dissolution, under which Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Holland, and even little Portugal have for a few centuries profited economically. They became rich on the basis of their colonies and although they introduced certain material blessings and even encouraged spiritual growth by supporting missionaries, nevertheless, in every colony the deep, fundamental relationship between the imperialist and the subject race was one of power—raw, physical power based essentially on gunboats and machine guns.

In my discussion of communism versus capitalism, I define capitalism as the political-economic system which protects freedom of enterprise as well as freedom of thought, worship, speech, and assembly, and other civil rights for its own citizens as individuals, limited only by reasonable restraints. I speak of the system which has encouraged free enterprise to attain a per capita productivity beyond the wildest imaginings of a few decades ago; the system which brought about such wide and equitable distribution of its material benefits, as to have almost abolished poverty and insecurity.

If communism and capitalism, whose antagonistic goals are apparent in their definitions, are to coexist for a substantial period of time, it must necessarily be a peaceful coexistence. In an atomic war, the extinction of one or the other systems would be virtually inevitable, if indeed, either could survive the holocaust.

With both systems armed with atomic weapons to the point where the only alternatives open to both are war that could easily destroy both, or peaceful coexistence, we are up against our original question. Stalin gave an answer to this question in his book *Problems of Leninism*, when he said, "It is inconceivable to me that communism and capitalism can live in the same world. Sooner or later one or the other must conquer."

It could agree with Stalin in this instance, although we arrived at our answers in different ways. Let us examine the reasons for reaching this conclusion:

I am convinced that the communistic system contains the seeds of its own destruction. The saber-toothed tiger was a formidable fellow. However, his extinction was the result of his own terrible weapon, which became his handicap and his impediment when the supply of his large prey became exhausted.

All forms of tyranny and despotism eventually destroy themselves. Though temporarily successful, they breed the desire to resist faster than the tyrant can generate power to overcome the resistance. Political structures without the cement of mutual trust and love of fellow men eventually fall apart. Those who cannot be safely enslaved must be liquidated. That is why one purge must of necessity follow another.

Capitalism is a threat to communism. Knowledge of the blessings of the competitive system must be kept from the victims of communism lest that knowledge give hope and the courage to resist tyranny.

Gen. William H. Wilbur, in his recent book, *Guidposts to the Future*, tells how the Communist leaders fear the Voice of America

and of the subtle and cruel Soviet program to shut it out. For example, a class of Polish schoolchildren were asked by their teacher to identify a number of melodies. The little hands went up in recognition of well-known Polish songs. Then another tune was played and several children raised their hands, not realizing that it is one frequently played on the Voice of America program. When those children returned home a few hours later, their parents had all gone to parts unknown, never to be heard of again.

The abominable use of fear and terror is a frightful and immediately effective weapon, but it will destroy the user, just as the awful fangs of the now extinct tiger destroyed him.

The Communists recognize belief in God as a further threat to their philosophy. They boldly assert that belief in God is an "opiate of the people" and "must be destroyed everywhere before communism can be safe anywhere." No greater indictment could be drawn of any movement than to say it cannot exist in a religious atmosphere. We in America practice brotherly love and we recognize God as the Great Architect of the Universe.

With two ideologies so diametrically opposed as to make peaceful coexistence untenable, and with the realization that an atomic war could bring about total destruction of one or both adversaries, what hopeful options are open to the world?

It is clear that we cannot sit idly by and let the Communists skillfully maneuver ideas and events to their advantage. We, too, must guide the natural course of things so as to derive the maximum benefit from them.

JOHN THE GARDENER

This reminds me of the story of John the gardener, which the Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, former United States Senator from New Jersey, and a long and close friend of your rabbi, tells with such force and effectiveness.

In a small, attractive community, the owner of a large lot in the center of town allowed the property to become an unsightly dump heap, and couldn't be persuaded to clean it up. However, he was not averse to having the town do it. The city council, with a plan to make the ugly lot into a beautiful flower garden, borrowed John the gardener from one of the wealthy citizens of the town who owned a magnificent estate with beautiful gardens.

In about a year's time, John the gardener had cleaned up the place and converted it into a thing of beauty. Everybody complimented him and told him that no one else could have done such a wonderful job. John's head began to swell and he really began to believe that he was a superman.

A minister of the gospel heard of John's growing conceit and decided to help John straighten out his thinking. The minister said to John, "John, this is a wonderful piece of work you have done. But I hope you remember you couldn't have done it without God's help. It was God who put the ingredient in the soil, and the characteristics in the seeds and sent the rain and the sun."

John readily agreed that without God there could have been no garden at all, "but," he reminded the minister, "don't forget what a terrible mess this whole property was when we left it to God alone."

And so I would remind you that if we leave it to God or to John the gardener alone to destroy communism, this godless form of government may make such a mess of our world that capitalism cannot live in it.

However, there is hopeful evidence that the people are turning to God for help. In the period from 1945 to 1954 the number of church members in the United States increased from 72 million to 95 million—an increase of 13.7 percent, as compared with a 12.5 percent increase in the Nation's popu-

lation. Today 59 percent of the population of the United States are church members, as compared to 16 percent in 1850, when the record was first available.

Even in Russia the Communists are discovering that too many Russians go to church and are stepping up their program to combat this movement which is a threat to their atheistic philosophy.

As further evidence that people are turning to God, there is the fact that Dr. Norman Vincent Peale's book, *The Power of Positive Thinking*—a religious work, written by a clergyman, has been at the top of the best-seller list for 114 weeks. For more than 2 years this little book has outsold any other book to the general public.

Communism is its own greatest enemy. In time its cancerous nature will eat away at its vitals. In the meantime, we must keep ourselves strong spiritually, economically, and militarily, and exercise a reasonable amount of wisdom in combating this godless force. In this way our way of life will survive this crisis.

"George Stringfellow's thesis contains both logic and a welcome ray of hope as to the outcome of the present bloodless war between communism and the free competitive system called capitalism. * * * If we keep ourselves spiritually, economically, and militarily strong, we can count on the self-destruction of communism." (Robert Gardiner Wilson, Jr., 33d degree, past imperial potentate, member, board of trustees, Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children, probate court judge for Suffolk County, Mass.)

"I wish there were more people in America who had the courage and conviction that George Stringfellow possesses. I say this after reading his address, *Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World?*" (E. V. Rickenbacker, chairman of the board, Eastern Air Lines, Inc.)

"Temple Emanu-El was filled to capacity. Rabbi Marius Ranson presented George E. Stringfellow, the speaker, as one of America's leading industrialists and consecrated Christian layman. The members of the congregation sat in rapt attendance as the speaker delivered his address, *Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World?* in which he fearlessly attacked the Communists' way of life. * * * It was an hour we shall never forget. * * * America needs more such men in this crucial hour." (Dr. Carl C. E. Mellberg, minister, Simpson Methodist Church, Paterson, N. J., chaplain, Salaam Temple, AAOONS.)

"George Stringfellow exemplifies friendship in all of its noblest phases. He has hundreds of devoted friends throughout the United States because he is a real and devoted friend. * * * It has been one of the dreams of my life to have George Stringfellow deliver an address from my pulpit to my friends. That dream was fulfilled in his great address, *Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World?*" (Rabbi Marius Ranson, Temple Emanu-El, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.)

"I think George E. Stringfellow's address, *Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World?* is one of the most remarkable and understanding that I have read in a long time." (George E. Sokolsky.)

"George E. Stringfellow has set down the problem of survival in clearly spoken and very understandable words. Every American should read them." (Frank S. Land, 33d degree, imperial potentate, Mystic Shrine of North America, and founder and secretary general, Order of DeMolay.)

"Here is a hard-hitting, sound, sagacious statement of some fundamental truths; I wish Dr. Stringfellow's admirable address could be read and pondered by all Americans." (Hubert M. Potat, past imperial potentate, AAOONS.)

"I feel that George Stringfellow's address, Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? should be published so that even he who runs may read. Take heed and join the crusade advanced by this great American." (Arthur H. Raith, potentate, Salaam Temple, AAONMS.)

"To me, it is always a privilege to read a speech by my honored friend, George E. Stringfellow. He never fails to bring inspiration and sound common sense to his readers." (Norman Vincent Peale, pastor, Marble Collegiate Church.)

"George Stringfellow is a realistic, successful, industrial leader. His comments in his address, Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? reflect his philosophy, couched in the simple, lucid dramatic language characteristic of him." (Archle T. Keene, president, Indiana Technical College, Fort Wayne, Ind.)

"It is always a headline when a layman puts into plain words the ideals that we men in the pulpit are trying to emphasize. This George E. Stringfellow has done in the sermon Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? which he preached at the Temple Emanu-El in Fort Lauderdale, Fla." (Rev. Dr. William F. Rosenblum, rabbi, Temple Israel of the city of New York.)

"Mr. George Stringfellow has long been a spokesman for religious faith, and his prominence in business and political and benevolent affairs gives his preaching exceptional force. The truth spoken incisively here is of primary importance." (Harry Milton Taylor, minister, Calvary Methodist Church, East Orange, N. J.)

"Mr. George Stringfellow's address, Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? is one of the best analyses of this important problem that I have ever read. His clear-cut ideas define . . . the real issues which confront the world today, and the conclusions which he draws pinpoint convincingly and emphatically that the church offers the one great hope of a just and lasting peace." (J. Goodner Gill, vice president, Elders College.)

"Our imperial high priest and prophet's address, Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? is a forthright and fearless exposition in defense of our American way of life. . . . I hope it will be given wide publicity." (Albert H. Flebach, 33d degree, past imperial potentate, AAONMS.)

"Noble George E. Stringfellow has given his address, Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? great thought and consideration. . . . Noble Stringfellow is doing his patriotic duty in his effort to make American citizens understand that our system of government cannot coexist with communism and in pointing out what the citizens can and should do about it." (Albert W. Hawkes, former U. S. Senator from New Jersey.)

"Once again, which has repeatedly happened, illustrious George Stringfellow has given a stirring message in his address Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? God give us more men like George Stringfellow who are capable of giving to the world a message like this one." (Albert Ellis, 33d degree past potentate and recorder, Maskat Temple, AAONMS, secretary-treasurer, Shrine Recorders Association.)

"I believe Noble George Stringfellow's address Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? is excellent and I sincerely hope that it is given wide circulation." (George H. Rowe, 33d degree, past imperial potentate, and member of the Supreme Court of New York State.)

"It is gratifying to know that one of my associate imperial officers is making a major contribution to the obvious need for alerting America on the subject of Americanism and the dangers thereto encompassed in godless

communism. Furthermore, Noble Stringfellow's contribution reflects a motive of true patriotism beyond question." (Walter C. Guy, 33d degree, deputy imperial potentate, AAONMS.)

"We are now approaching another crucial period in the life of our country when clear thinking is indicated. In my opinion, our imperial high priest and prophet, Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow with his astute analytical diagnosis of the acute problem of communism and capitalism is doing just that." (Harold Lloyd, 33d degree, past imperial potentate and member, board of trustees, Shriners hospitals for crippled children, AAONMS.)

"The truth Noble George Stringfellow has stated needs to be repeated over and over again. . . . I consider it a privilege to have my name linked to his address, Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World?" (Harvey A. Belfa, past imperial potentate, chairman emeritus, St. Louis unit Shriners hospitals for crippled children, AAONMS.)

"Do not fail to read George E. Stringfellow's address Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? . . . it is needed by you and by me . . . in bolstering our spirit for the fight for survival which lies ahead." (Adrien B. Hommel, 33d degree, commander in chief, Valley of Paterson, N. J., northern Masonic jurisdiction, United States of America, AASR of Freemasonry, and past grand master of the grand lodge of the Most Ancient and Honorable Society of F. & A. M. for the State of New Jersey.)

"Can Capitalism and Communism Coexist in the Same World? is a splendid address and should, in my opinion, receive wide circulation." (Alfred G. Arvid, 33d degree, past imperial potentate, AAONMS.)

"This sermon by George E. Stringfellow, is, in my opinion, one of the clearest outlines on this subject that it has been my pleasure to read." (Walter S. Gibbs, 33d degree, illustrious potentate, Crescent Temple, AAONMS.)

"George Stringfellow's sermon is full of wonderful words and food for thought." (Gerald D. Cray, imperial chief rabban, AAONMS.)

"It is a hopeful sign when one of our truly great businessmen will appear in a church or holy temple and stand and be counted for God and make such a timely and well-developed pronouncement in favor of our way of life, under God, as against a godless Communist." (Galloway Calhoun, 33d degree, past imperial potentate, president and chairman of the board of trustees, Shriners hospitals for crippled children, AAONMS.)

"George Stringfellow, with his customary forthrightness, forcefully explodes the theory of peaceful coexistence that Communist party lines and Communist dupes are trying to purvey to the American public." (Charles Edison, former Secretary of the Navy and former Governor of New Jersey.)

Their Rules, but Red Witnesses Are Always the Same." The editorial was published in the February 19 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and is a very timely one.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEES CAN CHANGE THEIR RULES, BUT RED WITNESSES ARE ALWAYS THE SAME

Sometimes it is said that we ought to create some tribunal as lofty and unassailable as a British Royal Commission to replace congressional committees as probers of Red infiltration. The comrades show less enthusiasm for this idea than they once did, since the Canadian Royal Commission rooted out the Dominion's Reds with no more compunction than a gardener trapping moles.

Australia now has a Royal Commission investigating Soviet espionage and its connection with domestic Communists as an aftermath of the Petrov case. The distinguished commissioners are making a noble effort to carry on in the Liberal tradition, with public hearings. How are they making out? The London Times reported this passage from the testimony of W. H. Bird, Victoria, secretary of a seamen's union.

"Mr. BRD. I have come here to tell you what I know, without this boy [indicating Mr. Pape, junior counsel to the Royal Commission] interrupting me all the time. . . .

"Mr. PAPE. You are here to answer questions, not to talk.

"Mr. BRD. Dry up. I know what I have to say without you telling me.

"Seamen in the gallery began to applaud, calling out, 'Good on you, Bill.' The commissioners retired to allow the gallery to be cleared, amid calls of 'This is a free country,' 'You can't take it,' 'You're a lot of cowards.' If it all sounds familiar, it is because the method used by the party to disrupt social institutions is the same in every case and every country.

They've been doing it for years. In November 1928, at Zagreb, Yugoslavia, one Josip Broz went on trial for Communist agitation and propaganda, contrary to the law of the realm. The defendant told the presiding judge arrogantly: "I do not recognize the bourgeois court of justice, because I consider myself responsible only to my Communist Party."

When he was sentenced to 5 years and led away by the guards, there was the standard shouting match, joined by supporters in the packed audience. Broz, of course, is now better known as Marshal Tito, and the interesting fact is that his official biography cites this as one of the glorious episodes in his career.

There isn't much you can do with Communists except let them yell. But it would be a mistake to amend our procedures to make their obstructive tactics easier.

Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28, 1955

MR. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there is a great dramatic appeal in the name Hells Canyon, an appeal which undoubtedly evokes a wide variety of mental images about the geography of the area involved in the struggle to save this section of the Snake River for full, multi-purpose development.

Committees Can Change Their Rules, but Red Witnesses Are Always the Same

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28, 1955

MR. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Committees Can Change

Recently, Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, made an airplane flight over the Hells Canyon area. Later, he wrote a vivid editorial for the Northwest Public Power Bulletin, which not only gives an excellent bird's-eye view of this rugged and remote region, but also spells out the significance of Hells Canyon as a challenge to the foresight of Americans in seeking full development and wise use of their resources.

So that the Members of Congress will have the benefit of this word picture as discussion develops further on Hells Canyon, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINGS OVER HELLS CANYON

(By Gus Norwood)

Flying up the deepest gorge on the North American continent is high adventure which will often return to haunt the memory.

We arrive at the Spokane airport at 6:30 on a crisp morning. The West Coast Airline DC-3 glistens with frost. Overhead not a cloud greets the rising sun. The clear, blue sky promises unlimited visibility.

Not given to formality the pilot says he will gladly detour a little to fly over the Nez Perce damsite and the more famous Hells Canyon damsite. The first leg of the flight is about an hour from Spokane to Lewiston, Idaho. The second leg from Lewiston to Boise requires 2 hours, of which the first half is up the grand canyon of the Snake River.

Wheatlands of the rich inland empire checkerboard the route to Lewiston. But Lewiston itself lies in a deep valley at the confluence of the Clearwater and Snake Rivers. All around this deep valley stretches the bleak plateau of dry farming wheatlands. Also on this plateau on a high bluff is the airport.

As if presaging the wonder and awe of the next hour is the takeoff from Lewiston. The pilot merely taxis to the end of the runway and keeps going, like taking off from an aircraft carrier. Seconds later the plane soars easily hundreds of feet above the broad swelling flow of the Snake River. Yet on each side of the edges of the plateau bound our pathway and as the plane climbs, the rim of the benchlands, changing to foothills, climbs also.

CANYON HOLDS ONE-EIGHTH OF FUTURE POWER

In this Pacific Northwest country of titanic proportions the famed Columbia River receives the glory as America's greatest hydroelectric resource with little credit or mention that one-third of its waters come from the mysterious and remote gorges of the powerful Snake River. Yet in these gorges one-eighth of the Nation's future water-power awaits the engineer. Unspoiled by railroads, highways, and towns, useless for farming, the yawning chasms of the Snake and its great tributaries the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers offer over 11 million kilowatts of future hydroelectric power, the energy of 21 Bonneville Dams.

Defining the boundary between Idaho and Oregon the maps show the Hells Canyon of the Snake to be some 50 miles long. But actually the entire central portion of the river is encased in a canyon from the time it leaves the southern Idaho plain at Weiser until it reaches Lewiston 180-river miles or 150-air miles later. In this reach the river drops from 2,077 feet above sea level at Weiser to 757 feet at Lewiston, a total drop of 1,320 feet.

The sluggish Mississippi River drops about half a foot per mile, but the amazing Snake

plunges into the canyon below Weiser and keeps on plunging, dropping 5 to 10 feet per mile. Even from the plane one sees and almost hears the roaring crashing rapids with their churning white water.

The plane is half empty and we shift from side to side as the friendly steward points out the Grande Ronde River where it joins the Snake and as we fly across the border from Washington into Oregon up the west bank of the Snake River.

CONTINENT'S DEEPEST GORGE

Ahead, looking like a tumorous swelling of the earth, lies a vast hump of mountains split by the deepest gash on the North American continent. Like two medieval fortress walls these mountain ramparts face each other for many miles along the Snake River trench. On the Oregon or western side lie the Wallowa Mountains with Sacajewea Peak slightly the highest at 10,033 feet. On the Idaho or eastern side the Seven Devil Mountains show their sawtooth pinacles along the very brink of Hells Canyon with the He Devil standing at 9,387 feet.

We're at the Nez Perce damsite. Forty-six miles above Lewiston, 2½ miles below the mouth of the Salmon River and 5 miles below the mouth of the Imnaha River lies the rock cradle of the proposed 615-foot high Nez Perce Dam. This is the Army's proposed project for generating 1,980,000 kilowatts of power and storing flood waters in a reservoir reaching 63 miles up the Salmon and 64 miles up the Snake to the toe of the proposed Hells Canyon Dam.

To the eastward one traces the upper portion of the curving abyss of the Salmon River, the "River of No Return," as it recedes into mountain ranges yet unnamed. Under the morning sun, still low on the horizon, the canyons lie in deep shadow made more ominous by trails of vapor and fog banks. Powdery snow on the northerly slopes helps to etch further the rugged landscape.

Now we are in the Hells Canyon, over 1,000 feet deeper than Arizona's mile deep Grand Canyon. The plane must be flying at about 8,000 feet, almost 7,000 feet above the water, yet one feels that the pilot is flying too low because the mountains crowd close. The jagged points of the Seven Devils tower above. Someone said Hells Canyon was so named as the playground of the Seven Devils. At least their sharp shadows play along the eroded wall.

BLUFFS FORM DAMSITE

The canyon is a broad V miles wide at the top and with an undulation of granite buttresses or headlands crowding in upon the river every quarter mile or so and each such pair of buttresses looks like another good damsite. The steward points out a sheer bluff which stands straight up 4,000 feet above the turbulent waters.

At the Hells Canyon damsite the pilot obligingly makes a wide S turn crossing the river. Down there the engineers will someday place a dam higher than Hoover Dam. It will raise the river from a tailwater level of 1,475 feet above sea level to 2,077 feet, a rise of 602 feet. Its reservoir will back water to the head of the canyon at Weiser 92 miles upstream.

What's that ahead? The river, which has seemed dark and forbidding in the gloomy shadow of the canyon, now curves around a rocky promontory and is flooded by the warm morning sun. Deep in its trench the narrow ribbon of water shimmers almost blindingly like a stream of molten silver.

As the pilot leaves the river for the shortcut to Boise, one sits back for the first time to ponder the wonderment of this river. Even when the Nez Perce and Hells Canyon projects are built, the fabulous gorge will remain. Man's highest dam will not reach 10 percent up those canyon walls. Thus in America's greatest and deepest chasm man can place

huge dams to store the unruly and devastating floodwaters and put them to work for the good of mankind producing more power than the output of Grand Coulee Dam. Still there will remain for all future generations the primeval, awesome beauty that is the Hells Canyon of the Snake River.

Right To Work Law Conflict Broadens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Right To Work Law Conflict Broadens," which was published in the Prescott Evening Courier.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT TO WORK LAW CONFLICT BROADENS

Union labor leaders, and maybe sincere rank and file members, lately have been waging a crusade against the so-called right-to-work laws of a number of States. Whether their efforts to induce Congress to adopt nullifying statutes would be effective if successful is problematic, since such legislation might conflict with the Federal Constitution. Anyway, Arizona's experience fails to offer evidence wherein the law has restricted organized labor's activities. Despite the clamor for suppressing the measure, no examples so far are recorded that emphasize its alleged unfairness.

The move to abrogate the statutes through Washington cooperation naturally brought reaction from those favoring them. Hence, due to labor groups bringing pressure toward erasing the States' authority, an association recently was created to fight the movement for voiding the various laws whose merits are yet to be proved by the opposition. In outlining the purposes of the new formation, its chairman, E. S. Dillard, stated:

"The National Right to Work Committee declares its keynote belief to be that unionism by compulsion is utterly wrong and is a rising menace to the future of the United States.

"This organization will strive diligently to accomplish a single major objective, which is to establish in the United States the principle that Americans must have the right, but not be compelled, to join labor unions.

"Labor unions hold in their membership hundreds of thousands of American citizens against their will. Furthermore, thousands of persons have lost their jobs because they would not bend the knee to such compulsion.

"Emphasizing these and the many related facts and the injustices inherent in them is the determination of this committee. Further, the committee intends to defend the right to work principle against all who would invade it, whether unions or employers.

"A basic fundamental of American democracy is for every individual to have the right to earn one's own livelihood without being compelled to join, and pay money to, any organization. The National Right to Work Committee expects to carefully avoid injecting itself into the many complicated problems of labor-management relations. The committee will not oppose the expansion of voluntary unionism.

"The committee's conviction is that, in keeping with American guarantees of personal liberties, unionism must be voluntary,

devoid of compulsion. The intentions of this committee are to sponsor a program sufficiently broad and adequate to accurately present this whole problem in its many details not only to the American people but also to those men and women who exercise the authorities of government.

"When analyzed, this right-to-work problem presents political and economic issues which are of deep and far-reaching importance. Ranking first among these issues is whether or not justice is violated when a one-sided State of law protects the individual's right to join a union while providing no protection whatever for the right not to join a union.

"Another of these issues is this: Shall the Federal Government be allowed to strike down all State laws which seek to give the individual free choice as regards labor-union membership? American policy is positively set against the evils of monopoly in business and yet the question arises whether labor unions shall be permitted to achieve monopoly over the working forces of the Nation.

"A basic principle of our Republic is to protect civil liberties and minority rights against majorities. Shall this principle have no effectiveness in the basic realm of working and earning a living? The National Right To Work Committee hopes to convince the American National and State Governments and the whole populace that failure to eliminate unionism by compulsion will represent a triumph for collectivism. Already widespread unionism by compulsion has drastically encroached upon, and has severely damaged, various American individual rights.

"The foregoing paragraphs present broadly the fundamental policy and objective of the National Right To Work Committee."

"Flat Wheel" Harry Karr Retiring After 52 Years on Rails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, March 1, 1955, is the retirement date of Harry A. Karr, of Washington, D. C., one of the most able passenger traffic men in the railroad industry.

"Flat Wheel" Harry, as he is known to Presidents and other officials of the Government, has served the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. for 52 years, spending 30 of them in Washington, D. C., as a division passenger agent.

Having worked under Harry Karr as a representative of the Pennsylvania Railroad traffic department not only did I learn to know him as an excellent supervisor but also as one of the most likable persons I have ever met.

In addition, my friend Harry has the reputation of being one of the most persistent "go-getters" in the railroad passenger field. Competition was his meat, and regardless of how keen it was, Harry Karr fought for the business without sacrificing any of his principles.

As a retired railroader Harry Karr will now be able to enjoy to a fuller extent the comforts of his home and family, which

consists of his charming wife and son Harry. Credit for "Flat Wheel" Harry's accomplishments in the railroad industry is shared by his wife and son, who have constantly been at his side and supporting him in all his daily endeavors.

The February 27, 1955, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald carried the following article which is a deserving tribute to one of the grandest employees of the Pennsylvania Railroad system.

The article follows:

"FLAT WHEEL HARRY" RETIRING AFTER 52 YEARS ON RAILS

(By Edward T. Follard)

Harry Karr says farewell to railroading Monday.

He is retiring as division passenger agent of the Pennsylvania Railroad after 52 years of service with that company, 30 of them here in Washington.

"Flat Wheel Harry," as he has been called, has traveled with five Presidents of the United States—Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower. He sometimes gives the figure as six, because he was the railroadman in charge of the special train that bore the flag-draped body of Warren G. Harding from Washington to Marion, Ohio, in 1923.

Now a spry 66, Karr enjoys talking about all but one of his trips. When he comes to that one—a 3 week journey on a special train with Mme. Chiang Kai-shek—he shakes his head, and on his face appears a look of pain and bafflement. It was, he says, the most terrible trip of his career.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek had come to Washington on February 17, 1943, to be the guest of the Roosevelts at the White House. The First Lady of China, as she was called at the time, caused quite a stir.

A famous beauty, who as Mel-Ling Soong had been an honor student at Wellesley College, she had an aura of romance about her; and, besides, hers was the voice of Free China, an ally of America against Japan.

All hearts went out to her when, attired in a split skirt and sables, she glided into the halls of Congress and spoke eloquently for an all-out effort in the Pacific.

There were whispers around the White House that Mme. Chiang Kai-shek was difficult, but they came from the servants and never got into print.

At any rate, Harry Karr had no reason to feel apprehensive when he got a telephone call from the White House one day. It was from Mike Reilly, then chief of the Secret Service there. He told Karr that FDR wanted him to get up a special train to carry Mme. Chiang on a tour of the United States.

Karr did a good job in making up and manning the 7-car special, or at least he thought he did. The Pullman porters assigned to the train were handpicked. They included Bill Reed and other veteran porters who had traveled with Presidents and who were known for their skill and courtesy.

The rolling stock, including a private car, was first rate and so was the food for the dining car. The late Jim Maloney and other Secret Service agents were aboard as guards.

The itinerary called for a visit to Wellesley in Massachusetts, to New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. The trip was to end at West Palm Beach, Fla., where Mme. Chiang would board a plane for the flight back to China.

Among those traveling with Mme. Chiang was her niece, Miss Jeanette Kung. Harry Karr says it will be a long time before he forgets her.

Miss Kung, who affected a boyish haircut, began to complain in the name of Mme. Chiang. She told Karr that the trip was too rough. She complained about the service.

"Mme. Chiang doesn't like the way you stopped the train," Miss Kung told Karr.

On other occasions, Karr recalls, Miss Kung complained because the train did not stop so Madame could get the latest editions.

In Chicago the party left the train for a night and put up at the Drake Hotel. The Secret Service assigned Karr to a room on the same floor as the Chinese entourage.

Miss Kung happened to pass Karr's room when his door was open. Seeing him inside, she said to him:

"What are you doing on the same floor with us?"

Karr explained the room had been assigned by the Secret Service. Miss Kung called the hotel manager and demanded that he be moved to another floor. He moved voluntarily.

On the way across the prairies, Karr recalls, Mme. Chiang decided to give a tea party for the lady journalists. She asked Bill Reed, the porter assigned to her car, to prepare cookies and garland them with the colors of China. Bill had no way of doing this, since he lacked the necessary ingredients, and he told Karr.

Another railroadman wired ahead to North Platte, Nebr., to appeal for help. The wives of railroadmen in North Platte went into action, made the cookies with China's colors, and that crisis was solved. Madame was pleased.

By this time, however, a really alarming situation had developed. The Pullman porters, saying they couldn't stand the nagging by the Chinese, threatened to leave. Karr and others finally persuaded them to stick it out.

One day, according to Karr, Miss Kung reached a peak in her complaining. She said that if Karr and the others didn't do more to make Mme. Chiang comfortable, she would have to make some other arrangement for the journey.

"If you were in China," Karr says Miss Kung told him, "you would have your heads cut off."

Karr still finds the experience sort of incredible.

"We did everything in the world to please them," he says.

It was different traveling with Presidents, he says, and spins many a yarn about them. Coolidge, he recalls, liked to prowl up and down the special. One evening "Silent Cal" ventured into the club car where the newspapermen were locked in a game of poker.

Coolidge, unnoticed, stood in back of George Durno, White House reporter for the International News Service. Durno had a tremendous hand—four aces. Coolidge gave him a jab in the back.

Durno, looking around, saw it was the President and became so excited the four aces tumbled out of his hand. That ended his chances of making a killing.

Karr traveled with President Hoover in his ill-starred 1932 campaign, and he vividly remembers an incident at the railroad station in Des Moines, Iowa. The Chief Executive was booed.

"That is not a nice thing to hear," he says.

President Roosevelt, Karr recalls, was unfriendly to the Pennsylvania because the head man of Pennsylvania at the time, W. W. Atterbury, was a prominent figure in the Republican Party. He made it clear his favorite railroad was the Baltimore & Ohio.

Ironically, the train that bore FDR's body to Hyde Park in 1945 was a Pennsylvania Railroad special. In charge of it was Karr.

Harry's legion of friends and admirers are throwing a cocktail party and reception for him at the Willard Monday from 6 to 8 p. m.

United States Relations With Latin-American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article concerning our relations with Latin American countries, written by Mr. Nathaniel P. Davis, formerly the distinguished United States Ambassador to Costa Rica, and published in the Glens Falls (N. Y.) Star. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEN SKETCHES

(By Nathaniel P. Davis)

Recent events in Central America once more bring to the fore the plaguing and complex question of military aid and training for foreign governments whose avowed foreign-policy objectives are similar to our own. An editorial in the Post-Star a few days ago drew a parallel between arms aid to Central American countries and to those of the Near East. It might be profitable to broaden the scope of our thinking on this matter to the whole world. And because we have had more experience with arms aid to Latin America, and greater opportunity to compare results with intentions, perhaps a review of some recent history of this continent can lay the foundations for some general principles of worldwide application.

When the United States entered World War II it urged all of the American Republics to follow suit. Most of them did so promptly, and before the fighting was over all but Argentina had declared war on one or more of our enemies. It will be recalled that in the early days of the war there was considerable hostile submarine activity off the coasts of North and South America and some widespread and well-grounded fear that German and Japanese agents might stir up military and sabotage activities in South and Central America to the detriment of our supply of strategic materials from those areas. When the United States urged its Latin allies to take preventive measures against such possibilities as well as against possible sea or air borne raids on their territory, most of them replied quite truthfully that they could only do so if we could furnish arms and other military equipment and train native personnel in their use. We did so quite generously considering our own state of unpreparedness, but quite inadequately considering the use to which they might have to be put.

We trained and equipped a modern mobile unit in Costa Rica. It never fired a shot at a German or Japanese, but was used by the Government to upset an election and plunge the country into civil war. We helped to create a small but effective force in Venezuela. It never got into the war either, but its officers overturned a popularly elected government and set up a military dictatorship which still rules the country by force of arms. American machineguns, military vehicles, and air facilities in Nicaragua seem to have confirmed the dictator president of that country in his belief that might makes right. Brazil's Army and Navy, rehabilitated and equipped by the United States, did take an active part in the Italian campaign and in patrolling the high seas. They also

took a determining part in installing one president and ousting another.

These examples, by no means an exhaustive list, disclose a pattern which we should not ignore. It is not enough for a government to declare its solidarity with us in our opposition to military threats from Moscow. Before putting arms in its hands for the avowed purpose of common defense against that threat we should inquire very carefully as to the sincerity of that avowal. We ought to know by now that there are countries where the possession of arms by the organized few makes it certain that they will win the next election or upset it if by chance they lose. We ought also to know that there are countries which can think of more immediate and more interesting uses for modern arms than keeping them handy for an aggression that may never occur, particularly if the arms we give are better than those of a neighbor.

We ought also to satisfy ourselves as to the ability of the recipient to use the arms effectively for the purpose for which they are supplied. The mere possession of modern arms, without intelligent leadership, organization, some resources, and a will to defend oneself, plus a sincere and demonstrated devotion to democratic ideals, does not add strength to the democratic coalition. Quite the reverse. It is no service to democracy to arm would-be dictators just because they call themselves democrats. It is no service to world peace to arm would-be aggressors against small states just because they say they fear aggression against themselves by a larger one. And it is no service to anyone to put our reliance on bigger and better armaments for everyone not on the other side of the fence. Careful discrimination in this matter might add to Western strength, save the taxpayers some money, and contribute to the growth of democracy the world around.

The Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Highway Program," which was published in the Washington Daily News of February 23, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

It is hardly necessary for anyone to point out the inadequacy of our present highway system, although President Eisenhower did a realistic job in his special message to Congress.

Anyone who rides in a motor vehicle is aware of the appalling accident toll, the extra cost poor roads impose on commercial traffic, congestion, and the usefulness of the highways in wartime.

The President was less realistic in his statements on how the huge program he has outlined might be financed. He said he rather favors special bond issues, to be paid off out of a big boom in tax revenues from highway users which his advisory committee thinks is in the offing.

The committee, you may remember, recommended that the Federal Government put up \$31 billion in the next 10 years, the States and local governments the remainder of a

total of \$101 billion. The committee wanted to borrow this money, but not to count it as Federal debt.

We don't think Congress will buy any such deal, no matter who proposes it. We hope Congress won't accept any highway program which involves more Government debt.

The President says the States "cannot effectively" meet the need for a vastly expanded highway system. The only reason they can't is lack of money. And the same applies to the Federal Government. It is more deeply in debt than any State.

If ever there was a time when the country could afford to pay for the roads it builds, as it builds them, it is now. If we are going to borrow money in good times for the things we need, and pass the cost along—at a high rate of interest—to future generations, what are we going to do for the things we need in less good times?

We need a highway program. But first we need a way to pay for it. We hope Congress concentrates on that phase of it.

The Statehood Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the February 20, 1955, issue of the New York Herald Tribune is deserving of our attention:

THE STATEHOOD ISSUE

Hawaii and Alaska moved at least a shade closer to admission to the Union on Wednesday. A combined bill to confer statehood on the 2 Territories was approved, 19 to 6, by the House Insular Affairs Committee. It has still to be released by the Rules Committee, which blocked a somewhat similar measure last year, but Speaker RAYBURN indicated that this year it may have better success. There is a possibility of a Presidential veto, but a compromise within the bill, proposed by Alaskan Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, may have removed the grounds for such action.

The President's reservations on the subject of Alaskan statehood were intimated in a sentence of his state of the Union message: "As the complex problems of Alaska are resolved, that Territory should expect to receive statehood." One of these complex problems is, clearly, national defense. Secretary Charles E. Wilson, calling attention on Tuesday to the great size of the Territory, its sparse population, limited communications, and strategic location, told the Insular Affairs Committee that it would be in the interest of the national security that Alaska remain a Federal Territory.

On the point of the relation between national security and Alaskan statehood, opinion is by no means unanimous. Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska from 1939 to 1953 and author of a recent book on the Territory's problems, believes with a number of military leaders that the grant of statehood would, if anything, strengthen Alaska's defenses. In any event, the compromise authorizing the President to set aside up to 40 percent of northern Alaska as a defense zone, should meet objections on this score.

A serious consideration of the claims of Hawaii and Alaska to a place in the Union is long overdue. The Insular Affairs Committee has done its part by approving the combined bill. Now it is up to the House to take action.

Democrats and the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Democrats and the Truth," written by Ralph McGill, and published in the Atlanta Constitution of January 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEMOCRATS AND THE TRUTH

(By Ralph McGill)

Democrats take over the Congress tomorrow. There is no vindictiveness in them. There is no great anger. Certainly there is none directed toward Dwight D. Eisenhower. But more and more Democrats feel that certain of the men about him, and some of their friends, have deceived him and have used the confidence he has in them for the benefit of special interests.

So, there will be some investigations.

There will be a look at some of the curious aspects of the Dixon-Yates Co., created to build a plant on the edge of TVA's territory.

TVA's annual report, an official and factual Federal document, has just been published.

TVA's opponents, in large measure, have succeeded in doing two things. One, they have ignored the flood control features of the valley plan. This control not merely prevented great, almost annual damage, it enabled general farm plans to be worked out.

TRUTH

Agricultural wealth—which paid increased taxes on its land and income, grew with the years. New businesses, selling machinery, seed equipment, and other items, came into being. They paid new taxes. The purchasing power of the vast valley grew—and so did the tax total to local and Federal governments.

In addition, the recreational facilities produced new business. This, too, brought new taxable wealth to the TVA area.

Also, the lives of the people were improved in many ways. Income, schools, diet, a better standard of living—many intangibles of great value to the Nation came out of TVA.

Opponents of TVA have succeeded in obscuring most of this benefit to taxation and the general betterment of the area and, through it, the Nation.

Secondly, not content to try and make TVA appear as merely another power operation, its relentless foes have sought to make it seem an operation entirely subsidized by the Government. They have spoken of it as if it were operated wholly at the expense of the Federal taxpayer.

This is not true.

The truth is available in the report.

Last year TVA earned 3½ percent net profit on its power installation.

Over the whole period of its existence it has averaged 4 percent annually.

By law it is required to pay back into the Federal Treasury (to the taxpayers) across a period of 40 years the total cost of all its power installations.

TVA PAYMENTS

It has actually paid back \$101 million, of which \$20 million was returned during the last fiscal year.

In addition, TVA has paid about 5 percent of its power-sales revenues, exclusive of those from Federal agencies, in lieu of taxes.

The enemies of TVA may argue about these figures all they wish, but the truth remains—TVA does pay taxes; it is not getting a free ride at the expense of the taxpayer.

Not only that, but the report shows the TVA rivers are carrying an increasing amount of freight. Research continues in fertilizers, chemistry, and physics.

More than that, it is TVA which is carrying a major load of national defense in the power field.

Without TVA the atomic bomb and later developments would have been long delayed. Future defense plans depend largely on TVA.

All the dam sites long ago were used up. But the valley and its development demand more and more power. It is already worth more to the Nation, as the New York Times said editorially, "than many divisions of troops, many ships, and many airplanes. What it does and can do might make the difference between victory and defeat, or even between peace and war."

That is true.

It is a great national asset.

That greedy men seek to destroy it is one of the more sordid chapters in the long history of greed.

Early Casualty of H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, February 24, 1955, well states the urgent necessity of prompt study leading to a new and more effective policy of industrial and urban dispersal. This could be done either by a Commission as suggested by Defense Mobilizer Fleming or by a congressional committee as proposed in my House Concurrent Resolution 66.

EARLY CASUALTY OF H-BOMB

One of the first casualties of the hydrogen bomb already is being buried by the Government. It is the much-publicized dispersal program for cities and industrial centers, drawn up before the ghastly and far-reaching effects of the H-bomb had been tested. Defense Mobilizer Arthur S. Flemming has told Congress that previous dispersal plans have been outmoded by developments in the grim realm of nuclear explosives. And he has sounded an urgent call for establishment of a special commission to prepare a rush report to Congress on the problem.

The hydrogen bomb has blasted into oblivion the so-called mileage yardstick setup by the civil defense authorities for dispersal of Federal defense and private industrial plants outside of the big cities. That yardstick provided for placing of key buildings and installations at least 10 miles beyond the limits of probable targets of enemy atomic bombers. Washington, of course, stands high on the list of such targets. The Office of Defense Mobilization even went so far as to propose a policy under which no new Federal buildings would be erected here except those housing agencies of a non-sensitive nature.

The old yardstick went out the window when estimates of blast and fallout hazards were confirmed during the H-bomb tests in the Pacific. The Atomic Energy Commission recently revealed that the fallout danger zone of a hydrogen bomb encompasses some

7,000 square miles. Ten-mile dispersal zones, or wider ones, would be completely inadequate against such an attack. Nor would previous plans for rapid evacuation of cities be of much value against the frightening background of the nuclear-fusion threat.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Flemming's suggestion of a prompt study of the new situation by a special commission makes sense. How much hope of survival such a group might be able to offer the potential victims of an H-bomb war, however, is a question which is as uncertain as the intentions of the men inside the Kremlin.

Swiss Watchmakers Lose Tiny Bit of United States Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the reasons for the watch tariff increase are widely misunderstood. I was, therefore, gratified to see in the Chicago American of February 20 an article, by Hal Thompson, which clearly states the case with great objectivity. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SWISS WATCHMAKERS LOSE TINY BIT OF UNITED STATES MARKET

(By Hal Thompson)

There was much wailing and gnashing of the teeth last year by the Swiss watch industry when the United States, in the interest of maintaining its own watch trade as part of a defense preparedness program, boosted the tariff on watch imports.

By lifting the tariff, the United States admittedly hoped to provide a larger portion of the domestic market for its own watchmakers.

The Swiss watch industry, however, hollered loud and long that the action of the United States was discriminatory, that it didn't square with this Nation's professed liberal foreign-trade policy and finally it asserted that the financial loss might well high prove irreparable to Switzerland.

IGNORE UNITED STATES EXPLANATION

Never once to our knowledge did the Swiss ever take cognizance of the number one reason given by the United States for taking such action—the protection of the domestic watch industry, so that it might be ready to turn out military weapons and parts should an emergency arise. That, they probably assumed, was a phony argument.

Well, for the edification of the Swiss it may be reiterated that it wasn't a false contention, but was the principal motivating factor that influenced the tariff commission to recommend the boost in duties on Swiss watches.

The United States needs the watch industry as a link in its defense program and it is committed through this administration to see to it that such facilities are maintained.

But getting back to the breast thumping which the Swiss watchmakers engaged in last year when the notice of the impending tariff hike was issued. At that time they were certain that they would immediately lose the bulk of the American market.

Experience has now shown that they were a bit too pessimistic concerning their industry's prospects in this country.

Figures on exports of Swiss watches for 1954 now are at hand. They show that such exports to the United States on a dollar basis were down only 6 percent from the preceding year.

Such exports last year netted the Swiss watch industry 1,039,915,622 Swiss francs, approximately \$239 million. In the previous year these exports were 1,106,682,297 francs, or \$254 million.

Final statistics on this Nation's exports to Switzerland are not as yet available. However, it is doubted that they will fall below the volume of Swiss watch imports and probably will be a lot larger.

SHOULD BE APPRECIATIVE

Instead of continuing to rail against the United States the Swiss should be appreciative of the flow of American dollars to their nation to help pay for the Swiss exports. So far it hasn't been slowed down very much through the boost in the tariff on Swiss watches. The sum of \$239 million should go a long way toward helping the Swiss industry to assist financially in the maintenance of that nation's defense force.

The United States watch industry also should be afforded an opportunity to assist this country in meeting its defense requirements.

Edith S. Green, Representative From
Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all the State of Oregon is proud of Edith S. Green, Oregon's first woman Member of Congress in 16 years. We know that she will make an outstanding record that will be a credit to her State, her family, her sex, and her country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very informative article about Mrs. GREEN and her noteworthy career, which appeared in the Oregonian of Monday, February 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITH GREEN FINDS CAPITAL BUST, INTERESTING

WASHINGTON.—After 6 weeks of representing Oregon's most populous congressional district, Mrs. EDITH GREEN said of her new job: "I like it very much. It exceeds all my expectations."

That includes, she said, the stacks of letters to be answered as well as the many new challenges, the long hours, as well as the many friendly Oregonians who stop in to say "hello."

As one of 17 women lawmakers in this 84th Congress, Mrs. GREEN is a member of the largest band of women ever to sit in the national legislature. And she has happily discovered there is "certainly no discrimination" by the men who once made lawmaking exclusively their province.

Mrs. GREEN said the transition from ex-Representative Homer D. Angell's departure from office to her entrance into it was made smooth by Angell's helpfulness in turning over his files on such matters as pending

immigration cases and appointments of young men from Oregon to West Point and Annapolis, as well as his advice and counsel.

"Mr. Angell was very cooperative and kind," said Mrs. GREEN. "I have found that other Congressmen have not had the same experience, so that is why I especially appreciate it."

Representative GREEN has good cause to feel grateful on another score, in view of the choice committee posts she received from the Democratic leadership. She got her first choice, Labor and Education Committee, plus a special dividend, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

EDUCATION FIRST INTEREST

As a former schoolteacher, Mrs. GREEN's first love is legislation to promote improvements in the Nation's educational process. She favors a broad program of Federal aid to the States for support of local school programs, and said she thought President Eisenhower's recent proposal "does not meet in any degree the severity of the problem."

One of her first bills introduced in Congress was in this general field—a measure to authorize \$7,500,000 annually for Federal payments to the States for use in extending the public library service to rural areas.

Her first concern in the field of her other committee is power. When the time comes she expects to throw her weight in the committee to gain favorable action on legislation to authorize a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon on the Oregon-Idaho border. This may be the next big fight in that committee, now that statehood for Hawaii and Alaska has been approved by a 19 to 6 vote in which Mrs. GREEN voted for both.

ELASTIC SCHEDULE FOLLOWED

With committee hearings taking a big bite out of her mornings, Mrs. GREEN in her first week's office has operated on an elastic daily schedule which usually bulged out at both ends into this sort of typical day:

8:30 a. m.: Breakfast meeting, usually 3 or 4 mornings a week. Each Wednesday it is with the Democratic freshman lawmakers, who elected her president of their group, the 84th Club. Others are various groups and associations.

9:30 a. m.: Arrive at office, scan first batch of mail to come in, deal personally with most important matters, confer with administrative assistant, Don Larson, and delegate assignments to staff. Her staff here includes Larson and two secretaries, Sue Mills and Patricia Hobbs.

10:30 a. m.: Off to a committee meeting until noon.

Noon: Lunch, almost invariably with visiting Oregonians, whom Mrs. GREEN says "make home seem much closer than 3,000 miles away."

12:30 or 1 p. m.: Go to House Chamber for afternoon session, unless House is in recess for day, which sees her back at office for scheduled appointments. She has average of three afternoon appointments, often with Oregonians who have come personally to the Capitol for solutions to the problems with the Government. Others on calling list have included labor officials and representatives of various groups trying to enlist her backing for this or that bill or cause. Among them was Mrs. Elizabeth Roelcloud, of 3120 Southwest Schools Ferry Road, Portland, who is currently associate director of the American Indian Development Program of National Congress of American Indians. She sought to familiarize Mrs. GREEN with Indian problems that may arise in the Interior Committee.

6:30 p. m.: Dinner, usually at nearby restaurant.

8:30 p. m.: Back to office to finish up answering mail, which has been running 50 to 100 letters daily since Congress convened.

The No. 1 plea numerically in the mailbox of the Third District Representative has been

from the postal workers of the Portland area for the 10-percent pay raise they want from Congress. Mrs. GREEN is on their side, having cosponsored a bill to this effect.

Next on list of topics of current concern in Portland, judging by her mail, has been foreign trade, with many conflicting views being voiced. Mrs. GREEN backed up her support of continued reciprocal trading by voting this past week for the broadened trade bill advocated by President Eisenhower. In preliminary skirmishing on the bill, she went along with those who voted to open the bill up to amendments on the House floor, but later switched her vote to prevent this after Speaker SAM RAYBURN made a dramatic plea for reversal of this action. It carried by one vote, 193 to 192.

While most of her correspondence comes from her district, Mrs. GREEN has been surprised to find women from throughout the Nation writing to endorse her bill to lower from 65 to 60 the age at which women qualify for social-security benefits.

NEWSLETTER ISSUED

To keep in touch personally with many of her constituents in Multnomah County, the Congresswoman has begun writing a newsletter which went to 10,000 homes the first run and is to go to many more in subsequent editions. And she is dicker with Portland radio and television stations for time in which to present periodic reports.

"I want to let the people in my district know what we are doing here and what my views are on the issues," said Mrs. GREEN, explaining she hopes this will increase their interest in national affairs so they will "let me know what they think."

Another device for keeping in closer touch with constituents, said Mrs. GREEN, is her local office in the Portland Post Office Building where Mrs. Sybil Rinke maintains office hours from 10 a. m. to 6 p. m. daily and 10 to 1 Saturday. She said she finds this is particularly helpful to constituents who might find it difficult to explain their problem in a letter directly to her and can't afford a trip to Washington, D. C. She said "dozens" of persons have discussed such problems with Mrs. Rinke, who has communicated with the Congresswoman about them.

Like many other women who have made successful political careers, such as Mrs. Dorothy McCullough Lee, Portland ex-mayor now on the Federal Parole Board, and Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Portland's new woman lawmaker doesn't despair at the little time her job may leave her for housekeeping.

She and her husband and son have an apartment in the suburbs in which they slept on cots "camping out style" until their furniture arrived from Portland after some delay last month. They are now looking for something a bit larger.

"But I have never been one to sit at home," declared Mrs. GREEN. "I like work—challenging work. All the issues I am concerned about are here, and this is the best opportunity one can have to do something constructive about them."

The Greatest Wonder: The Epic of the Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the

RECORD an article entitled "The Greatest Wonder," published in the Red Lantern, the publication of the 40 & 8 organization. The article refers to the 4 chaplains, 1 a rabbi, 1 a Catholic priest, and 2 Protestant ministers, who went down at sea on a troopship during World War II.

To my mind the story here retold records one of the most wonderful examples of unity in our country, and the article should receive the very careful consideration of all Americans, particularly at this time.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST WONDER

A dozen years have passed since the German torpedo found its mark and the United States troopship *Dorchester* went under the icy Atlantic off Labrador. Six hundred lives were lost that night—and yet, in the annals of American history, this disaster must be listed as a victory, not a defeat.

For in those grim moments on the sinking ship, the American dreams of unity took substance. Amongst the frightened and the dying, 4 men of God walked together—1 Catholic, 1 Jewish and 2 Protestant. Calmly, quietly, they helped the boys into their lifebelts and bolstered their morale with words of hope and encouragement as they leaped over the side. Deftly they administered to the needs of the wounded, easing their pain, offering God's solace and reassuring as they waited for the end to come. And resolutely—as one man—they made their heroic choice. To stay with the ship; to give their own life belts to four youngsters unable to reach their own; to go down with the injured, praying, comforting, inspiring to the very last.

George Fox, Alexander Goode, Clark Poling and John P. Washington stood on the deck of the *Dorchester*. Their backgrounds were different; so were their creeds. But their spirit—the spirit of American unity—was the same. The men in the lifeboats saw them, arms linked, Bibles in hand, till the waters swallowed the ship. Those men and all future Americans will see them thus in their minds forever.

World War II was still far from over. Some of the bitterest battles were yet to be won. But, pitted against nazism with its vicious doctrine of racial and religious bigotry, were the teamwork and brotherhood symbolized by the Four Chaplains. The news of their heroism helped seal the fate of the German superman.

Twelve years have brought many scientific wonders to America's arsenal. But the epic of the Four Chaplains reminds us that however fast our planes, however powerful our weapons, the greatest wonder and the greatest strength still lies in our national brotherhood—in the fellowship that unites and protects us all.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Decatur Daily, of Decatur, Ala., an editorial entitled "What Are You Waiting For?"

The editorial deals with the proposed program of extending Federal aid for the construction of school buildings, and the editorial relates particularly to the hearings which have been conducted by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of my distinguished, very able, and long-time colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

I think the editorial is a very good one, and is interesting, informative, and thought-provoking. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be reproduced in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE YOU WAITING FOR?

Senator LISTER HILL, who has had as much to do with the education and welfare of the American people during his term of service in the Congress as any man, continues to spur the Congress toward action in meeting the increasing American school crisis.

Indicative of progress is the representation in Washington before committee hearings from back home. In our own county of Morgan both superintendent of county schools Lester Wooten and Decatur superintendent of schools Walter Jackson have testified as to school needs. There have been many others. The appeals to committee members is straight from the grassroots.

Senator HILL is saying in substance to fellow Congressmen, "What are you waiting for?" in the following statement made to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held extensive hearings on school construction legislation last spring. In those hearings witnesses provided a very complete picture of the education crisis as of that time. It is our purpose at these present hearings to bring the information on the needs of our Nation's schools up to date.

"The need for speedy action to meet the situation in our schools becomes more urgent every day. There is no need for lengthy proceeding at this time, particularly since our committee made such a full inquiry last year. What is needed in this emergency is to take emergency action.

"There is no more pressing problem confronting the Nation today than the crisis in our schools. Each day the shortage of classrooms grows more severe and we are finding ourselves with fewer and fewer trained teachers. School operating expenses have risen to new heights. The total financial demands are so great that, despite heroic efforts in community after community, we continue to fall further and further behind as each year brings a new and greater floodtide of children into our schools.

"Today it is estimated that over one-half of the classrooms in the Nation are so overcrowded as to make effective teaching almost impossible. Every 15 minutes of everyday our tremendous birthrate is bringing 30 more children into the population—creating a need, in effect, or another classroom and another teacher. Within 3 years our shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation will have climbed to 800,000. Day by day we are falling behind, with serious damage to our children and to the Nation. Millions of American boys and girls are being denied their American birthright—the right to an adequate education. Our national security is being endangered by the inability of our schools to provide the basic training needed by many who might become scientists and engineers and research workers and leaders in every walk of life. We are stricken by the worst wave of juvenile delinquency in our

history because children are neglected and too often left to roam the streets.

We know that this past year enrollment again broke all records. We were short at least 370,000 classrooms last September and faced a net lack of about 135,000 new teachers.

People throughout the country are demanding, rightfully, that the Congress act to remedy these intolerable conditions. They are troubled not only for the well-being of the children themselves, but by the possibility that our superiority in the struggle against communism may be menaced by our failure to maintain American brain-power to overbalance the Soviet bloc's massive brawn-power."

Dissent and Separate Views of Commissioner Chet Holifield on Commission Report on Medical Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission released as of today—February 28—their recommendations regarding medical services furnished by the Federal Government to veterans, military personnel, and others.

I present herewith a copy of my dissenting and separate views to the majority recommendation and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

DISSENT AND SEPARATE VIEWS OF COMMISSIONER CHET HOLIFIELD ON COMMISSION REPORT ON MEDICAL SERVICES

The burden of the complaint in the Commission report is that (1) too many persons are receiving medical (particularly hospital) care at Federal expense; (2) they are receiving more care than is necessary; and (3) the Federal Government is maintaining more facilities than are needed to take care of the present patient load.

The Commission therefore proposes that no more general hospitals be built by the Veterans' Administration, that some VA hospitals be closed, and that hospital care for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities be limited in several ways. An effort is made, also, to reduce disability allowances to veterans.

Furthermore it is proposed that the general hospitals of the Public Health Service be closed and that merchant seamen no longer be given medical care by the Federal Government. Other beneficiaries and their dependents now receiving care at such hospitals (commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, and employees of the Coast Guard and Coast and Geodetic Survey) would be shifted to military hospitals for treatment pending the development of voluntary health insurance plans for all Federal Government employees.

Hospital and clinical facilities of the military services would be reduced by making one service in a given geographic area responsible for taking care of all military patients, whether Army, Navy, or Air Force. Dependents of military personnel would have access to military medical facilities only until such time as voluntary contributory plans for health insurance are developed by the Federal Government.

My objections to certain parts of the report are summarized as follows:

1. Hospital and other medical facilities of the Federal Government should not be curtailed in the face of impending civilian defense needs and greater Federal responsibilities in meeting them, which have yet to be clearly defined. Recent disclosures of the potential danger of radioactive fallout to millions of people are reason enough to make us pause and proceed with care.

2. Until the health insurance programs proposed by the Commission for Government employees generally and for dependents of military and certain other Government personnel are fully developed, and their adequacy demonstrated, I am opposed to any reduction whatever in the Federal medical services presently available to such persons.

3. It is not in keeping with congressional intent to take a narrow and restrictive view of hospital care for veterans. Although the veteran population will decrease, medical needs will increase as it grows older. On the basis of present and authorized hospital facilities, the Veterans' Administration should be able to plan and provide a stable program of medical care to veterans without severe restrictions on eligibility.

4. The proposal to make veterans who receive medical care for non-service-connected disabilities liable for future payment is wholly unrealistic. It poses awkward and difficult problems of assessing costs and enforcing collection in future years. It would create inequities as between those who received care in the past and those who receive it in the present or future.

5. Medical care for merchant seamen in hospitals of the Public Health Service in an historic function of the Service dating back to its inception more than 150 years ago. Whatever the arguments for discontinuing such medical care, certainly the Federal Government has a responsibility to see that suitable alternatives are developed within the maritime industry before terminating present arrangements. Huge subsidies paid to ship owners and operators by the Government should provide sufficient leverage to cause the industry to initiate and develop a program of medical care for merchant seamen.

I would add as a general comment that the repeated mention in the report of alleged waste in expenditures for Government medical facilities and services should not make us lose sight of the tragic waste of human life resulting from inadequate medical care.

The Government is said to be furnishing some type of medical service to 30 million people. Among the millions of taxpayers who do not receive such assistance, or receive it only in minor degree, are many families unable to meet the present high costs of medical care.

When the Government faces up to this problem and takes the initiative in devising an adequate medical insurance system for the whole population, perhaps it will be relieved in substantial part of the heavy demands for direct medical services and resultant large expenditure cited in this report.

From Yalta to Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on last February 11 the Yalta treaty was 10 years old. This tragic blunder should be remembered by all and sundry, because we can sometimes learn from our errors. We can only do this if we face

up to these errors squarely, with penitent and contrite hearts.

The following article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlain retells the whole dismal fiasco and points up once again that it might be well if we would stand by our friends, instead of trying to win over enemies who are still bent on our destruction as much today as they were 10 years ago:

FROM YALTA TO FORMOSA

(By William Henry Chamberlain)

The 10th anniversary of the Yalta agreement between Roosevelt, Stalin, and Churchill, which came on February 11, 1955, should not be overlooked. Not that it is a date to inspire any feelings of pride or happiness. Yalta was one of the greatest moral and diplomatic defeats in the history of the United States. But the memory of defeats is sometimes more instructive than the recollection of victories, especially at a time when new defeats of the Yalta type cannot be ruled out.

Yalta has been a main target of the white-wash brigade of the Roosevelt administration, of course, and historians and apologists. Desperate efforts have been made to prove either that Yalta was a regrettable military necessity or that the original pact would have been excellent if Stalin had only kept his word; that Roosevelt agreed to nothing that was dishonorable or contrary to United States national interests.

So it is worthwhile to recall those features of the Yalta pact which mark it as both a crime and a blunder and a sort of Pandora's Box, from which most of our international troubles in the postwar era have emerged.

First, Yalta signalized the abandonment of the free Poles, who had been fighting on our side during the war, the throwing over of their representative government and the acceptance of a made-in-Moscow puppet regime which has been governing Poland as a Soviet province ever since. At the same time, although the Atlantic Charter is hypocritically invoked in the past several times, there were several flagrant and obvious violations of the Atlantic Charter assurances of self-determination for peoples.

The Soviet Union was allowed to incorporate, without a plebiscite, about half of Poland's prewar territory and about one-third of the prewar Polish population. Poland was given "compensation" in the annexation of considerable areas which were historically and ethnically German. This was emphatically a case when two wrongs did not make a right.

The Soviet Union was also assured a stranglehold on China's most industrialized area, Manchuria, and this was done without consulting or even informing the ally concerned, the Nationalist Government of China. The United States in the Yalta pact set the seal of its approval on the dismemberment of Germany and on the use of German slave labor as "reparations." The United States and Great Britain consented to be policemen for the execution of a kind of fugitive slave law. They assumed the obligation to return to death or concentration camps Soviet citizens who were found in the western zones of occupation.

No amount of apologetics on the part of Dean Acheson, the Alsop brothers and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., can obscure the plain historical fact that Yalta was a tremendous factor in the consolidation of the super-Genghis Khan empire which the Kremlin built up from the Baltic to the Pacific. Yalta made the United States and Great Britain accomplices—"unwitting handmaidens," if one prefers the expression—in the underwriting of this empire.

News of the Yalta agreement was a blow to anti-Communist forces of freedom everywhere, among the Poles and the other peoples of Eastern Europe, among the Germans,

among the Chinese. If the United States and Great Britain were not prepared to stand up to Stalin, how could weaker countries, or resistance groups within these countries hope to do so?

It is sometimes argued by apologists for Yalta that Stalin received under this pact little which he had not taken, or could not have taken by force of arms. But this overlooks the vital point that American and British military sanction made the Soviet dictator's tremendous land grabs very much easier.

Even after Yalta, underground groups in Poland continued the struggle against Russian and Communist rule. They were only suppressed after thousands had been killed on both sides in the unequal struggle with the government troops and police. Had there been no acquiescence in Poland's mutilation and the subjugation by the Western powers, the underground struggle would, in all probability, have been much harder to put down.

Another argument of the Yalta apologists is that it was a great moral victory to persuade Stalin to sign his name to some promises about democracy, free elections, etc., all of which he broke without the slightest intention of keeping. In view of Stalin's long previous record of bad faith, this is something like hailing it as a sign of financial genius to accept without question at face value the checks of a notorious fraudulent bankrupt.

Was there an alternative to the Yalta sell-out of Poland, of Nationalist China, of the ideals of Western civilization? Of course there was. The United States could have announced that it stood on the ground of the Atlantic Charter, that it did not propose to annex foreign territory itself and would not recognize as legitimate one square mile of Stalin's annexations beyond the prewar frontiers of the Soviet Union. Behind this declaration would have stood the power of a country that was still fresh in the war, that had achieved the mightiest concentration of air and naval power in history, that would soon detonate the atomic bomb. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, was exhausted in manpower and resources, had sustained enormous casualties and was dependent on American lend-lease trucks, food, and field telephones to keep its offensives rolling.

The chances are that Stalin would have bowed to such a firm and clearcut statement of purpose. And if he had proved intransigent, the showdown in 1945 would have been less costly and risky than a showdown in 1955, or in 1965.

Yalta was not an isolated lapse. It was a consequence as much as a cause, a consequence of the persistently favored delusion of the Roosevelt administration that, if Stalin was only flattered and appeased enough, he would become a cooperative dogooder in a brave new world.

In the interest of this delusion American public opinion was systematically drugged by the agencies for molding public opinion during the war. And it must be recognized that some eminent commentators, columnists, and magazine editors were pretty willing drug addicts.

As a result, it was only by stealthy, almost underground methods and in publications of limited circulation, like Human Events, that the less pleasant facts of Soviet behavior in newly annexed territory were brought to light. American public opinion at the time of the Yalta conference had been deliberately denied the facts on which it might have judged what a monstrous thing it was to hand over people to Communist rule or to send back Soviet refugees.

Few Americans at that time realized that the Soviet Government had murdered 15,000 Polish officer war prisoners in cold blood in the Katyn Forest and elsewhere (this atrocity was conveniently ascribed to the Nazis); that about a million and a quarter human

beings had been deported from eastern Poland under circumstances so cruel that about a quarter of them perished; or that similar atrocities were committed in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

I happened to be present at a small, informal dinner in a representative medium-sized American city just after the news of Yalta was announced. One of those present was an Estonian woman who had escaped from that Baltic country before the Communists took over. Her husband, less fortunate, had been shot. She knew, and I knew, that Yalta amounted to ringing down the curtain on freedom in Eastern Europe for a long time.

But the other guests—not Communists or fellow travelers, just average Americans—were enthusiastic over what they considered the happy news of agreement at Yalta. Had not Raymond Gram Swing assured them that "No more appropriate news could be conceived to celebrate the birthday of Abraham Lincoln" and Senator ALBEN BARKLEY given his blessing to "one of the most important steps ever taken to promote peace and happiness in the world"?

By appropriate coincidence the 10th anniversary of Yalta comes at a time when tremendous pressure is being put on the United States to repeat the Yalta formula of giving the Communists everything they want in the Pacific. Again we are being called on to sacrifice a loyal fighting ally, Chiang Kai-shek, in pursuit of the will-of-the-wisp of placating and appeasing an implacable and unappeasable enemy in Peiping and in Moscow.

Have we learned the bitter unmistakable lesson of Yalta, that appeasement in international relations, like blackmail in personal relations, never pays off and never ends? In that case we will keep up our clear "No trespassing" sign around Formosa and give the power-drunk dictators in Peiping the choice between backing down on their tail talk about liberating Formosa or taking on the United States in an air and naval war, in which there will be no privileged sanctuary, as in Manchuria during the Korean war. In this case we will win, whatever decision may be taken in Peiping, and will regain in Asia and in the world some of the prestige that was lost by the war fought with one hand tied behind our back in Korea and by the policy of shaking first a fist, then a finger, in Indochina.

But the decision to bring the United Nations, of unhappy memory for its ignoble role in Korea, into a picture as an agency for bringing about a cease-fire is full of ominous possibilities. Very few members of the United Nations are wholeheartedly committed, as we are, to keeping Formosa and the adjacent islands free from Communist domination.

We have had the spectacle of a distinguished British thinker, Bertrand Russell, going temporarily off his rocker and suggesting that 1955 may see the end of the human race, unless the fighting in Formosan waters is stopped. We can rely on Prime Minister Nehru of India, on the basis of his past performance in Korea, to serve up all sorts of 99-percent surrenders to Red China in the guise of acceptable compromises.

There will be a Tower of Babel chorus of voices urging us to be "flexible," not to stick at a trifle like surrendering the offshore islands which are so essential for the defense of Formosa. Few if any voices will urge the Chinese Communists to be flexible.

It is worth remembering that 10 years ago we sacrificed a fighting loyal ally, Free Poland, and in the vain hope of placating Stalin and winning a peace. Let us not imagine that we shall appease Mao Tse-tung and buy peace, in our time or for any long time, if we offer up Free China as a sacrifice in a Formosan Yalta.

Hon. Pete Jarman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart and much regret that I belatedly learned of the passing of a colleague and friend, the Honorable Pete Jarman, Congressman from Alabama for the years 1937 through 1949.

Despite the great distance separating our respective constituencies, I found that the common ground of this House afforded me the privileged opportunity of knowing this great American. The tribute I wish to pay him, on the advent of his passing on February 17, is best told by way of the following anecdote:

It seems that at this particular time, Mr. Jarman was a member of the committee having jurisdiction over the Public Printer and, hence, the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In those days the RECORD was printed in two columns instead of the present three columnar arrangement. The then Public Printer, Mr. Augustus E. Giegengack, had sought for some time to change the format of the RECORD so as to effect a sizable economy of some \$200,000 per Congress; but for some reason had not been too successful in selling his idea to the committee. Mr. Giegengack brought the matter to my attention which I, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, pursued in a statement on the floor when the matter came before this House. After presenting the case for revision of the RECORD, I was forcefully asked by Mr. Jarman if I would yield—which I granted. He consumed the first 5 minutes excoriating the Appropriations Committee's position in concerning itself with a matter not properly their primary concern. His indignant objections were interrupted by the Speaker's gavel giving notice that his time had expired. I immediately asked if the gentleman from Alabama desired additional time; for I felt that he had not touched on the merits of the question in his preoccupation of reprimanding the Appropriations Committee. The next 5 minutes were spent in the same manner as the first 5; for he was exercised greatly by what he considered an imposition on his committee's rights. But at each additional grant of time his vindictiveness waned until he culminated some 45 minutes later somewhat spent. He never honored my question on the floor, but was later instrumental in revising the RECORD to its present form and effecting the great savings.

Some time later I encountered the lovely Mrs. Jarman in a casual social gathering where, in her inimitable charming manner, she assured me that Pete intended nothing personal in his remarks. Strangely enough, I had felt no personal abuse from Pete Jarman's comments; instead, I was struck by the vitality of his manner in standing up to

what he considered an encroachment of authority. It was principle, not personality that brought his verbal wrath upon our heads. This misunderstanding was the beginning of a long and memorable personal friendship with a truly great American who jealously guarded the principles of Jeffersonian democracy with uncompromising dedication.

In this day when expediency is sometimes confused with principle, the absence of men like Pete Jarman shall be noticeable. His service to country has been recorded here; his spirit, I pray, shall always permeate the proceedings of this House.

I tender to Mrs. Jarman deep sympathy in this time of her great bereavement and sorrow.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a letter sent to me which includes therein a resolution adopted by the priests and people of St. Casimir's Parish, in Westfield, Mass., at a meeting in St. Casimir's Hall on February 20, 1955:

WESTFIELD, MASS., February 20, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK,

Majority Leader,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: February 16, 1955, marked the 37th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence. To commemorate the event with appropriate patriotic exercises, the priests and people of St. Casimir's Parish in Westfield, Mass., and their guests from the surrounding cities and towns assembled together at St. Casimir's Hall in Westfield on February 20, 1955. In the course of the celebration those assembled unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas in 1940 Soviet Russia, in vicious conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all the treaties and obligations solemnly underwritten by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and, against the will of the people, annexed her to the Soviet Union, and, in 1944, following the defeat of the German armies on the eastern front, again took over that country in complete disregard of the wartime policies and obligations to which the Soviet Union was co-signatory with the United States and other Allies of World War II;

"Whereas Soviet Russia absolutely refuses to stop the persecution of religion in Lithuania, to exile her freedom-loving people into the cold, bleak wastes of Siberia, to plunder her people and institutions, and to separate the members of one family, one from the other;

"Whereas military aggression is not the sole means of enslaving people today, nor are conventional arms the only ways of conquest, intrigue, subversion, propaganda, and economic pressure are also weapons which have been used to diabolic perfection by the sadistic Kremlin masters;

"Whereas the United States has always followed a democratic policy based on the prin-

ciple that a true and lasting peace cannot exist in the world unless the peoples of every nation, be it large or small, are permitted to determine for themselves their own form of government, without the interference of any outside source; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States refuses to recognize and has on repeated occasions denounced the subjugation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States by Russia and the present President of the United States in his preelection campaign talks has stated that Lithuania and other countries like her should be freed from Russian aggression; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the American citizens of Lithuanian descent of the city of Westfield, That a new committee to investigate the facts and techniques of Communist aggression be appointed by the 84th Congress in order to continue and complete the work splendidly done, during the last Congress by the select Committee on Communist Aggression headed by former Representative Charles J. Kersten; be it

"Resolved, That the United States Government sponsor a resolution in the United Nations based upon the finding and conclusions of said investigation, denouncing the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all the nations now enslaved by communism; be it

"Resolved, That the Government of the United States ratify immediately the Genocide Convention, an act which will open up the way for Lithuania to present her just and legitimate case to the free world and without which little hope remains for the poor unfortunate victims of Soviet tyranny and aggression; be it

"Resolved, That we express our profound and sincere gratitude to the United States of America for the tremendous support it has given to Lithuania by refusing to recognize the unjust enslavement of the Republic of Lithuania, by the Soviet Union and by continuing to recognize the diplomatic representatives of Lithuania in the United States, and that the Government of the United States enter into no agreements which would in any way acknowledge the fruits of any past, present, or future Soviet aggression; be it further

"Resolved, That the Genocide Convention be immediately ratified by the Senate of the United States so that Soviet Russia may be made criminally responsible for the genocide perpetrated by her in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it finally

"Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of Westfield, Mass., once again reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their whole-hearted support of the administration and Congress of the United States in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world."

CHAS. A. COVALESKI,
Chairman.
ANTHONY J. ROGERS,
Secretary.

Plea for British Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the partition of Ireland, now 30 years in existence, daily becomes a greater irritant to the naturally close and friendly rela-

tions which the people of Ireland seek to enjoy with the British people.

The solidarity of Western opposition to the communism of the East is broken by the absence of Ireland from the community of nations banded together for the mutual defense of Western civilization. Lacking the actual jurisdiction over a part of the natural territory of the Irish Republic, Ireland is unable to commit her people or her land to the NATO countries, since such commitment would imply the acknowledgment of British sovereignty over the subjected six counties in her north.

Mr. Liam Cosgrave, Ireland's Minister of External Affairs, recently called upon British statesmen to set an example for the rest of the world by the ending of the partition of Ireland. In this connection, I include with these remarks the following United Press article from the Washington Daily News, Monday, February 7, 1955:

PLEA FOR BRITISH STATESMANSHIP—IRISH FOREIGN MINISTER CALLS FOR END OF PARTITION

DUBLIN, February 7.—Liam Cosgrave, Irish Minister of External Affairs, called on Britain today to end the north-south partition of Ireland "as one of the greatest possible acts of statesmanship" toward strengthening the free world against the dangers of communism.

In an exclusive interview with the United Press, Mr. Cosgrave said unification of the six British-controlled counties of Northern Ireland with the Irish Republic "would not only begin a period of real and sincere friendship between England and Ireland, but allow Ireland, with her strong racial attachments to the United States, to become a new and important link between America and England."

Mr. Cosgrave said no state in the free world was more opposed to communism than Ireland.

ANTIRED

"The Irish Government has no relations with any of the Communist states nor does it propose to enter in such relations," he declared.

But, he added firmly, it is difficult for Ireland to consider membership in the anti-Communist North Atlantic Alliance so long as the question of her own sovereignty "hangs like a baneful specter over our foreign policy."

He said Ireland would never recognize nor reconcile herself with permanent British rule in the six counties of northern Ireland.

"We can no more yield forever to partition of our country," he said, "than Germany can to her division between east and west."

Britain should realize this inevitability, he said, and take the first opportunity to allow consolidation of the country under the Irish flag—"she should not allow the Irish problem to be another one of too little and too late."

Mr. Cosgrave, a vigorous man of only 35 years, spoke with great feeling in discussing what he described as the right of the Irish people to live as one nation.

COOPERATION

He said there was some encouragement in signs of increasing cooperation between the republic and the six northern counties. He cited the electrification projects on the Erne River, fisheries control in the Foyle Estuary, and joint control of the Great Northern Railway linking Dublin with Belfast, principal city of the British-ruled north.

"I know that British leaders are terribly anxious over the possibility that some day atomic bombs will be dropped out of the skies

in the region of the Irish Sea and destroy England. In an international situation which makes such an eventually possible, it is obvious that England could be greatly aided by having Ireland as her true friend, a friend that could be made by ending partition now, without waiting for it to be exploited by people who are enemies of Britain and Ireland alike, and who profit by such divisions within the free world."

Who Are the Irresponsibles?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Who Are the Irresponsibles?" which appeared in the February 25 issue of Labor's Daily:

WHO ARE THE IRRESPONSIBLES?

(By Willard Shelton)

President Eisenhower's indignation at what he labels the "fiscal irresponsibility" of the Democratic tax-cut plan seems the emotion of an Executive who is able to tolerate only his own kind of irresponsibility, which of course, he considers mere hardened common sense.

Mr. Eisenhower didn't call the personal income-tax cuts advocated and passed by Republican congressional leaders in 1953 irresponsible.

He didn't think it was irresponsible fiscally to kill the corporation excess-profits tax at the end of 1953, and to advocate and sign another tax bill in 1954 that in the name of technical corrections gave corporations enormous favors in the way of quick writeoffs on equipment and carry-forward, carry-back devices for lowering actual tax payments.

His Treasury Department lost about \$1½ billion in corporate tax revenues in the first 7 months of the current fiscal year as a result of these tax revisions, but Mr. Eisenhower didn't think it wrong to grant these favors even at the expense of a still-unbalanced budget.

The Eisenhower administration threw all its heavy guns into a fight last year to grant special tax favors to corporate stockholders, with the great bulk of relief going to the families with the largest income from stocks.

Democrats fought the plan, and forced modification of the original program, but the principle of greater favors to investors than to people who earn their incomes from current work was written into the law. This scheme is costing the Treasury some hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes that otherwise would have been payable on April 15, and applicable against the \$4.5 billion deficit Treasury Secretary Humphrey expects. But the President didn't deem that tax cut for stockholders "irresponsible."

The only time Congressmen act with fiscal irresponsibility, according to the administration theme, seems to be when they propose a tax cut that would do something for the low-income and medium-income families.

It becomes especially wicked, apparently, when they attach this plan to an administration-backed revenue bill and thus make it impossible for the President to veto it as a separate item.

Mr. Eisenhower, of course, could veto the whole bill and demand reenactment of his

own program minus the Democratic amendments, but this would require moral courage on his part and the capacity to wage a successful fight over the head of Congress by appealing directly to the people. He does not seem to view this alternative with relish, preferring to talk about the alleged lack of courage of Democrats in refusing to make it easy for him to outmaneuver them.

The Democratic-sponsored \$20-per-person tax cut may never go through. It faces opposition in the Senate from such orthodox financial leaders as Senators Bryan and George, both Democrats—who were also orthodox enough last year, incidentally, to support the President on tax cuts to favor corporations and their stockholders.

It passes understanding, however, that the only tax relief tolerable to the President is "trickle-down" relief, with the public supposed vaguely to benefit eventually by the money corporations save on their tax bills—and with Mr. Eisenhower permitted next year, the election year, to have all the advantage of general tax-cut proposals.

Hoover Commission Report on Medical Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the Hoover Commission report on medical services which was released to the press yesterday and which will shortly come before Congress. The report contains many sweeping and, I think, dangerous innovations. Today I wish to call attention only to recommendation No. 15 and a part of recommendation No. 17.

No. 15 is "that the provision of hospital and clinical services to American merchant seamen by the Federal Government be ended."

No. 17 provides that, except for certain institutions not pertinent to my comments, "the Public Health Service should close all of its general hospitals."

Since 1798 the Federal Government has provided some medical and hospital service to American-flag seamen, under authorities enacted, and with funds appropriated, by Congress. There are now, I believe, 12 general hospitals owned by the Government in which such cases are handled. One is known as the Public Health Service Hospital on Staten Island, in the district I represent.

The Public Health Service Hospital on Staten Island is one of the largest general hospitals operated by Public Health Service. It has 800 beds and has been running 80 to 85 percent filled. Something like two-thirds of its patients are American seamen. If service to those seamen were to be ended, as the report recommends, the hospital would of course have to close entirely. Beyond that, recommendation No. 17 expressly urges that it be closed.

Closing of that hospital would be calamitous in many ways for the community and would be a serious step backward for the Government. Such a

move would work against the Government's policy of developing and maintaining a strong privately owned and operated merchant marine to be available for Government use in time of emergency, as well as for Government and private business at other times. And with present uncertainties as to whether or not, and if so when, a national emergency will develop, it seems unthinkable that the Government would consider closing an 800-bed hospital now fully staffed and equipped, in the part of the country in which that hospital stands.

I have the highest regard for the Hoover Commission and its work thus far, but not for this report. While I have spoken today only of the Public Health Service general hospitals in relation to merchant seamen, there are a number of other recommendations which seem open to serious question. It is fortunate that recommendations 15 and 17, as well as some of the others, cannot be made effective without first repealing or amending existing statutes. That fact insures time and opportunity for adequate study and consideration of the revolutionary changes proposed.

Señor Miguel Alemán, Former President of Mexico, Encourages Joint Action in Promoting Economic Development of Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as a result of several visits to Mexico, the countries of Central America and South America, I have become greatly impressed with the economic future of these countries and the possibility of the extensive development of their resources.

In view of the above I have been a strong and persistent advocate of closer relations between our Nation and those to the south. I regret that the advantage of such a policy has not been recognized as fully as it should have been. I trust, however, that a better understanding and a greater cooperation will grow out of the combined efforts that are finding expression in many different ways.

In this connection, I call attention to the Inter-American Investment Conference opening in New Orleans on February 28, 1955. This conference was initiated in Washington officially; then the idea was taken up unofficially by several parties and sponsored by the city of New Orleans through its International House and by Life and Time magazines. The individuals in charge of promoting the idea are Mr. Edgar R. Baker and Mr. Rudolph S. Hecht.

Señor Miguel Alemán, former President of Mexico, was invited to attend but was unable to do so because of prior engagements in Central and South Amer-

ica. However, he sent the conference a message, as follows:

Latin America requires capital for development, designed to enlarge her economy on a plan of collaboration with her private capital resources, through sound investments creative of new sources of wealth and of labor, making for the real permanent advancement of each of her countries and of the hemispheric community.

We are all good neighbors and loyal partners and should furthermore be devoted in common to the principles of democracy applied to human fellowship in all its aspects and everywhere.

In the spiritual field, by consecrating ourselves to the service of the fundamental liberties to believe and to think, as well as of the freedom to express thoughts and beliefs.

In the economic field, by joining our efforts in order to make the progress of our countries an exemplary thesis set before the world, conceived in the following terms:

That private investments made for the equitable profit of all concerned do firmly uphold, together with justice, the peace among nations.

That in order to abolish the dire impoverishment which is one of the breeding grounds of communism, it is not enough to aim at a decorous poverty; the decided promotion of a generous and honorable abundance for all is what is needed.

This is now possible in the New World, as proven by the determination that inspires the Inter-American Investment Conference.

The spirit of cooperation and mutual helpfulness expressed by former President Alemán are entitled to serious consideration. A recognition of such principles would help materially in promoting goodwill between the respective nations in the Americas.

Work of the American Friends Service Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the American Friends Service Committee has long been known for its practical application of the principles of Christianity. Its wide range of activities is indicated by the following summary taken from the January 1955 issue of the American Friends Service Committee Bulletin:

QUAKER SERVICE TAKES MANY FORMS

COLLEGES

Staff members in 10 regions and New York City visited 350 college campuses to recruit workers and leaders for 55 summer projects and held 75 one- and two-day conferences on world affairs.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

We worked to integrate members of minorities (most of them Negroes) in employment (Dallas, Chicago, Columbus, Greensboro, N. C., Indianapolis and Philadelphia); housing (Philadelphia, Chicago, and two areas near San Francisco); and the classroom (Washington, D. C.). We helped Indians adjust to city life in Rapid City, S. Dak., and Los Angeles. On reservations from Maine to California our staff encouraged self-help projects of economic and social betterment.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

Two staff members counseled several hundred objectors and visited 1,000 others in prisons, Army stockades, and at work in hospitals across the Nation. We assigned 9 conscientious objectors who sought work with the AFSC to projects in the United States, 19 to Mexico and El Salvador, and 12 overseas.

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS FOR CHILDREN

Thousands of youngsters aided children overseas by making mitten trees at Christmas or becoming friendly beggars at Halloween. Traveling exhibits and booklets like *If You Were a Child in Korea* enabled children overseas to share their games and crafts with American youngsters.

FOOD

We shipped 2,338 tons of surplus food to 6 nations (and plan to send more than twice as much in 1955). Three-fifths of food shipments last year went to Germany; Italy and India each got 14 percent; France 5 percent; Austria 2 percent; and Korea less than 1 percent.

HIGH SCHOOLS

Staff members in 6 regions held 1-day or weekend conferences on world affairs for high-school students, who also participated in 3 summer work camps, 7 summer institutes, and a unit in Mexico. Students also met United States and foreign leaders 7 seminars in Washington, 3 at the U. N., and 1 combined session.

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE UNITS

Ninety-six volunteers from 68 colleges worked during the summer at mental hospitals in 6 States (Arizona, Illinois, Indiana, New Mexico, Rhode Island, and Vermont) and at 2 reformatories in Illinois. (Two year-round units were dropped at the end of the year for lack of volunteers.)

INTERNATIONAL CENTERS

The AFSC staffed or help finance centers in seven countries: The Netherlands, Denmark, Switzerland, France, Austria, India, and Mexico, as well as Davis House and International Student House in Washington, D. C., and Quaker House near U. N. headquarters in New York.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SEMINARS

Nine seminars in world affairs of 2 to 4 weeks' duration were held in the United States, Japan, India, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Yugoslavia. Participating were 343 students of 48 nationalities including 28 Americans.

INTERN PROJECTS

Summer projects in 5 cities (Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and St. Louis) gave 112 young people, most of them college students, a taste of factory life. Year-round intern projects with community agencies in Chicago and Oakland, Calif., added an extra 23 recruits during the summer.

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCES

Rising young diplomats explored the roots of international tension and their own resources and responsibilities at AFSC-sponsored conferences again last summer in Switzerland.

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

Nine of these houses, which began by meeting physical needs, now foster fellowship: 4 are in Germany, 3 in Japan, and 1 each in Israel and in Pakistan. A similar center near San Francisco seeks to build racial brotherhood.

PEACE EDUCATION

Nearly 4,000 persons attended 23 summer institutes on world affairs—9 for families, 7 for high-school students, 6 for adults, and 1 for college students. Several regions trained community peace leaders the year round and we had special programs for leaders of labor unions, farm groups, churches, and friends meetings.

PRISONS

Two regional offices in California sponsored prison-visiting programs. In the summer of 1954 young volunteers worked in two Illinois reformatories.

QUAKERS

Reports from International Affairs representatives stationed in foreign capitals were circulated during the year.

REFUGEES

In Germany, we helped refugees who had been homeless for 10 years and new arrivals from East Germany find homes and jobs, both by giving funds to other groups and by programs of our own. In Korea, we staffed a hospital and sought jobs for widows. In Austria AFSC loans have helped refugee tradesmen, farmers, and professional men re-establish themselves.

SCHOOL AFFILIATION SERVICE

Pupils in 112 American schools exchanged essays, classmates, teachers, and ideas with children in 128 partner schools in France, Germany, England, Italy, Japan, Jordan, and the Netherlands.

SELF-HELP HOUSING

Work continued on a slum-prevention project in Philadelphia where tenants have become owners by making a downpayment of 700 to 1,400 hours of labor.

SOCIAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Ambassadors in shirt sleeves assisted pre-industrial peoples in India, Israel, and Jordan raise bigger crops, battle disease, and overcome illiteracy. (Similar problems are being tackled by UNLA in Italy, to which AFSC has given funds, and by young Quaker volunteers in Mexico and El Salvador.)

UNITED NATIONS

An office and a year-round residence in New York provided a meeting place for U. N. delegates and a base for the team we assemble for each General Assembly session. Quaker working parties studied mediation, charter revision, and relations with Russia. A Quaker representative in Paris maintained close relations with UNESCO; one in Geneva worked with U. N. agencies on such international problems as food, health, and human rights.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Newark (N. J.) Star Ledger newspaper under date of February 24, 1955:

CD's No JOKE

The Atomic Energy Commission's announcement that one H-bomb could kill almost everybody in a 7,000-square-mile area should serve as a much-needed spur to Civilian Defense.

We've treated CD as too much of a joke. The reason, of course, is fatalism. Most people act as if they can't do anything about atomic attack anyway, so they pooh-pooh the work of CD.

The Commission pointed out that one H-bomb could kill every human in a 7,000-square-mile area—unless they were adequately prepared for it.

CD is the only adequate preparation. The people who pooh-pooh it are wrong. They might be dead wrong.

New Attack Levelled at School Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there is today in the United States a movement to destroy our private school system which since the establishment of this Nation has augmented our public school system in providing adequate educational facilities for our youth.

As a Nation we have been ever mindful of the vital necessity of providing public educational facilities free to our citizens. We have built a vast public-school system at the grade and high school level. We have established free State universities where a college education can be obtained for minimum cost to the student.

But the unprecedented growth in our population, especially during the past decade, has overtaken our public-school system so that overcrowding and short sessions are seriously imperiling the efficiency of our public schools.

The fact that we have an excellent private-school system at this time has proved an invaluable aid in providing additional facilities to carry some of the overload now felt by our public schools.

In the field of higher education, our State colleges have never been adequate to provide facilities for all those wanting to attend a university, but privately endowed colleges and universities throughout the Nation have carried the main responsibility for higher education of our youth.

It has been as fundamental to our American way of life to permit parents to choose between public and private schools for the education of their children as it is allowed every American the right of free worship, and any attempt to destroy the private school in the United States should be met with instant opposition by every American who cherishes our heritage of liberty and individual freedom of choice.

The National Educational Association through its Educational Policies Commission has made a serious attack upon the right of private schools to continue in the United States, an attack which cannot go unchallenged.

In reply to this ill-advised attack, the following article and editorial which appeared in the Tidings, of Los Angeles, Calif., of which Msgr. W. E. North is editor, clearly state the case for our private school system which has contributed so much in raising the educational standard of our Nation, and the fallacy of attacks against our private schools which attempt to destroy them:

NEW ATTACK LEVELLED AT SCHOOL FREEDOM—NEA COMMISSION INFERS ONLY STATE CAN EDUCATE

A new policy statement by a national public school teachers' group was strongly attacked this week as inferring there was no room for private schools in America and suggesting they be put out of business—by law.

Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, director of the Department of Education, National Catholic Welfare Conference, took sharp issue with "Public Education and the Future of America," made public last Monday.

The Monsignor says the booklet "purports to prove historically that the whole American tradition calls for a universal public school."

The booklet is the work of the Educational Policies Commission, a joint agency of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators. The commission is a small but influential research group. A foreword to the pamphlet says "publication in this form does not constitute formal approval by the sponsoring associations."

"WILL DISTURB CATHOLICS"

"We are convinced that any plan to force all children into a common school is a serious threat to the future welfare of our Nation," said Monsignor Hochwalt.

He added that these policies from such a high source in the public-school profession will disturb and confound many Catholic educators as well as parents, but that they are ready to meet the challenge.

In its study, the commission, which includes some 26 educators, said:

"Faith in public education rests ultimately on two beliefs: that a particular kind of education must be designed to support a particular way of life, and that public education will best support the American way of life."

In an address before the meeting of the National Catholic Educational Association last August, his eminence Samuel Cardinal Stritch, archbishop of Chicago, while citing the tremendous influence of the tax-supported school on our country and its future, added this comment:

"We do not admit that these tax-supported schools are, to the exclusion of private and group conducted schools, the educational system of our country. In this educational system we must include all the schools which exist and function under our laws and Constitution."

PARENTS CRITICIZED

"In its latest publication, Public Education and the Future of America, the educational policies commission of the National Education Association has called upon all Americans to make an act of faith in public education," said Monsignor Hochwalt. "This appeal has been phrased in terms of a neo-nativist orthodoxy that virtually equates certain values of our American way of life with the highest values of heaven and earth."

"Good Americans must believe, the policies commission says, that public schools develop moral and ethical commitments common to all great religions, that public education gives the best support to the American way of life, and that public schools alone can teach the real meaning of brotherhood because they intermingle children of all religious faiths."

"In effect the Commission's report labels Americans who believe in the values of both public and private education as persons of questionable loyalty to America's ideals. It infers that parents sending their children to private schools lack faith in public education and in a sense should be reprimanded for their failure to give full allegiance to an uniquely American institution like the public school."

"The report seems to urge all Americans to make the public schools good enough to put the private schools out of business. Although the writers of the report admire the complexities of American life it is quite apparent that they cannot tolerate a complex of educational systems, both private and public. They see and deplore the tyranny of the single school systems of Fascist and Communist countries and then with surprising illogic demand that the American way

be made secure by a common public school system."

OREGON CASE CITED

"This report could be the beginning of a crusade to persuade all American parents to send their children to public schools. It purports to prove historically that the whole American tradition calls for a universal public school."

"It even goes so far as to suggest that the Supreme Court of the United States may have made a mistake when it invalidated a law compelling all children to attend public schools. There is a possibility, the report infers, that the fulfillment of the historic common school ideal may necessitate a reversal of the Oregon decision."

These policies from such a high source in the public school profession will disturb and confound many Catholic educators as well as the parents of Catholic school pupils. But they are ready to meet the challenge. They will refuse to profess faith in the report's doctrinaire assertions about democracy and the American way. They will resist every effort of the organized public school profession to seek laws that would force all children to attend public schools. They will continue, now as before, to build and to expand their flourishing private school system. They will not be intimidated by assertions that their devotion to private education makes them less American than their neighbors who favor public education for their children.

We are convinced that any plan to force all children into a common school is a serious threat to the future welfare of our Nation. Indeed, the very best safeguard against totalitarianism in our land is variety, diversity and independence of schooling.

In the Oregon School Case, decided on June 1, 1935, the Supreme Court held the Oregon anti-private-school act of 1922 to be unconstitutional.

The Oregon law required all children between the ages of 8 to 16 years—with very limited exceptions—to attend the public schools. The Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, and the Hill Military Academy obtained an injunction restraining the State from enforcing this law. The Supreme Court upheld this injunction and reaffirmed the right of parents to direct the education of their children.

The meaning of this momentous decision for education, says the booklet of the Educational Policies Commission, has been a subject of debate almost from the moment it was handed down. There seems little doubt but that most citizens and educators took it to mean that the vast majority of American children would continue to attend public schools—as was then the case—but that the way would be open for those who so desired to attend private institutions. On the other hand, the decision has been followed by a substantial expansion of private—particularly church-related school facilities.

EDUCATIONAL FASCISM

The National Educational Association again fondles the dictator's baton in its briefcase. Through its educational policies commission it deplores the existence of the private school, finds it inimical to the American way of life, berates the patriotism of parents who yet patronize other than public schools, laments the Oregon decision of the Supreme Court upholding the rights of parents in education, and calls for its revocation in the educational wave of the future.

One would think that public educators had enough problems of their own these days without tormenting their lot with the advocacy of regimentation in education. A little shelf full of books by even friendly critics has appeared lately bewailing their failures and shortcomings. Unprecedented demands by the schools are being made on

the tax coffers of the Nation, and the citizens begin to be disturbed with the insatiable appetite of a new Moloch. Meanwhile, the Federal machinery is being oiled for at least insurance of multimillion State and local programs for education.

Much is made of parenship in education when the big partner is under attack, or when the fortunes of yet another bond issue are at stake, or when the people murmur and fume with visionary departures from the traditional curriculum. When professors are justly suspicioned for un-American affinities, who is expected to rush to their defense but secretaries and presidents in private education? Let the little partner seek only the redress of unjust taxation and the silence thunders dissent while the plot proceeds to banish freedom of education in the land yet free.

All this cant about public schools and the American way of life is so much bosh historically, philosophically, and pedagogically that it hardly merits attention. The American way of life embraces unity in diversity, and uniformity is utterly alien to it. These educational Fascists who tirelessly seek conformity in education are thought-brothers to the systems of tyranny they so glibly condemn. The depth of their nonsense is sounded in the statement that public schools alone can teach the real meaning of brotherhood—this we must suffer from the clique that hesitates even before the proclamation of the Fatherhood of God.

What are they afraid of, or what kind of society do they plan, this group that presumes to sway the schools of America to its whims? Surely, the little 10-percent partner with its feeble resources offers no serious competition to a system with the sky the limit at its beck and call. No, the fear lies in the constant reproach which private education offers to a scheme of schooling in secularism and sentimentalism which presumably, if unquestioned, will move the American temper docilely to embrace the ways of a semisocialist society. Education is the first concern of the totalitarian. And they are Fascists—whether red or brown, it hardly matters—who subtly insinuate State compulsion in the field of education.

The NEA should rather be about the betterment of the public schools. Benjamin Fine, its favorite reporter, essays in the New York Times a piece about the inadequacies of teacher-training preparation. He finds our schools of education crowded with courses that teach how to teach but not what to teach. He trumpets a return to general education, to English, history, mathematics, and science for those who will presume to teach English, history, mathematics, and science. He finds only seven States with sufficient and satisfying programs of teacher preparation. Mr. Fine writes naively as if to startle the smugness of the educational Ph. D's for whom jargon is more important than geography.

Here is but one field that could profit from the deliberations of the doctors for a generation or two. Meanwhile, we could enjoy surcease from these rash forays into fields foreign to the traditions of the free people.

The Summerfield Reclassification Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, we in West Virginia, have suffered mass unemployment

ment and the misery that comes with that economic illness.

The current depressed economic conditions have not made things easier for post-office employees. Let no one make any mistake about that.

On the contrary, the economic problems of the area have closed the possibilities of self-help that the postal workers had formerly turned to. The West Virginia post-office employees had sought to supplement their meager incomes by getting additional part-time jobs and by having their wives work. But when the bad unemployment situation developed, the part-time jobs disappeared and the opportunity for large-scale employment of women ended.

The additional income upon which the post-office employees have had to depend for so long, therefore, ceased to exist.

West Virginia and the post-office employees in the State have some peculiar economic problems, but the need for an adequate postal wage increase is nationwide. It is up to us in Congress to meet that need.

When I say an adequate wage increase, I mean one that will really help post-office employees out of their really bad economic situation. Such an increase, I believe, is the 10-percent increase contained in several bills which have been introduced during this session.

I sincerely hope that Congress will approve the 10-percent increase for the postal workers, and I also want to urge that we flatly reject the Summerfield reclassification plan. This bid for extra powers by an appointed official is dangerous, not only to the post office employees' rights but also as a giveaway of congressional powers.

Last year Congress was assured in some of the most determined lobbying that has ever been carried on by a Government department that the Summerfield reclassification plan, then offered, carried no dangers. Yet, according to press reports, the Postmaster General in testimony a few weeks ago, in effect, admitted that many of the charges made against the 1954 plan had basis in fact.

The present plan, the Department assures us, removes all these problems. But we had assurances from the same people last year that no such problems even existed.

The present plan is still shot through with loopholes for downgrading of employees; it still involves the surrender of authority over tens of thousands of postal positions by Congress; it still provides meaningless raises of \$210 a year to the rank and file employees and munificent grants of \$4,000 a year to some top officials.

Even the postal positions which Congress would continue to control would suffer under this scheme. A Washington newspaper recently called the job descriptions of the Summerfield plan "frauds." It said that these descriptions are written so as to justify the salaries the Department wants to pay.

Any plan that has this type of unfairness to it, should be rejected at the outset. But the Summerfield job reclassification plan has the distinction of

not only being unfair—in part a "fraud"—it is also dangerous.

It merits the same rejection that Congress accorded to its parent plan last year.

Arabs Step Up Border Attacks; Number of Incidents Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following news item which appeared in the February 18, 1955, issue of Israel Digest is deserving of our attention:

ARABS STEP UP BORDER ATTACKS; NUMBER OF INCIDENTS INCREASE

JERUSALEM.—An Israel soldier was killed and 2 wounded early this week when a patrol near Hirtet Sika in the south was attacked by a group of 20 soldiers of Jordan's Arab Legion who had occupied a hill in Israel territory. The Israel unit routed the Jordanians from the hill. Israel has requested an emergency meeting of the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission to consider this violation of the armistice agreement.

This incident was only one in a wide series of attacks from across the Jordanian, Egyptian, and Syrian borders which have taken place during the last 2 weeks. The following is a partial list of these incidents:

On February 1, an Israel soldier was wounded when automatic rifle fire was opened from an Egyptian position at an Israel unit near Nahal Oz in the Negev.

On February 1, an Israel patrol was fired upon from Syrian positions when it encountered infiltrators near Kfar Szold in upper Galilee.

On February 2, a Syrian position opened automatic fire at four Israel fishing boats on Lake Kinneret (Sea of Galilee).

On February 2, Israel boats on Lake Hule were fired upon from across the Syrian border.

On February 2, Syrian soldiers fired across the armistice lines at a group of children in Kfar Szold.

On February 4, armed Jordanian infiltrators stole building materials from Elat, Israel's southernmost port on the Red Sea.

On February 4, shots were fired from a Syrian position at members of Sh'ar Yashuv working in the settlement's fields.

On February 5, an Israel patrol encountered a group of armed Jordanians at Kfar Saba in the Sharon. The infiltrators fled across the border.

On February 7, a vehicle belonging to Kfar Szold came across a stone barrier south of the village. While removing the barrier, the occupants were attacked by rifle fire from a Syrian position.

On February 8, an Israel soldier was wounded by Arab Legion fire in the Sakhedria quarter of Jerusalem.

On February 9, an Israel unit was attacked by Jordanian fire southeast of Rosh Ha'Ayin, in the hills of Judea. Two Israelis were wounded.

On February 9, an Israel patrol in the area of Duweima in the Negev was attacked by armed Jordanians. On that same day, an emergency meeting of the Israel-Jordan Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Jordan for firing upon an Israel patrol in the same area on January 25.

On February 9, armed Jordanians opened automatic fire upon members of the settlement of Shlabin in the Latrun area.

On February 11, fire was opened upon an Israel patrol by members of the Jordan National Guard in the Duweima area in the Negev. Later, the same patrol was attacked in the area of Hirtet Sika.

On February 13, an Israel boat at Lake Hule was attacked from Syrian positions.

The Great West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "The Great West," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., and Mrs. G. S. Reuter, of Monticello, Ark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GREAT WEST

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., and Mrs. G. S. Reuter)

Truth is always desired. A love for our Nation is normal. Thus in telling of the greatness of a section in our country is just relating a noble heritage. The writers recently returned from a 7,500-mile trip where positive values were noted. This trip carried them through the final 3 of the 48 States.

After leaving Joseph T. Robinson's Arkansas, Oklahoma was entered. The names of Joshua Bryan Lee, Elmer Thomas, Ernest W. Marland, Roy J. Turner, Robert S. Kerr, and A. S. Mike Monroney have given greatness to this State.

In Kansas, George McGill, Walter A. Huxman, William H. Burke, Edward W. Patterson, Randolph Carpenter, and John M. Houston, have been the statesmen. At Greensburg is the largest hand-dug well in the world, which represents a natural wonder.

In Colorado, Edward T. Taylor, John A. Carroll, Wayne N. Espinall, Byron G. Rogers, Edward P. Costigan, Alva B. Adams, Edwin C. Johnson, Teller Ammons, William Adams, Walter Johnson, and William L. Knous have been the pacesetters. It now appears Alva B. Adams, Jr., has a great future. From an institutional point of view, Dr. Sam Bradford's sermons Looking to Jesus and Guaranteed Security at famed Beth Eden Baptist Church and the Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary at Denver, represent eternal values. In a lighter vein it is C. E. Beach and his beautiful horses. Also, beautiful Rocky Mountain National Park is a lasting sight.

George W. Norris, Roy L. Cochran, and Charles W. Bryan, have been Nebraska's pride and joy. Of course, William Jennings Bryan made contributions in so many parts of America, that a single State may not classify him.

In South Dakota, the names Tom Berry, William J. Bulow, Herbert E. Hitchcock, Fred H. Hildebrandt, and Theodore B. Werner ring out as faithful servants of their people. Many speak highly of the late Peter Norbeck.

Mount Rushmore National Memorial is located in Custer State Park, near Keystone, S. Dak. The heads of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt are carved to the proportions of a man 465 feet tall. They are carved in the granite escarpment of the mountain, and this is one of the highest points between the Atlantic Ocean and the Rocky Moun-

tains. The late Gutzon Borglum was the artist-sculptor.

Another unusual scene in South Dakota is the Badlands National Monument. Congress has set aside this area to preserve the enchanted area for the perpetual enjoyment of the Nation. Writers have tried unsuccessfully to describe the beauty here.

The trial of Jack McCall for the killing of Wild Bill Hickok in Deadwood, S. Dak., on August 2, 1876, is reproduced 5 nights per week. While McCall was acquitted, he was arrested again at Cheyenne, Wyo., by a United States marshal. He was tried in Federal court at Yankton, S. Dak., and hanged in 1877. Some would question whether this was double jeopardy. McCall is classified as "bad" by the people in that section, even though the motion picture presented him as a grand person with a lot of bad luck.

The Passion Play at Spearfish, S. Dak., is shown three times a week during the summer, and is one of the truly great events in our Nation. Josef Meier plays the role of Christ. The entire ensemble consists of 250 players.

In North Dakota, John Moses and Thomas H. Moodie have rendered real service. Many admire the independence of WILLIAM LANGER. The State has many possibilities in the years ahead.

Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Lester C. Hunt, H. H. Schwartz, Leslie A. Miller, William Jack, Sam Tully, Paul R. Greever, and John J. McIntyre have rendered the State of Wyoming the same high type of service in Government that is found in the beauty of Yellowstone National Park.

Yellowstone National Park is the largest and oldest of our national parks, with an area of 2,213,206.55 acres of federally owned land, lying in Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana. The average elevation of the park is between 7,000 and 8,000 feet. Altogether there are about 10,000 separate and distinct thermal features. Most geysers are located in seven principal basins—Norris, Lower, Midway, Upper, Thumb, Heart Lake, and Shoshone. Old Faithful, Daisy, and Riverside erupt at regular intervals. John E. Erickson, Thomas J. Walsh, James E. Murray, Burton K. Wheeler, Elmer E. Holt, Roy E. Ayers, John W. Bonner, and Michael J. Mansfield have given Montana a proud heritage.

While sharing with Wyoming and Idaho concerning Yellowstone National Park, Montana also has Glacier National Park. This park lies athwart the Rocky Mountains. Its glaciers are among the few in this country which are easily accessible. It comprises approximately 1 million acres. Among its high peaks are more than 60 glaciers and 200 beautiful lakes. The spectacular Going-to-the-Sun Highway links the east and west sides of the park, and it crosses the Continental Divide at Logan Pass at an elevation of 6,664 feet.

Idaho's fame is partially through Yellowstone National Park. Also, C. Ben Ross, James P. Pope, Glen H. Taylor, Charles C. Gossett, Bert H. Miller, and Gracie Bowers Pfost have rendered outstanding service to our Nation. Hungry Horse Dam services this area, and after visiting this large dam it is easy to understand the philosophy of these statesmen. It is a wonderful project and a sound investment. Exclusive of irrigation, it will cost \$102,900,000 but the entire cost plus interest will be returned to the Federal Government.

Vancouver, British Columbia, is a beautiful city near our Nation. Kitsilano Beaches, the International Airport, the city hall and archives, the trans-Canada Highway, Chinatown, the public library and museum, Harbour Navigation Pier, North Vancouver Ferry, the art gallery, the Burrard Yacht Club, and the Royal Vancouver Yacht Club are important places to see.

Not only is Seattle, Wash., the home of the August William Hempelmenns, but the State has many attractive features. No State capitol grounds are better kept. No greater statesmen can be found than Monrad C. Wallgren, Homer T. Bone, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, C. C. Dill, Warren G. Magnuson, Hugh B. Mitchell, Clarence D. Martin, Henry M. Jackson, Charles H. Leavay, Don Magnuson, and Clyde V. Tisdale.

Oregon has one of the newest and most beautiful capitol buildings. Portland is one of the most scenic cities in the Nation. Alfred E. Reames, Charles H. Martin, Walter M. Pierce, and Nan Wood Honeyman have given splendid service to America. The entire world knows the greatness of WAYNE L. Morse, but only God knows how many more fine services he will render. Mr. and Mrs. Richard L. Neuberger represent the ideal couple in this grand Nation.

California has the beauty of the famous redwoods of San Francisco, of Palo Alto, of Los Angeles, of Long Beach, of San Diego, and many events. Americans like to recall the War Memorial Opera House in San Francisco and the United Nations, but Mrs. Edward B. Reuter at Palo Alto represented the best in American education whether at Stanford University, the State University of Iowa, or Flak University.

The noted Old-Fashioned Revival Hour of Dr. Charles E. Fuller at Long Beach is serving the world for the 29th year. There may be found Mrs. Fuller and her letters, Rudy Attwood and the quartet, Leland Green and the chorus, George Broadbent at the organ, and Dr. Fuller preaching on The Blood Sprinkled Mercy Seat.

Also, the Fuller Theological Seminary at Pasadena under the leadership of Dr. Fuller and Dr. Harold John Ockenga, of Boston, is making a mark. The faculty is outstanding and sound. Here there are 250 students from all parts of the world. The plant represents over half a million Christian dollars and much effort.

Then there are the California statesmen who have meant so much to our civilization: William G. McAdoo, Helen G. Douglas, Culbert L. Olson, Upton Sinclair, Jerry Voorhis, James Roosevelt, Will Rogers, Jr., Robert L. Condon, and Sheridan Downey.

Dr. Richard S. Beal, of Tucson, Ariz., is not only the "desert saint," but he has been termed the father of an ideal American family. The Painted Desert is an inspiration to behold.

Henry F. Ashurst and Carl D. Hayden have been the grand old statesmen of Arizona. Ernest W. McFarland, George W. P. Hunt, Dr. B. B. Moehr, R. C. Stanford, Robert Jones, Sidney P. Osborne, Dan E. Garvey, Isabella Greenway, John R. Murdock, Richard F. Harless, and Harold A. Patten have maintained that noble tradition.

New Mexico has an interesting civilization. There is much evidence of a beautiful blend of the Old and New World. Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson represent such a culture. Many fine things have come from the worthwhile service of Carl A. Hatch, Sam G. Britton, Clyde Tingley, John E. Miles, John J. Dempsey, Thomas Mabry, David Chavez, Jr., Antonio M. Fernandez, and Georgia L. Lusk.

Texas is large, beautiful, and mighty. Its might can be both good and bad as indicated by able former Speaker Sam Rayburn. James V. Alford, Morris Sheppard, Tom Connally, Wright Patman, Marvin Jones, Maury Maverick, Ralph Yarborough, and Lindley Beckworth are some of the other truly great Texas statesmen.

It was good to return home after reliving many of the experiences that made America great. While 1954 resulted in the passing from this world of Lester C. Hunt (June 19), Albert J. Merklin (June 27), Mrs. Joe Lee Allen (July 13), Blair Moody (July 20), Mrs.

Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde (July 20), Alcide de Gasperi (August 19), Getulio Vargas (August 24), Robert L. Doughton (September 30), and Robert H. Jackson (October 9), the West will join together with the other section to continue our heritage.

More Facts on Drought Damage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, February 27, 1955:

TWENTY MILLION ACRES ARE READY TO BLOW

(By Aubrey Graves)

The specter of continuing and worsening drought hovers over many areas of the country, particularly the southern Great Plains. After 4 (and in some cases 5) dry years, some sections face conditions that can become more acute than those of 1954.

Compounding the accumulated effect of prolonged drought come depressing reports of greatly below normal winter precipitation.

In 11 Western States as of February 1, the mountain snowpack and reservoir storage for instance, were reported to be low—in some areas dangerously so.

More than 4 million acres of land have been damaged by wind erosion this winter, according to late Soil Conservation Service advices. Most of this soil blowing occurred in December. The high-velocity-wind months (March and April) are yet to come.

"We are praying that in the period immediately ahead we get more moisture than we get wind," Harvey Dahl, Agriculture Department drought program official, said last week.

MORE DISASTER AREAS

Last spring's soil blowing was the most widespread and severe since 1938. In some localities, moisture and crop conditions have deteriorated still further since then. In the 1954 emergency, 945 of the Nation's 3,000 counties were given Federal drought relief. Today, about 1,050 counties are officially designated disaster areas.

In Colorado, the mountain snow cover in some regions is down to 50 percent of normal. The upland soils are dry. In 47 Colorado reservoirs, storage is only about one-fifth of normal. In New Mexico, flow of the three streams feeding into the San Luis Valley is expected to be three-fourths of normal. In this area, the reservoir storage is 50 percent below the 10-year average.

In greatest jeopardy this spring are southeastern Wyoming, the extreme southwestern corner of Nebraska, eastern Colorado, western Kansas, the extreme northeastern part of New Mexico, and the panhandles of Oklahoma and Texas. More than 20 million acres, according to statements by Agriculture Department spokesmen, are ready to blow.

Soil Conservation Service Administrator D. A. Williams blames present difficulties largely on two things: (1) The continued plowing up of rangelands unsuitable for cultivation, and (2) improper farming and grazing methods. "There are now," he says, "about 7 or 8 million acres in cultivation in this region that should never have been cultivated."

There were few dust storms back in the early days when the hoofs of Indian ponies and buffaloes were about the only things that

agitated the prairie sod. Until the coming of the white man (about 1870), wild grasses held the topsoil in place. But with the white man came the plow.

Moist seasons favored the first crops the settlers planted. They plowed up ever more land. But in 1890 came a dry growing season. The drought persisted for 4 years. Crop disasters were general in the Great Plains in 1894. Many farmers moved away.

In 1896 came the rains, and shortly afterward the farmers returned. Fortune in the form of weather favored them for most of the next 14 years.

By 1912 the pendulum had swung back. In that year 65,000 acres of cropland in one Kansas county alone blew away. In the following spring, 38 dust storms lowered visibility to less than 1 mile on the Southwestern plains.

In 1933, though the soil was extremely dry, only 22 hard blows occurred; the winds that spring were unusually mild. Forty storms plagued the area in 1935. In 1936 there were 68; in 1937, 72.

During these years, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed to plant belts of trees to serve as windbreaks at points throughout the Great Plains where cultivated fields were most unprotected. Farmers were educated to the advantages of contour plowing and strip cropping in combating erosion.

THE QUICK PROFIT

The great demands for wheat and cotton created by World Wars I and II are blamed for man's misuse of much Western soil. It was not just the "suitcase farmers" of those eras who were responsible. These were the fly-by-nights who came in, leased lands and put in crops. In years of good crops, they took a quick profit and departed, leaving the fields devoid of protective winter cover.

The landowners themselves were guilty of the same offense, to a lesser degree. When they saw the possibility of making more money by plowing than by leaving their holdings in grass, they plowed.

Only one State—Colorado—has a law which really forces a man to protect his farmland in time of drought. Landowners there are required to "chisel" their fields when the soil starts blowing. A narrow plow point turns up moist soil in small ridges to arrest the destructive action of the wind. The State itself performs this service, and levies the cost of it against the treated land, just as it levies taxes. A few other States have wind erosion laws but with far less teeth in them.

SCS Administrator Williams believes that one of the big jobs of his agency is to induce farmers and ranchers of the arid and semiarid areas to farm and ranch "according to the existing climate, not according to what they hope it will be."

Soil surveys of the region show a wide variety of land conditions, ranging from that suitable for permanent cultivation (if good soil and water conservation practices are used) to that suitable only for range. In between these extremes are areas of hazardous croplands.

A farmer may produce profitable crops on this land in wet years, but he usually has a crop failure in drought years. And when drought persists, the soil starts to blow away.

"After the soil blowing starts, it is too late to plant grass on the land," Williams points out. "Hence, it usually continues to blow until another wet spell comes. By that time, much of it may have been so seriously damaged that it will no longer produce profitable crops even in the wet years."

Williams says that our present dilemma was caused in part by improper methods of cultivating and grazing.

"The improper farming or grazing," Williams adds, "is not always done by the man whose crops and land are damaged. Some fields with an excellent cover or productive

stubble or straw are covered with drifting silt or sand from nearby unprotected fields. Some good grassland was smothered with dust from adjacent misused land.

There were many conservation farmers who followed the best advice they could get, yet saw their crops ruined and their land damaged by their neighbors' careless practices."

The problem of wind erosion, he insists, must be attacked on a community basis.

Williams reports that farmers cooperating in soil conservation measures in the potential dust bowl areas are practicing stubble-mulch tillage (leaving winter crops or wheat stubble and high-cut cotton stalks on about 5.5 million acres. They are "plowing on the contour" on another 6 million acres, and have built about 150,000 miles of terraces. They have reseeded nearly 1 million acres to grass since 1938.

There are at least 7 million acres of land which should not be cultivated at all, Williams says—land with thin or sandy soil, or land in low-rainfall areas. "These should be diverted to grass as soon as possible," he says.

The persistent drought harassing the farmer makes the men in the city street wonder what has been happening to the weather in recent years. Has less rain and snow fallen on the country as a whole, and has the climate actually got hotter?

Dr. Harry Wexler, chief of the Scientific Services Division of the United States Weather Bureau, has a quick answer to the latter question. The earth, he says, has become only 2.2° hotter in the last 60 years. In Philadelphia, the rise has been 4° since 1870.

The weather scientists assure that, on the average, the 48 States as a whole receive just about as much precipitation one year as another. It is just that the pattern shifts.

In recent years the Pacific coast, the northern border of the country, and New England have been getting more than their normal share of the precipitation. The Great Plains and the South, including Maryland and Virginia, have been short-changed. Some reason is given to hope that the pattern will change back again, sooner or later.

Virginia, in particular, hopes it will be sooner. Arlington and Alexandria found it necessary to ration water last summer. Some Fairfax County areas were left dry by the private-utilities companies for days at a time. Wells went dry that had never gone dry before.

Prolonged dry weather decimated crops throughout the northern part of the State. And many a Virginia Guernsey got her drinking water courtesy of the volunteer fire department, which hauled it to her in fire engines.

Virginia uses about 1,300 gallons of water per capita per day. The average citizen, of course, does not use that much. The manufacture of 1 ton of steel, for instance, requires 65,000 gallons of water. It takes 300,000 gallons to make a ton of rayon.

More than 27,000 gallons of water is needed to irrigate an acre of land to the depth of 1 inch, and there were more than 700 irrigation systems taking water from Virginia streams during last summer's drought.

Virginia has an annual rainfall of about 42 inches. About one-third of it flows away unbeneficially to the sea.

With population increasing the way it is, there is a growing conviction that Virginia will have to adopt some sort of legislation regulating the use of water, perhaps as the Western States do. A State legislature commission on water resources opened public hearings at Staunton Friday. It hopes to make water use recommendations to the next general assembly.

"The State needs a water code which recognizes the rights of everybody," said Dr. H. N. Young, director of the Agricultural

Experiment Station at Blacksburg, and a member of the commission.

By "everybody" he meant the farmer through whose fields a stream runs, the farmer who lives near a stream and feels he has a right to some of it, and the city fellow miles away who depends on the stream for his drinking and bath water.

Thoughts From the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. WATTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial appearing in the Winchester Sun, of Winchester, Ky., on Friday, February 11, 1955.

In his article entitled "Patient But Firm," the writer dwells briefly and succinctly, but comprehensively, upon our Nation's stand in Far Eastern affairs—the Defense of Formosa. It is a confirmation of my thoughts, and I feel those of a great majority of the membership; it stresses and emphasizes many of the factors underlying our recent action whereby we definitely, resolutely, and clearly demonstrated to the world that in such matters partisan politics were laid aside, and that we stood shoulder to shoulder—united in the common cause; that, truly, we were Americans first.

In view of the concise and accurate analysis of the mental processes of the Chinese Communists; and the splendid treatment covering the events leading up to the necessity for such outward indication of unity, it is my notion that a sober reading of this exceptional editorial will be of interest and value to each of us.

PATIENT BUT FIRM

It cannot be denied that a risk of war is involved in the decision to stand firm at Formosa and to assist in the evacuation of the Tachen Islands. But no course of action the free world can pursue in these times is free of risk and it may be that a bold policy will pay greater dividends in the long run than would one of timidity and vacillation.

The Communists have demonstrated in the past that the one thing they respect is strength. A show of weakness or indecision has always been interpreted by them as an invitation to grab something that doesn't belong to them.

It would be hard to find in all history a nation as powerful as ours which demonstrated as much patience, endured as much provocation from another power without retaliation. In Korea the Red Chinese intervened and turned what should have been a United Nations victory into a stalemate—yet rather than risk extending the war we refrained from air or land attacks on the Chinese mainland. They intervened in Indochina—again they enjoyed impunity. They shot down our planes and imprisoned our soldiers and civilians without cause. We still managed to keep our tempers.

Now we have decided to draw the line beyond which we will not retreat. We have made it plain that we will not shoot first, that we will exercise every decent restraint—but we do not intend to back down. This firmness, this assertion of quiet strength may yet avert disaster.

Committee of California State Bar Delegates Recommend Amendments to Emergency Detention Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a study of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 that was prepared by a duly constituted committee of the California State bar delegates as a result of a resolution adopted in 1952 and the amendments recommended by the committee.

It is, of course, the duty of the Congress to pass legislation to promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense. International unrest and the attitudes of Russia and Red China have brought the question of national security into prominence. It is certain that the Congress had the national security in mind when it enacted this law in 1950, but when we start dealing with the national security we must not, in its name, destroy or jeopardize the security of the individual citizen. We must try to balance values then in passing laws so that we do not sacrifice too much of one in order to achieve the other. These lawyers say, in commenting on judicial decisions, that hard cases make bad law. The same is equally true of the legislative processes—dangerous times can make bad law. But, even as we pass the laws we should be willing to listen to criticism of the legislation and willing to study recommendations for improvement. This, I think, is particularly true when those recommendations come from such a respectable source as a committee of the bar association of a State.

With these thoughts in mind I am inserting at the conclusion of my remarks some amendments recommended by the Committee of California State Bar Delegates. While I think that the avowed purposes of the amendments are good, I am not yet ready to say that I think all of them or only these should be amended. For example, I am advised that the proposal to confer original jurisdiction in the Supreme Court can be accomplished only by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and not by act of Congress. It is my intention, however, in the immediate future to look into some, if not all, of these proposals as amendments to the Emergency Detention Act of 1950.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

AUGUST 6, 1953.

To the Conference of State Bar Delegates:

In re: Report of the committee of State bar delegates formed pursuant to the 1952 conference Resolution 47, to study and report on title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, known as the Emergency Detention Act (1950).

The above-named committee, of which the undersigned is chairman, reports as follows:

Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, known as the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, does without doubt represent not only a complete break with the American and Anglo-Saxon concept of civil rights and liberties, but also a complete departure from the American tradition and the American way of life. There is no question but that, under the act, American citizens, in time of emergency, can be held in custody for a day, a year, or a lifetime (on secret evidence given by unrevealed witnesses) and can be deprived of reputation, property (and indirectly of life). This power is, by the act, vested in and may be exercised by a preliminary hearing officer of whom no particular qualifications are required for appointment to his position.

Since 1798 the President of the United States has had the power to confine enemy aliens in time of war for no reason other than that they are enemy aliens. The committee feels strongly that, in time of grave emergency, there should be legislation which will give the executive branch of the Government a like power with respect to enemies of the Government who are citizens, or have acquired citizenship (often with calculation) and who are thus better enabled to perpetrate or conspire to perpetrate espionage and sabotage.

The committee, therefore, feels that this act should not be repealed, but that it must be amended in many respects unless this country is now prepared to build up a secret police and follow a policy of detention on suspicion alone, a policy which has, in the past, been the weapon of absolute monarchs, and which, in our time, has been used with such devastating effect by Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy, and the rulers of the Soviet Union since its inception. This committee recommends amendments to the act because it feels that the United States should not adopt the terroristic weapon of a police state which is the very weapon keeping in power that government against whose ideology and world aims this act was purportedly legislated.

In time of grave national emergency, it may be imperative that potential, dangerous enemies of the State be picked up on mere suspicion by knock-on-the-door arrests, but it is equally imperative that means be provided for preventing the abuse of that power and for quickly rectifying mistakes.

Fundamentally, it is imperative, too, that the time and circumstances under which this sinister and extraordinary power may be used, should be clearly defined, and that unequivocal and specific regulations be set forth for the exercise of such power. There should also be a clear definition when the right to use such power ceases.

"In matters such as concentration camps, therefore, there is still great wisdom in the words of the Kentucky Resolution of 1798: 'In questions of power * * * let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.'" (50 Col. Law Review 761, 775, Protective Custody Act.)

The committee's analysis (appended hereto as an addendum) of the act has impelled it to make the following recommendations for amendment or change.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AMENDMENT OF CHANGE

1. The definition of "emergency" as fixed by subdivisions 1, 2, and 3 of section 102 should be amended so as to change subdivision 3. Subdivision 3 now reads as follows: "Insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy."

This should be changed to read:

"Declaration by concurrent resolution of both Houses of Congress that there is an insurrection in the United States in aid of a foreign enemy."

If subdivision 3 is not so amended, it would require no stretch of the imagination to

conclude that the language could apply to any simple strike in the country. A strike, as pointed out in the addendum, could easily come within the definition of an insurrection.

2. Section 102 (a) now provides: "In the event of any one of the following:

"(1) Invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions,

"(2) Declaration of war by Congress, or

"(3) Insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy, and if, upon the occurrence of one or more of the above, the President shall find that the proclamation of an emergency pursuant to this section is essential to the preservation, protection and defense of the Constitution, and to the common defense and safety of the territory and people of the United States, the President is authorized to make public proclamation of the existence of an Internal Security Emergency."

This portion of the act should be amended to provide that within 20 days after the proclamation of an emergency by the President of the United States pursuant to the above, the Solicitor General of the United States must, on behalf of the people of the United States, bring an action against the President of the United States in Declaratory Relief of which the Supreme Court of the United States shall have original jurisdiction. In said action, the Attorney General shall set forth the facts pertinent and request the Supreme Court to declare whether or not the President of the United States is justified in declaring a national emergency by the facts as they existed at the time of the presidential proclamation even though the conditions of items 1, 2 and 3 of the act have been met. The act should further provide that the Supreme Court must decide said action in Declaratory Relief within the 60 days after the filing of the action by the Solicitor General.

Amendment should be made to require the Attorney General of the United States to defend the action on behalf of the President of the United States. If the decision of the Supreme Court is a tie, this shall be deemed to be a disaffirmation of the fact that there is an emergency. The statute should also provide that the emergency may be terminated at any time by any one House of Congress rather than by the concurrent action of both Houses as is now provided.

3. The act should be amended to provide that, after the emergency has been declared, the chief security officer shall be, not the Attorney General as now provided, but a Justice of the Supreme Court or a Judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals who shall be forthwith appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States. There is no reason why either judge could not take a leave of absence from judicial duties during an emergency to handle so important an executive and administrative position. Each already has a position for life. The attainment of such eminence is demonstrative evidence that such a person is one of solid background, of a high order of integrity and one who has an objective perspective. In addition, such an amendment avoids the concentration of power in the Executive. Upon the proclamation of an emergency, all powers vested by the act in the Attorney General should be vested in the chief security officer, with certain exceptions.

4. The Attorney General, however, shall retain the power to issue warrants of arrest and warrants of arrest could still be served by such officers of the Department of Justice duly authorized to do so by the Attorney General.

5. The act should be amended to provide that preliminary hearing officers shall be appointed by the chief security officer and, further, to the effect that a preliminary hearing officer must be a person who is licensed to practice law. The feeling of the

committee is that any judge of a court of record, whether it be State or Federal, should automatically be eligible for appointment as a hearing officer. In short, in lieu of having untrained men who may be appointed to what is presumed to be a temporary job with all the temptations of pressure and bribery, the additional burdens created by a national emergency could, by the act, be placed upon judicial officers who have to a certain extent demonstrated their qualifications and ability to serve the public in an impartial and disinterested manner and who have some training in the judicial and legal processes.

6. Amendment should be made to provide that immediately after the service of a warrant, the officer serving the warrant should deliver the detainee into the official custody of some official who has been designated for the purpose of keeping custody of detainees and the official custodian to whom the detainee has been so delivered should be obligated (with penalties attached) forthwith to notify in writing the next of kin of the detainee or to deliver a written notice forthwith to such third person as may be designated by the detainee. The detainee, however, should not be obligated to give the names of his next of kin or of any other person.

In addition to the foregoing notice and irrespective of whether or not it is given, the official custodian of detainees must, in any event, give written notice to the State bar or some other organization or official which or who shall be designated for that purpose in the act so that the organization or person, in turn, can notify the attorney who has been provided pursuant to the recommendation hereinafter made to assist detainee in the preservation of his rights.

7. The act should define with much more certainty than it now does, the various criteria upon which the finding of probable cause can be based. Perhaps the act should definitely state that there can be no finding of probable cause merely because a person belongs or has belonged to an organization which the Attorney General has listed as subversive, or because a person has made statements which hold up any person who is or has been connected with the Federal or State government to public or private ridicule, scorn, contempt or hatred, or who merely criticizes our institutions, Federal or State. It seems that criteria should be evolved which will require definite and specific findings by a preliminary hearing officer.

8. Amendment should be made to provide that all hearings should be public, and each hearing before a preliminary hearing officer should be held in the county of the detainee's residence.

9. Provision should be made that when a preliminary hearing officer has heard evidence not disclosed to the accused, or when the evidence has been disclosed and the name of the witness kept secret, and as a consequence of any such hearing, the accused has been detained, such detention shall not continue for more than 30 days from date of hearing unless prior to the expiration of a 30-day period, the accused has been accorded a public hearing at which all evidence has been disclosed and at which he is confronted with all witnesses with full right of cross-examination.

The act should further be amended to provide that, when a detainee has been released because of a failure to disclose evidence or the names of witnesses within a 30-day period, as in the preceding sentence provided, such detainee cannot be further apprehended for detention unless he is to be accorded a hearing in which all the evidence and the names of all witnesses are fully disclosed.

Further amendment should be made with respect to secret evidence or failure to reveal the names of witnesses which will require

the Government to submit evidence of every kind and character and the names of all witnesses to the preliminary hearing officer on the first detention, and the preliminary hearing officer shall be empowered to examine and cross-examine said witnesses and call other witnesses if he so desires in secret.

10. Amendment should be made to insert specific provisions requiring arraignment when practical within 24 hours, but in no event can detainee be held for more than 120 hours without being arraigned and informed of his rights. Upon such arraignment, the preliminary hearing officer must set a date for the actual hearing not more than 30 days after the preliminary hearing unless an extension of time is consented to in open court by the detainee.

11. Since the nature of the charge does not permit of a double-jeopardy defense, the act should be so amended as to provide that the detainee shall not be apprehended or tried a second time unless at the time the subsequent warrant for arrest is issued, the Government has new, additional, and different evidence from that which was previously adduced.

12. As an added safeguard, the act should be amended to provide that a detainee who has exhausted his appeal rights and who is nevertheless held in detention should have the further right to be heard de novo at 90-day intervals, the first de novo trial to commence 90 days after his appeal rights are finally exhausted. Each such de novo trial should be held before a different preliminary hearing officer. Provision should be made which would require that the preliminary hearing officer must release the detainee unless he finds affirmatively as of the time of the de novo trial, that the detainee is and will continue to be a security risk.

13. The detention review board should be made up of lawyers who have had a minimum of 10 years active practice within a 15-year period prior to the date of their appointments. Service in any legal, judicial, or legislative branch of the Federal or State Government shall constitute active practice. It should be required that 1, but not more than 1 shall be taken from any one of the circuit court of appeals districts in the United States. Since there is a serious question as to whether one detention review board could handle the volume of appeals which would be certain to ensue, consideration should be given to the establishment of more than one board with correlative powers.

14. The nature of shelter and transportation, and the type of food to be furnished detainees, should be set forth with more particularity.

15. Machinery should be provided whereby a draft is made of every lawyer in the country as of the time of emergency. There should be set up authority whereby the court or president of a bar association formally selects the lawyers of every metropolis, town, and hamlet, and gives each a number upon the arrest of any detainee of such metropolis, town, or hamlet. The lawyer so provided must defend the detainee. Compensation for the lawyers' time would be provided on a scale to be set in the act. Whether the lawyer be a so-called corporation lawyer or civil or criminal lawyer, and whether his income be \$300,000 or \$3,000 a year—the lawyer must act as counsel for the detainee through every stage of the proceeding. The detainee, on the other hand, need not accept the lawyer so assigned. He may engage counsel on his own. Any counsel accepting such employment does not, by virtue thereof, lose his draft status. The detainee, instead of substituting the new counsel, for the one he would have had assigned to him by reason of the draft, could engage personal counsel to collaborate with the lawyer who has been

drafted for him. The name of such collaborating counsel might or might not appear, depending upon the wishes of the detainee. Collaborating counsel, by accepting employment, does not avoid his draft status. The mechanism so set up eliminates the possibility or probability that persons apprehended and detained would not be able to employ competent counsel. No detainee, however impoverished, could be without counsel. No opprobrium could attach to counsel who appeared for any detainee if such appearance were mandatory under the law.

The committee, therefore, recommends that this conference of State bar delegates and the board of governors of the State bar of California memorialize the Congress of the United States to the effect that the act in question be amended or changed in the above respects.

Respectfully submitted.

LESTER WM. ROTH,
Chairman, Conference of State Bar
Delegates Committee on Emergency
Detention Act (1950).

Committee members: Lewis W. Boies, Jr. (Fresno),¹ William N. Byrd (Brawley), Roy E. Chapman (San Bernardino),¹ Faber L. Johnston, Jr. (San Jose),¹ John L. Martin (Los Angeles), George G. Olshausen (San Francisco),¹ Timothy I. O'Reilly (San Luis Obispo), Jeremiah R. Scott (Eureka), Peter N. Teige (San Francisco),¹ John A. Wilson (Stockton).

Attention is called to separate report of Mr. Olshausen, attached.

SEPARATE REPORT OF GEORGE OLSHAUSEN

1. I agree with the main report as far as it goes. The amendments which it proposes are an improvement over the act as it stands, and, as far as they go, I am in favor of them. 2. I am still of my original opinion that the Detention Act provisions should be repealed in toto.

a. No such methods were used in our history, at any time, previous to World War II.

b. There have been five rebellions in American history. (Shays' Rebellion, 1786; Whisky Rebellion, 1794; Aaron Burr Conspiracy, 1807; Dorr's Rebellion, 1842; Civil War, 1861.) In all of them, and in the two wars against England, the enemy was English-speaking of the same ethnic stock and on our own soil. The Civil War had basically the same mechanical facilities, except for the airplane, the telephone, and the radio. The opportunities for spying and sabotage were at least as great as they are today, even conceding that persons now get themselves naturalized for purposes of sabotage.

Yet in *Ex parte Bollman* (8 U. S. 75, 2 L. Ed. 554), arising out of the Burr conspiracy, Chief Justice Marshall insisted on admitting the defendants to bail; in *Ex parte Vallandigham* (28 Fed. Cas. 874, 925 Fed. Cas. No. 16,810) Lincoln had Vallandigham only removed to a distance from the Federal lines, not imprisoned.

c. The assumption underlying continuance of the act is that the detention-camp methods of World War II will be used again anyway, so they should be brought within an orderly procedure. (See par. 56 of the committee's analysis.)

There is no connection between the Imperial Japanese Government and the Communists. The assumption in advance that the methods of World War II will be used next time, rather than the method of some previous war, seems to me to indicate a change of mood rather than a change of circumstances.

¹ Denotes members of committee who affirmatively have indicated their approval of this report.

This being so, I do not think that an attempt to change this mood should be given up as futile before it is undertaken. (See par. 62 of the committee's analysis.) If the bar expects to exercise leadership, it must attempt to influence opinion, not merely be swept along by it.

d. Since this act goes beyond anything heretofore decided by the Supreme Court, I would not concede its constitutionality. I consider unconstitutionality an additional ground for repeal.

Planned Use of Great Lakes Water Calls for Recognition of Sanitary District Diversion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing realization throughout the Great Lakes area that there is a real need for a program of planned use and planned conservation of Great Lakes water in order to benefit all of the citizens located in the Great Lakes region.

More and more communities are thinking in terms of conservation and use of Great Lakes water, and they certainly must look sympathetically on the heretofore somewhat controversial question of diversion down the Sanitary District Canal at Chicago.

John H. Byrne, executive director of the Lake Erie Watershed Conservation Foundation, recently expressed the thought that an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second into the Illinois Waterway would not adversely affect any of the boundary States or the levels of any of the lakes. A bill to authorize this increased diversion was introduced in Congress this year by Congressman THOMAS O'BRIEN, of Chicago. All of the Cook County Congressmen, both Democrat and Republican, are united behind the measure, H. R. 3210. It proposes to increase the diversion of water for a 3-year period, until the Army Corps of Engineers will have been able to make a more thorough study of the matter.

An interesting article on the subject, written by Chesly Manly, appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune of February 20. The article is as follows:

PLANNED USE OF GREAT LAKES WATER URGED— HIGHER DIVERSION WINS SUPPORT (By Chesly Manly)

Interstate and international cooperation for the planned conservation and use of Great Lakes water is being urged on both sides of the boundary with Canada as a result of greatly increased consumption and consequent shortages of water at many points inland from the lakes.

Demands for the use of Great Lakes water to supply vast inland areas have induced many long-time foes of Chicago's so-called water steal to reconsider that question sympathetically, as one of many problems that call for understanding and a mutual respect for mutual rights and interests.

NEW SLANT ON DIVERSION

For example, John H. Byrne, of Cleveland, executive director of the Lake Erie Watershed Conservation Foundation, declared in an interview that he has great sympathy for the problems of the Chicago area. Experts have advised him, Byrne said, that an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second into the Illinois waterway from Lake Michigan, as proposed in legislation now pending in Congress, would not appreciably affect the levels of the lakes.

Byrne produced a reprint of a column by John W. Love in the Cleveland Press, setting forth various proposals for supplying the interior of Ohio with Lake Erie water and adding:

"We may yet rue our agitation over the Chicago 'water steal' of the 1920's."

CANADIAN FOR INCREASE

Another recent example of the changing attitude toward Chicago's problem was the statement by J. W. Murphy, member of the Canadian Parliament from a district on Lake Huron, that Canada should immediately agree to an increased diversion of water into the Illinois waterway from Lake Michigan. Murphy declared that other members of Parliament representing lakeshore constituencies were alarmed about property damage resulting from high water levels.

The volume of water flowing through the Great Lakes system, averaging about 240,000 cubic feet per second from Lake Ontario into the St. Lawrence River, is stupendous. One-fourth of this volume would supply the whole United States, with a population of 164 million, at a per capita rate of 250 gallons per day, which is the amount pumped by the city of Chicago for domestic, industrial, and commercial use by a population of 4½ million.

POINTS TO VAST SUPPLY

Byrne cited records from the Army Corps of Engineers showing that a half inch of water from the surface of Lake Erie, 9,940 square miles, would supply the daily requirements of the Nation's public water systems and that a depth of 3 inches from this lake would supply a population of 1 billion. And all five of the Great Lakes have a total surface of 95,100 square miles, more than 9½ times the size of Lake Erie.

Until a few years ago there was little interest in the lakes except as a great inland water transportation system which provided incidental benefits of hydroelectric power and served domestic and sanitary purposes along their shores.

Cheap transportation on the lakes, together with an abundance of iron ore and coal, made the Great Lakes region the most productive industrial area on earth. Water conservationists now maintain that the potential of the lakes for further development is limitless, provided conflicting interests can be reconciled and served by regional cooperation.

PROBLEMS UNDER STUDY

Here are a few of the problems in which the conservationists are interested:

1. Pollution of the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair by municipalities and industries in southwestern Ontario may force Detroit to pipe its water from Lake Huron through a system that would cost more than \$200 million. Detroit, which now gets its water from the Detroit River, below Lake St. Clair, has threatened to sue the Province of Ontario, in the Canadian courts, as it has a right to do under the 1909 boundary waters treaty with Canada.

2. Milwaukee, long a center of opposition to Chicago's diversion of water from Lake Michigan, pollutes the lake by closing the gates of its sewage treatment plant, during rainstorms and thaws, in order to maintain the quality of the commercial fertilizer it

manufactures from sewage. Anthony Oils, president of the Chicago Sanitary District, has threatened to initiate a suit by Illinois against Wisconsin.

PROMOTING OHIO SYSTEM

3. The Lake Erie Watershed Foundation is promoting a plan for an integrated water system that would supply 23 counties in northern and northwestern Ohio with Lake Erie water. Fort Wayne, Ind., which is in the Lake Erie watershed, would be included in the system. While Akron, Ohio, rubber manufacturing capital of the world, is planning to bring its water 40 miles from Lake Erie, Syracuse, N. Y., is considering a project to pipe its supply about the same distance from Lake Ontario.

4. Governor Stratton's committee on metropolitan water and sanitation has submitted plans for an integrated water supply, waste disposal and storm drainage system that would provide Lake Michigan water to a metropolitan area comprising all of Cook and Du Page Counties, 5 townships in eastern Kane County and 9 in northern Will County.

URGES MICHIGAN CANAL

5. H. B. Tukey, head of the department of horticulture, Michigan State College, for years has advocated the construction of a canal to connect Lakes Michigan and Huron across northern Michigan and provide water for a vast supplemental irrigation system. He told a water conference at Elyria, Ohio, last November 23 that his project was closer to realization than many realized.

6. Dr. A. E. Berry, chief sanitary engineer of Ontario's health department told the Elyria conference that streams and ground water are not adequate for Ontario's rapid population growth and industrial expansion and that lake water must be supplied for inland development on a large scale.

DIVERSION FROM HUDSON BAY

7. Canada already diverts an average of more than 5,000 cubic feet per second of water from the Hudson Bay drainage basin into Lake Superior, through the Ogoki River and Long Lac projects, and engineers estimate that at least 12,000 cubic feet per second could be diverted.

Water conservationists maintain that such an increase in the water yield of the Great Lakes, together with regulating works and increased outlet capacities to control their levels, would assure an inexhaustible supply of lake water for unlimited development purposes in the eight Great Lakes States and Canada's Ontario province.

A plan for a Great Lakes basin compact, open to the eight Great Lakes States and to Canada's Ontario and Quebec provinces, was announced last December at a meeting of the Council of State Governments in Chicago. Under this plan, a commission, representing each State or province adhering to the compact, would make studies and recommendations on all lake problems.

SEE POLITICAL IMPACT

Proponents of the plan maintain that the States and Provinces would constitute a powerful, political force which could make itself heard in Washington and Ottawa. State Representative Albert Hachmeister, Republican, of Chicago, a member of the committee which drafted the compact plan, voted against it on the ground that it appeared to be aimed at preventing additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway.

Proponents of the compact scheme deny any such purpose but do not deny their long continued opposition to Chicago's demand for increased diversion to establish and maintain a clean stream in the waterway. Oils and other sanitary district officials regard the proposed compact as a device to

stall and defeat the legislative relief desired by Chicago.

ILLINOIS MAY CHANGE STAND

If this legislation is enacted, with or without a veto by President Eisenhower, and the dispute over Chicago's rights is thus settled, Illinois officials may have a different feeling about the proposed compact. Its proponents will have an opportunity to demonstrate their sincerity by continuing to press for it, without reference to the Chicago diversion question.

Whatever the motives of politicians may be, conservationists on both sides of the Canadian boundary regard regional planning and cooperation as indispensable for a proper utilization of the Great Lakes water resource. Ontario's Berry told the Elyria conference that in respect to water problems "the border must not act as a barrier but both countries must act together to reach a solution which will be best for all."

Ohio's Byrne, winner of the 1951 Ohio Governor's award for his work in conservation, agrees that the peoples of the two countries must seek common solutions to common problems.

TIME FOR IMAGINATION

Byrne cited a statement by an electronics expert about machines that see better than eyes, calculate more rapidly than human brains, communicate faster, and farther than the human voice, record more accurately than memory, and act faster and better than hands.

"A machine does not possess a soul or imagination," Byrne added. "Man does. The time has come to arouse his thinking and imagination for the utilization of our physical, mental, and moral forces. Our goal is to seek in the various regions of the Great Lakes a form of regional authority, acceptable to the citizens, for the conservation and distribution of water to the various communities within the watershed on a plan undreamed of not many years ago."

CITIES INDUSTRIAL SUCCESSES

"Cities that stop growing because they have reached the limit of their water capacity are like industries that must restrict their progress on account of scarcity of local processing materials. Industries have found a way to solve these problems. So must cities. The oil and steel industries are good examples."

"Transportation of ore, oil, gas, and lumber by pipelines, boats, and rails, have brought abundant supplies from long distances to their plants after local resources had shrunk below their needs. Transportation of water over natural courses and by pipeline may become the foremost undertaking on this continent as population continues its huge growth."

One Hundred and Sixty-third Anniversary of the Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by State Commander Irving Breakstone, of the Department of Illinois, American Legion, upon the 163d anniversary of the Bill of Rights. In the course of his address, Commander

Breakstone announced a new policy for the Legion's Department of Illinois, calling for a program of adult education directed toward a better understanding of the ideas of the Constitution. This very important policy statement follows Commander Breakstone's address.

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

(Address by Irving Breakstone, State commander, the American Legion, Department of Illinois)

Commander Lipsner, Past Commander Manos, Judge Geroulis, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, first, I want to thank Commander Benjamin B. Lipsner, of Aviation Post, who needs no introduction either in the State of Illinois or any other city in the Nation, he being the founder of the United States airmail system; I want also to thank my good friend Past Commander Nicholas G. Manos, of Hellenic Post, who have made possible this fine gathering of distinguished Americans. I want particularly to thank General Woodward, General Homer, General Kerner, General Whitney, Chicago's highly honored Postmaster Carl A. Schroeder, and all other patriotic Americans gathered here on this occasion.

We have just listened with intense interest to a historical discourse on American history and on the history of ancient Greece as well as some historical facts pertaining to our Bill of Rights by one of the most illustrious members of the Illinois bar, Past Commander Ralph M. Synder, which makes one proud and does honor to this occasion. Such scholarly and highly educational discourse gives one food for thought and makes us cognizant of the great contributions by our forefathers as well as ancient Greece to civilization. Only one steeped in the rich lore of history, philosophy, and literature and a devout student of the arts could be capable of expressing so eloquently these facts pertaining to the influence of our Bill of Rights and its comparative analogy to ancient Greece upon our glorious Republic and civilization in general. I regret that every schoolchild in America could not have been here today.

I want to thank our scholarly State's Attorney Judge John Gutknecht for his fine and timely talk and while I regret the inability of our distinguished United States District Attorney Robert Tieken to be personally present, we are indeed honored and appreciative of the presence of his first assistant, the Honorable Alexander O. Walter, himself a veteran and a man of high ideals.

While Judge James A. Geroulis is a member of Aviation Post, Hellenic Post nevertheless join in the presentation of this beautiful flag which will henceforth adorn the courtroom of our distinguished comrade as an ever present reminder of God and country to all who may appear before the bar of this court.

As commander of the Department of Illinois of the American Legion, I have particularly chosen the occasion of these ceremonies to open our drive to be known as Education for Freedom Week, and commemorating the 163d anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights. It is altogether fitting that we pause in tribute to the memory of the great men of our Nation who drafted the original document to which the Bill of Rights was made a constituent part. Under our Constitution, this Nation has enjoyed, and still continues to enjoy, the highest standard of living ever attained in history. We are an orderly society, with liberty and freedom for every citizen, in a measure seldom, if ever, equaled and never eclipsed on this earth.

Only 22 amendments have been attached to the Constitution. Of these, the first 10 constitute the Bill of Rights, which we celebrate today. These ten were added because

the conventions of several States refused to ratify the Constitution in its original form until they had been assured that the Bill of Rights would be made part of it.

The fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution give us a clue to the genesis of the Bill of Rights. It is a reference to the ancient right expressed in the phrase, "Every man's house is his castle." Lord Coke expressed this principle nearly 400 years ago when he stated: "The house of every man is to him as his castle and fortress, as well as for his defense against injury and violence as for his repose." At that time, this principle had been the law of the land for more than 1,000 years.

The makers of our Constitution and the framers of the first 10 amendments were never tired of quoting these immortal words of the elder Pitt:

"The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail; its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter; the rain may enter—but the King of England cannot enter. All his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement."

When ratification of our Constitution was pending before the Virginia Convention, the eloquent patriot, Patrick Henry, declared that he was "most awfully alarmed," that the document threatened the liberties of his country, among other reasons because it lacked a Bill of Rights. Henry challenged the view of James Madison, the so-called father of the Constitution. He challenged the views of the galaxy of scholars and statesmen who had drafted the Constitution and even that of the eminent George Washington, who had presided over the Constitutional Convention.

The Virginia Convention, after prolonged debate, ratified the Constitution by a bare majority of 10 votes, but only after James Madison had pledged his word that, at the earliest opportunity, he would use his energy toward placing in the Constitution the requisite amendments guaranteeing each citizen's rights, privileges, and immunities.

As soon as the Virginia Convention had finished the work of ratification, it adopted resolutions for the addition of a Bill of Rights as demanded by Patrick Henry, and these resolutions were forwarded to the Governors of the various States.

The first measure considered by the first Congress of the United States of America, under the new Constitution, was a bill to raise revenue to pay the expenses of Government. On July 21, 1789, James Madison, then a Member of the House of Representatives, introduced the second measure. This was a resolution to consider amendments to the Constitution in accordance with the pledges of faith and honor which had been made by public men everywhere in securing ratification of the Constitution.

The Bill of Rights amendments were ratified by the States within 2 years and 3 months. Thereafter, as far as Americans are concerned, and as far as the Constitution itself is concerned, they became as much a part of the original Constitution as if they had been signed on September 17, 1787, when the main instrument itself, was signed.

The 10 amendments constituting the Bill of Rights are restrictions upon national power. All the rights and immunities enumerated were already in existence. They did not owe their origin to the Bill of Rights. As had been stated in the immortal Declaration of Independence, these rights were inalienable and had come from the Creator. The Constitution was established, among other purposes, to make these God-given rights secure against oppression, secure against oppression even from the Government which the founding fathers were setting up.

The Bill of Rights amendments deal with 13 points covered by the opening words, "Congress shall make no law." The first 4 points view the citizen as a soul, or mind. Religion, speech, and the press, public assembly—all reflecting man as a spiritual being—shall be forever free from interference by Congress. The next 3 points protect the citizen's person, home, and effects from high-handed star-chamber methods of Government, such as are practiced in every totalitarian country today. The next 4 define the citizen's rights when involved with the criminal law.

These 11 points are double-clinched by the last 2—the one, warning that failure to mention a particular right in the bill must not be construed as denying that right's existence; the other, warning that a power not granted to the Federal Government is not thereby left ownerless but is reserved in full to the States or to the people.

The Bill of Rights is the law the people lay on their Government, but—notice—not on themselves. They themselves violate it with impunity. They constantly deprive others of what they will not permit Congress to deprive them. Does religious persecution exist in this country? Certainly, both public and private. Is free speech ever restricted by force, and violence, and boycott? Why, peaceable public assembly has been at the mercy of the mob in any number of our communities. Have you ever heard of the forcible invasion and destruction of private property in this country? Many times. And other rights also have been violated or denied. The law is written in the Constitution, but not on our hearts, which alone makes a law effective. Otherwise, all of us would know what some of us do not know, that to keep our own rights, we must respect the rights of others.

This great charter of the American—the American as a soul, as a citizen, as a political sovereign—has come to its 163d anniversary in circumstances emphatic with warning that rights entail duties. Evade the duty and you lose the right. May this anniversary serve to engrave sharply the meanings of both in the deep places of our minds.

The faith of our forefathers gave them the strength to plan for the ages. May we, with equal faith, guard our birthright and hand it down to posterity so that this heritage of liberty and this Nation, under God's will, may long endure.

In pursuance of this goal, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, takes this occasion to announce the following statement of policy:

"STATEMENT OF POLICY, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS"

"The American Legion, Department of Illinois, announces a new approach to the problem of Americanism. This approach is the positive one of emphasizing the importance of understanding and advocating the principles which are our heritage as Americans and to which we are loyal.

"In the past the Legion has devoted a major portion of its Americanism program to rooting out Communists and other enemies of Americanism and to exposing the nature of communism as the enemy of American principles. Our zeal to protect Americanism from subversion and un-American sets of loyalties has sometimes appeared to take the historic form of a fight to extirpate persons and ideas deemed heretical or disloyal. This phase of the Legion's Americanism program has received an emphasis out of all proportion to its extent and importance when compared with other Legion Americanism activities, such as those carried on in the schools and veterans' hospitals,

"In concentrating on the negative phase of fighting the enemy, we have neglected the positive phase of Americanism set forth in the preamble to the constitution of the Legion, which places us under the obligation of upholding and defending the Constitution of the United States of America. The preamble obligates us to safeguard and hand down to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy.

"To fulfill this primary obligation of Americanism, it is obvious that we must first understand the ideas of the Constitution which we are sworn to uphold and defend. We must understand the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy we are sworn to safeguard.

"This positive approach to the problem of Americanism is in conformity with present thinking of the American Legion at the national level.

"In accordance with this understanding of our obligations as Legionnaires, every post in Illinois has been instructed to appoint an education for freedom chairman, who will be responsible for implementing the education for freedom program in his community. By enlisting the aid of educators, experts in constitutional law, writers, TV and radio commentators, etc., the legion will bring to every community a series of programs as traditionally American as the old town hall meeting or cracker barrel session.

"The program will be based on the reading and free discussion of the basic documents and critical issues of our heritage, especially the Constitution of the United States and the writings of great Americans like Abraham Lincoln.

"It is the principles and ideas expressed in these important source materials, as they have been defined and redefined by great Americans in times of crisis paralleling our own, which we must first understand if we are to protect them in the present global battle of ideas between our own free world and the dictatorships.

"This will be the first American Legion program of its kind. It will be a novel entry of the Legion in the field of adult education. It will be a new way of implementing the principles of the preamble of its own constitution.

"Education for freedom programs will bring to people in the State of Illinois an understanding of principles and ideas to which Americans are loyal—principles and ideas which, if dropped behind the Iron Curtain and actually practiced there, would prove more powerful than any H bomb.

"This is the Legion's operation freedom."

We adopt the language of our national commander, Seaborn P. Collins, who says: "I want you to know how grateful I am personally, and how appreciative all Legionnaires are for the additional prestige which the Department of Illinois is earning for the Legion through your education for freedom program. The positive approach to Americanism embodied in this program reflects the thinking of your organization on the national level. . . . Every other department of the Legion will be made fully aware of this inspiring program. Each department will be encouraged to further the objective of promoting greater public understanding and love of the principles and ideals which are our heritage as Americans. The American Legion's preamble obligates us to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, and to safeguard the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy. Our positive program of Americanism is one important way by which we discharge this obligation."

Socialism by Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include and have printed in the RECORD an editorial in the February 28, 1955, edition of *Realtor's Headlines*, a weekly publication of National Association of Real Estate Boards, which I think my patriotic colleagues will find very thought provoking and something that should be read and considered by all of our leaders that do not wish to see socialism come upon America. The editorial follows:

If you are permitted by the Federal Government to keep any part of your income, this is, in effect, a subsidy to you and your family. Feeling is growing in Washington that the income of the American people is a national asset which belongs to the National Government to be disposed of by it as political leaders think best.

There are 76 million people in our country, according to a tabulation of *Look* magazine, who now receive Federal money or equivalent benefits. That is nearly half of our whole population. It seems incredible, doesn't it?

Every day it becomes more difficult for businessmen to accumulate capital from earnings to expand or invest. The financial tycoons of the future will be labor unions and other institutions that do not have to pay Federal taxes.

Our private-enterprise system can be destroyed just as certainly through high taxes and unlimited Federal spending, as through political action by Socialists or Communists.

Deficit spending, now popular, is the surest way to promote continued inflation and render valueless the savings and the security of our people. Why we should have deficit spending in times of great prosperity is difficult for anyone with commonsense to understand.

Blowing up "bugaboos" to frighten voiceless taxpayers into despairing acquiescence to the extortions of the Federal Government has become a fine art. Government departments spend over \$100 million a year selling the American people on big spending and deficit financing. The newest plan for Federal spending is to set up a kind of double budget. One will be for regular expenses; the other, a so-called investment budget. Whatever an anesthetic they try to give, the tax bite will be just as painful.

They can't even spend the money as fast as it is appropriated. Some of our giveaway agencies still have billions of dollars authorized in the past, but not expended. The same is true with respect to whole departments.

Isn't it about time that by constitutional amendment we limit this taxing and spending orgy? Should we not adopt a provision that would hold down Federal taxing and spending in any year to a seventh of the national income for that year, unless we get into war and two-thirds of the House and Senate agree from year to year to spend more if necessary? Should we pledge the faith and credit of the people through the Federal Government without the consent of our States? If they are not asked about a

matter of this kind, then our Federal system of sovereign States becomes meaningless.

It is true that the Members of Congress may not agree to submit any such limiting amendment to the various States. The Members of Congress that you elect and send to Washington become infected with the same spending mania that has placed us under the rule of a giant bureaucracy that has its finger in the business and affairs of every single one of us.

Members of Congress are now increasing their own salaries so that they can spend your money with greater comfort. This is the best evidence that there is no intention in Washington to reduce the Federal budget, or to stop spending money we do not have.

Our only hope lies in the 40 million home and property owners of the Nation who, if aroused to the gravity of the issue, can force a change in policy and the adoption of constitutional limits on the runaway Federal Government.

HERB NELSON.

The Cairo Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter which was sent to Secretary of State Dulles by Dr. H. Bernard Birnbaum, president of the Bensonhurst Zionist District No. 19:

BENSONHURST ZIONIST DISTRICT NO. 19,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

SECRETARY OF STATE,

Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A resolution passed at a meeting held of the District No. 19, Zionist Organization of America, reads as follows.

"The number of Jewish victims of the odious trials held at Cairo has now reached four.

One, according to the Egyptian authorities, took his own life in the cause of the trial, and two more were put to death this week-end.

"We rise in their memory and convey to their families expressions of our deep-felt sympathy. Just as other regimes in the past have resolved to similar criminal devices, have thereby in the end sealed their own doom.

"Egypt has chosen to revenge itself on Jews in whose hearts there is a longing for Israel. Revolting sentences were imposed by military courts and the head of State confirmed the execution of some—life imprisonment or long term of penal servitude for others.

"Egypt will not be sustained by the blood which it has thus far spilled. Nor will Israel nor the Jewish people ever forget these, their blessed martyrs. Their love for the people will vanquish the hatred surrounding them.

"We as organized Zionists pay tribute to, and record our profound appreciation of the efforts which were made all over the world. Particularly by the Government of these United States, to save the condemned in Cairo, and we are voicing herewith our contempt and horror at the heartless rejection by the rulers of Egypt, of these urgent representations made to them.

"As the same time, we gathered at this moment wish to express our recognition of the efforts of all those who did what they could, by word and deed to save human lives and prevent the gallows from casting its

shadow on the relation between Israel and Egypt."

Very truly yours,

DR. H. BERNARD BIRNBAUM,
President.

West Coast-Hawaii Airlines Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, membership on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee brings those of us fortunate to serve with that body in intimate contact with civil aviation and its multiple problems. I have been particularly interested, in the past few weeks, in what has taken place regarding the so-called West Coast-Hawaii case as determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board with the concurrence of the President.

There seems to be a great deal of misunderstanding as to what President Eisenhower did and did not do in the West Coast-Hawaii case. Since the record is clear, the misunderstanding must be created by those having a motive to do this.

The certificates for the Seattle/Portland-Honolulu route were first issued in 1948. Then, as now, there was a contest between Northwest Airlines and Pan American Airways as to which should be certificated.

The CAB decided, by a 2-to-1 vote, to give Northwest a temporary 5-year certificate. Northwest had argued that it could develop traffic to Hawaii from the Central and Eastern States which it serves on its transcontinental route. Pan American had argued that the route was important to it for through trans-Pacific traffic. Pan American had argued also that it could operate more economically than Northwest because it already had installations at both ends of the route required for other operations for which it was permanently certificated, whereas Northwest had these at Seattle only.

Pan American sought reconsideration of the decision, claiming that the Board had been misled into various errors. President Truman directed that Pan American should be given a temporary 5-year certificate in addition to Northwest because "the national security and the public welfare require the establishment of the most direct and expeditious service between the Northwest and points on the existing services of Pan American Airways, Inc., in the South Pacific, Philippines, Japan, and other points in the Orient served by that company."

When the certificates expired in 1953, both companies applied to have them renewed. There was again general agreement that only 1 of the 2 should be selected.

The Board's staff investigated the claims of the two carriers. They de-

cided Pan American had the better case. They found that Pan American had demonstrated by experience the truth of the assertions, made 5 years before, that it could operate the route more economically than Northwest. They found this would continue to be true in the future. They found that, on the evidence available at the time of the hearing, neither carrier had developed much through traffic. Since it appeared that the route would require subsidy whichever carrier was chosen, the choice should go to the one that would require less.

The CAB's examiner, who heard the evidence, agreed with the CAB's staff. He recommended also that Pan American be selected. He agreed with the staff's analysis of the relative costs. He also relied heavily on President Truman's determination that broad national interest considerations required an operation by Pan American. If one carrier was to go, as everyone including Northwest then agreed, it must therefore be Northwest.

The five-man Board reversed its staff and its examiner and selected Northwest over Pan American. Just why, its opinion does not make very clear. It admitted—at page 13—that—

Upon consideration of the route structure of Pan American and Northwest, there can be little doubt that Pan American enjoys certain cost advantages which should enable it to operate the route at less total cost, and therefore, for less mail-pay subsidy, than Northwest.

It referred—at page 15—to a last-minute offer by Northwest to operate the route without subsidy but said that this proposal was not made at any earlier stage of the proceeding and was neither presented in detail nor subjected to critical scrutiny and that therefore the Board's decision was not predicated on this offer. Concerning the examiner's point as to President Truman's determination that broad national interest considerations required operation by Pan American, it specifically noted that these matters are properly within the province of the President—page 10.

On February 1, 1955, President Eisenhower advised the Board of his disapproval of this decision. He stated that he believed the choice of Pan American "will contribute most to the sound development of our air-transportation system in the Pacific." Quite obviously the President was acting on the same broad national-interest considerations that had led President Truman to determine in 1948 that Pan American should initially be certificated and to which the five-man Board had itself referred as being within the President's province. Since the hearing the amount of through traffic carried by Pan American over this route to points beyond Hawaii has tremendously increased. The loss of this through traffic to foreign-flag carriers, which would have resulted from the elimination of Pan American in favor of Northwest, was undoubtedly a factor in the President's decision. In any event, the President was simply going back to what the CAB's own staff and examiner had recommended, on a basis which the

five-man Board had recognized to be within his province. His selection of Pan American was no more a promonopoly decision than was the Board's selection of Northwest.

While Northwest's friends would have seen absolutely nothing wrong in a decision establishing a Northwest monopoly of this route and throwing off Pan American, which had become the carrier preferred by a large majority of the traveling public, they were horrified at the elimination of Northwest in favor of Pan American. All the stops were turned loose. The President was informed by the Board that although the opinion written as recently as November 26, 1954, stated—page 11—that all parties and the examiner agreed that "the operation would require substantial Government support in the form of subsidy mail pay for the foreseeable future," it now appeared that all of the Pacific operations would shortly go off subsidy. The President therefore altered his decision and directed that both carriers should be allowed to operate over the route so that both might have "an equal opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to develop adequate traffic to operate without subsidy or prove definitely that the route cannot economically support two carriers."

Both actions taken by the President were sound in the light of the facts before him at the time. If the route would require continued subsidy, as the Board's opinion had said it would, the route should be operated by only one carrier and that the carrier which had demonstrated that it could operate at lower cost and for which the route was a link in a through international operation rather than a stub end—page 15. If circumstances had changed so that the route can be operated without subsidy, the Board should have advised the President and not allowed him to be misled by the contrary view stated in its opinion. For if no subsidy is needed, then by all means both these carriers, which had developed a substantial business on the route in competition with each other, should be allowed to compete on fair and equal terms in the future.

Deadline Dates for Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, assembled here is a list of several deadline dates before which eligible veterans must act if they wish to take advantage of certain benefits.

July 25, 1956: For those now in training under the World War II GI bill, no additional education or training may be afforded after this date except for veterans who may have additional training time under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945.

July 25, 1956: In general, no vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 16 based on World War II service may be afforded beyond this date except for certain hardship cases who are granted an additional 4 years in which to train.

July 25, 1957: No guaranty or insurance will be available on World War II GI bill loans for homes, farms or businesses after this date except for those who have established a later terminal date under the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945.

January 31, 1963: Those who start their education or training within their required 3-year period must complete their training under the Korean GI bill by this date or 8 years after discharge, whichever is earlier.

January 31, 1964: For vocational rehabilitation under Public Law 894, eligible disabled veterans of the Korean conflict must start in time to finish their rehabilitation by this date or 9 years after separation, whichever is earlier.

January 31, 1965: For GI loans on homes, farms or businesses, eligible veterans of the Korean conflict now have until this date to receive VA guaranty or insurance as a result of the President's proclamation. No further guaranties or insurance may be issued after that date on loans made to veterans under the present law.

The Korean benefit termination dates apply to eligible veterans except in certain hardship categories. For these, an additional 4 years are granted by law in which to complete their rehabilitation.

Seriously disabled veterans of the Korean conflict may apply for a \$1,600 grant toward the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance, but they must apply within 3 years after they leave service or they forfeit the benefit. The President's proclamation set January 31, 1955, as the end of the Korean conflict period, during which eligibility for this grant may be established. This means injuries to be covered by the law must have been sustained in active service on or before that date.

No application deadlines prevail on the other VA administrative benefits for veterans of the Korean conflict on the wartime basis. These include: hospitalization and domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities; compensation for service connected disabilities or death at wartime rate; pension for total and permanent and non-service-connected disabilities or death; reimbursements of burial expenses and a flag to drape the casket.

Progress Through Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial

from the Washington Daily News of February 28, 1955:

PROGRESS THROUGH INFLATION

It may have been mere coincidence, but is interesting that just after the House of Representatives had voted a \$20 borrowed-money cut in income taxes, the Council on Economic Progress came out with a big-spend, tax-reducing program for the Government.

The \$20 deficit-making tax whittle voted by the House was sparked by Democratic politicians trying to beat President Eisenhower to the punch before the 1956 election campaign starts.

The Council on Economic Progress is run by Leon H. Keyserling, who used to be economic adviser to President Truman, back in the days when inflation was rampant.

Mr. Keyserling claims the way to national prosperity is to increase Government deficits by several billions through spending more and taxing less. This is a theory highly popular in quarters opposed to the Eisenhower administration.

It is not exactly in line with statements of Mr. Keyserling back in 1951 when he urged still higher taxes, firmer wage and price controls and Government economy as a means of fighting inflation.

In the 15 years before President Eisenhower took office, excessive Government borrowing and a succession of deficits had created such inflation that the purchasing power of the dollar was cut almost in half. Now, for 2 years, there has been no more inflation, to the immense benefit of millions of Americans—especially the least well-off who depend on pensions or other forms of fixed income.

Inflation can sap our defense program, imperil our financial stability, lower our standard of living and impoverish millions of Americans. It is the road of "progress" toward disaster. And its nursemaid is Government borrowing.

More Americans Are Traveling Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 10 of this year I introduced H. R. 1795, a bill designed to increase American travel abroad by raising the dollar limit of goods tourists can bring into the United States duty free. The importance of the bill is that it provides a valuable means of enabling our allies to earn dollar currency, thus decreasing their need for direct loans and grants. The bill is an important part of the administration's foreign economic program.

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask unanimous consent to include an article from the New York Times of Sunday, February 27, 1955, which discusses in detail the number and categories of Americans who traveled abroad in 1954:

HOUSEWIVES LEAD IN TRAVEL ABROAD—70,242 WENT TO FAR PLACES IN 1954 TO ESCAPE KITCHEN—UNITED STATES GIVES PASSPORT DATA

Nearly half a million Americans picked up passports, packed their bags and left for

foreign parts last year. A fifth of them were from this city.

The State Department's annual count of passports showed that 250,000 traveled by ship, that housewives were bigger gadabouts than anybody else and that more Americans went abroad on personal business than for any other reason.

The Department gave out 452,059 passports to persons in all 48 States. This city, the only municipal listing in the table, supplied 82,855 travelers, more than any State. The nearest number to that was California's with 33,458 foreign-bound citizens. Trailing the passports totals were 867 Wyoming residents.

Three out of four of the American travelers crossed the Atlantic to visit Western Europe. They required 339,024 passports for that area. Latin America drew 49,736 passport requests, the Near East 16,239, eastern Europe 15,702, Africa 14,244, the Far East 10,109, and Australia and New Zealand 6,059. Only 936 passports were issued for travel in Canada where the documents are not normally required.

MANY GO JUST FOR FUN

A total of 179,534 Americans told passport officials that they had personal business abroad. But 170,832 confessed that they traveled just for the fun of it. Commercial business accounted for 48,469 passports and education for 23,081. The remainder went away for employment, religious, health, or scientific reasons.

Ships carried 253,065 passport holders to foreign strands, while 194,923 others traveled by airplane. Automobileists received 2,719 passports and train travelers used 1,342.

Passports were taken out by 70,242 housewives to get as far from the kitchen sink as possible. They were many lengths ahead of the 35,114 clerks and secretaries who followed them. But the latter were ahead of their bosses, who received 34,576 passports.

MANY LABORERS GO ABROAD

Laborers (skilled) were not too far behind the swivel-chair men, accounting for 31,537 passports. Laborers (common) were common travelers, too, taking 23,023 border-crossing documents. Passports were issued also to 29,080 students and 20,986 teachers.

The report noted that 22,381 retired Americans got the traveling papers. Another 21,425 citizens proudly said that they had no occupation. They might have been anything from international rod riders to international playboys.

Merchants picked up 11,828 passports. Other categories spanned the alphabet from accountant (3,408), through farmer-rancher (7,446), and musician (1,328), to writer (6,908).

However, men edged out the women 236,906 to 215,144. Native-born Americans numbered 292,138, while naturalized citizens totaled 159,911.

Tax Cuts and Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD 2 editorials from the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis. The editorials deal with the Democratic sponsored tax cut of \$20 and the Republican opposition to this proposal.

I wish to draw these editorials to my colleagues' attention because last year—when we voted on tax cuts for the benefit of a very few—there was no talk of irresponsibility on the part of Republicans. However, it appears that the Democrats are charged with irresponsibility when we sponsor legislation to give the small or average taxpayer some needed relief.

Following are the 2 editorials from the Capital Times—the first is from the February 23, 1955, edition and the second editorial is from the February 24, 1955 issue:

TEN-THOUSAND-DOLLAR SALARY INCREASES FOR CONGRESS—YES; \$20 TAX DEDUCTION FOR ORDINARY GUY—NO

Many of the Republican Congressmen who have just voted themselves a \$10,000-a-year pay increase have announced that they will fight the Democratic proposal to give the taxpayers a \$20 tax reduction. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, who endorsed the tax reductions and other give-aways to corporate wealth in the last session, is aghast at the proposal for a tax reduction for the little fellow. Yet they charge the Democrats with playing politics.

It seems to us that if the Democrats were playing politics, as the Republicans are charging, they would have waited until next year to make their proposal. This is not an election year.

It seems to us too, that the Democratic proposal is necessary to stop the continued drift toward depression. It will add some much needed purchasing power that will help to check growing unemployment and the continued slide of farm prices.

The signs that we are heading into the same economic climate that preceded the great depression of the 1930's are increasing. The Wall Street Journal published a national survey on February 21 showing that a growing number of bankers and businessmen fear the American consumer has shinned a little too far out on the credit limb.

From the East, New England, Midwest and South came reports that installment buying, the precursor of the great depression, is way up. Slower pay trends are very much in evidence. More checks are bouncing. Repossessions in some lines are the worst in 10 years.

Consumer credit at the end of 1954 had reached a record high of \$30.1 billion, up 2 percent from the record high of the previous year.

Economists, of course, disagree on where the credit saturation point is for our economy. But this much is certain: As long as the present trends continue businessmen will be forced by the pressure of competition to ease credit terms.

The administration has been trying the old trickle-down theory, giving tax reductions to the favored few on the theory that investments would be increased in productive facilities at a time when we are not using our present productive facilities to capacity.

What is needed to put the economic machine on the tracks is more purchasing power. A \$20 tax reduction for everybody will be a step in the right direction.

TALK ABOUT IRRESPONSIBILITY

Reporting on the President's press conference Wednesday, the Associated Press said in connection with the President's remarks about a \$20 tax reduction.

"Speaking with marked show of irritation, Eisenhower said that when anyone talks about cutting Federal revenue when spending is greater than income, then we are reaching some kind of a height in fiscal irresponsibility."

In 1954, the Eisenhower administration

added \$3.1 billion to the national debt. It spent that much more than it took in.

But in 1954 the Congress of the United States with the approval of President Eisenhower did the following things:

1. Allowed the excess-profits tax to expire, costing the Government more than \$2 billion.

2. Passed a tax bill that gave special tax exemption to the 6 percent of the American people who receive income from stock dividends.

3. Renewed a 27½-percent exemption on the gross income of oil drillers as a so-called depletion allowance.

4. Gave corporations depreciation write-offs in the new tax law which, according to the New York Times, will cost the Government \$1 billion in taxes this year.

5. Handed out millions in other tax reductions to corporations and the wealthy.

All this was done in a year when spending was greater than revenue. But now, when it is proposed to give a tax reduction of a piddling \$20 to the average guy, it becomes the height in fiscal irresponsibility.

We suggest that the President is demonstrating something that might be called the height of political irresponsibility by his remark at the press conference.

Political Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in his farewell address, President Washington warned against the danger of excessive party politics under our form of Government.

There being constant danger of excess—

He said—

the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it.

A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

In this connection, I call attention to the editorial printed in the New York Times of February 24, 1955, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date at page 1707 by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], entitled "Political Handout."

In this connection, also, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the following editorials:

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1955]

THE TAX HANDOUT

By the narrow margin of five votes Democratic proponents of the \$20-a-head tax handout succeeded yesterday in the House of Representatives in tacking this flagrantly political proposal onto an administration measure calling for the continuation of present excise and corporation taxes. By a wider and less partisan margin this hybrid bill—half of it destroying what the other half is intended to do—was then approved by the House and sent to the Senate.

It is to the Senate, therefore, that we must now look for enough political courage to defeat a project which would increase the Federal deficit, bring new inflationary pressures to bear on the economic situation

and relieve many thousands of present taxpayers from making any direct contribution whatever toward the support of their National Government. Politics had its heyday yesterday on Capital Hill.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 26, 1955]

RAID ON THE TREASURY

The House Democrats advanced to their raid on the Treasury yesterday with a discipline and unity which they seldom display in worthier causes. The Republicans, fortunately for their own credit, showed a similar solidarity, but failed by a hair's breadth to muster enough votes to protect the public purse. Now the issue goes to the Senate, whose Democratic members may be able to take a longer view of their responsibilities.

The strict party line-up in the narrow victory of the \$20 tax cut is illuminating. If the measure, in itself, had elements really favorable to the national welfare or even if it seemed that a sizable fraction of the electorate would be fooled by it, the party lines could hardly have been drawn so sharply. There would have been a more vital defense in debate, a greater tendency to split ranks. Tax cuts are usually hard for Representatives to resist, no matter which party sponsors them. On this occasion, however, only 5 Republicans went over to the other side, while 16 Democrats found the measure too much for their party loyalty. The partisan, vote-getting aspect of the scheme was too apparent.

It is to be hoped that the Senate Democrats will realize the folly which the House majority has perpetrated. If not, the voters certainly will be able to do so. The American people are not unused to legislators who try to win votes by a crude kind of appeal to the pocketbook. But the callous Democratic appraisal of the voter's intelligence and integrity as being worth \$20 a head—payable by the voter himself, in one way or another—should neither be forgotten nor forgiven.

[From the Washington Star of February 26, 1955]

FIELD DAY FOR POLITICS

On a day during which a majority of the House could hardly have looked less like responsible legislators deserving a \$7,500 pay boost, the Virginia delegation acquitted itself with distinction. Seven of the eight Virginia Democrats in the House voted, on the key test, against the transparently political Democratic proposal to give \$20 in the form of a tax cut to every man, woman, and child in the country. In the end, the House approved the proposed tax cut, but if only 3 of the 205 Democrats who voted against the motion to recommit the proposal had joined the Virginia Democrats the scheme would have been defeated.

This tax-cutting device is a thoroughly bad and reckless project. Its political coloration is clearly revealed by the fact that the Democrats tied it to legislation requested by the President to postpone excise and corporate tax reductions scheduled to take effect on March 31. The effect of this is to put the President in a position where he cannot veto the \$20 tax reduction, which will cost the Government \$2,100 million in its first full year, without also vetoing the extension of the corporate and excise taxes, which would cost the Government \$2,800 million. In other words, a veto would produce a net loss to the Government of \$700 million, and this, of course, is why the Democrats tied the two together.

It has also been claimed that the Democrats, in putting through the \$20 tax cut now, are merely doing what the President indicated he would do next year. This is not accurate. What the President said in his state of the Union message was that he was hopeful that further tax cuts can be made

next year, and that they will "be possible when justified by lower expenditures and by (other) revenue increases." Thus, the President's expressed hope was subject to two qualifications. The \$20 Democratic project, on the other hand, is subject to no qualification, and, if finally enacted, will become effective next year regardless of what the Government's fiscal condition may be at that time.

It is this which makes it such an irresponsible political maneuver, and it is this which argues so persuasively for a Senate reversal.

[From the Washington Star of February 27, 1955]

DEMOCRATS HELD GUILTY OF SHABBY POLITICS (By Frank R. Kent)

Not infrequently the smartest of our politicians outsmart themselves. There are many examples of this. The most recent seems to have been given by the Democrats in and out of Congress in the unrestrained violence and practical unanimity with which they have lined up against the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. Even now when there is plain evidence that they have badly overdone their attack, the Democratic politicians still continue to kick this issue around with unabated ferocity.

At the moment, prospects are that the contract, with the President's unwavering support, will be ratified by the Congress and the loud threats of taking it to court coming from the more garrulous of the demagogues will not materialize. One reason for this is that the opinion is practically unanimous that the courts would completely uphold the legality of the contract. This, however, does not diminish the stream of demagogic oratory still being loosed at the administration on this subject. Nevertheless, it is true that some of the more cautious Democrats are beginning to realize that the completeness with which their so-called leaders have made this a party question in the end is likely to leave them in an untenable, not to say ridiculous, position.

It does seem that the facts have begun to catch up with them. Most of the important newspapers in the country are supporting the President's position and no first-class economist, outside the labor field, has taken a stand against him. Nor have the Democrats supported their charges that the contract is a sinister plot in the interests of private power companies; that it is evil in its conception, economically unsound, wasteful of the people's money, and worst of all, a diabolical plot to destroy the more or less sacred Tennessee Valley Authority.

No evidence that stands up under scrutiny to support any of these dreadful allegations has been presented. Both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Securities Exchange Commission have indorsed it. The idea that it will interfere with the AEC's military work is regarded as utterly fantastic. Altogether, the Democrats are playing a particularly shabby kind of politics on this issue. Except for the Democratic politicians (particularly those from Tennessee) there would be no controversy at all over this contract and the notion that they can "keep it alive for years" is absurd. For the predicament in which they now find themselves they can thank the recently retired Democratic chairman, Stephen Mitchell, whose mistakes his successor, Chairman Paul Butler, seems determined to continue.

Another untenable position the House Democratic leadership has taken and which seems entirely dictated by politics is in their demand for a \$20 income-tax reduction for everybody at this session. The unbalanced state of the budget, the great increase in defense expenditures and the increasing size of our unprecedented national debt make any proposal to lower taxes this year seem indefensible and unsound. None but the professional labor economists and the Demo-

cratic politicians advocate it. Obviously, the purpose of the latter is to head off the tax reduction which the President hopes to make next year. To do this they are willing to reduce Federal revenue this year by several billion dollars, thus vastly adding to fiscal difficulties not only for this year but next.

The House already has put through this \$20 decrease, but it is exceedingly unlikely to pass the Senate. Not only will the administration oppose it, but such powerful Democratic Senators as BYRD, of Virginia, GEORGE, of Georgia, and others already have declared their opposition. In addition, there seems little more public demand for this \$20 tax reduction than there is popular hostility toward the Dixon-Yates proposal.

Soon or late, when the showdown comes on these two issues the belief is that the President personally will lay the facts before the American people. And when he does there will be no convincing answer to him because the facts are all in his favor and in both cases the causes he advocates are clean and sound. It is not tribute to the intelligence of the Democratic leadership that it should have permitted itself to get so far out on this exceedingly precarious limb. They can't possibly substantiate their position either as to Dixon-Yates or tax reduction. Their contentions constitute the worst exhibition of demagoguery seen here for a long time.

The New York State Maritime College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the following resolution from the legislature of the State of New York, introduced by Assemblyman Joseph R. Younglove, asking that the present appropriation for the State Maritime College be continued:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONTINUE THEIR PRESENT APPROPRIATION FOR THE STATE MARITIME COLLEGE

Whereas the New York State Maritime College has been of inestimable value to our national defense and to our educational system; and

Whereas it is the oldest nautical school in the United States and since 1946 has been a degree-granting college; and

Whereas the ever present emergency which seems to continue from year to year requires the type of training offered by our State Maritime College; and

Whereas the national educational program requires an expansion of educational opportunity as offered by the New York State Maritime College; and

Whereas the many illustrious alumni of this college provide convincing proof of its value in our educational program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to continue their present appropriations for State Maritime Colleges; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to Members of Congress elected from New York State, urging them to devote their efforts to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

Appendix

Career Planning in a Changing World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Mr. Millard Cass, Deputy Under Secretary of Labor, at the College of William and Mary:

ADDRESS BY MILLARD CASS, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF LABOR, AT THE COLLEGE AND CAREER DAY PROGRAM, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., FEBRUARY 24, 1955

CAREER PLANNING IN A CHANGING WORLD

That the world is changing is a truism too obvious to require proof. Even in the lifetimes of those now in college, we have developed guided missiles, jet propulsion, atomic energy, television, electronic computers, radar, tubeless tires, antibiotics, numerous alloys and plastics, and countless other products.

Back in 1937 the only commercial transportation from here to Europe was by boat. This required 4 days on the *Normandie*, which was then the world's fastest ship. Today, planes regularly fly the Atlantic in approximately 12 hours.

It was 1930 before we had a telescope that was able to locate the planet Pluto, which comes within 2 3/4 billion miles of the earth. Now the 200-inch telescope at Mount Palomar Observatory captures from stars light which has been on its way to the earth for 2 billion years and has traveled at the rate of 6 trillion miles a year all that time. The distance of such stars from the earth runs into literally astronomical figures.

Change and progress are not, of course, new to the American scene. The difference between the technological advances of this generation and those which preceded us is basically in the rate, degree, and intensity of the progress.

You men and women now in college may, therefore, wonder in planning about the future. You may ask whether skills acquired today will be obsolete before they are perfected through experience. You may even feel that career planning in this changing world is futile. I do not blame you for being puzzled, but there is no need to be apprehensive.

Each generation of Americans has thrilled to the promise of new inventions. Some workers in each generation have viewed with fear, however, the effect which new industrial developments would have on their own opportunities for employment. Such fears—then and now—cannot be discounted. Industrial progress has oftentimes involved displacement of some workers. Always, however, it has required the employment of others in the new processes. Many basic inventions which at the time appeared to reduce job opportunities in fact opened vast new fields of employment. This was true of the invention of the steam engine by Oliver Evans in 1755, the steam locomotive of John

Stevens in 1825, the Duryea Brothers' automobile of 1896, and the Wright Brothers' airplane in 1903.

It is up to us to be aware of the economic problems which arise from industrial progress and to render help whenever possible to those who are displaced by technological advances. It is up to those planning their careers to plan with a view to meeting the changing demands of a changing world.

The number of jobs available to our people has constantly increased through the years. Labor-saving devices have reduced our work but not our work opportunities. They have made it possible to reduce the workweek and lengthen vacations, thereby increasing our leisure time, improving our health, and expanding our cultural and educational activities. The marvelous inventiveness of the American people has thus helped rather than hindered our forward progress. Our ever-rising standard of living is based upon the industrial development of our Nation and the skill, ingenuity, and industry of our people.

There are some who have seen in the development of atomic energy cause for great fear. Like any other powerful force, atomic energy can be used to create or to destroy, to promote progress or to devour things we hold dear. Fire, gunpowder, dynamite, and electricity all share with atomic energy the power to make life more pleasant and fruitful or to destroy persons and property.

There is no more need for our generation to be paralyzed by the fear of a mushroom cloud than there was for prehistoric man to quake at the sight of fire, for the people of the Middle Ages to recoil at the threat of gunpowder, or for our own grandfathers to be petrified by the development of electric power or shaken by the explosion of dynamite.

Fire, gunpowder, dynamite, and electricity have all brought more blessings than sorrow to mankind. I am confident that this great new development of our generation will also, in the years ahead, become a benefactor of man and a servant of the human race. Already we have started to reap rich dividends from atomic research in the fields of medicine and agriculture, and have taken the first steps toward commercial production of electrical energy by atomic power.

I am convinced that we shall meet successfully the dilemma which nuclear fission has posed. We shall be able, through the peaceful uses of atomic energy, to bequeath to our children a better world than that we received from our parents.

As President Eisenhower said in his magnificent address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 8, 1953, we are determined "to find the way by which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life."

Underlying all other economic and social change in the United States is the rapid growth of our population. Nearly 4 million children were born each year between 1948 and 1953. Last year, the number exceeded 4 million for the first time in our history. As a result, demographic experts predict that our population will increase to between 200 and 220 million by 1975. This increase in population will stimulate the economy by creating growing markets.

Men and women now in college will be about in the middle of their working lives in 1975. At that time, the labor force of

the United States will be over 88 million, according to the Bureau of the Census—20 million more than now. We will need one-third more jobs for a work force of that size.

Of course, not every industry or every occupation will increase employment by one-third. For a second significant trend in our economy is the shift in manpower requirements as between certain industries. This shift has brought about a substantial realignment in recent years in the employment opportunities in the various sectors of our economy. Some industries, such as agriculture and mining, have been declining in employment for some years. Other industries, such as railroads and textiles, have been remaining relatively stable. The Department of Labor's occupational outlook studies suggest that some of the other basic industries, such as steel, electric power, and automobiles, may expect only moderate increases in employment over the next two decades.

Greater than one-third expansions will therefore have to take place in other segments of the economy—for example, such rapidly growing industries as chemicals and electronics manufacturing, health services, and educational services. We may need a half-million more teachers in the next 10 years to take care of a 50-percent increase in school enrollments.

The industrial trend in the years ahead, then, is definitely toward an increasing proportion of employment in services and a decreasing proportion in the goods-producing industries.

A third underlying trend in our economy is increasing productivity. Changing technology increases productivity and affects employment opportunities, as well as the whole social and economic framework of the changing world.

Output per man-hour in the economy as a whole has grown by about 2 percent compounded annually over the long run, and some studies indicate even more rapid growth in recent years. The heavy expenditures on factory construction and new equipment over the last 8 or 10 years have had a substantial effect on increased productivity. So has the increase in the number and percentage of our workers who are skilled.

The dramatic impact of technological advances upon our entire way of life can be illustrated with the important effects of a few products developed in the last 20 years, such as nylon, plastics, frozen foods, television, and antibiotics, which have already become taken for granted as a part of our daily lives, and atomic energy.

On the horizon we can see the beginnings of a few new developments which may have the same far-reaching effects in the next 20 years, such as solar energy, the gas-turbine engine, automation, and electronic computers.

We must assume that in the future technological development will proceed at an accelerated pace because the number of scientists and engineers in the United States is growing rapidly. In the 1930's, when the basic research was done which later gave rise to nylon, television, atomic energy, and antibiotics, there were less than one-quarter of a million engineers in the United States. There are now over half a million. The number of scientists has grown equally rapidly. Taking engineers and scientists together, we now have between three-quarters

of a million and one million people engaged in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge in the natural sciences and converting this new knowledge into practical use in industry, medicine, military applications, and our daily lives. There is every reason to think, therefore, that the fruits of their labor, which we will reap 20 years from now, will be even more impressive than the gains over the past two decades.

A fourth major underlying trend, and one that results directly from increasing productivity, is a vast and very widespread increase in consumer purchasing power. It is safe to predict that the American people will continue a steady gain in purchasing power out of an increasingly productive economy as long as there is no all-out war. This means, of course, a higher standard of living in terms of housing, leisure, vacations, labor-saving devices, education, and health services.

A fifth aspect of our changing world is the growing importance of international events to us in the United States. Our position of leadership in the free world provides us with a challenge and a responsibility. Today's college students will have to strive toward a greater understanding of the people of other countries so that, as thinking citizens of the United States, they can help our country exercise its leadership effectively.

What are the implications of all of these developments for you who are attending college today?

In the first place, the rapid changes of the past and the prospect of even greater ones in the future suggest that no individual can count upon making a career in one occupation or working for one employer his whole life. He must strive to maintain flexibility. Our studies of occupational mobility have shown that in every field there is a great degree of mobility into and out of the occupation, from one employer or industry to another, and from one part of the country to another.

To a person in college, getting a broad educational background is extremely helpful. It makes possible greater flexibility in the years ahead and increased mobility. Many of you are now struggling with subjects which seem at first glance to be quite remote from your chosen field of endeavor. You may wonder why a foreign language is important or what you are going to do with the mathematics or English which you are required to study. I think when you graduate and start to work, you will find that practically every subject you studied in your college career is of real use to you.

In order to progress in the world, to earn a good living and to find satisfaction from his work, a person must be qualified to accept the many and varied employment opportunities which come his way in the course of a lifetime. Now is the time when you must acquire the basic tools and the fundamental knowledge necessary to adapt yourselves to changing jobs in this changing world.

Even in professions like law and medicine, changes are constantly taking place and a broad background of education and training is essential in order to keep up with new developments. For example, commercial air transportation has opened to lawyers the new and specialized field of aviation law. The same is true of atomic energy, which has brought in its wake legal problems far different from those we have faced before. This is also the case in medicine, where new drugs and new methods of treatment require constant changes in techniques. New medical problems have been posed by radiation and, on the other hand, we hope to find new cures for old ailments through atomic research.

In addition to the need to be informed of international affairs so as to discharge your responsibilities as citizens, you should be interested in them in connection with your career planning. The number of jobs in all phases of international work has increased tremendously in the past 15 years and will continue to grow. These positions are in a number of Government agencies engaged in international affairs and technical assistance programs. They are also available in industrial firms having export business or overseas operations, as well as tourist and travel businesses.

The increased opportunities in the international field may confront many of you now in college with attractive job opportunities for which you can qualify if you have, for example, taken seriously your study of foreign languages. Thus, a subject which now seems to have no practical value may pay great dividends in the years ahead.

Many economists, statisticians, chemists, and physicists have found in later years that it is as important to be able to write a good letter as it is to know the technical tools of one's specialty. The English compositions which may seem like drudgery in college may, in fact, lay the groundwork for a good impression upon some business associate in later life. Too many of us forget that a large majority of the people with whom we deal may judge us by the letters they receive from us or the articles we write.

Just 2 months ago, the national manpower council at Columbia University released its study of a Policy for Skilled Manpower. This report points out that the nuclear age will not eliminate the need for skilled workers. Quite to the contrary. The more highly complex and automatic the machinery of production and daily living becomes, the more skilled technicians are required to produce, operate, and service this machinery.

The skilled worker will have to have a broad base of training and experience to meet the changing and increasingly complex problems he will face. As the research staff of the national manpower council found: "Automatic machines will require highly skilled maintenance and repair men. Atomic generators will require maintenance men who are more skilled than at present. Many of today's electricians will have to learn electronics if they are to retain their skilled status. Pipefitters may have to learn hydraulics. A skilled worker who formerly measured with calipers and now uses a micrometer will soon have to learn to work to tolerances measured with light waves." This is just as true in the professional and scientific field.

The college graduate of tomorrow will find, as so many of us have already found, that learning is a continuing process. The truth of the matter is that the college degree you will earn does not certify that you have learned anything of great moment in the business world. A college degree just certifies that you are ready to begin learning how to use to practical advantage the theoretical training you have already acquired. This truth does not confront only the college graduate. I have heard skilled craftsmen, who served an apprenticeship and worked as journeymen in their trades, state that they were only then beginning to acquire the well-rounded skill that permitted them to be justly proud of their ability.

All of use, whether we are in the skilled trades, in a professional field, or in the world of business or finance, continue to learn throughout our working lives by study and by experience. We must keep up with the changing developments, new tools, novel problems, and modern techniques in our vocations.

These facts emphasize the importance of a broad educational background which can

provide a foundation for future learning and facilitate the acquisition of knowledge throughout one's working life. This changing picture has prompted Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to give a new direction and increased impetus to the training activities of the United States Department of Labor.

As Secretary Mitchell has said: "For the training of our workers we use many sources—schools and colleges, vocational education, apprenticeship, the Armed Forces, and the on-the-job training courses of industry. We must reexamine all of these with a view to determining whether the methods they employ and the skills they teach are keeping pace with the temper of our times and the requirements of our economy. We must constantly reevaluate our training programs to determine whether we are training enough of the people we need in the skills we require."

Security is one of a number of factors worth considering in choosing a vocation. It is not the only or even the main factor, however. Yet, in the past 20 or 30 years there has been a growing emphasis on job security. People are deeply interested in protection against depressions. Security in this sense of permanence is not always consistent with opportunity. Relatively secure jobs, such as those in public utilities, retail establishments, or in the local, State, or Federal Governments, do not always offer the greatest opportunity to advance, the greatest earnings, or the greatest job satisfaction.

The United States is dedicated to the maintenance of a high level of employment and business activity. We believe that we have learned a few things about how to forestall serious depressions, and that we have developed mechanisms and programs to cushion our economy against economic declines, and to stimulate business when an incipient downward trend is spotted. We have come so far along the road of economic stability that all of us can appropriately face the future with confidence. The strength of our economy was fully demonstrated in the economic downturn of 1949-50 and in the decline through the first half of 1954.

I certainly would not advise any persons planning their careers today to choose their path upon the basis of economic fears or a depression psychology. Those whose main interest in choosing a career is security may find that they are paying a very high premium for insurance against something that is not very likely to happen.

You here at William and Mary are to be commended for holding a Career Day. This occasion provides an opportunity for you to give attention to job openings that might presently be available, and also to give thought to the broader aspects of career planning. I hope that today's program has been of both immediate and long-range assistance to all of you. But to get real returns from this program, you must follow-up; you must continue to think about and plan your careers, and to use the counseling facilities of your college.

In closing, I should note that by your presence here at this fine college you have already shown that you have a real interest in career planning. Merely by attending college, you are taking effective steps to prepare yourselves to meet the challenge of the world of tomorrow. Through your studies, extracurricular activities and social contacts, you are equipping yourselves to face the problems of this troubled world.

In you, and millions like you, studying in colleges, secondary schools, vocational schools and through apprenticeship and on-the-job training of industry, is the hope of our Nation.

The Wall Street Journal Shoots From the Hip and Misses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there are two ways of doing things—the right way and the wrong way. No more striking example of these two ways of doing things has come to my attention for a long time than the handling of the same set of facts by the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1955, and the Wall Street Journal of the same date. Both papers were reporting on the hearings held by the subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee on legislation cosponsored by 12 of my colleagues and myself to create a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center.

One of the witnesses who appeared and testified in support of these bills was Robert W. Dowling, president of the City Investment Co., of New York, and president, also, of the congressionally chartered American National Theatre and Academy. The same day Mr. Dowling appeared before the subcommittee he repeated an offer he had made a few years ago to President Harry S. Truman to raise through private subscription from businessmen, foundations, and wealthy individuals whatever sums were necessary to build the kind of cultural center envisioned in these 14 bills. The New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post and Times Herald, and the Washington Evening Star handled this story the right way. The Wall Street Journal handled the story the wrong way. I include the following material for the information of my colleagues who will undoubtedly have this legislation before them shortly for decision:

[From New York Herald Tribune of February 24, 1955]

PLAN FOR FINE ARTS CENTER IN WASHINGTON IS REVEALED

WASHINGTON, February 23.—A group of New York art patrons stands ready to underwrite the entire cost of a national fine-arts center in Washington. Representative ADAM C. POWELL, Jr., Democrat, New York, said today. Such a center, long proposed, would cost from \$15 to \$20 million.

Representative POWELL made his statement while testifying before a House District of Columbia subcommittee studying a bill to establish a commission which would plan such a center and a civic auditorium.

"I can state positively," Representative POWELL said, "that a group associated with the arts for many years and spearheaded by one of the biggest investment corporations will completely finance the project without one cent of expense to the United States."

The group would want from Congress only Federal land to build on, Representative POWELL continued, and indicated the probable site would be near the Smithsonian In-

stitution on the wide Mall which leads from the Capitol to the Washington Monument.

DOWLING HEADS GROUP

Representative JAMES H. MORRISON, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman of the subcommittee later said the head of the group, Representative POWELL, was talking about, is Robert W. Dowling, president of the City Investment Co. in New York, who also is board chairman of the American National Theater Academy, a private group promoting the American theater.

Representative MORRISON said Mr. Dowling had told him there was an excellent possibility that funds could be raised by private subscription to build a cultural center here second to none in the world.

NOT YET ORGANIZED

In New York last night, Mr. Dowling described the phrase "excellent possibility" attributed to him by Representative MORRISON as describing the situation accurately. He said the matter has been discussed by a number of groups, but that no organization has been formed nor any steps started toward raising the funds for the project.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 24, 1955]

CULTURE BY DECREE

Like many other people in this country, we're all for culture. But like many others, we're not for all-out culture. We think people ought to be free to take it or leave it.

So we don't like the idea of the Government getting into the business of building theaters and cultural centers as proposed recently to a congressional committee. Some officials of the American National Theatre and Academy suggested that Congress pass a bill which would set up a District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, which in turn would plan construction of a civic auditorium including an inaugural hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center in the Nation's Capital.

The ANTA says that the center is necessary because of the State Department's cultural exchange program; France, for instance, has placed at United States disposal five Government national theaters there for painting exhibits and for performances of the Philadelphia Orchestra and Oklahoma. We think that's fine; it will doubtless do us more good for Europeans to see some American folklore and hear music by Americans than some of our other efforts to make friends there have been able to accomplish.

The trouble is, ANTA says, that while everything's up to date in Paris, France, the same isn't true of Kansas City or New York or Washington. There just aren't five Government theaters where visiting troupes or art collections from abroad can be housed to reciprocate in the exchange of culture. There isn't even one.

Well, we think that state of affairs is sound. For one thing, we doubt if there is such a lack of private space as ANTA says; a couple of years ago the Austrian exhibit packed the crowds into the art gallery the Mellons built in Washington. For another, you can't get culture by decree any more than the Treasury can get taxes by osmosis. For still another, why should taxpayers in San Antonio or Seattle or Sarasota be forced to contribute to a National Theater in Washington or New York which they may never have the chance to see? It would make as much sense to pass a law saying that every collector of old masters must scatter some surrealism about the walls.

There's even a better reason in our view why this proposal should be voted down. Art has languished and the theater has been prostituted everywhere exactly to the extent of Government interference and control.

Though he didn't mean it that way, what we mean was put very well by President Derwent of ANTA when he told the House District of Columbia Committee:

"Only in America do we lag behind in the establishment of a National Theater. We need to counteract efforts of Russia—the Russians use their arts in propaganda."

Exactly.

FEBRUARY 26, 1955.

Mr. WILLIAM H. GRIMES,

Editor, the Wall Street Journal,

New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GRIMES: I am very interested in the editorial "Culture by Decree" which appeared in your publication on Thursday, February 24, particularly because it was inaccurate in several respects.

As you know, I am 1 of the 13 House Members who introduced bills creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center. All of these bills provide that the proposed commission shall "endeavor particularly to formulate a method of financing the project on a self-liquidating basis."

The Nation's Capital is particularly disadvantaged and underprivileged in cultural matters in comparison with other world capital cities and many cities in our own country, we are told by competent observers who cannot be accused of making political hay or of trying for partisan advantage. In his message on the state of the Union last month the President declared that—

"In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities."

An appropriation of only \$25,000 is called for in these bills which are sponsored by members of both parties on a strictly bipartisan basis. If your Washington representative had attended the hearings, or if you had taken the trouble to read the New York Herald Tribune of February 24, page 9, to check the facts, you would see that Robert W. Dowling, president of the American National Theater and Academy and the City Investment Co., who testified in support of these bills, repeated an offer he had made to President Truman to raise through private subscription from businessmen, foundations, and wealthy individuals whatever sums were necessary to build the cultural center envisioned in these bills. I would hope, also, that every American, when Mr. Dowling begins his fund-raising campaign, will be given the opportunity to contribute any amount he wishes toward building a great cultural center in Washington which will make the Federal city the Paris of America. Money is raised for the Metropolitan Opera Co. and the Philharmonic-Symphony Orchestra of New York on a national basis and the advancement of the cultural status of our National Capital is a challenge to the loyalty and patriotic love of country which is present in each and every one of us.

As you know, the Congress insists on depriving Washingtonians of the vote and in serving as the city council of Washington—a role it has jealously maintained since the 1870's. The citizens of Washington pay nearly \$170 million, more than is paid by a good many States, in Federal taxes each year. Yet they are deprived of all voice or representation in local or National Government, and the District's Commissioners are appointed by the President. Washington can't build a sewer, collect garbage, or put a dog in the pound without the consent of Congress. Washingtonians would like to

abolish segregation in their Fire Department and there is much discussion of this at the present time with Congress insisting that segregation be maintained. Forty percent of Washington's real estate is reserved for Federal purposes which effectively removes it from the tax rolls. The Government started out with a 50-50 division of costs of running the Federal City but has reduced its contribution over the years until now it is about 15 percent. No other American city is treated like this by private business located within the city's limits. Our forefathers threw the tea in Boston Harbor and went to war when King George III insisted on taxation without representation.

I have been told that the Federal contribution to the civic center at Columbus Circle in New York City was about \$6,500,000. American tax dollars have been used to rebuild opera and music buildings in Europe (see the testimony of the CIO which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Feb. 10, pp. A793-A794, by Representative LEE METCALF). Why can't similar funds be spent at home on cultural programs in San Antonio, Seattle, Sarasota, the cities you mention, as well as Cleveland, Trenton, New York, Washington, and other cities and towns across our land? Surely, more money should be spent in each State and in each community on the advancement of the various activities which make our civilization endure and flourish, for, as you may know, all of our cultural programs are finding it increasingly difficult to continue in the face of constantly rising costs.

In my statement on behalf of my bill, H. R. 4215, I said in part: In view of the many roadblocks which have defeated all efforts of earlier Congresses to enact legislation similar to the bills which you are considering here today, it is my considered opinion that it is very important to make a thorough and detailed study of American subsidy, direct or indirect, of foreign art programs and cultural centers. This information should be available through the Department of State and the Foreign Operations Administration. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will request this information and include it in the hearing record of your subcommittee. I believe that this information is essential to a general, public understanding of the issues involved in this legislation and to the advancement of these excellent bills in the Congress.

Copies of my bills, H. R. 4215, H. R. 4307, and H. R. 2210 (H. R. 4215 being considered), together with my statement before the subcommittee, are enclosed for the information of your readers and yourself. I hope you will do me the courtesy of carrying this material in order to correct the picture you presented. Dare we hope that once you have established your branch office in Washington the accuracy of your reporting will improve?

Cordially,

FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Member of Congress.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL,
New York, N. Y., February 23, 1955.
Hon. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: Thank you very much for taking the trouble to write us such a long letter about our editorial, Culture by Decree, and explaining to us your own views on the matter.

I note that you are interested in having the funds for this national theater raised by popular subscription or otherwise financed by private means. The Wall Street Journal would certainly not oppose a national theater financed on this basis and if our editorial gave any such impression, I am very sorry. What we questioned—and what we continue to question—would be the idea of having such a theater paid for out of Federal funds. Our view may be wrong, of

course, but it is our opinion that a government ought not to take money from all the taxpayers and use it to subsidize individual cultural affairs.

You mention some cases where it has been done and can only note that we were opposed to it in those cases also. Specifically, we wrote an editorial opposing the use of Federal funds for the proposed civic center in New York City.

I hope this position does not make you think I am opposed to cultural activities. I personally contribute to both the Metropolitan Opera Guild and the Philharmonic Society and believe that this is the way for Americans to pay for their cultural activities.

You say you hope that the accuracy of our reporting will improve. I do not see from reading over the editorial again where our reporting was in error, although, of course, our opinions might be, but I am sure you will do us the courtesy of not denying us the right to a different opinion.

Sincerely yours,

VERMONT ROYSTER,
Senior Associate Editor.

The Canner in a Consumption Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, the canning industry as a part of the food industry represents the largest and the most vital part of our economy. It is for this reason that, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the address by Ralph O. Paine, Jr., publisher, Fortune Magazine, New York, at the general session of the National Canners Association's convention at Chicago on Saturday morning, February 19, 1955.

The address follows:

THE CANNER IN A CONSUMPTION ECONOMY

It is a very high honor indeed you have conferred by asking me to appear on this program. There seems to be no argument whatever that the annual convention of the National Canners Association is the largest business convention in America. And that is saying quite a lot.

In addition to the honor of participating in this biggest of conventions, there is the very special honor of appearing on the same program with the Secretary of the Treasury. What I really mean is this particular Secretary, not just any Secretary of the Treasury. I don't think it will haunt him if I say that he is the best Secretary of the Treasury in the 25 years of Fortune's history.

Of course I know why I am here; I'm here to get out of the way as gracefully as possible so you can hear what Mr. Humphrey has to say. I feel the same way. So, without wasting any more of your time, I will tender a few observations on the food industry which, in all its manifestations, is by far the largest industry in the country. And the food industry in the United States since the war has confounded both the laws and the prophets.

If I talk more about the food market in general than about the canning industry in particular, it is because I know a little more about food than canning, which of course isn't saying much. Some of my associates, however, have studied this phenomenon in

some detail and are still following it closely because food has played such an important role in this rapidly changing American market.

And the first big point about the food market, as you know, is that, contrary to all historical experience, the American people have increased the proportion of their income spent on food at the same time that their total disposable income was rising, and rising rapidly. How extraordinary this is can be seen when you realize that there was a well-recognized economic formulation to the opposite effect: Engel's law said that the higher a family's income, the smaller the percentage allocated for food. The corollary to Engel's law, namely that the smaller the percentage of national income spent on food, the more advanced the Nation, that went out the window, too. In 1941 Americans were spending 24 percent of their cash income for food. At one point right after the war the figure reached 30 percent for some pretty special reasons which you all recall, but by 1953 it had stabilized at 27 percent. And 3 percentage points applied to total consumer cash income at recent rates is roughly \$7 billion dollars, which is the equivalent of a pretty good sized industry in itself.

Let me emphasize that this \$7 billion more or less is in addition to the tremendous expansion which would have occurred if the food industry had simply maintained its relative market position. Rising consumer income would have guaranteed a great shift to better and higher priced foods; it would also have guaranteed a vast expansion in the convenience market.

Now, we all know, Americans still only eat approximately three-quarters of a ton of food per year. They eat better food and they are eager to pay for service, preparation, processing, built-in cooking, heat and serve, thaw and heat, add water, add milk and bake, and what have you. But how did you get them to spend the \$7 billion more?

This is unquestionably the outstanding selling job of postwar America. And by selling I use Fortune's definition of salesmanship: "Everything that contributes to the salability of a product from the time it is conceived until it is finally used up or worn out."

Apparently the food industry was the first to sense the profound changes that were occurring in American society, and the first to do something about it. You were there with new products, better products, products better designed for the servient society, the growing middle-income market, for the suburban market, for the baby boom, for the working-wife market, even for the all-pervasive barbecue market. And it cannot be contradicted that you sold superbly, for the food industry was taking its rising share of the market, from the clothing industry, from the home-goods industry, and from the automobile industry. A really tremendous achievement.

But what do you do now? The food industry was in there first after the war but other industries are beginning to catch on to this changing American market.

There are some indications that the terrific drive for automobile sales in 1955 may be at the expense of food. The clothing industry is also out in force to regain some of the ground it lost to food. What is the food industry going to do about it?

Before even suggesting an answer, I think it might be profitable to review a few underlying factors which strongly favor the food industry. They are all familiar to you but they are worth recalling for this discussion.

1. The upward trend in the rate of population growth is irreversible for another generation. This works in favor of the food industry, day after day, week after week, year after year. No other industry is such a sure beneficiary of population growth as food. And the birthrate has been so high

for so long that even if it dropped off unpredictably—and there is no reason to suppose it will—another upward surge will certainly occur when all the war and postwar babies start having babies of their own. A United States population of 200 million or more within 20 years seems inevitable.

Moreover there is a sizable expansion in the food market due to start very soon. That expansion will occur as the 37 million postwar babies develop teenage appetites. Children are such a large proportion of the population today that the food market has yet to benefit in full from population growth. For children do eat less than adolescents and adults. Fortune estimates that there is a good \$2 billion additional expenditures for food coming up as the food intake rises from the 2,000 calories per day for a 6-year-old to the 3,800 of a 17-year-old boy.

Another way of putting it is that from now well through the 1960's the rise of the food market should increase about 3 percent faster than population.

2. Productivity is rising faster than population. Output per man-hour on average is increasing at an accelerating rate. We used to think 2 percent per year compounded yielded a pretty fair standard of living. There is now good reason to believe the figure is nearer 3 percent.

That is of great significance to the food industry, for it offers assurance that the United States people will not revert to lower food standards. Three-quarters of a ton of corn meal, sweet potatoes, turnip greens, and salt pork per person will support life after a fashion, but there isn't much profit in it for the canning industry.

3. The United States has arrived at a true consumption economy. The first, and still the only, consumption economy in the world.

Our problem is to get people to consume what we can produce. In the rest of the world the problem is to withhold enough from consumption to accumulate the capital by which production may be increased. In Communist Russia capital formation is achieved by government fiat; the standard of living is kept at a bare minimum, with the result that capital investment there is running very high. Throughout Asia and the Middle East the margin is so thin that capital formation is pitifully small.

In the United States, by contrast, we are over the hump; the more we consume, the more we can produce. In fact, if we don't consume, the whole machine begins to stall. Thrift is still a personal virtue, but the cold fact is that the American propensity to save is probably the most uncertain factor in this new American economy. The choice of spending or not spending is now available to most of the people of the United States over a very wide range of purchases. And they are prone to fads.

You know what happened to butter, and to potatoes. Suppose this crazy backyard barbecue thing went so far that men started to cook food instead of play with it? Men want their raw materials raw; no cans for them. You would be in serious trouble.

Consider what would happen if any very considerable number of people decided to make the old car do for 1 more year, to put up another year with that old 21-inch television, to carry on with that old nonelectric range. These are not very hard choices for Americans to make; a sudden national feeling that it was smart to be thrifty—for 1 year—would bring on a catastrophe that would shake the world.

WHAT HAPPENED IN 1951

How even moderate shifts in consumer attitudes can affect this new economy of ours was highlighted in a startling fashion in 1951. As you will recall, a good recovery from the 1949 readjustment was well underway by the spring of 1950. Then came Korea and a pretty wild 6 months of inflation, with little faith that the Truman adminis-

tration was going to be able to bring it under control. There was every reason to believe that people would continue to turn cash into goods, that is, continue their buying spree.

But what happened? As we put it in Fortune: "In March 1951 the consumer clutched his pocketbook to his breast, spat in the face of world economic forces, and began to save a higher proportion of his disposable income than he ever had in peacetime."

By April the American consumer was saving at the rate of \$20 billion annually and for the balance of the year up to 9 percent of his disposable income. This was a turnaround of 4 percent in the saving rate from the previous year. It was a good thing for the country that he did; this unprecedented and unpredictable savings spree brought Mr. Truman's inflation to a sudden halt, much to the surprise, if not annoyance, of the administration, which, of course, had the ground cut out from under its frantic appeals for a price freeze and direct controls.

It was a good thing for the country, that unpredictable savings spree, but it is frightening to think what would have happened to the economy had this occurred when defense spending was not rapidly expanding, which, of course, it was in 1951. If you were making or selling appliances you would have been acutely aware of the savings spree. For instance:

Refrigerator sales dropped from 6,200,000 units in 1950, "a scarcity year," to about 4 million in 1951, a year of oversupply. Television sales dropped from 7,500,000 in 1950 to a little over 5 million in 1951.

Some hard goods like freezers and unit air conditions, it is true, increased sales in 1951. It was also true that some companies did a better selling job than others. But generally speaking, 1951, was not a good year to be in the retail business. Yet the measurable difference in spending was around \$6.5 billion, but that little 3 percent of consumer income carries enormous leverage.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOOD INDUSTRY

The food industry, of course, is much more stable than consumer durables, and I am not suggesting any direct comparison. What I would like to suggest is the unpredictability of the American consumer—this new consumer who has such enormous reserves of optional buying power. The food industry, as I would like to repeat, has done a superb job of selling in this new economy. And by selling I mean to include not only sales, advertising, promotion, and merchandising; I mean also continuing innovation and improvement to meet consumer needs and wants and tastes. Any industry which can shift its share of the entire consumer market 3 percentage points—up—is some industry.

And it would be a bold man who had the temerity to lecture it. But, as someone who is not in the food industry, I feel I should point out that food is now taking such an extraordinary share of the consumer dollar that, in a very real sense, everyone else in the consumer field has to sell against food.

Can the food industry continue to hold its 27 percent of the consumer dollar? Or will Engel's law—that food expenditures drop relatively with rising income—become valid once more in the United States? Income in the United States is bound to rise, barring war. Can food, can the canning industry hold its share?

Let me say hastily that I hope it does. (That is a paid advertisement for my associates on Life magazine.) There is no limit in sight to the market for convenience. There is no limit in sight for rising quality. There is still an inordinate amount of time spent in the American kitchen—a form of labor which is considered so unproductive that it is not even entered in the columns of gross national product.

The larger question is, How successful will our efforts be in selling what America produces? The limiting factor in this new consumption economy is not production but sales. There is hardly an industry in the country in which the production men are not itching to open the throttle. If they did, of course, we would all soon drown in a sea of surplus goods.

In the overall, of course, the production process also produces the means to buy goods. But this marvelously tuned economy demands very close tolerances. Today the difference between prosperity and recession is very, very small when measured in terms of consumer spending.

Now consumer spending is not the only element in our prosperity. Capital goods and defense spending are both large factors. However, only one man in this room has much influence on defense spending, and as for capital goods, that market depends largely on business expectations, which comes back pretty much to expectation of consumer behavior.

The primary job in business today is to keep the consumer buying, to keep him buying steadily, and to persuade him steadily to buy more.

On Fortune several years ago we asked ourselves this question: "Why do people buy?" That is, after people reach a point where they possess optional or discretionary purchasing power—and today almost everyone in the United States has that in some degree, and at least half the population has it to an important degree. After a prodigious amount of research, we came to a very simple and unavoidable conclusion: People buy because they are sold.

This we discovered had never been admitted by any respectable economists. For to economists, selling, the persuasive element of the distribution process, has always been laughed off as one of the excesses or exuberances of American capitalism. It is treated as "economic waste." It may be. But I find it very hard to believe that the entire apparatus of American salesmanship, advertising, promotion, merchandising, and personal selling has no power to influence the total consumption of goods and services. I not only find it hard to believe; I think it's nonsense.

If the apparatus of American selling did no more than keep a consumer spending 2 percent above what he would without it, then the apparatus of American selling is worth everything it costs.

If the apparatus of American selling can keep people buying, keep them buying steadily and steadily buying more, it will have worked a greater wonder in the world than American production.

Sell more canned foods. Sell better canned foods. But above all, sell. That way it can be truly said of you that what is good for the canning industry is good for the United States.

Are States Rights Disappearing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in a republic like ours, composed of member States, the trend is to enlarge the powers of the National Government and limit the power of the States; and this has been true since our Federal Government began.

The ninth amendment of the Federal Constitution declares:

The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The tenth amendment provides that:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

There is no question, therefore, that Federal authority over the police powers of the States was not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, yet we have seen measures passed by Congress that invade the powers of the States. For example, no one will deny that a State has the right to fix hours of labor and to prohibit child labor and other matters pertaining thereto, but the courts have held that labor in connection with the manufacture of goods designed for shipment in interstate commerce is national in character, and that therefore the Federal Government has authority to pass laws which, in an extreme case, may annul a State law. So in criminal cases, such as the driving of a stolen automobile from one State to another, the Federal law controls. Almost any set of facts can be considered of national interest and concern; and when it is, the Federal Government assumes command. The tendency is, and has been for 100 years, to read into a set of facts a national interest.

The more business the National Government gets into in a State, the more the Federal courts ignore State laws. When the Government participates in appropriations for roads and the support of schools, when strings are tied to the appropriations, it is very easy to find a national interest, and hence Congress legislates where the State should and where it has a perfect right to do so.

Wars wreak great havoc with the Constitution. When a soldier is drafted or voluntarily enters the Armed Forces his civil rights end, and if sent to a foreign country the laws of his own country and the Constitution do not protect him in criminal cases. Congress saw fit to pass an act making all soldiers of occupied countries subject to the laws of that country. After a war stops, the whole economy of the country has suffered to such an extent that the Federal Government, to stop depressions and aid those in distress, gets busy with appropriations for relief. It then directs the manner of relief, the agents of relief, and jurisdiction over violations of law with respect to it.

If this course continues, the States will have a very small voice in the affairs of their own Government. That is not what the framers of the Constitution intended, but that is the way it has been interpreted.

Public health programs sound good on paper, but where the Federal Government supports them in a State, the Government will, directly or indirectly, control it. In this case it is easy enough to find a national interest, because the Federal Government wants sound soldiers, and I will not be surprised to see the

health programs carried out in each State with minute details of administration prescribed by the Federal Government. The Government Health Department at Washington will make rules and regulations, regardless of what the States desire.

On the illegal manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor the Federal Government made great headway in subjugating the States to Federal law and has steadily encroached on their powers since that time.

I personally know of one glaring incident which illustrates well this Government interference in State matters. A merchant in a small town, whose reputation for honesty was not questioned, sold 100 pounds of sugar to an oldtime customer whom he had known for years, who wanted it to put up his fruit. Everything was open and aboveboard, and the sugar was delivered and the fruit saved.

Shortly after the sale revenue officers appeared at this merchant's store and said that the sale was illegal. The storekeeper consulted me about it and I said I would look it up. I did so, and found no law anywhere that would make the sale of sugar for canning purposes illegal. I so advised him. He was later arrested and hauled into a Federal court in Baltimore, tried by a jury and under the charge given the jury by a Federal judge was promptly convicted and sent to prison for 3 months. No one was permitted to see him, and although suffering from diabetes he was given no relief and died soon after his term was served.

What the court relied upon was a regulation issued by the Treasury Department saying that a sale of 100 pounds of sugar or more must be reported to that Department, and providing a penalty. I do not think one Member of Congress knew that there was any such regulation, having the force of law. From a strictly legal standpoint the regulation had been authorized by Congress. That is, Congress gave the Treasury Department the power to make such rules and regulations as it saw fit.

In this case the merchant did not know a thing about the regulation, but the court said they are printed every night in a book known as the Federal Register, and that publication there is notice to everyone. I since learned that the regulations are made during the day, hundreds of them, and published that night. Some of them come in late in the day, just in time to reach the printer. At 6 o'clock in the evening there was no law against selling sugar, but at 7:30 there was.

A successful lawyer in the Federal courts does not need any lawbooks. All he has to have is the Federal Register, and if printed at 12 o'clock at night, he must get a copy and sit up the rest of the night to find out what new law has been passed by some bureaucrat. Here you see the State laws of the State of Maryland set aside and ignored, and a Federal regulation taking its place. This is an extreme case, but a true one, as I know every fact in it from beginning to end.

Surely we ought to stop and listen, or all the power reserved by the Consti-

tution to the people will be lost, and we will have in this country an arrogant Federal Government controlling our every action; and those rights which were guaranteed to the States in the Constitution will disappear forever here in this great heralded democracy.

I do not believe that the public generally recognizes this tendency toward an autocratic Federal Government. Wars, and depressions following wars, with all the distress that comes in their train, has made Government assistance necessary, but as soon as possible Government assistance ought to be discontinued or the Federal Government will usurp all authority down to the smallest township.

For their own good people should not encourage Government hand-outs while able to do for themselves. We did that to the Indians, and now, after a hundred years of dependence on the Federal Government, with very few exceptions, they cannot take care of themselves. We adopted the opposite course of action with the Negroes. With them it was "dig in for yourselves," and as a result the Negroes of today have made most praiseworthy progress. They have shown that they can make their way as well as any other class of citizens.

I hope the American people will not be lulled to sleep by a paternal Federal Government and thereby lose their own initiative, their desire to progress, and see their State governments mere agents of the Federal Government. This Government was never organized to insure success to any individual. All it was intended to do was to give him an equal opportunity, and how successful he becomes is up to the citizen himself. Special privilege can be controlled by law, but the success of a citizen must be determined by himself. Too much paternalism will lead to the destruction of individual liberty.

Reckless Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "Reckless Tax Cut," which appeared in the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of Saturday, February 26, 1955:

RECKLESS TAX CUT

Politics took over in the House of Representatives Friday afternoon when the Democrats put through a bill to cut income taxes by \$20 for each person and to continue corporation income and excise taxes at their present rates. President Eisenhower had asked that there be no tax cuts. He had requested Congress to continue the corporation tax at its present level of 52 percent, instead of permitting it to drop to 47 percent on April 1, as provided in the present law.

House Democrats made a political football of the tax bill. They talked loud and long of the tax cuts corporations had received

last year and asserted that this was the year to help the little fellow. They were not only willing but happy to vote for keeping the corporation and excise taxes at their present levels, while providing for a tax cut for the little fellow. That way they tried to make doubly certain that he would know they were thinking of him.

Tax cuts are wonderful—but when, as in this case, they mean plunging the Government an additional \$2,200,000,000 into the red they are downright reckless. There is only one reason why house Democrats have insisted on a tax cut this year—it is President Eisenhower's statement that if things go all right a tax cut may be possible next year. If Congress waited until next year, the tax cut would be labeled a Republican reduction. This year if one went through it would be in spite of the administration.

But whether this one does go through remains to be seen. It still has to get through the Senate, and the Senate usually is much more cautious about such matters. It is a fact that the House frequently votes for measures that seem to do something for large numbers of persons (it's been voting a soldier's bonus with considerable regularity since the war ended) and then leaving it to the Senate to put things right. This way House Members get credit for having nothing but the best intentions and are relieved of any responsibility when the Senate balls them out.

It will be up to the Senate again to restore reason, if it is to be restored, because the tax cut has been made part of a package. Since the President does not have the power to veto an item in a bill, passage of the present measure by the Senate would compel him to approve the cut or sacrifice the rest of the bill. And that he couldn't do for the simple reason that it also provides for continuing the corporation tax at 52 percent. If this tax were permitted to drop to 47 percent and certain excise taxes were permitted to lapse the Government would be out about \$3 billion.

The casual observer might view this as a clever bit of maneuvering. But he would be wrong. It isn't clever, it's irresponsible.

Plight of the Dairy Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the problems attendant with trying to represent the views of all constituents are aptly illustrated by a letter which has been written by one well-known Adams County farmer to another well-known Adams County farmer relative to the plight of the dairy farmer, and the farmer in general. Adams County is a part of the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following copy of the letter written by J. Claude Hammond of Gettysburg, to President Eisenhower, also of Gettysburg:

GETTYSBURG, PA., February 26, 1955.
The President, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
White House, Washington, D. C.

Sir: I am one of the thousands of dairy farmers throughout the United States of America who have a few acres of ground and a small herd of dairy cattle, struggling for a meager existence at best.

According to newspaper and radio accounts, members of the Republican Party openly stated that there are too many people engaged in the dairy business and that some of us should be put out of business in order to reduce the amount of dairy products. This is a very cold and heartless way to accomplish an end. If that is what your administration wishes to accomplish, I suppose your collaborators would say you have been successful (success being used in the sense that your administration is accomplishing what it set itself to do). From any point of view, I should think that the word "destructive" would be more applicable. Many dairymen in the State of Pennsylvania, and even locally in Adams County, are being forced out of business because of the inequalities in the prices they receive and the prices which they must pay for things they need.

What class of people does the Republican Party, and the present administration cater to, the wealthy, of course. Ever since I was a boy I have heard this said about the Republican Party. If there was ever any doubt in my mind as to the truth of this statement, all doubts have been dispelled since the last presidential election.

Your administration did not hesitate to reduce taxes for the wealthy class of people who did not need relief and according to current news reports, many large corporations are reporting an all-time high in net earnings, some in spite of the fact that their gross earnings were smaller than in prior years. And what do they, openly and brazenly, attribute this increased net earnings to? Why, the answer is simply and factually stated by them, "reduced taxes." They are doing well as they were before this tax reduction. And now, how do they show their appreciation for this tax relief? They raise prices still more on things we dairymen need to buy (that is if we had the money). How long can this condition continue?

Now when the Democratic members of our Government say that the small taxpayer should have some relief—even a very meager \$30 per person—members of the administration forces cry "inflation, the Government would lose millions of dollars." I wonder why some of the guardian angels of this great country of ours did not think of this phase of the matter when the millionaires of industry had more (unnecessary) millions of dollars literally dumped into their coffers in the form of reduced taxes? With what, I ask you, will the farmers and cattlemen of this country buy the expensive items produced by these millionaires—when many of us have already reached the breaking point, and thousands more are rapidly approaching that point?

The present agricultural program, to me, is grossly unrealistic and in the matter of the dairy business, basically unsound. Take tobacco for instance. Tobacco is supported at 90 percent of parity, while dairy products are supported at 75 percent of parity. Which, I ask you, is more essential to the welfare of the 160 million Americans (either in peace or war)—a cigarette, a cigar, a chew of Brown's Mule, or a cool glass of nutritious, life-sustaining milk? Which would be more beneficial to the hungry workman, or the tired soldier in the muddy trench or bomb shelter? Milk and various other dairy products sustain life. As for tobacco, there has been considerable speculation recently as to whether the smoking of tobacco encourages or even actually causes cancer. Yet tobacco is supported at 90 percent of parity and dairy products at 75 percent (if you can call that support) of parity. Tobacco, of course, produces more revenue—and we must have money to finance our governmental operations. But we must also have a healthy agricultural program—our people must eat as well as smoke.

It is true that prices have skyrocketed in every branch of our national economy, and it

is agreed that prices are due for a downward revision. But, please, Mr. President, do not force the agricultural and cattle industry to carry the entire load of the downward revision while organized labor and big business continue to enjoy an all-time high.

Agriculture is a very difficult branch of our economy to organize for concentrated and effective protective action. The giant industrial labor organizations can effectively defend themselves. And, now, they are talking of another round of wage increases—while the essential and vitally important dairy industry is rapidly sinking to the depths so conspicuous and so prevalent during the Hoover administration.

Please, Mr. President, do not permit our vitally important dairy industry to be beaten to it's knees again. Agriculture in general has crawled on its knees, and even on its belly, for the major part of its existence and we are approaching the prone position again. The noteworthy exception to the above was during the several years of Democratic administration prior to the present Republican administration. Agriculture is willing to shoulder its share of any necessary economic adjustment, but it is unsound and grossly unfair to expect the dairy farmer to carry all or even a major part of the burden of economic adjustment while the rich get richer and the farmer gets poorer.

Respectfully submitted,

J. CLAUDE HAMMOND.

(Blind copy to Hon. JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Member of Congress, Old Office Building, Washington, D. C.)

Forestry Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen-Times of February 27, 1955:

FOREST SERVICE ANNIVERSARY

From the first days, America's forests have been the sign and symbol of America's strength.

Coast-running explorers sailed home to Europe with high reports of the virgin forests of pine and hardwood crowding down around bays and riverbanks.

Timber and its byproducts of pitch and turpentine were the first major exports of North Carolina and other Southern seaboard States in the naval stores industry.

Later, as pioneers pushed past the Blue Ridge, they sent back word: "Good forage. Good wood and water here."

Wood and water. Later generations found the two vital resources linked far closer than the first settlers dreamed.

Behind the onrushing frontier, axes flashed and saws whined in an unleashed assault on forest wealth to meet the needs of a fantastically expanding population.

"Cut and move out" was the order of the day. Millions of acres of timberland were cut over and left with no thought of replanting. Slash waste was left where it fell, breeding forest fires that ravage huge areas.

With hillsides stripped, rains gullied out the onetime forest floors to send disastrous floods over lowland riverbanks. With no roots to hold the rainfall back, winter floods gave way to summer dryness.

A few voices were raised early to protest the reckless waste. Forest conservation methods, long practiced in Europe, were

urged to save the dwindling timber resources.

Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, was one of the first and most dogged campaigners for conservation. He bored many ordinary citizens and angered some profit-hungry exploiters with his endless preachments for guarding natural wealth. In the Biltmore, Pink Beds, and Pisgah woodlands, Pinchot gave the Nation one of its best lessons in scientific forestry.

The Pinchot doctrine took hold as more and more people, lumbermen included, saw the growing results of unregulated forest exploitation.

A program of Federal forest reserves was instituted for setting aside timberlands where scientific forestry methods could be practiced. The program grew into the huge national forest holdings of today.

In North Carolina, Joseph A. Holmes, the State geologist, first called Pinchot's attention to forest reserve opportunities here in 1893.

Today, with the 50th anniversary of the United States Forest Service, North Carolina national forests include 1,138,000 acres of timberlands. They form a vast reserve of managed lumber resources and watershed protection. They give magnificent fringe benefits of preserved beauty and vacation happiness.

The conservation doctrine took hold among private lumbermen with increasing force. Enlightened businessmen saw the folly of destroying the source of their own operations with no care for replacements.

Champion Paper & Fibre Co. was a pioneer in private conservation practices. Bemis Lumber Co., of Robbinsville, and Mead Corp., of Sylva, encourage tree farming and other conservation programs.

The great work of the Forest Service goes on and grows in importance with each year through programs of conservation and research.

This golden wedding anniversary of dedicated men and the great woodlands is one of which all the people can be gratefully proud.

Science Talent Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL C. KING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the highest award in the 14th annual science talent search was awarded last night to a boy of my district, Frederick P. Greenleaf, 17-year-old senior of the Allentown High School. This young physicist-mathematician-chemist was awarded the \$2,800 Westinghouse grand science scholarship after 5 days of intensive competition with 40 finalists filtered from several thousand contestants throughout the country.

The people of Allentown and my whole district are very proud of this high honor paid to one of our boys, and we congratulate him, his parents and his school instructors who have guided him in his education.

In this talent contest young Greenleaf expressed his scientific knowledge with a project which demonstrated a process of practical use in separating almost any complex mixture of metals by distillation. I could not fully comprehend his explanation of the process, but it was

apparent that Fred is an expert builder of "stills." Accordingly, I have offered his services as consultant to my congressional colleagues from the hills of West Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky.

The more important use of Fred's process will be in diverse fields, ranging from refining operations to atomic energy production. He believes the distillation method of separating mixtures of metals will be quick, economical, and efficient.

Science has interested Fred Greenleaf since he was 6 years old, when he received a chemistry set as a gift. Later he won top honors in the Annual Lehigh Valley Science Fair and competed in the 1954 National Science Fair.

The Science Talent Institute and Westinghouse are to be congratulated for their work in stimulating young talent in the field of technology which will be so important in the future development of our country.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, at this time when we are to consider appropriations for soil conservation, I take great pleasure in presenting to my colleagues of the House the following letter of Luther H. King, of Clarksville, Ark., who is president of the Arkansas Basin Association and a great advocate of soil conservation and upstream development. It is one of the best examples of straight thinking that has come to my attention. Mr. King's statement is as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

(By L. H. King)

What can we expect of our boy, a young man, who wants to farm and is prepared by experience; has taken his training in our agricultural schools and has the know-how about farming. He has only the means that God gave him to start with; plenty of energy and ambition to succeed, but no means to work with. Place him on the average eroded farm. He has to make a living and would like to earn a little money, but he has the problems of rebuilding the soil that his ancestors have permitted to wash away for over 100 years, and he is supposed to build this soil up for present needs and the 200 million people which we expect to have in the not-to-distant future.

You know as well as I know that he will starve to death, let alone paying for the farm, save some money, and rebuilding the soil, without some aid.

Should the sins of our ancestors in letting this soil wash away be placed on this boy; something entirely beyond his control; something he could not help. I emphatically say "No." Do you expect him to build this soil up to feed this anticipated 200 million people without aid? Again I say "No."

Whose duty is it to rebuild the soil. I say that it is everybody's. Everyone who eats food should pay for this mistake of our ancestors and not this poor boy alone.

Who can claim that this is a waste of money or bad economy to aid this boy. No

one with a sane mind. We are only saving our own hides in furnishing this aid.

I was born and reared on the farm and have farmed all of my life and know from experience the problems of soil erosion. I have seen millions of tons of topsoil go down the little gullies into the small streams and on into the Arkansas River, never to be of any use again. I can think of no worse economy than to permit this to continue. While I am writing this it is raining down in torrents and it makes my heart heavy to think of all the soil that is getting away from us forever. This soil means food, it means life. You cannot eat the soil, but you can eat the food that it produces, and if this soil could be converted into food, and it was being wasted, as it is now, we would be calling in the United States Army to stop it.

Our national debt is big and it would be fine to balance the budget, yet we could live without either, but we cannot live without food, and soil means food.

Are we going to reduce our standard of living to that of the Chinaman and our eastern Asiatic countries and be on starvation. We will if we don't conserve our soil. Our population is increasing and our soil is decreasing. God only gave us so much soil and he placed us guardians over it. We have done a bad job. Christ promised forgiveness of sins and I think it is time we ask forgiveness for wasting our greatest national resource and pledge ourselves now not to lessen soil conservation, but increase it if any change is made.

I know that some people say that it is a donation to the farmer—it is not. It is a donation to save our lives. We cannot help the mistakes of our ancestors in not conserving the soil. Some say the farmers cheat on the program—maybe a few farmers did cheat a little in the beginning of the program before they were educated to the workings and benefits of the program, but today I don't think one single man can be found cheating in our country. I, personally do not want one cent donated to me and I think the great majority of farmers feel the same way. You know that our farmers are honorable and honest in the main and their occupation has made them by nature self-reliant and independent, and I resent the charges of donation and cheating because I know it isn't true.

What can be done to save the soil? Build ponds and small lakes to save a lot of the overflow. Water is always needed on the farm for irrigation, stock water, spraying, fish raising, and fire prevention. Terrace the land to prevent an accumulation of water which makes the gullies. Cover crops, especially legumes, stop erosion; furnishes grazing for livestock, and the surplus may be made into hay and silage.

Fertilizer is an absolute necessity to start the cover crop. It is astonishing how fast the soil can be reclaimed with cover crops, fertilizer, and erosion control.

What to do. The least Congress can do to save the young man on the farm and to save our own lives, is to maintain the soil conservation program. I have farmed 62 years and these ideas are not "pop-ups."

I respectfully submit this for your consideration.

Statehood and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there never has come to my attention a more

eloquent, convincing, and logical expression why the grant of statehood to Alaska and Hawaii would aid our foreign policy than that which was made on February 22 by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, when S. 49, the Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill, was under consideration by the Territories Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Senator O'MAHONEY's remarks were made when Under Secretary of the Air Force James H. Douglas was before the committee; they were so appropriate and so right that I take pleasure in presenting the statement here:

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us, Mr. Secretary, two recommendations from the Cabinet level. One of these is the letter of the Secretary of Defense, C. E. Wilson, from which I will read this sentence, which, of course, has been repeated several times during the hearing:

"With respect to title II of the bill"—being the Alaskan portion—"however, the Defense Department believes that it would be in the interest of the national security that Alaska remain a Federal Territory at the present time."

Now, those last three words are qualifying words "for the present." They may have little significance, or they may have much. I do not know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will be very glad to ask the Secretary if he thought it practical and appropriate to interpret those words.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I think it would be very well if you would do so. It would be helpful.

Now, the other report which I have here is the letter of the Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton, dated February 4, 1955, to the chairman of this committee. In the second paragraph of his letter he says, speaking of the two Territories which are affected here:

"It is this Department's view that such action would serve to support American foreign policy and strengthen the position of the United States in international relations."

Senator JACKSON. Senator O'MAHONEY, that seems to corroborate the statement made by the then General Eisenhower in Denver after the Korean war, the very point that President Eisenhower previously made.

Senator O'MAHONEY. When I was chairman of this committee some years ago, and we held hearings on the Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills, and the committee endorsed them, I took them to the floor with the deep conviction that what Secretary Morton said was right, namely, that it is an efficient method of defense of the United States and of the freedom for human beings for which it stands, to prove to the Asiatic world that we believe in letting people govern themselves.

We are represented in this cold war as being imperialists who want to step into the shoes of the vanishing empires of Great Britain and France and Holland in Asia.

I have been convinced from the very outset that the most effective thing that we could do in the Pacific area would be to prove to the Asiatics that we do believe in self-government by granting statehood both to Hawaii and to Alaska. And when I say Alaska, I say it because I know that the Aleutian Islands are just directly north of Hawaii, and Bering Strait, only 40 miles across, separates Alaska from Siberia.

I am mindful of the testimony that was given on behalf of the governors of the 11 western States by Gov. Earl Warren, of California, now Chief Justice of the United States. I want to make a part of the record here his statement:

"I am also appearing as a westerner who happens at the moment to be chairman of a governors' conference of 11 western States,

which organization has gone on record several times during the past few years in favor of statehood for Alaska. We in the West believe that the development of any part of the West is of great benefit to the entire West and we consider Alaska as an integral part of the West. We have had the association of its governor in the council of the governors' conference committee 5 or 6 years and we have come to believe that this is the time for Alaska to be given statehood. We believe that we have a particular interest in the defense of Alaska and we believe that if Alaska is given statehood, is given an opportunity to develop its resources and its civilization, that it will be a greater factor in the defense of our Nation than it could otherwise be. We believe in the last analysis the defense of Alaska will come from the civilization that we develop there rather than just from the airplanes we send there or the fortifications that we develop.

"We are of the opinion that Alaska will not develop to the full extent of its potentialities unless it does achieve statehood."

I cannot think of a more eloquent expression of the point of view which this committee has shared in the past. But the testimony that is now presented here on behalf of the Department of Defense is vague and cloudy and uncertain.

The issue before us is whether or not our foreign policy, of which Secretary Morton speaks in his letter, is to be supported by an attitude of the extension of freedom to our own integrated Territories or whether it is going to be hampered by a policy which would seem to indicate that instead of advocating the right of self-government in the Territories, we are being asked by the Department of Defense to insist that the territorial status be maintained in Alaska, but you do not say that as to Hawaii. Alaska is closer to the area of war than is Hawaii. If it is a matter of defense, if there is a present danger, if there are any conditions that this committee does not know of which are governing the Secretary of Defense in what he says, by all means let the Secretary come here and in executive session tell us what they are.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I make another statement here?

Mr. Secretary, what bothers me about this matter is this: during this period while Congress has been declining to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska, the situation in Asia has been deteriorating. At this moment the Secretary of State is at Bangkok seeking to convince southeast Asia, where Thailand now is apparently about to be attacked by the Communists, that its interests lie in joining with the other states of southeast Asia in defense against communism, and the chief obstacle to the progress of the Secretary of State in Bangkok is the fact that we have been represented as only colonials of a different kind.

I cannot understand why it is not clear to the Department of Defense, unless there is something that you cannot tell us, why it is not clear to you that by granting statehood to Alaska and Hawaii we will be telling all of Asia that we are not colonials.

Conference Report on H. R. 3828

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to passage of this bill at this time.

I regret the action of the Democratic leadership of the House in bringing up such a bill now. Congress is the board of directors for managing the country's affairs, and I believe Members of Congress are entitled to a fair increase in salaries in line with their heavier responsibilities, greatly increased workload, and the increased costs which they face along with all other people in the Nation. Congress has had no increase since 1946, while other governmental employees have had two cost-of-living raises during that period and deserve a third. It is only reasonable that Congress be given a raise also.

However, the first responsibility of a board of directors is to the organization's employees, in this case the workers in the Federal service. We tried to enact a pay increase for them in the last Congress, and I voted for it twice. Unfortunately, some who pretended to be the special friends of Federal employees were more interested in playing politics with the issue. They blocked passage of the only kind of bill that could become law with the promise that they could get a better bill. The result was no bill at all.

Our first task is to correct that situation. I do not believe that Members of Congress should raise their own salaries until they have first taken care of employees in the lower-paid brackets.

Furthermore, how are Members who vote for the conference report now to resist the demands of all sorts of groups during the remainder of the session for all sorts of subsidies, increased grants, or appropriations? Full independence in using my best judgment on each issue as it comes along is more important to me than the salary increase.

President Eisenhower Should Suspend the Dixon-Yates Contract While the Shadow of Doubled dealing Lies Upon It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I herewith submit an editorial which appeared in the February 21, 1955, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The editorial entitled "Doubled deal in Dixon-Yates" follows:

DOUBLEDEAL IN DIXON-YATES

The fact that the administration negotiated the Dixon-Yates power contract in thick secrecy, and not at arm's length, was already known. It remained for Senator HILL's disclosures last week to show the Government's gullibility and the extremes to which secrecy was carried right up to the moment when the Alabamian dug in.

Mr. HILL reports that a vice president of a Boston company which was arranging financing for the Dixon-Yates contract was at the same time employed by the Bureau of the Budget as a consultant to advise it on the contract. The versatile gentleman in question is identified as Adolph H. Wenzel,

of the First Boston Corp., which had been consulted on sale of \$114 million in bonds to finance the proposed Dixon-Yates plant at West Memphis, Ark.

Mr. Wenzell was thus serving in two mutually exclusive capacities. As a private financier it was his duty to press the interests of the First Boston Corp. and to argue down any objections which he might entertain in his capacity as an adviser to the Budget Bureau. As a consultant to the fiscal arm of the office of the President of the United States, it was his duty to listen with a skeptical ear to the views he was presenting in his role as a private financier. It all sounds like something out of Gilbert and Sullivan, and as in fact much more successful as nonsense than as public administration.

Senator HILL points out, furthermore, that Mr. Wenzell, the budget consultant, had access to confidential information from the Government's side of the bargaining table—if bargaining table it can be called. Some of this information might have been handy for Mr. Wenzell, the vice president of the First Boston Corp., to have on tap in representing his company's interests. Senator HILL does not know, but he would like to find out.

Senator HILL observes that the chronology of the Dixon-Yates deal issued by the Budget Bureau last August, which was represented as containing all the pertinent facts, contained no reference to Mr. Wenzell or to the First Boston Corp. More recently, when he asked Budget Director Hughes about Mr. Wenzell's employment as a consultant, Mr. Hughes mentioned the Bostonian's work on the TVA program but not his participation in the Dixon-Yates contract, Senator HILL says. Senator HILL says there is "definite indication that these facts have been deliberately concealed from the Congress and the American people."

This is a serious charge. It is all the more serious because these negotiations from the beginning, and continuously since then, have been distinguished by a remarkable lack of candor.

Senator HILL thinks it "imperative" that the Senate-House Joint Committee on Atomic Energy thoroughly investigate the disclosures he has made and any further disclosures to which they may lead. It would be hard to think of any plausible objection to a course so plainly indicated.

Meanwhile, would it not be the part of propriety for the President to suspend the operations of the Dixon-Yates contract while the shadow of double-dealing lies upon it?

Address of Mrs. James B. Patton, Past President General, DAR, Before the Society of Mayflower Descendants, District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, at the meeting of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia at the Daughters of the American Revolution chapter house on Massachusetts Avenue in the city of Washington, on the evening of February 4, 1955, the guest speaker was Mrs. James B. Patton. This distinguished and

highly patriotic woman, as is well known, served as president general of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the term 1950 to 1953 next preceding the election of Miss Gertrude S. Carraway to that high position. Mrs. Patton is therefore a past president general of the national DAR; and she is presently serving in the very important post of national chairman of the national defense committee of the national DAR. Her address before the Washington Society of Mayflower Descendants was in line with her patriotic sentiments and ideals as so constantly and well expressed during the crowded years of her activities.

Under leave accorded, I am very glad to include her address as a part of these remarks:

ADDRESS OF MRS. JAMES B. PATTON

IS TIME RUNNING OUT?

As Thomas Paine wrote in *The Crisis*, in 1776, "These are times that try men's souls," and so it is today. I am speaking as one greatly concerned about some problems which confront our country.

The United States stands at a crossroad in its history, and for a number of years we have been approaching this crossroad and all of the signs along the way have given us plain warning that we are nearing a new milestone. Everything will depend upon the route we take.

This is the year, 1955, when the Charter of the United Nations comes up automatically for possible revision. It is now, at the present time, that every patriotic citizen should assume his or her responsibility to make certain that the charter is not revised so that any of our sovereign rights as a Nation are taken from us. Keep aware of events as they happen from day to day.

We must remember that the U. N. Charter originally was adopted as a treaty by our United States Senate. Also you will recall there have been cases where judges have upheld the U. N. Charter over our Constitution.

The purpose of the United Nations when it originated almost 10 years ago was to preserve peace on earth and many millions of people rejoiced at the idea. But the U. N. has not preserved the peace.

The strong supporters of strengthening the United Nations always refer to Korea as an example of the united effort of the free world in successfully halting Communist aggression. But on closer examination—with the United States furnishing the overwhelming majority of men, machinery, and leadership and actually being limited by U. N. directives in properly defending our lines—can this be a United Nations victory?

The U. N. caused the United States and South Korea to sign an armistice which is regarded throughout the Far East as a defeat for the United Nations forces. Can we call it any sort of victory as long as we leave even one of our boys in a prison camp on Red soil—and there are reportedly hundreds there?

I think that we all believe in cooperation with other countries which are trying to retain their freedom and we in our country have cooperated at the cost of thousands of American lives and untold billions of dollars.

It has been proved time and again that peace-loving nations cannot do business with the Soviets. The breakdown of the conference at Geneva last June alone proves that point.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we find the Kremlin blueprint for conquest which has been given to Congress. From whom this critical document was obtained is a closely guarded secret.

The gist of the document is this: Conquest of Indochina by 1955. Complete domination by Communists of the rest of all southeast Asia—that is, Burma, Thailand, and Indonesia—5 years later by 1960. Then in another five years, by 1965, conquest of all of Asia, including India and Ceylon. This to be accomplished without bloodshed, according to the Kremlin. Following these successes this secret memorandum shows the submission of Japan to Communist government "by peaceful means" and waves of Red revolutions which would sweep over the Arab countries, the Philippines, and Africa.

As Senator WILLIAM JENNER said, "It is time that this was brought to the attention of the public and time that we get a policy to cope with it."

In 1930, speaking to young men and women from all over the world who had been brought to Moscow to be trained in espionage so that they might go back to their native lands and practice their nefarious activities, Manulsky had this to say: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. . . ."

"So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate on their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Do you peacefully coexist with men who would thus train youth? We Americans need to remember as we have never remembered before in our national life how definite a sentence of death has been passed upon us by the very power with whom we have been asked to peacefully coexist.

Do you know the last lines of the infamous and secret Communist oath? It reads: "I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

How may a Communist be recognized? He or she cannot be recognized by merely looking at him. The person may be short or tall, fat or thin, rich or poor. They look and act much like any other human being. Outward characteristics reveal no clues to their attitude toward communism.

When a person professes communism or tangible evidence is produced, it is regarded as definite proof that he is a Communist. On the other hand, he might neither profess his affiliation nor have official credentials, but still be 100 percent Red.

The only way a Communist reveals his identification with this peculiar philosophy of life is through speech and actions. Certainly, if he accepted Communist philosophy, he would be sure to reflect it in his daily life, whether in the classroom or in the factory.

No one can be a true Marxist if he is a member of any church, or if he believes in any religion, or if he even believes in God. A Communist must be an atheist. Marx was an atheist, and so have been all the leaders of communism everywhere.

They are untold numbers who honestly do not regard themselves as Communists yet they are Communists in the making, because they have accepted and put into practice one or more of the identifying characteristics of communism. These people are perhaps the more dangerous to our Republic because they are not aware of the fact that they are collaborating with the Communists. This is something they honestly have no intention of

doing. Yet they can do untold harm when they occupy positions of influence in the levels of Government, labor unions, education, or anywhere that public policy and thinking are generally affected.

Now that we know the master plan for the domination of the world, the type of oath the Communists take and also what has taken place in the world during the last 20 or 30 years, we are cognizant of the fact that time is running out for the United States.

If all of the nations which comprise the U. N. had been sincere in their desire to preserve peace, the world would be very different today.

Various agencies began to spring out of the U. N. and with them many treaties which they hope to impose on the nations.

Some of these proposed treaties are well known to us at this time. The proposed Covenant of Human Rights is an interesting document to read, especially for what it does not say. The same holds true of the Genocide Treaty or Convention, as it is sometimes called. In 1954 the U. N. Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution urging upon every member the ratification of the Genocide Convention. The United States voted for this resolution. At present the Genocide Treaty is lying dormant in the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and where we must be certain it will remain.

Secretary Dulles, representing the present administration, has stated that he would not ask for ratification of these two controversial documents at this time. But how do we know what subsequent administrations will do? If these treaties were ever ratified by our United States Senate, they would become the supreme law of the land and our sovereign rights as a nation would be taken from us.

We are a member of UNESCO, a branch of the U. N. As you no doubt know, UNESCO is the United Nations Economic, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Through this organization our children are to be prepared for membership in a world government. Although the words "world government" are seldom used by UNESCO, all of its propaganda is directed toward that end. The more shocking publications are not issued by UNESCO but spring from conferences and study groups held under UNESCO auspices.

Through an assortment of international agreements we must now go to war in defense of more than 20 separate nations the moment they are attacked. Under most of these agreements the war can start by Presidential order. Thus the exclusive constitutional power of Congress to declare war may be ignored. The Korean war is an example of this type of obligation. We have similar commitments in almost every part of the world.

One of the important links in the chain of international agreements which our country forged is the Yalta agreement. There, the then President of the United States obligated himself to enforce vital provisions of this nefarious document.

As we analyze even a few of these proposed treaties by the U. N. and know of executive agreements, we realize more than ever why we need an amendment to our United States Constitution which would prevent any treaty or executive agreement from superseding our Constitution.

The Status of Forces Treaty, ratified by the Senate in July 1953, deprives American soldiers of their constitutional rights in a supplement to the North Atlantic Treaty. It provides that treason, espionage, and offenses committed in the performance of duty shall subject a soldier stationed in a foreign country to trial by the authorities of his own country. For all other offenses he shall be subject to trial in the courts of the foreign country where he is stationed.

American soldiers, drafted and transported beyond the seas for the defense of foreign

countries, are deprived of their constitutional protections.

Before the approval by our Senate of this treaty, soldiers stationed in foreign countries could be tried only by the military authorities of their own country.

Shall we go ahead and blithely give up our freedoms to foreign nations which jealously guard their own, or shall we work for an adequate amendment to our Constitution?

On January 6, 1955, Senator BRICKER introduced the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States designed to limit the treaty-making power of the President and the Senate in the following respects: (1) To prevent any treaty in conflict with the Constitution from having any force or effect, and (2) to prevent any treaty from becoming internal law except through valid legislation.

Legislation should be required to make a treaty effective as domestic law. All other countries, with the possible exception of France, Holland, and Mexico, follow this practice.

I believe that the American people are thoroughly aroused over the need for such an amendment and they will not rest until a fully adequate amendment is passed by our Congress and the State legislatures.

The type of legislation called for by the Bricker amendment can never be party politics—it is the very life and strength of our country which is at stake. Party politics would never enter into the question if an enemy should attack our shores, so why bring politics into a question just as vital in that it maintains our Constitution as the bulwark of our Republic?

Each Senator upon entering the office of Senator takes an oath to protect and defend the Constitution. Would not our legislators then be committed to support any legislation required to protect our Constitution? There is no limitation placed in this oath—such as protect and defend within the limits of political expediency.

Have we done enough to let our Senators know that the American people want this added protection now? Individual letters and personal contacts mean a great deal. That is the only way our Congressmen know the will of their constituents.

We believe that our Constitution embodies the most effective system for the preservation of liberty ever devised by the mind of man. However, now, because of existing conditions, this particular amendment to further safeguard our sovereign rights as a Nation is needed.

If you will remember, Article VI, paragraph 2, of our Constitution at present provides that all treaties shall become the supreme law of the land. Do you realize that it takes only two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to ratify a treaty? There is not even a provision that a quorum of Senators be present and not even a roll call vote is taken.

In 1952, treaties with Greece and Turkey were ratified with only six Senators present and voting. Three treaties were ratified that same year by the votes of two Senators—the only ones present when the treaties were presented. Also, in 1952, a treaty with Ireland was ratified by one Senator. It is difficult to believe that this could happen in our country.

Time is running out for our country unless we take a positive stand and act accordingly.

Earl Browder, who headed the American Communist Party for 15 years, declared in 1950 that socialism had progressed farther in the United States than in Great Britain which was ruled by a socialist government from 1945 to 1951.

The term "democracy" has been used so recklessly as to make it almost meaningless. Today it is commonly used in the political phraseology of the Communists. Certainly, we cannot express our concept of our American principles in the same language.

Our Constitution says: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union, a republican form of government."

Our form of government can only rightly be called a "republic." Neither the Constitution nor the Declaration of Independence use the term "democracy" even once. None of the existing 48 State constitutions have any reference to the word.

We in America, and many people the world over, know that here we have something unique in government. We have built our foundations on the premise of individual liberty and free enterprise.

There are those who would advocate more of a "democracy" in this country along the lines of the socialist government of England. Think for a few minutes of how many times our Republic has come to the aid of these "democracies" with loans, gifts, Marshall plans, etc. For us the choice must be obvious—to retain our republican form of government.

I urge each one of you not to join any organization which comes to your community until you have investigated those who are behind that organization on a national level. Many new organizations are and will be formed, with high-sounding names and purposes. Be alert and do not sponsor or join or lend assistance to these organizations or movements until you have made a thorough investigation. Too many fine Americans have been caught in the web of Communist-front organizations. It is so easy to sign your name and so difficult to explain why you did it later on that organization is found to be a subversive one.

Perhaps the Communist Party as such is no longer the chief menace in the United States because many of its members are known and many have been exposed and discredited. The weight of the fight against Communists is now shifted to other groups which operate under the cloak of "respectability." By virtue of their social positions these men and women exert greater influence and so are more dangerous than members of the Communist Party.

According to the FBI, there are only approximately 25,000 hard-core Communists in the United States. But as Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has pointed out: "The extent of dangerousness of the Communist Party should not be judged merely by the extent of its membership."

If and when you should have any information for the FBI, report it to them. Their telephone number is on the first inside page of every telephone book. They will respect your anonymity, if you so request.

If we will be realistic, we must consider the concealed numbers, the great underground menace that is in our very midst. Remember that no people ever voted for communism. But more than 800 million people live under communism because, when they still had the power to protect themselves, they could see only the relatively few enemies above ground, and were not alerted against the great army that remained hidden.

There is no such thing as a permanently free country without effort to keep it that way. Czechoslovakia proved that wealth, industrial power, and a high standard of living were not enough to save it from communism.

It is necessary to understand the oneness, the universality of the Communist movement to know how to fight it. To understand the problems of Europe and Asia, it is necessary to recognize the Soviet state as a single entity, with delegated tasks to member states.

The boys and girls of today are our first line of defense. In their very early life they should be inculcated with the fundamentals of Americanism. This should start in the homes and be continued in the schools with the proper textbooks on American history and government.

We must intensify our religious life as a people. We must restore to our homelife some measure of that information which our fathers and mothers bequeathed to us. We must give our children that sense of responsibility which will give strength to their characters and direction to their lives.

Our youth should understand that with all of the freedoms which our country gives, these freedoms also carry responsibilities which they must be prepared to assume.

Various groups are supporting drives to see that State legislatures enact laws to require the teaching of American history and State history in all schools. Perhaps we have taken our heritage of American principles and ideals so much for granted that we have neglected to instill the same love and reverence for our way of life in our children. We should remember that each generation is a new one and although we are born free we must be taught to recognize the basis of our freedom in order to protect it.

Let us remember the words of Abraham Lincoln in respect to reverence for the Constitution: "Love of the Constitution should be the political religion of the Nation. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. Let it be written in primers, in spelling books, and in almanacs. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislation halls, enforced in courts of justice."

Parents should know the kind of books their children are studying, especially those on history and social science, as well as the type of books in the school libraries. It has been amazing what parents have discovered along this line. Eternal vigilance is truly the price of liberty.

Thirty-five years ago Lenin made this prophecy, "First, we will take Eastern Europe; then the masses of Asia. Then we will encircle the United States of America, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack it; it will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

If we look at the world map of today, Lenin's prophecy must startle us. The confident boast of Lenin that the United States will not have to be attacked because it will be like overripe fruit into the hands of the Communists cannot casually be dismissed.

What so many people fall so tragically to realize is that communism has a world plan and it has been following a carefully set up timetable for the achievement of that plan. Red rulers know what they want with terrible clarity; determined to get what they do want.

Time is running out for us because, given the present pace of the Communist advance, it cannot be long before its encircling pincers will be turning on us.

Far too many people in our country have felt that nothing could ever happen here in the United States to disturb their easy living and the enjoyment of their freedoms, when suddenly they came to the realization that communism in reality was invading this hemisphere as they read and heard of the revolution in Guatemala last summer, as well as troubles in other countries in our part of the world.

When the Director of the United States Information Agency returned last fall from South America he stated that "there are today about 200,000 Communists at work in Latin America, well financed and well organized." He also said that this was in spite of the fact that "13 of the 20 American Republics outlaw the Communist Party."

Certainly the time has come when our Government must reappraise the world situation now that the Communists have moved into the countries in our part of the globe. We cannot permit the Reds to take one piece of territory after another in this hemisphere as they have done in other sections of the world.

How long will it be before the great mass of our citizens realize the infiltration which is in every phase of our national life, in our labor unions, schools, churches, Government departments, and many other places. When will they realize the many years of planning and thoroughness of organization that the Communists have been following to accomplish their end, namely, the ultimate destruction of the great freedoms that are guaranteed to the citizens of these United States of America.

Communism as we know it today is not new in these United States, for it has been at work in small groups or cells for more than 30 years, extending its tentacles of destruction into all walks of life.

We Americans have created a great country and there is so much which is right in our country. Let us compare our country to a beautiful house of which we are so proud, but in many lovely homes there are termites gnawing at the foundations. So there are termites gnawing at the foundations of our Nation. Termites just like subversives are difficult to discover and eliminate.

Our American independence must be preserved. That must be our chief objective in the days which lie ahead. We must be ready to meet the challenge as women unafraid, mindful of our present duties, confident of the future.

As time is running out for our Nation, let us think of the words of Abraham Lincoln: "I appeal to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you is the question: Shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generation?"

In a recent hearing in Washington on the strategy and tactics of communism, Mr. Louis Budenz told a subcommittee that the Communist conspiracy is stronger than ever in the United States. The realization is widespread that the power of the Communists over American life is increasing, and increasing at a frightening pace.

I believe that we cannot take one useful step to safeguard America from Communists in Europe and Asia unless we can find and remove every Communist agent and every Communist collaborator from every position of trust within our gates.

Communist conquest is not something planned for 50 years from now. We cannot fight communism tomorrow. There is only today.

In war, you live in the present or die, and we are at war. The Communist high command is waging war on us today by new and subtle methods of destruction.

As you know, we in the United States have been fighting communism for 35 years. Something must be wrong with our methods. American resistance to Soviet invasion, which had been effective in the twenties, received a setback in 1933 when our country gave recognition to the Soviet Union.

We must remember one thing, Soviet communism is not a party and not an ideology. It is not a leftwing political movement. It is an army, trained and drilled and officered by Moscow.

We need as full and accurate a list of collaborators in high places as we have of the people who have lent their names to the Communists' fronts.

This task cannot be left to our Government alone. The FBI and the Department of Justice have to work with legal evidence. That is the American way. They can catch spies and saboteurs. They cannot deal with a corporation president or a politician or a magazine editor who has made a deal with the Communists.

We need a committee on internal security in every State legislature in the Union. The danger to our Nation is clear. But we have so little time. The enemy is silently pressing deeper and every day the collaborators

seem to be gaining in power over the patriots.

What is America worth to you? What would it mean to you if the beauty of America, the meaning of America, were to be wiped from the earth?

If America were today a conquered nation, with Red Chinese slave drivers forcing our people to work, and Red jailers, under Soviet masters, were torturing our fighting men and clubbing our leaders to death, what price would you pay to win back our country's freedom?

If each one of us would give a part of her time and strength and resources to safeguard America today, we could look forward to the time when the black cloud of Communist barbarity would be lifted from the earth.

The people of this country must know and face the facts and then move forward.

Are we—the American people—going to awaken from our apathy and insist that none of our sovereign rights as a nation are taken from us through treaties and executive agreements? Are we going to insist that a fully adequate constitutional amendment be passed which will prevent any treaty or executive agreement which would supersede our Constitution?

Are we going to insist that this Bricker amendment be ratified or are we going to take the slow train of socialism to communism, or do as some people are advocating, that we revise the U. N. Charter and have world government overnight? The time for us is very, very late.

Before going to bed, one little boy gave this definition of the stars he saw through his window: "They're lights God hangs out so I won't be afraid of the dark." When the clouds are the darkest, we must remember that there are stars behind those clouds.

We must not be afraid. Only with devotion to our ideals and with full faith in God can we hope to succeed in keeping America American.

No Wheat Should Be Sent to the Soviet People as Long as Good Americans Now Unemployed Are Denied This Same Wheat in Their Surplus Commodity Rations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the recent Associated Press news article which appeared in the February 19, 1955, issue of the Washington Evening Star revealing the possibility of our Nation donating surplus wheat to the Soviet people is alarming.

In all fairness how can we, as a nation, give our surplus wheat to the Soviet people when unemployed Americans are denied surplus wheat in the form of flour to provide themselves with bread. For months a group of us in Congress representing labor surplus areas have been trying to get action on bills designed to permit wheat and corn to be processed into a form suitable for home consumption, such as wheat into flour and corn into meal. These food com-

modities would be added to the surplus commodities now available for needy families.

Until Congress takes care of our own unemployed Americans with what surplus wheat we have on hand under no consideration should a gift of wheat be made to the Soviet people.

The Associated Press article of February 19, 1955, follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 19, 1955]

PRESIDENT REPORTED STUDYING GIFT WHEAT FOR SOVIET PEOPLE

Secretary of Agriculture Benson said today he has talked over with President Eisenhower the idea of a gift of wheat to Russia and the idea "has not been dropped."

Mr. Benson said, in an airport interview as he was leaving for a Caribbean trip, that in his own opinion the idea is speculative. He added, however, that he and the President have discussed it.

"Of course, I can't tell you what the President said," he continued.

Meanwhile, it was reported that Nelson Rockefeller, who recently joined the White House staff to advise Mr. Eisenhower on international affairs, has been asked to study the wheat gift proposal.

Michael Newsom, master of the National Grange, said his office suggested the wheat gift to the White House shortly after Premier Malenkov resigned with a confession of failure to solve the Russian farm problem.

The American Farm Bureau Federation came out against the giveaway aspects of the proposal. A Farm Bureau spokesman said Russia should buy what wheat it needs with money the Communists now spend on subversive activities in this country.

He said the Russians have a trade balance of around \$50 million in this country which they are unable to spend otherwise and added: "Let them use that money to pay for wheat if they need it."

James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary, had no comment.

The plan, discussed by the New York Herald Tribune's Washington correspondent, Roscoe Drummond, would have the President personally write Russia's new Premier, Marshal Nikolai Bulganin, offering the wheat as a gift from the American people.

Some 675 million bushels of surplus wheat are now held by the Agriculture Department. It is valued at \$1,767,220,000.

Financing Schools, Highways, Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Greensburg (Ind.) Daily News of February 22, 1955:

FINANCING SCHOOLS, HIGHWAYS, HOSPITALS

To meet the requirements of its growing population, the United States requires better school facilities, improved highways, and additional hospitals.

If local communities and the States do not assume this responsibility, the Federal Government will be forced to enter these fields.

With Federal aid will inevitably come Federal supervision, since the Government cannot appropriate money for these purposes and sign a blank check to States or local units of government.

At the present time the United States has reached the limit of \$250 billion for its national debt.

One of the proposals which has been advanced has been formation of Federal corporations to defray the cost of these projects. In this manner the limit to the national debt would be bypassed.

These pressing problems were discussed by United States Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART at the Lincoln Day dinner here last week. The senior Senator from Indiana took a realistic view as to these problems and pointed out that schools, hospitals, and highways must be built. He expressed the belief that the best interest of the American people would be served if these projects were assumed by governmental agencies other than the Federal Government.

Senator CAPEHART asserted that he would welcome suggestions from his constituents in Indiana on these problems.

Organization of giant Federal corporations to finance schools, highways, and hospitals has several definite disadvantages which Members of Congress should consider.

Such a procedure would mean that communities and States would rely upon the Federal Government for financing their requirements.

Operation of the Federal corporations would be apart from the Federal budget, and no accurate picture of Federal indebtedness would be possible. This could easily lead to excesses over which Congress would have little control.

In the long run, any indebtedness of Federal corporations will be an obligation which American taxpayers will have to assume. The only avenue for liquidating the corporation will be from Federal taxation.

Some phases of the program can and should be financed locally. Many communities are in a financial position to build modern schools without relying on the Federal Government. On their own initiative many communities, including several in Indiana, are improving their hospital facilities.

The Federal Government could greatly aid highway departments of the respective States through repeal of the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax, making this money available to States for highway construction. Congress has apparently been unwilling to lose this revenue. As a result, Indiana and other States have no alternative but to seek Federal assistance in construction of highways.

In providing for improved schools, highways, and hospitals, four guiding principles could be employed advantageously. They are: That the Federal Government will enter these fields only in instances of exceptional need and inability to pay; that as much as these programs as is possible should be undertaken from local and State resources; that Congress should raise the national debt limit and give taxpayers an accurate picture of the Nation's finances rather than conceal obligations through Federal corporations; that the Federal Government should limit some of its functions so that through a reduction of Federal taxation more money will be in the hands of the Nation's taxpayers for local civic enterprises.

Veteran Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the welfare of our veterans is a subject in which we all are greatly interested; and,

therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following news release of February 23, 1955, in the Record:

WASHINGTON, February 23.—Jack Williams, department adjutant of the North Dakota American Legion, today bitterly assailed Hoover Commission recommendations to close down the only two Veterans' Administration hospitals in North Dakota.

The VA maintains general, medical, and surgical hospitals at Minot and Fargo. Williams, in Washington to attend the American Legion 32d annual National Rehabilitation Conference, criticized the recommendations as being "based wholly on outdated and unrealistic information." He said the Hoover Commission recommendation is certainly not in keeping with the present needs for VA hospital services in North Dakota.

Williams said there is a potential patient load of 63,000 men and women in his State.

He said he would talk today to the North Dakota congressional delegation with Department Service Officer George Rulon, "of the inaccuracies and serious implications of the Hoover Commission recommendations."

Williams denounced the Hoover Commission for attempting to economize Government costs at the expense of the veteran. He said the Hoover Commission report is not founded on facts or the moral obligation the Nation has to the veteran.

"Where would these veterans—who served our country honorably and without stint during our time of need—go for medical care if the VA hospitals at Minot and Fargo were to be closed," he asked.

Rulon said that present patient loads in private hospitals automatically prohibit the influx of patients from the VA hospitals if they were to be closed.

Williams said that North Dakota had more actual battle casualties, proportionately, during World War I than any other State. He said that during World War II, North Dakota ranked third in the number of battle casualties.

"Certainly," he said, "we have a moral obligation to those veterans."

Williams said he saw the attempt by the Hoover Commission to close down the VA hospitals at Minot and Fargo as the first step toward shattering every concept of the veterans' benefits program.

Address of Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr.—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Record a portion of the address of Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, which was delivered at the National Press Club here in Washington on February 28, 1955.

Mr. Hearst, you will recall, has recently returned from a visit inside the Soviet Union where he had an opportunity to meet the current ruling leaders of that country.

I wish to commend this address to the attention of the House of Representatives because it is a keen analysis of a little-known subject—what is going on behind the Iron Curtain. Mr. Hearst

has very aptly pointed up the fact that the rulers of the Kremlin recognize strength and that the best means of preserving peace is to not let the Politburo forget that the United States is prepared to stand firm in the fight for freedom.

The address follows:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies, gentlemen, and colleagues, I would like to clear up one point first. That is to assure you that we had no invitation to Russia. No advance tip of any kind that important things would be taking place while we were there, nor any assurance that we would positively be able to talk with any of the Soviet leaders.

My reason for wanting to go was simply to get a first hand glimpse of the country and its rulers and its people.

It was my father's conception of journalism that it can and should be an exciting and audacious enterprise.

The original suggestion for this trip was made to me at the Gridiron dinner last December by Dave Sentner, a member of your club and bureau chief of the Hearst newspapers here in Washington. I had been mentally kicking the idea around ever since it became apparent that the atmosphere in Russia had undergone a change after Stalin's death.

I told Dave I would go on one condition, and that was that Kingsbury Smith, the INS European general manager, and Frank Conniff, my editorial assistant, go along.

Kingsbury, with nearly 20 years experience as a European correspondent, was, I knew, familiar with the Soviet problems and machinations and knew his way around the European diplomatic circles.

Frank Conniff had served as a war correspondent both in Europe and Asia. In addition to his city-desk side experience as a reporter and rewrite man on the New York Journal-American, he is a student extremely well informed on matters of history and the military. As you probably know, he is also my right hand at home.

With these two close friends and associates, I felt that we could handle any curves they might throw at us.

To my surprise, the visas for the three of us came back in 7 days. We flew to Paris, picked up Kingsbury Smith, and proceeded to Berlin, where we boarded a Soviet passenger plane for the flight to Moscow. It was a twin-engined Convair type of plane, which flew most of the time about 4,000 feet. It made one stop at Vilna, the capital of Lithuania, and landed us gently just after dusk in a snowstorm at the Moscow airport. The flight took 7 hours.

Now for some of my impressions and observations on this trip:

We became aware from the very first day of our arrival that we were getting the red-carpet treatment, or rather what we chose to call the whitewall treatment, from the sides of the gleaming Packard-like ZIs that was made available to us.

We knew we were seeing only what the Soviet leaders wanted us to see and that no secret experiment or unflattering inner problem would be exposed to our prying gaze.

What we saw of the Russian people encouraged us to believe that a strong sentiment of friendliness toward Americans exists among them. When we were recognized as Americans in the streets, the theaters, the restaurants, and stores, we were greeted with smiles and friendly looks. Ten postwar years of anti-American propaganda seem to have had much less effect on the people of Russia than one would expect.

As for an overall impression of life in the Soviet land as seen from two of its main cities—Moscow and Leningrad:

I would say that living conditions in Russia are less bad than the West generally believes but by no means as good as the Russian people are led by their government to think they are in relation to the outside world.

A day in any Soviet city would, I am sure, convince an American shopgirl, factory or white-collar worker that in comparison with conditions in Russia, the United States is the paradise of the proletariat.

Indicative of what little influence the people have on the government that rules them was the apparent lack of popular excitement over the sensational shift in political power that occurred during our visit.

Replacement of Malenkov by Bulganin as head of the government was certainly an event of far-reaching importance. It was accompanied by policy pronouncements which made it clear that the change would affect the life of every individual in the Soviet Union. It meant less consumer goods and greater emphasis on the production of heavy industry.

Such a momentous political event would have aroused public controversy in any western democracy. One would have overheard it being discussed in the busses, subways and restaurants. Yet if there was any discussion of it among the Russian people, it was confined to the intimacy of the close family circle. No one would dare debate the right or wrong of it in public. As far as any public comments in Moscow or Leningrad were concerned, the downfall of Malenkov might never have occurred. We tried to draw out our intourist guide, but not a word would he say. The western envoys likewise told us they had received no reports of any public excitement or agitation over the news.

Some of the Russian translators in the press gallery of the Soviet Parliament at the time Malenkov's resignation was announced were heard exclaiming, almost in a whisper: "It's sensational."

Later, in the streets of Moscow, all was calm. In the shops, people did not even gather around the radios as the news was broadcast. They simply went about their business as usual. If they were listening intently, as they doubtless were, they allowed no sign of it to show. Unusual interest in such things might, I suppose, be interpreted as questioning the wisdom of what the rulers were doing. That would be deviationism, the first step to opposition.

The subjects of our interviews ranged from Khrushchev to Shostakovitch, the composer; from Premier Bulganin to Ulanova, the ballerina; from Marshal Zhukov to Patriarch Alexei, the head of the Russian Orthodox Church, and from Molotov to Sytlana Stalin, the late dictator's daughter.

In addition, we literally spent hours in discussion with the leading western ambassadors, checking our impressions and gauging our reactions against the experience of these diplomatic experts.

Our own Ambassador, Chip Bohlen, was most helpful and considerate. We consulted him every step of the way. We made certain that no move of ours would embarrass American policy.

We turned over verbatim transcripts of our interviews with Khrushchev, Bulganin, Molotov, and Zhukov, to the Ambassador as soon as Kingsbury Smith could type them out following our return from the Kremlin.

I do not think I violate any confidence when I say the Ambassador congratulated us on what we had obtained from the diplomatic as well as professional standpoint.

We felt that America has on the spot in Moscow a man whose training and background have well prepared him for the painstaking job of unscrambling the devious Russian moves and puzzling shifts in Communist policy.

To lend some perspective to our Russian journey, I made certain that at both ends it would be sandwiched by balancing talks with the influential soldiers and statesmen of the free world.

At Paris on the way in, we talked with Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, the SHAPE commander. Al Gruenther has a keen, agile mind and a penetrating understanding of the problems we face in Europe today.

And on our way home, when our party reached London after a day of flying from Moscow, I experienced the sentimental climax of the whole trip as far as I was personally concerned.

I spent an hour with Sir Winston Churchill in the historic cabinet room at No. 10 Downing St. Earlier in the day we had lunched with Minister of State Anthony Nutting and then talked informally with Sir Anthony Eden at the foreign office.

That hour with Sir Winston was something really special. He listened closely while I gave my impressions of the Russian leaders and ventured a few thoughts on the significance of recent Russian moves.

I assume that one of the questions uppermost in your minds must be whether the new leadership in Russia is more or less likely to precipitate war with us one of these days.

I must say the strongest hope for peace that I found in my 3 weeks' visit to the Soviet Union was the shrewdness of these new rulers of Russia.

These men can be ruthless. They have been merciless. Certainly no humanitarian considerations would cause them to hesitate to wipe us out if they thought they could get away with it.

They believe the end justifies the means. And for them the end remains Communist domination of the world. Khrushchev said so to me quite frankly. He said they hoped to gain the upper hand one day.

Nevertheless, these men are cold, calculating realists. I don't believe they are possessed by the madness that drove Hitler to bring Germany down in ruins. Nor by the recklessness that led Mussolini to tie Italy's kite to the shooting star of nazidom's short-lived conquest.

Crafty all the time, cruel if the occasion, in their opinion, warrants it. Yes. Unquestionably. But they are not paranoids.

They know the destructive power of nuclear weapons. Even if they possess the H-bomb—which British officials doubt—and even if they use it first, they know America has superiority in these weapons and the means to deliver them.

They know that the chance of emerging victorious from a thermonuclear conflict with the United States would be a very slim one. They know the risk of being wiped out along with their system would be great.

Furthermore, as Eden put it and in which we agree, the Soviets have now become the bourgeois of the Communist world. They have established an empire extending from the heart of Germany to the borders of China. They are becoming property owners—cars, television sets, iceboxes, even country homes. They have vested interests to protect.

As long as they feel they are not going to be directly attacked—as long as they know they cannot themselves attack without the certainty of swift and terrible retaliation—I seriously doubt that they will deliberately precipitate a fight with us.

If America was to let down its guard, if the day were to come when the Soviets thought they could deliver the knockout blow that would neutralize the United States, then the temptation to strike would be strong and I would give no odds on them not doing so.

For the present, however, I think they realize they could not pull an atomic Pearl

Harbor on Uncle Sam without getting back a nuclear punch that might well knock the red right out of Russia.

That is why I told President Eisenhower, when I reported to him on my return, that I felt his policy of firmness without provocation, of keeping up our guard and maintaining strong retaliatory force in readiness, was the right one.

The history of Soviet Russia during the past 30 years has shown that one can never be sure what is going to happen, especially within the inner circle of the Red hierarchy. As Marshal Zhukov said to me, "Fortune tellers can go wrong."

Nevertheless, I am prepared to dare a guess about the future of the Soviet leadership—that is, if another Stalin is to emerge on the Russian political scene, it will not be the new Premier.

Bulganin, with whom I talked for over an hour, did not impress me as the type who would be capable of seizing power and making himself the absolute ruler as Stalin did.

He lacked the dynamic personality and forcefulness of Khrushchev. He did not seem to possess the cunning that would be required for victory in a struggle for power with the tough ones in the Kremlin.

Bulganin struck me more as a front man for the principle of collective leadership. That principle, I think, for the time being, at least, continues to be the basis on which the Soviet system is now being run.

With his wavy white hair, trim goatee, and neat mustache, Bulganin has a professional look. As you know, he is a political general, not a professional soldier. Stalin bestowed the title of marshal on him during the war when he was commissar of the armed forces. He has a reputation for being an able administrator and organizer; more of an efficient bureaucrat than political crusader.

In his talk with us Bulganin adopted a conciliatory tone. He seemed to be trying to offset the violent attacks on the United States which he and Molotov had made a few days previously in the Supreme Soviet.

We took him to task for those attacks. We told him we did not see how he could reconcile them with the protestations for improved relations with our country. He denied that the attacks reflected any decision of the new government to pursue a more antagonistic attitude toward the United States. He insisted the Soviet leaders were sincere in their desire for the reestablishment of normal, friendly relations with America.

There is so much double talk in Soviet verbiage that it's difficult to know when they are speaking the truth. However, I do feel they think it is in their own interests to try to improve relations with us.

We thought we smoked out Bulganin on one thing. Molotov claimed in the Supreme Soviet that Russia had surpassed the United States in the production of hydrogen bombs. We called Bulganin's attention to the warnings of scientists that the continued explosion of nuclear weapons would have dangerous effects on human and animal life. We asked him whether Russia would be willing to enter an agreement with the United States and Great Britain to limit the number of these explosions for experimental purposes.

The quick and sharply negative reaction of the Soviet premier convinced me that the Russians are far behind us in the stockpiling of these new weapons, and may not have the H-bomb at all.

Of the four top leaders we met, Khrushchev was in many ways the most impressive. If any of the four were to grab power and build himself up into a Stalin-like dictator, my guess is it would be this boss of Russia's 7 million Communist Party members.

A bullnecked, blunt, and rugged individual, this heavy-set little man with the beady blue eyes and aggressive vitality gave the impression of being the boss of the Kremlin show at the moment, and knowing it.

On the day Malenkov publicly lost his job as premier, it was Khrushchev who dominated the scene in the Supreme Soviet. He nominated Bulganin as successor, and as he did so he remarked that he was sure the deputies would accept the suggestion. There was more than an expression of hope in that remark. It was clear that the "boss" was speaking. No one else was nominated, and no one else spoke for or against Khrushchev's candidate. The vote was called and the hands of some 1,300 deputies sprang automatically into the air. They remained up only a few seconds, then came down. The chairman glanced quickly over the room, said there were no dissenters and no abstentions. Of course, he could not tell whether one or more deputies in the back of the hall failed to raise their hands, but he was confident no one would question his statement. It was interesting to watch Soviet democracy at work.

During our private interview with Khrushchev, which lasted about 2½ hours, he also spoke with the voice of authority. He did not seem to bother to weigh his words the way Bulganin, Molotov, and even Marshal Zhukov did. He was fast on the comeback, and he talked with as much ease about foreign affairs as he did about internal policy.

He made no bones about the hope of the Communists to gain the upper hand in the world one day. But he sought to convince us that the Soviet leadership wants to confine the global struggle between the Communist and Capitalistic systems to measures short of war.

Unlike American Communists, he and most of the other Soviet leaders we met displayed a sense of humor. He laughed and joked and at times showed flashes of wit. He would doubtless order you liquidated without batting an eye if he thought it would serve Soviet interests. But he can be amiable.

He said quite frankly he could appreciate the feeling of our countrymen about Communist China's imprisonment of the American airmen. He added that he personally hoped the matter would be settled satisfactorily. That is more recognition of the wrong that has been done by the Peiping regime to our flyers than we would get from Communists and fellow travelers here at home.

As for Molotov, he seems to have become the elder statesman of the Soviet Government. Always the professional diplomat, he was cautious in his statements and quick to give us the propaganda line. He talked at length about American military bases surrounding the Soviet Union and, referring to our protection of Formosa, labelled it: "United States interference in the internal affairs of China."

From time to time, Molotov offered me a Russian cigarette and while he talked or listened to our questions, he toyed with a match box.

He spoke with an air of self-confidence, as though supreme in the handling of Soviet diplomacy and without worry about what the other members of the presidium might think of his methods.

However, I had much the same feeling about him that I had about Bulganin. I could not quite picture Molotov developing into another Stalin. He seemed to lack the flair for lone wolf leadership.

The western diplomats thought the most important part of our conversation with Molotov concerned the question of a temporary cease-fire in the Formosan area. This had to do with proposed evacuation of Chinese Nationalist forces from the exposed Tachen Islands.

When we put the question to Molotov, he said he thought hardly anyone would hinder such an operation. It was most gratifying to learn upon our return to Washington that

this remark of Molotov had an important bearing on the decision to send the United States Navy to the Tachens to cover the withdrawal of the Chinese Nationalists.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr.—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD at this point part II of the address of Mr. Randolph Hearst, Jr.

The address follows:

Of all the four top men with whom we talked, Marshal Zhukov was the most pleasant. He received us alone except for our interpreter guide. He greeted us warmly when we arrived in his office at the National Defense Ministry. Here was the old soldier who had been on such friendly terms with General Eisenhower in the closing period of the European war and for a short time thereafter. He had stood with Ike beside him in Moscow's Red Square for the great victory parade. He had accepted an invitation from Eisenhower to visit Washington. Ike had offered him his own plane and his son, John, as an aide. The cold war prevented Zhukov from making the trip. He told us that it was his dream to do so, though he doubted that the time was ripe for it.

This husky, forthright military man commanded the defense of Moscow, prepared the Soviet stand at Stalingrad, and let the Red army to victory against Germany. He gave me the impression of being sincere in his expressed hope for improved relations with the United States and the warm sentiments he voiced about President Eisenhower.

I felt almost a sense of relief later when I heard that he had been moved up to the post of Defense Minister. Not because he would hesitate to do everything within his power to defeat us in the event of war between our two countries, but because I believe that soldiers like the President and Zhukov know all too well the horrors of war and want to avoid it. The presence of Zhukov in the high councils of the Soviet regime might be a conservative, perhaps even restraining, influence on recklessness.

Not that I think there is any likelihood of Zhukov exerting a dominant influence on Soviet policy. He strikes me as a soldier, likely to carry out the orders given to him. He also gave me the impression of being a dedicated Communist. Speaking rather proudly of being a member of the central committee, he said: "We soldiers follow the party line."

Nevertheless, I had the feeling that Zhukov is a patriot first and an international Communist second. As long as he remains in the top echelon of the Government I feel he would raise his voice strongly and perhaps effectively against any wild whims for a war that might lead to the destruction of Mother Russia.

With these four coldly realistic men at the top in the Soviet Union, I could not help feeling that any immediate threat to world peace is more likely to come from Red China than Russia.

Khrushchev told us he was confident that the Chinese Communist leaders would show what he described as commonsense in this respect.

If that is so, and we are not going to have war in the foreseeable future, then I believe we are going to face a struggle that may

prove more difficult for us to wage successfully than a military conflict. In the long run, however, this struggle will involve the survival of our way of life just as much as war would.

I am referring to the conflict of competitive coexistence. This is intended to be an ideological and economic struggle aimed at achieving Communist domination of the world by measures short of an all-out, East-West war. That is what we face now. It will be much less terrifying and much less destructive in a material way than a military conflict. It will be far more subtle than the cold war under Stalin. But its ultimate objectives, as far as we are concerned, will be the same.

The second half of this 20th century will determine whether Khrushchev was right when he told me that communism would ultimately gain "the upper hand" through-out the world.

He said it confidently and matter-of-factly, although acknowledging my right to believe that our way of life would become the stronger force.

This indicates the challenge of the future as clearly as any other hint during our 3 weeks' visit to Russia.

The faith of the bald, blunt man who bosses 7 million card-holders in Russia must be matched by a belief just as strong and just as deep.

Time alone will tell whether the free world is equal to the sacrifice, the self-denial, and the courage required to first control and then turn tide against rampant communism.

That means keeping our guard up. It means being prepared for the next 5, 10, or even 20 years to risk war at any moment to restrain Communist imperialism from further military conquests, just as we are doing today in respect to Formosa.

We must not let coexistence lull us into a false sense of security.

Unless and until Russia, Red China, and the rest of the Communist world would accept a really effective system of international control and inspection of armaments, we must maintain in a state of constant readiness a powerful retaliatory force.

I am absolutely convinced that is the only hope of preserving world peace. For let me repeat, if the Soviets or Chinese Reds thought they could neutralize us with a quick knock-out blow, they would not hesitate to do so.

They are not refraining from war because they have renounced it as an instrument of national or international policy. Nor because they are worried about what war would mean for western civilization.

We heard Molotov tell the Supreme Soviet and I quote him:

"World civilization will not perish no matter how much it might suffer from a new war."

He predicted that what would perish would be our way of life.

That should make it clear enough to us that the Soviet leadership does not rule out war because of its possible effect on civilization. It rules it out for the present simply because of the respect it has for the effectiveness of America's counteroffensive power.

That is why we must continue to be prepared.

But preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence. Something more is needed.

I believe in the strength and ultimate survival of the free world's system, based on human freedom, the dignity of the individual, and private initiative. Quoting to Bulganin the immortal words of Lincoln on Government of the people, by the people, for the people, I made clear my confidence that we will be able to cope with communism on a coexistence basis.

But the mere statement of this creed is not enough.

The western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front.

While in Moscow I gained the impression that communism was moving ahead in many fields which the present western strategy overlooks.

The arms race is not the only event in which they are competing with us. They have taken sports and culture and the impressionable years of youth and transformed them into arenas of the cold war.

Dedicated materialists though they are, they are working mightily on the minds of men and seeking to capture the imagination of the susceptible.

Our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected.

By inviting to Moscow picked delegations from the satellite countries and wavering neutrals like India, they strive to convey the impression that Soviet customs are superior to those of the west.

The delegations are carefully chaperoned, of course. They only see what the Communists want them to see. On that basis the good things of Moscow can be impressive—the splendid Moscow ballet, the mosaic-adorned subway, the up-to-date classrooms of towering Moscow University, the new apartment buildings, and the progress that has unquestionably been achieved in the industrialization of a backward, almost primitive agricultural nation.

It would be cause for wonder indeed if the Indians, the Chinese and even the Communists militants of Eastern Europe did not go back to their homelands somewhat impressed.

Sports is another front on which the commissars are moving full steam ahead.

On one frigid night while we were there, 75,000 Moscovites jammed Dynamo Stadium—the local Yankee Stadium—to watch the home team humble West Germany in a hockey game, 10 to 3.

The United States is likely to have a tough time at the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, when Soviet Russia enters a team which even now is being prepared for the big test.

America has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has also been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people.

How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956? Of course, these Russian athletes are not really amateurs. They are professionals. They are trained under government guidance, with government help. They receive bonuses and money prizes.

We should find some way of making sure that our Olympic contenders get everything they need in the way of training opportunities.

The lively arts are another field wherein the commissars are operating with the professed intention of proving to the young people of the world that Russian achievements far surpass the West.

Ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but to give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

From Moscow radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism.

It stands to reason that such extensive wooing of impressionable minds is likely to pay dividends—unless we compete vigorously with the Communist effort and even surpass it.

We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor.

But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete.

Nor is it enough for our leaders to advocate and appropriate large sums for foreign military and economic aid and think they have met the challenge.

Money is not enough. I came away from Russia convinced that only deep thought and long-range planning would suffice to prevail over communism in the conflict of coexistence.

Money spent on foreign aid will not get the most effective results unless it is thoughtfully expended in those fields where it will do the most good.

We should seek to convey to the world—to our allies, to the uncommitted countries especially, and to the Russians if possible—the idea that America is not only proud of its motor cars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements.

I believe that any cultural exchange between Russia and the United States is certain to develop in our favor. Within limits, I think such exchanges should be encouraged.

Last year the Soviet Union welcomed a group of American student editors to Russia. The United States of America refused to grant visas to a similar group of young Russian students.

The reason given was that a provision of the McCarran Act made it impossible to sanction the visas automatically. And neither the Justice Department nor the State Department would take the technical steps needed to circumvent the provision.

Somebody was timid on that one.

We had nothing to lose by exposing those young Communists to the wonders of our civilization. Their faith in communism might have been rocked by a view of America with its vastly higher standard of living, its free press, its cultural institutions, its open-hearted give and take.

And I'm sure the traditional friendliness of the American people would have dispelled the Kremlin's propaganda about our alleged warmongering and dedication to the destruction of Russia.

Everywhere we went in official Russia, the case of the student editors was thrown at us. The astute foreign editor of Pravda appropriated Sir Winston Churchill's "Iron Curtain" phrase and asserted it was America, not Russia, that had such a barrier around it.

What I would like to advocate here today is the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence.

This board should be scrupulously non-partisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available, both in public and private life.

It should survey the whole global scene and develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems.

Who can doubt that America would emerge on top in any such competition?

My suggestion is not blueprinted. It may even be a little vague. But formulating and implementing it would be the job of the planning group of men and women, each devoting time and energy to developing an overall American strategy in those nonmili-

tary fields for 1955—and for the next generation.

We have a National Security Council. I would like to see a national competitive co-existence council to combat communism.

One side or the other is going to win the battle of competitive coexistence.

It had better be our side.

Everyone and everything we love and cherish is at stake.

I thank you.

The Serious Situation Confronting the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from the Textile Workers' Union of America, signed by Arthur Gustafson, president of Twin City Joint Board, and Anna Vanusek, secretary, Lumber Exchange Building, Minneapolis, Minn., with copy of resolution adopted at the national CIO convention in Los Angeles, Calif., December 6 to 10, 1954. The resolution sets forth the serious situation confronting the textile industry and recommends action be taken to prevent widespread unemployment and suffering. The letter and resolution follow:

TWIN CITY JOINT BOARD,
TEXTILE WORKERS' UNION OF AMERICA,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 17, 1955.
Hon. Roy Wier,
Congressman, Third District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed, herewith, is a copy of a resolution which was passed at the national CIO convention at Los Angeles, Calif., December 6 to 10, 1954.

This resolution puts forth the depressing plight which grips the textile industry in the United States and is causing great hardship to all people who are depending on this industry for a living.

The members of Twin City Joint Board, TWUA, most earnestly ask you to do all in your power to have the proper agencies of our Government carry out the suggestions to investigate this situation, and as a result we feel a remedy will be worked out which will bring relief to the textile industry and cause reemployment of thousands of workers who are now unnecessarily unemployed.

Yours truly,

TEXTILE WORKERS' UNION OF AMERICA,
ARTHUR GUSTAFSON,
President, Twin City Joint Board,
ANNA VANUSEK,
Secretary, Twin City Joint Board.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY PROBLEMS

(Resolution adopted at 16th convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Los Angeles, Calif., December 6-10, 1954)

The textile industry preceded the rest of the American economy in the descent to mass unemployment and suffering. Today some 300,000 textile workers are idle, more than 50,000 as a result of permanent mill closings during the last 2 years. Several hundred thousand are working part time. Employment is less than in 1932. Thou-

sands have exhausted unemployment compensation benefits and have been forced onto local relief rolls. The depression in the industry has caused widespread hardship in textile communities throughout the country.

The plight of the industry is due to the failure of managements to fulfill their responsibilities to their customers and workers. Fabric and apparel design has not kept pace with the changing living habits of American consumers. Instead of fashioning materials to whet the appetites of the new suburbanites, the mills have continued to produce fabrics designed for more formal urban living. There is a dearth of fabric and apparel designs suitable for this era of the long, casual weekend, backyard sports, TV-viewing and the home workshop. Expenditures on advertising and sales promotion have been woefully inadequate. Research is needed on the potentialities of textiles for new industrial applications as well as for expansion of old uses.

Consumer per capita expenditures on apparel have not increased in proportion to the rise in total consumer spending because the textile industry has not moved to maintain its position in the consumer market. Employers have resigned themselves to shrinking the industry's capacity without consideration for their public responsibilities. Some have carried their irresponsibility to the point of capitalizing on tax loopholes and local government subsidies to reap financial gain by closing their plants. The welfare of the workers and the community has been ignored in the ruthless drive of a few men to profit from the low tax rate applicable to gains from the sale of capital assets. Others have exploited the industry-hungry towns which used their tax-exempt authority to float municipal bonds to pay for new plants and equipment.

Many companies were forced out of business because of their failure to reinvest the excessive profit earned during previous boom periods. Others were unable to compete in a buyers market because they lacked enterprising management. Their inability to keep pace with new methods, style changes, and merchandising developments made their demise inevitable.

In contrast, there are many companies whose efficiency and superior merchandising have continued to yield profitable financial returns. Corporations with strong financial backing have grown through the acquisition of additional plants. These mergers and acquisitions have resulted in an unprecedented concentration of control in the industry. Some 50 textile giants control half of the industry's basic capacity.

Rapid improvements in textile technology have added to the workers' problems by reducing the amount of labor required per unit of production. Management has taken advantage of these developments to extend work assignments inordinately and has refused to share the gains from increasing productivity. Man-hour productivity has risen at the annual rate of 4.5 percent since 1946 with a total cumulative rise of 36 percent. Combined with a declining total production to an annual rate of 12.7 billion yards from a rate of 14.76 billion yards at the end of 1950, these developments have permanently eliminated thousands of textile jobs.

Imports of textiles, including woolsens and worsteds, cordage and twine, fine cottons, silk scarves and others, have increased markedly and have accentuated the problems of the industry. In the woolen and worsted branch the impact of imports has been most severe because of the shrinking American market and the concentration of foreign exporters of lightweight fabrics for this country.

The Federal Government has abdicated its responsibilities in the textile field. The de-

fense manpower policy which authorized allocation of some Government orders to areas of high unemployment has been scuttled. The protection promised by the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act to employers with decent wage scales in bidding for Government contracts has been wiped out by the Fulbright amendment which authorizes court action to prevent minimum wage regulations from being put into effect. Increases in the minimum wage for work on public contracts, from \$0.87 to \$1 in cotton-rayon and from \$1.05 to \$1.20 in woolen and worsted, have been blocked by such litigation. The Government has refused to implement a provision of the tariff agreement which authorizes higher rates to protect the woolen and worsted industry from growing imports. On the other hand the Government maintains a duty on raw wool which adds to the cost of wool products without protecting the wool farmer.

It also supports an artificially high price for cotton which results in the accumulation of a huge cotton surplus and prevents the consumer from enjoying the benefits of lower cotton costs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. We call upon the Federal Government to take affirmative action to stem the tide of depression in the textile industry:

(a) An agency should be set up by Congress to represent the textile industry, labor, and the public for the purpose of enforcing a basic 35-hour workweek in the industry at 40 hours' pay. The agency should be empowered in periods of distress to limit machine operations to two shifts per day.

(b) A program of stockpiling needed military fabrics should be created now so that production orders can be released immediately.

(c) American textiles should be used in the same fashion as surplus food and coal for the relief of needy nations overseas. In similar fashion, textiles should be distributed to needy Americans as surplus food is now distributed.

(d) Contracts should be negotiated with mills in distressed manpower areas to reemploy the unemployed.

(e) A systematic investigation should be undertaken of ways to broaden the use of wool fibers as well as cotton. The Department of Agriculture should provide leadership in establishing a wool fabric library to stimulate new design and aggressive merchandising.

(f) Industrial expansion programs must be revised to locate new plants in areas where surplus manpower is available.

2. We support the proposal of the House Ways and Means Committee to disallow, for tax purposes, the deduction of rent from taxable income by industrial companies which lease plants built from the proceeds of municipal bond issues. This action would be a suitable first step in eliminating State and local tax exemptions and other subsidies to private enterprise.

3. All profits and capital gains resulting from the liquidation of mills should be taxed at a special rate of 25 percent and the proceeds used to finance local development programs, to aid workers to adjust themselves, and to set up public works and the development of local resources and facilities.

4. We call upon the Senate Committee on Labor and Education to look into the use of capital-gains taxes, local subsidies, and corporate mergers as stimuli to the liquidation of business enterprises.

5. The Federal Government should provide a research organization for studying methods of broadening the markets for textile fabrics.

The following unions concur in this action: Local Union No. 36, Tracy Chase, president, H. M. Lykke, secretary; Local Union No. 1262, Mary Zeppa, president, Dorothy Frank, secretary; Local Union No. 1260, Arthur Gustafson, president, Lesin L. Adams,

secretary; Local Union No. 1052, George J. Turnbull, president, J. Melton Johnson, secretary; Local Union No. 132, Sidney B. Thompson, president, Margaret Humphrey, secretary; Local Union No. 418, Ople Hopper, president, Wilma C. Ryan, secretary.

Pacific Locks, Panama Canal—Views of Sibert and Stevens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the history of the Panama Canal, in a large measure, is a record of heated controversy—debate as to choice of route and contentions over type and features of design. Of all the decisions as to design, none have affected more profoundly the planning, construction, and subsequent operation of the canal than that which separated the Pacific locks into two sets.

A brief summary of the background of this decision was presented on May 8, 1948, by Consulting Engineer Harry O. Cole, a builder of the Pacific locks, in a significant address before the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D. C., which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 11, May 21, 1948, page A3191.

In this address, Mr. Cole traces the development of the idea of a summit-level anchorage in the Pacific section of the Panama Canal from its conception in 1879 by Adolphe Godin de Lépinay through its proposal in 1906 by Chief Engineer John F. Stevens and its attempted revival in 1908 by Col. William L. Sibert.

These men were far-visioned engineers of distinction. Though they necessarily had had no experience in operating an interoceanic canal, they recognized and understood the problems of the Panama Canal, and urged the terminal lake solution. Unfortunately, they were unable to secure adoption of their idea. The Pacific end of the canal as constructed contained defects revealed by years of subsequent operation.

The critical situations produced by World War II again focused attention on the study of marine operations in the Panama Canal, at which time I was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It is a great tribute to the vision of these three engineers that a naval officer, Comdr. Miles P. DuVal, who, in 1941-44, was captain of the port, Balboa, after a painstaking study of the problems of ship transit, developed the same plan. This proved to be the first comprehensive proposal for the operational improvement of the Panama Canal ever derived from marine experience. The proposal is described by its author in a notable paper, *The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution*, published in the *American Society of Civil Engineers Proceedings*, volume 73, February 1947, page 161, and *Transactions*, volume 114,

1949, page 558. In this Captain DuVal extends full credit to those engineers for their brilliant conceptions.

Fortunately, Chief Engineer Stevens and General Sibert outlined their views on the Pacific lock question in chapter IX of their splendid book, *The Construction of the Panama Canal*, published by D. Appleton & Co. in 1915—one of the best accounts of the construction era.

In order that this illuminating summary by these engineering leaders may be readily available to the Congress, the Executive and the Nation, I include its text:

THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PANAMA CANAL (By William L. Sibert and John F. Stevens) CHAPTER IX. CHANGES IN THE ADOPTED PROJECT

The exposed position of the proposed lock at the Pacific entrance insofar as ship-fire from an enemy's fleet was concerned, in addition to foundation troubles in the construction of the necessary dams, especially the dam from Sosa Hill to near the mouth of San Juan River, caused investigations to be continued with a view to moving the locks in question inland to a position where the natural hills would protect them from hostile gunfire.

The advantage of a commodious lake at the Pacific terminus were many from a navigation and commercial standpoint, but the military features were considered paramount. The investigations which consisted principally in making borings in search of suitable foundation material were commenced at the old French lock location, at Miraflores, and continued south. These borings soon established the fact that suitable foundations existed at Miraflores for at least two locks. Work was proceeding, building the dams connecting Sosa Hill with the highlands on either side and starting the excavation for the Sosa Hill Locks, so if a change were to be made it was necessary that the decision should be arrived at quickly so as to stop expense on a project that might be discarded. When the question was brought before the Isthmian Canal Commission for recommendation, it was not known that suitable foundation existed at Miraflores for 3 locks and it was thought and stated by those conducting the explorations that there was not a suitable foundation for 3 locks at this site, so 2 locks were recommended at Miraflores and 1 at Pedro Miguel, which plan was approved by the President of the United States.

It was thought by some of the engineers connected with the canal that there would be a great advantage in having the 3 locks in 1 flight at Miraflores, making the 2 ends of the canal symmetrical. Investigations were therefore continued and soon established the fact that the three locks could advantageously be built at Miraflores on a rock foundation, thus making it practicable to carry out a little further up the valley essentially the same plan that had been studied in 1908 and abandoned because suitable foundations had not been located.

As soon as it was ascertained that suitable foundation existed near Miraflores for a duplicate flight of 3 locks, comparative estimates were made for that construction and for the locks separated—1 at Pedro Miguel and 2 at Miraflores. These estimates showed that the 3 locks on the Pacific side could be built in flight one structure for about \$4 million less than if separated. This saving resulted largely from the following facts:

First, that only 1 set of guide and flare walls aggregating a length of about 4,000 feet would be needed if the locks were in 1 structure, while 2 sets of such walls would be necessary if the structures were separated as stated.

Second, that only 20 lock gates and 33 sets of gate valves were necessary if all locks were together, while 26 gates and 51 sets of valves would be needed if the locks were separated. The six extra sets of gates would also require a material increase in length of lock walls to accommodate them.

Third, the smaller number of expensive machines for operating the gates and valves.

Fourth, only one emergency dam would be needed in the first case, and two in the second.

The estimates also showed that the operating and maintenance cost would be about \$250,000 a year less for the three locks in flight.

The advantages and disadvantages to navigation afforded by each of the propositions were discussed. One line of thought led to the conclusion that the navigation interests and the water-supply question would be best met if all the locks of the Panama Canal were separated by material distances, and that where this could not be attained it should be approximated as closely as possible, and that not more than two locks should be built together if it could be avoided; it being thought in the beginning that the saving of water due to the use of intermediate gates could not be affected in a flight of three locks.

These intermediate gates divide the 1,000-foot lock chamber into two smaller chambers of lengths sufficient to accommodate to the best advantage ships of commerce not exceeding 550 feet in length. Ships of this class constitute over 95 percent of the world's shipping which may reasonably be expected to use the canal.

It was also pointed out that a ship breaking through the upper gates in a flight of locks would be more surely and completely wrecked than if it broke the upper gate of a lock where only one lift existed. Gen. H. L. Abbot proved that, if the boats going from Colon to Panama were always passed through the same flight of locks—the west side, for instance—and those going the opposite direction through the east flight, that the same saving of water could be accomplished by the use of intermediate gates in a flight of three locks as could be if the locks were separated—without any cross-filling devices—which devices are of doubtful utility when the locks are used to maximum capacity.

The advocates of the three-lock design contended that it would probably make very little difference to a ship whether it plunged down one fall of 30 feet, or 3; that it would be wrecked anyway; and that the damage to shipping would, in the 3-lock design, be largely confined to the ship actually breaking the lock gates; while if the locks were separated, many other ships might be involved in the disaster on account of quickly draining the levels between locks and grounding the ships in such levels.

It was pointed out in the case of the flight of locks at Gatun that the upper miter-sill, which is about 25 feet above the general lake bottom in that vicinity, would limit the available depth in Gatun Lake, with the water flowing through the locks, to about 31 or 32 feet, and that, as the lake fell, there would be no unusual difficulty in stopping the flow before the largest draft vessel would ground in the anchorage space south of the locks. That is, should such a catastrophe happen, the damage to shipping would be limited to the ship breaking the summit level.

It was also pointed out that should such an accident happen the damage to the canal would be practically limited to the wreckage of the lock gates involved in the collision. The flow of about 100,000 cubic feet per second, which might result from breaking the summit level could not damage the masonry of the lock walls or floors and there was nothing below the locks to be damaged except the sea-level section of the canal. This section is 500 feet wide and 41 feet

deep and would carry 100,000 cubic feet with a mean velocity of about 5 feet per second, or less than 4 miles per hour. In that part of channel immediately below the locks where the guide wall divides it, the velocity should not exceed 7 miles per hour. To have no essential structures below the locks leading to the summit level of a canal, which in this case was a reservoir 164 square miles in area, was considered a material advantage.

It was also pointed out that should a lock gate be carried away at Pedro Miguel, there would develop almost immediately in the section through the Culebra Cut, which was then planned with a width of 200 feet, a current velocity of about 10 miles an hour which would imperil all vessels in such cut and would fill to overflowing in about 30 minutes the small lake between Pedro Miguel and the two locks at Miraflores. This might result in serious injury to the earthen dams and fills at Miraflores unless the spillway in the dam at that place was surely operated in a very short space of time.

It was pointed out that, if three locks were placed at Miraflores, the size and depth of the lake would be so increased over that in the two-lock project that, should a lock gate be carried away at Miraflores, the lake would fall so slowly that all ships in the Culebra Cut would probably have time to safely pass into either Gatun or Miraflores Lakes before currents could be developed in that cut destructive to shipping.

The congestion and consequent difficulties to navigation brought about by providing a lock at the end of a long narrow channel such as the Culebra Cut, due to the fact that ships accumulate and pass each other at locks, was pointed out. It was also pointed out that large ships could not pass each other in a 200-foot channel and that in order to attain the maximum number of lockages per day, it might be necessary to dispatch ships through the cut in fleets and that lakes at both ends of the summit level would facilitate this.

The advantage of such lakes was still further emphasized by the fact that dense fogs are frequent in the Culebra Cut during the year, especially in the rainy season. These fogs rise from 8 to 10 p. m. and disappear about sunrise. The records showed that navigation would experience practically no difficulty in the sea-level parts of the canal on account of fogs.

It was pointed out that the ability to pass ships to the summit level and have there a commodious harborage, where they could await the disappearance of the fog, would be a material advantage.

It was also pointed out that the greatest chance of accident in passing a ship through a lock was in entering the lock from the pool level above, as evidenced by the construction of duplicate lock gates at both ends of a lock next the summit or other levels, and by the construction and maintenance of expensive devices to stop the flow of water through a lock so situated, should its gates be carried away. Such entrance would take place only once if the three locks were in flight in one structure, and would take place 2 or 3 times if the locks were built at 2 or 3 sites.

A board of seven consulting engineers reported confidentially to the President that the better plan would be to build three locks at Miraflores. The matter was never passed upon by the Isthmian Canal Commission. An extended and bitter public discussion was then being carried on in the papers of the United States concerning the type of the canal. Changes in the adopted project could be utilized, it was thought, by the advocates of the sea-level plan in their arguments. Changes in plans were classed as admissions of weakness in the lock-type canal.

It is interesting to note, in this connection, that the Annual Report of the Panama Canal, 1914, shows that the three locks on the Atlantic side of the canal cost \$2,130,000 less than the three locks on the Pacific side notwithstanding the fact that the sand, stone and cement in a cubic yard of concrete in the Atlantic locks cost \$2.01 more than in a cubic yard of concrete in the Pacific locks.

The decision afterwards to widen the Culebra cut to 300 feet will reduce the current in that cut to 6½ miles an hour in case such an accident as that described above should happen. The many devices adopted to prevent accident to the lock gates, of course, make it very improbable that any such accident will occur, and the entrance to Pedro Miguel lock can be still further widened, and thus minimize the disadvantage of having a lock at the end of a long narrow section of a canal.

The change of lock location on the Pacific side was the only change in location of the essential parts of the Panama Canal excepting the following changes in channel location: first, from the Pacific terminal to the south side of the group of islands about 3 or 4 miles off shore; second, the extension of the sea-level section to Miraflores, which route followed quite closely that followed by the French in their last plan.

The change in location of the channel leading from the Pacific terminal to deep water in the Pacific, placing the same on the west side of the islands, was primarily for the purpose of reducing the cost of maintenance, experience having shown that the currents in Panama Bay caused a movement of fine silt along the shore to the westward. By changing the channel and building a causeway on the east side of it from the shore to the islands, this channel silt would be stopped, and furthermore this causeway constituted a line of communication from the shore to the sea-coast fortifications on the island that could be protected by guns on the shore on that side of the canal that would be least subject to surprise by a raiding force.

The Cattle Program on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Indian Bureau evidently does not understand the agricultural program among Indians. At the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in North Dakota the Department advised the Indians to go into the livestock business. Through that venture, the Department thought, the Indians would become self-supporting. This was a good plan, but apparently the experts on agriculture in that Department did not think the plan through.

No one can go into the cattle business for 1 year or 2 years and get very far. This is a long-term enterprise. There have been some losses on the reservation from this livestock venture, but nowhere near the loss which the Department is now forcing on these Indians. Since 30 percent of the cattle loans are in default, the Bureau has decided to advance no more money—and remember, it is Indian

money and not taxpayers' money—and are recommending that the cattle loans in arrears be closed out. In other words, the cattle on hand are to be sold and the proceeds credited on the loans.

Just as soon as this is done those loans will be an almost total loss. If the cattle are sold through forced sale, the Indian will have nothing from which he can get money to pay. What should be done is to tide these loans over, put into the venture more money, and bring the herds up to a good standard of production. In many cases the Indians have bred their original stock up to better beef animals, and that cannot be done in a year or 2 years. It takes time, and these herds should not be sold but financed. These good cattle should not be sacrificed to make small payments on the indebtedness. What would you think of a man who started a turkey venture, bought birds for production, set the eggs, and then sold the turkey hen before the eggs hatched? This would be the same as what the Department is now doing in the cattle business on the Fort Berthold Reservation.

Senator LANGER's committee held hearings at the reservation in October 1954, and pages 116 to 163 of Senate Report, Senate Resolution 89, sets out the whole situation in the cattle business on that reservation. In my opinion the cattle loans must be refinanced in order to do two things:

First. To stop any further losses.

Second. To bring the cattle program to final success.

It cannot be done in a short time, but it can be done with proper financing over a long period of time. I am in the cattle business myself, and it took me several years in breeding better stock and getting a herd built up to a proper size to make my efforts worthwhile and to finally reach a point of success. I reached that point, but I didn't do it in 1 year or even 2.

The Indian Bureau evidently knows but little about cattle raising.

End of Ireland's Partition Draws Closer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in reading the Irish Times of February 17, I was pleased to read an article indicating the willingness of the Irish Premier to meet with the Prime Minister of the six counties to discuss matters of common concern. The article is the result of an interview given to Mr. L. R. Muray and published in the Yorkshire Post. It may be of interest to the Members of the House to know that the Yorkshire Post is owned by the family of Sir Anthony Eden. Mr. Muray is a well known international correspondent, who visited in Washington about a year ago.

Not only does Mr. John A. Costello, Premier of the Republic of Ireland, indicate a willingness to meet with the representatives of the Six County government to settle problems of mutual concern, but also expressed the hope that this might help to create an atmosphere of friendly relations in which the grave problem of partition might also be considered and amicably terminated. The ending of the partition of Ireland has long been a matter of concern to me, and it has been with that in view that I have continuously urged the passage by this House of my resolution concerning Ireland. It has been my hope that such action by Congress would help to spur on the interest in and the solution of the partition problem.

In the course of the interview, Mr. Costello stressed the point that international cooperation was handicapped by reason of partition and that close defense ties with the United Kingdom could not be negotiated so long as the border remained. Based on these remarks, the *Yorkshire Post* also published an editorial regarding the necessity for coordinating defense plans between the two countries.

Knowing the interest of my colleagues in these matters, I am including in these remarks, the article which appeared in the *Irish Times*, recounting the interview with Mr. Costello, and also their reprinting of the editorial in the *Yorkshire Post*.

The two articles follow:

TAIOISEACH WILLING TO MEET NORTHERN PREMIER FOR GREATER GOODWILL

The Taoiseach, Mr. J. A. Costello, is prepared to meet the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland, Lord Brookeborough, "at any time to discuss matters of common concern." These words are a quotation from an exclusive interview recently given to L. R. Muray, and published in the *Yorkshire Post*.

Mr. Costello said that a discussion could create greater good will and prepare for a saner view to be taken of problems; a view that might ultimately lead to a climate of opinion in which the end of partition could be discussed.

"When I asked Mr. Costello about the Irish Republican Army, the extremist underground organization, Mr. Costello said that he could not discuss it with the North except on the basis of the ultimate eradication of the root of all evil—partition," the article goes on.

"The IRA, he told me, did not enjoy very widespread support, though there was sympathy with the young people who got themselves involved in the raiding of Armagh Barracks in Ulster last year, but it should be borne in mind that no party in the Eire Parliament advocated the use of force as a solution of the problem of partition. Ireland's outlook, Mr. Costello said, was to secure international cooperation irrespective of partition, but closer defense relations with the U. K. would depend on circumstances prevailing at the time, and whether or not the problem of partition was solved. The undertaking still stood that Ireland would never allow her territory to be used as a base to attack Britain. No government, however, could contemplate closer defense ties while partition existed. He complained that the British press maintained a barrier of silence on these issues.

"Mr. Costello would welcome further developments of agricultural exports to Britain, and more investments in Ireland by well-disposed people. His Government could not

repeal the Company Act, which laid down that 51 percent of the capital of new companies must be Irish, but it would be glad to operate the special licensing clause of the act, that created exceptions very liberally.

"Mr. James Dillon, the Minister for Agriculture, to whom Mr. Costello referred me, said that he was about to reopen negotiations for a renewal of the 1951 pig and bacon agreement with Great Britain. Mr. Dillon expressed enthusiastic confidence in the future relationship between the two countries. 'By stepping up cattle production here,' he said, 'we can, by common effort, produce the iron ration of meat, in order to ensure that no one can starve out the people of our two islands in the event of war.' Britain, he went on, could never be beaten in any war, provided she was able to hold out the first 12 months. Such cooperation would, at the same time, confer substantial prosperity on 'our two peoples.' Mr. Dillon added that nobody could ever beat an Anglo-American Commonwealth, which by its strength could ensure the peace of the world, and which free nations could join. He smiled when I suggested that Eire would have to join the proposed commonwealth.

"Mr. Liam Cosgrave, the foreign minister, answering a question about meeting the Northern Ireland Premier, said that they would be prepared to discuss matters in a realistic manner, members of both governments had met before to discuss railways and fisheries. The Government of Ireland Act reserved defense and external affairs to Westminster and any general discussion would, therefore, have to be tripartite. Ireland, Mr. Cosgrave said, was willing to do her part in the struggle against communism, but one could not expect her to join NATO since the Atlantic Pact guaranteed the existing borders of the signatories. When I pointed out that the Atlantic Pact was for 50 years only, Mr. Cosgrave agreed that partition had been with them for more than 30 years now. It was a question, ultimately, he said, of a definition and agreement of the term 'realistic.'

"Apart from the reference to the IRA by Mr. Costello which is quoted above, I could gain no information from government sources in Dublin about the secret army. From well-informed sources, however, I gather that the IRA's enrolled membership is about 1,000, of whom 400 to 500 are in active cadres. The IRA leader, whose pen name is McDermott, can draw on those cadres for raiding parties, and my informants expect them to be active in Northern Ireland some time this year. The present policy of the IRA, it was explained to me, was to avoid antagonizing public opinion in the Irish Republic by acts of violence in the republic, but to draw blood and fire by provoking the authorities in the north. By such acts the IRA hopes to revive antagonism against Britain, which has virtually died out among the masses in the republic. The understanding attitude and the sober words of the Northern Ireland judge who tried the raiders of Armagh Barracks baffled the IRA leaders and took the wind out of their sails. One source quoted Pearse, the executed leader of the Easter rising of 1916, as saying to a friend just before he went into action that he and his friends would only succeed 'if the British are stupid enough to shoot us.' According to my informants, the present government is making discreet efforts in conjunction with the Roman Catholic Church to dissuade young men from joining the IRA.

"A recent speech by the Primate of Ireland, Cardinal D'Alton, was referred to as an illustration. On the other hand, neither government circles nor informed opinion appears to be disposed to ponder over the effects that acts of violence by the IRA committed in Northern Ireland might have on the attitude of the British public to the

thousands of Irish subjects employed in Great Britain. It is almost taken for granted that relations will remain unaffected."

COORDINATION OF PLANS FOR DEFENSE NEEDED

A leading article in the *Yorkshire Post*, commenting on this interview says: "Is it possible to secure firm understanding and cooperation on matters of common concern between the Irish Republic and the United Kingdom?" In the exclusive interview which we print on this page today, Mr. John Costello, Prime Minister of Eire, declares himself ready at any time to meet Viscount Brookeborough, the Northern Ireland premier. He suggests that a discussion would create greater good will and prepare for "a saner view to be taken of problems—a view that might ultimately lead to a climate of opinion in which the end of partition could be discussed." It was a sign of improving relations that Irishmen representing all parts of the island attended the Leeds St. Patrick's Society dinner to hear the Irish ambassador, Mr. Frederick H. Boland, last night. Mr. Boland also made a moving appeal for the problem of partition to be tackled. Reactions in this country to this suggestion will be clear. We in the United Kingdom want to put an end to old, vexatious quarrels. We want to create an atmosphere of trust and friendship between our people and their close neighbors—the Irish. But we cannot disregard the wishes of Northern Ireland, nor could we contemplate an arrangement which would deprive us in time of war of the use of the Ulster ports, as we were deprived of the use of the southern Irish naval bases to our grievous cost during the last war. We welcome the undertaking which Mr. Costello assures us still stands—that Ireland will never allow her territory to be used as a base to attack Britain. But we hold that this assurance does not go far enough to ensure the safety of both islands should war come once more.

Closer defense ties are needed between the United Kingdom and Eire, who have so many cherished beliefs and interests in common. Their defense plans should be coordinated to make certain that everything possible is done to keep the lifeline across the Atlantic open. It would be a great advance if representatives of Eire, northern Ireland, and Great Britain could meet for a frank exchange of views on problems of this kind. Is it too much to hope?

Defense and Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following editorial from the *Evansville Press* of February 25 which appeared also in other Scripps-Howard papers states very well the need for clarification by the Department of Defense of its opposition to Alaska statehood:

Apparently it may be necessary to summon the Secretary of Defense in order for Congress to find out why the Pentagon is opposed to statehood for Alaska.

Senator HENRY JACKSON, Democrat, Washington, is quite justified in demanding that be done if Mr. Wilson refuses to clarify the matter. The officer sent to testify at the statehood hearings hardly did more than repeat the administration's previous vague

mummings about national defense. That is not an explanation and Congress should not accept it, even from the Secretary himself.

If the Armed Forces need large portions of Alaska for military purposes, they need only ask for them. It was to make that clear beyond question that the House statehood bill was amended to specify that 40 percent of northern Alaska can be set aside for military reservations. As a matter of fact, areas in Alaska or in any of the 48 States can be taken for military use, as has happened many times. Statehood for Alaska would not change that situation in any respect.

Alaska's strategic importance and the responsibility of the Armed Forces to defend it are precisely the same now as would be the case if it became a State.

These facts make it difficult to imagine what purpose of national defense could conceivably be served by refusing any longer the legitimate aspirations of the Alaskan people for full citizenship.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the editorial entitled "The Great Commoner of Mankind, Abraham Lincoln." It appeared in the East Side News of February 12, 1955, and was written by my good friend, Harry Schlacht. The editorial follows:

THE GREAT COMMONER OF MANKIND,
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

One hundred and forty-six years ago a great soul beamed like a morning star on a troubled world.

In a log cabin among the green-clad hills of Kentucky, and in an atmosphere that was similar in its humbleness to the birth of Christ, the first cry of the babe that was Abraham Lincoln fell upon human ears.

He lived for others and sacrificed his all that humanity might live in a better world.

Carlyle said that in Dante 10 silent centuries found a voice.

In Lincoln, America found hers, a voice that pleaded and thrilled and ultimately brought light and life to oppressed mankind.

He was the great commoner of history.

His homely, humble and honest humanity carried him to the heights of rare achievements.

He was a child of the people.

There is no accounting for genius: It has neither ancestors nor descendants, genius is the child of necessity.

Lincoln was the product of a crisis, and a crisis gave birth to his savior.

He was the personification of Americanism, a symbol of all that gives life and strength to the Nation.

His worth is reflected in every impulse of his heart, and in every act of his life, and their splendor shone in one lustrous orbit.

In the firmament of life he moved in a circle all his own, the course of which has never been paralleled.

Lincoln said that "our reliance is in our love of liberty which God has implanted in us."

Our defense is in the spirit which he prized as the heritage of all men everywhere.

He plucked a thorn and planted a flower. He caused in human beings the hardness to vanish, the pettiness and the cynicism to

depart; and in their place he planted flowers of strength and power, love and human kindness.

He knew and obeyed the higher sentiments of his soul.

He traveled the upward trail, for the dedicated his energies to the common good of mankind.

To him America was not so much a place as it was a people, not a creed nor a dream but a breathing thing with a magnificent past and a great future.

Lincoln at Gettysburg was an immortal and soul-stirring scene rich in solemnity and pregnant with historical significance.

Neither the practiced hand of a Raphael nor the art and skill of a Praxiteles could adequately portray it in its original setting.

His Gettysburg address is the fountain spring of the American way of life.

The truths set forth in his historic speech are the foundation stones of free government.

His was the summation of American ideals, a flaming torch for the oppressed peoples of the earth who seek the blessings of liberty.

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

These few words constitute the basis of the entire history of all mankind for human freedom.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any other nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

By these words, Lincoln sought to emphasize that the supreme question was the survival of popular government, not only ours by "any nation so conceived and so dedicated."

He climaxed his speech with a plea for a lasting democracy in these words:

"That from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion."

Then followed 14 historic words:

"That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

This was a declaration of the eternal and inalienable rights of man.

Standing before the graves of our fallen sons, he told his silent witnesses, and the world that:

"This Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

America needs the spirit of Lincoln.

It needs the rekindling of the love of liberty which will rebel against slavery and enslavement.

The spirit of him must give the soul of America its rebirth.

To every generation of Americans is given the task of carrying forward the torch, of passing on to each succeeding generation undimmed the heritage of America's tradition—a tradition based upon the highest conception of mankind the world has ever known.

We are all the defenders of our faith.

America united is America invincible.

The Late Charles Laban Abernethy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a press

account of the death of the late Hon. Charles L. Abernethy, a former Member of this body, as carried in the New Bern Sun Journal, a newspaper printed at New Bern, N. C.:

C. L. ABERNETHY SUCCUMBS AFTER LENGTHY ILLNESS—FUNERAL SERVICE FOR FORMER CONGRESSMAN, 82, SET FOR FRIDAY

Critically ill there for the past 2 days, former Congressman Charles Laban Abernethy, one of the best known men in eastern Carolina until illness forced his retirement, passed away at the Kafer Memorial Hospital here at 3:30 o'clock Wednesday afternoon at the age of 82 years. He would have been 83 on March 18. For the 2 years preceding his death he had been confined to his home at 608 Pollock Street in New Bern, and illness had forced him to abandon his law practice prior to that.

Funeral services are to be held at the Centenary Methodist Church in this city Friday afternoon at 3 o'clock. Rev. John A. Russell, pastor of that church, will officiate. Interment will be in Cedar Grove Cemetery in New Bern. A member of the Centenary Methodist Church, Mr. Abernethy organized the Deems Bible Class there, and the Congressman frequently came from Washington to conduct the class while serving there.

A son of the late John Turner Abernethy and Martha Scott Abernethy, Mr. Abernethy was born at Rutherford College, North Carolina. His grandfather had founded that institution and he was educated there. In 1883 he located in Beaufort, N. C., as editor of the Beaufort Herald. He continued in that position for 8 years and took an active part in the upbuilding of the town.

Deciding to take up the practice of law, Mr. Abernethy entered the law school of the University of North Carolina. He graduated from the university and received his license to practice law in 1895. The same year he married Miss Minnie May, of Pitt County, and began the practice of law at Beaufort. For 2 years he was attorney for the town of Beaufort and for the Atlantic & North Carolina Railroad. His law practice is said to have been remarkably successful.

In 1900 he was elected a member of the electoral college and was the youngest of all the members. He served in that capacity again in 1904. In 1902 he was made a leading candidate for Congress, but withdrew in favor of Charles R. Thomas, of New Bern. During the governorship of R. B. Glenn in North Carolina, Mr. Abernethy was appointed by the Governor as superior court solicitor in the third judicial district, which later became the fifth district. At the time of his appointment, he moved to New Bern. He remained solicitor for 12 years.

A former member of the Democratic executive committee, Mr. Abernethy was elected to the 67th Congress to fill the unexpired term of the late Sam M. Brinson. In 1923 he was elected to succeed himself as the representative of the Third Congressional District, and there was no interruption in his 13 years of service in Congress.

It was during the depression days of the Hoover administration, while Congressman Abernethy was serving as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that he secured the appropriation for the present handsome Federal building here to house the post office and the New Bern division of the Federal eastern district court. When that had been completed, he aided the city of New Bern in securing the building being abandoned for use as a city hall. New Bern has been proud of one of the finest Federal buildings and one of the best city halls in the State. There was national recognition of the achievement of the Democratic Congressman during a Republican administration and a depression.

Congressman Abernethy was one of the first advocates of the inland waterways for North Carolina. That was one of the many

projects for eastern Carolina to which the Congressman gave untiring energy. The waterways became a reality during the time of his active service in congress.

An association which began while he was a resident of Beaufort, Congressman Abernethy was a past master of the Franklin Masonic Lodge there. He became a 32d degree Mason. He was a Knights Templar, a member of the Sudan Shrine temple, a member of the New Bern Elks Club, of the Odd Fellows, the Woodmen of the World, the Kiwanis Club, the Red Men, and the Sons of the American Revolution. He was the first president of the New Bern Historical Society.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Minne May Abernethy; one son, Charles L. Abernethy, Jr., who was associated with his father in the practice of law in New Bern; two sisters, Mrs. Frances Hardenburgh and Mrs. Dora A. Blount, both of Washington, D. C.; two brothers, Ivan B. Abernethy, of New York City, and Benjamin Abernethy, of Washington, D. C.

With Congressman Abernethy the oldest member of the Craven County Bar Association, the six newest members have been chosen as active pallbearers. They are C. E. Hancock, Cecil May, Lamar Sledge, Kennedy Ward, Raymond E. Sumrell, Raymond Dunn or Elwood Dunn, George Riddle, N. C. Reed, Jr., A. D. Ward, and J. W. Beaman have been named as alternates.

Honorary pallbearers are to be members of the Craven County bar and court officials, and W. C. Chadwick, L. C. Newman, George Wood, James W. Mitchell, Hugh Waldrop, Hugh Swan, S. G. Clark, N. F. Rowe, R. L. Tyndall, T. C. Fitzgerald, Leon C. Scott, Jr., N. E. Mohn, Joe Alben, Marcus Dill, Bryan Duffy, Dr. Charles Duffy, Dr. Richard N. Duffy, Dr. C. H. Ashford, Dr. C. S. Barker, C. T. Midyette, Sr., H. C. Lawrence, and Royal G. Turner.

Fiftieth Anniversary of the United States Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by me before the House Committee on Appropriations March 1, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, and members of your distinguished Committee on Appropriations, I appreciate this opportunity to appear in support of the appropriations for the United States Forest Service. I feel confident that your committee will give the forestry items in the budget the thorough and careful consideration needed to assure their future well-being.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Forest Service. While February 1, 1905, is considered the birthday of the Forest Service, it really marks the beginning of the great conservation movement in forests, soils, water, and wildlife as we know it today in America, a movement that has captured the imagination, attention, and concern of millions of our people. Today more citizens are interested in what Congress is doing to protect and develop our forest resource than at any time in the history of America.

Congress has always played a big part in the development, use, and protection of the forestry resources of our Nation, not only through legislation but also with appropri-

tions. We have often been generous with the first item and then failed to carry through in an adequate manner our responsibility under the second. Mr. Chairman, over the years Congress has passed numerous bills which will do reasonably well the forestry job at hand—both on our national forests and on State and private woodlands. Often, however, we have failed to appropriate the money needed to adequately carry on the work we have created, or we have been asked to make cuts in the working funds of the great forestry enterprises that have meant so much to our Nation. Under my remarks on page A995 of the RECORD for February 17, 1955, there is mentioned the gratifying progress we have made in forestry in the United States in the past half century. The Members of this and other Congresses can claim some of the credit for these accomplishments.

Mr. Chairman, today your committee is in an enviable and rather unique position, for in this 50th anniversary year of forestry you have a great deal to say as to just how the second half century of forestry in America will go forward. I, therefore, need not remind my distinguished colleagues on this committee that our responsibilities are great. Also, that throughout the Nation many eyes are upon us, conservation-minded eyes, so to speak.

There is an item on page 363 of the printed budget that deserves serious consideration. I refer to the proposed cut of \$1,083,690 in the appropriation for cooperation with the States in forest-fire protection. This reduction in an essential program with the States came as a surprise to me because I know that Congress does not intend to go backward in this vital cooperative work. The 81st Congress passed Public Law 392, which amended the Clarke-McNary Act, to provide an annual authorization of \$20 million for cooperation with the States in forest-fire protection. The appropriation for fiscal year 1955 is \$9,449,500, some \$10 million under what should be the annual appropriation if the full intent of the law were carried out. And now for fiscal year 1956 you have been asked to cut the current appropriation some \$1 million.

The appropriation for cooperation with the States in fire control is one of the most important in the budget. Through it 43 States and Hawaii are assisted in the protection from fire of forests which produce primary forest products worth over \$3 billion and which affect many payrolls and great investments in wood-using industries. This appropriation is the basis for protecting recreational values in State and private lands now estimated to exceed \$4 billion. The sport of hunting and fishing so dependent on good forests now brings about \$9 billion into the economy of this country. I need not dwell upon the need for protecting water resources and the reduction of loss from floods. All these are tied into this appropriation. Therefore, rather than a reduction at this time, an increase which would at least start to bring the Federal share of this appropriation somewhere toward the goal set by Congress would be in order and certainly would have the support of many organizations and conservationists throughout the Nation.

In fiscal year 1954, the total expenditures on this program were \$39 million of which the Federal share (\$9,449,500) as about 24 percent. This indicates that we are still a long way from doing the job particularly in light of a detailed study made jointly by the States and the Forest Service in 1949 which showed a need for an expenditure of over \$48 million to provide basic protection to the forests and watersheds on State and private lands in the Nation. I might point out here that this estimate was based on 1949 prices. Also it provided only a normal or average level of protection and it didn't include any refinements or superior protection facilities by the State government cooperating in the program.

If I appear to be unduly concerned about this item in the budget, it is because we still have about 53 million acres of State and private forest land in this Nation without any kind of organized fire protection. This unprotected acreage is burning at an annual rate of more than 13 percent of the area. In comparison, the burn on the 374 million acres under protection is less than 1 percent of the area. In other words, 7 million acres of the 53 million unprotected acres burn each year while only 2½ million acres of the 374 million acres under protection burn. This indicates that the States are doing a fine job on the areas under this program. It also indicates that the big job ahead is to get these remaining 53 million acres under protection as soon as possible. The members of this distinguished committee know that we cannot do this by a reduction in the amount of Federal participation in the program. We have been 44 years making the above progress—our efforts cannot be relaxed now.

The proposed reduction if not restored would mean that each cooperating State can expect about 12 percent less Federal Clarke-McNary fire funds in fiscal year 1956. The argument that a few States might make up this reduction overlooks the fact that we still have a big job if we are to maintain the present level of protection and at the same time bring in these millions of acres of unprotected land. Also many people forget that cost of living has gone up and that the Federal appropriation now buys less than it did even a year ago.

The woods are full of people. In the forests of my State of Pennsylvania we find millions of people now coming to the woods for recreation. "Smokey Bear" is doing a great job in preventing fires, but in spite of his fine work and the work of everyone else concerned the average number of forest fires on State and private forest lands in 1953 was greater than the average number of fires during the previous 5 years. Simply, this means that there are more people using the forest. If the cooperative funds are reduced at this time the chances are slim that the reduction will be made up by additional State or private funds. In Pennsylvania we are spending \$895,000 each year on this cooperative program; \$188,500 or 21 percent is Federal Clarke-McNary money from this appropriation. The \$20,000 more or less that Pennsylvania will lose if the proposed reduction is allowed could not be taken lightly because it would probably mean doing without several tractors or fire plows or other needed equipment. More seriously, it could mean loss of manpower. Pennsylvania has been in this program since 1920. Forest-fire protection has progressed under the cooperation of the Federal Government, and I urge the committee to give serious consideration to restoring the \$1,083,690 to this fund for cooperation with the 43 States and Hawaii in forest-fire prevention. At the same time, I believe it would be good conservation business to give very serious thought to increasing the overall appropriation by several million dollars. Such an increase would amount to what commonly might be called a cost of living increase to provide for the increased costs the States must now pay for fire equipment, labor, tools, radios, and other facilities for fighting fires. No Member of Congress has ever been criticized for supporting a conservation program as vital to the national welfare as this one.

There is another item on page 363 of the printed budget under State and private forestry cooperation in which I am vitally interested. I refer to the item "Cooperation in Forest Management and Processing." Each year I have discussed this Federal-State cooperative program with the Appropriation Committee. It is a privilege now to discuss it with you.

Since 1940 the Federal Government through the Forest Service has been cooper-

ating with some 38 States in giving technical forest management assistance to the private owners of small woodland properties. As you perhaps know, over three-fourths of all the privately owned productive forest land in the Nation is in the hands of some 4½ million small owners and farmers. Many of the forest problems of the Nation as far as proper cutting and regeneration of the timber crop occurs on these small properties. The problem is so important and caused so much concern that Congress in 1950 passed the Cooperative Forest Management Act which authorized to be appropriated annually the sum of \$2,500,000 for cooperation with the States in advising and assisting the small woodland owners to do a better job of forest management on their properties. The act also included provisions for advising small mill operators to do a better job of sawing logs into lumber and other forest products. There are 50,000 of these small sawmill operators.

The budget this year provides \$632,429 for carrying on this work in 38 States. The States are spending an additional \$1,228,000. The work has just begun in that about 5 percent of the Nation's small owners have been assisted and better management has been started on 21 million acres or 8 percent of the small woodland acreage in the Nation. There has been over 5½ billion board feet of timber products harvested from the improved small forests with a return of over \$100 million to their owners. Basically, however, the assistance of the farm foresters has been to improve the forest-management practices and to get better crops of timber on these small properties.

There are now about 275 farm foresters being employed by the States under the cooperative forest-management program. Some 8 or 10 States are marking time waiting to get into the program when Federal matching funds are available. These are States where the Federal leadership and advice in the development of the woodland management program, training the farm foresters, and review of the work is important. This is a program which has the support of the State officials wherever it is in operation; it is one which is of great importance to the Nation if our small woodland properties are to be brought into full productivity.

My own State of Pennsylvania has been temporarily out of this program for several years due to pressing requirements of surveys on State forest properties. However, it is my hope that Pennsylvania will be among the 7 or 8 other States that are coming into this program if a small Federal increase in this appropriation is forthcoming. Mr. Chairman, I have no hesitation in urging your committee to consider granting the full amount of the authorization in the Cooperative Forest Management Act. And if such action is impossible at this time, I hope you will consider at least an increase of \$100,000 so that more States can employ farm foresters. I know that there would be no criticism from the States or from conservationists throughout the Nation if this program were strengthened and brought up to operating needs of the cooperating States. Any increase, however, which the committee would make in this appropriation would enable the program to go ahead and bring better management on many thousands of additional small woodland properties.

Another item under "State and private forestry cooperation," page 363 of the budget, is cooperation with some 43 States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the production and distribution of forest trees for planting unproductive land in this Nation. This cooperation is under section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act. Each year a small annual appropriation of some \$450,000 (\$447,061 to be exact) is allowed for cooperation with the States in this worthy project. The States themselves in 1954 contributed \$1,600,000.

In 1954 almost one-half million acres were planted to forest trees under this program. This sounds like a tremendous accomplishment. It is small, however, when we consider that there are around 60 million acres of private and non-Federal public forest lands in need of planting to restore productivity for future timber needs.

Mr. Chairman, while the budget allows the same amount for this program as the appropriation act included last year, I believe it would be good business to consider bringing this cooperative tree-planting program up to the full measure of activity which Congress provided for in the Clarke-McNary Act. I firmly believe this committee would receive the commendation of conservation groups all over America, State foresters, and private landowners if the full authorization of \$2½ million in the Clarke-McNary Act were appropriated so that a realistic and dynamic tree-planting program could be started now and not 20 to 30 years from now when the situation is serious. I visited several foreign countries last fall and saw firsthand the terrible results of allowing denuded, unproductive land to wash away and erode into the rivers and streams. It's too late in many of these countries to do anything about it even though from time to time we have poured millions of American dollars into tree-planting programs far removed from our shores. I think it's about time we do something about this Nation's unproductive land. We can't make much progress by spending millions on conservation projects abroad and only a few thousand here at home.

White pine blister-rust control is another cooperative activity in which the Federal Government has been working with the States as far back as 1916. Federal funds for blister-rust control were reduced from \$2,986,354 in fiscal year 1954 to \$2,570,000 in fiscal year 1955. This represents a reduction of \$416,354. Of the 1955 appropriation, \$165,000 was earmarked for assisting States and private-property owners with control on their lands, a 50-percent reduction over 1954. The 1956 budget carries the same amounts as were appropriated for 1955—only \$165,000 for assistant State and private owners with control.

The sharp reduction in the cooperative item in the 1955 appropriation was predicated on the belief that the States and property owners can and should assume a greater share of responsibility for this and other similar cooperative programs. However, funds provided by the States and local agencies for conducting blister-rust control of their lands totaled \$732,192 for fiscal year 1954 and dropped to \$650,315 for fiscal year 1955. There were reductions in 8 States in 1955 over 1954 totaling \$97,880. There were increases in 9 States totaling \$16,003. This represents a net reduction of \$81,877 in cooperative funds in 1955 over 1954. The State of Pennsylvania was 1 of the 9 States increasing its contribution, from \$25,720 in 1954 to \$25,960 in 1955, an increase of \$240.

The record thus indicates that the States and the local agencies did not absorb the slack occasioned by the reduction in Federal assistance. On the contrary, the overall net action was a reduction in both Federal and local funds for blister-rust control on State and private lands with its consequent curtailment in control work. Treatment on non-Federal white pine areas decreased from 981,165 acres to 687,690 acres, a reduction of 30 percent. For Federal areas the decrease was from 179,033 acres to 165,425 acres, or 8 percent. Here is another area of Federal-State cooperation which should be carefully scrutinized by your committee. The Federal appropriation for cooperation with the States in control work on State and private lands was reduced to \$165,000 in the fiscal year 1955 appropriation act. I respectfully

recommend that this item be restored to the full amount that was appropriated in the fiscal year 1954 appropriation act, namely \$330,000. I urge this action because we are losing ground in the fight to control white pine blister rust. The blame for this backward step can be laid right at the door of the Federal Government.

In my appearance before this distinguished committee, I always consider it a privilege to speak in behalf of protection and management of national forests. Here I refer to the items on page 359 of the Budget. The small increases provided for timber resource management, the sanitation and care of public camp grounds and forest-fire protection on the national forests are a step in the right direction and should receive every consideration. In fact, the \$200,000 item recommended on page 359 should be increased to at least \$1 million.

While the national forests of the East do not have the tremendous volumes of timber sales of those of the West, the sales they do make are very important to communities and the wood-using industries on which these communities depend. The volume of saleable material is increasing rapidly on these growing forests and more thinnings should be made for the good of the trees. However, there are too many situations where the timber needs cutting, communities need the work, and industries need the wood, but the Forest Service does not have adequate funds to put the timber on the market.

It has been estimated that the national forests of the North, South, and East could increase their timber sales by almost 150 million feet a year if the necessary funds were available.

The \$800,000 increase requested in the budget for timber management will provide more sales and more jobs in many communities where unemployment has become a real problem. It is only good business to help people who want to work to help themselves. And it is particularly good business to do this by providing more timber sales since for every dollar spent on timber sales, at least \$10 is returned to the Treasury.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment on the item on page 361 of the budget, Forest Roads and Trails, for which an increase of \$1,500,000 is requested to provide the total amount authorized for appropriation in 1956. As I understand this item, it is to complete the access roads needed to make Government timber available in inaccessible areas in the West.

Most of the road money appropriated for national forest roads and trails since before World War II has been spent for timber access roads. The Forest Service needs this timber access road money. There are millions of board-feet of Government timber that should be harvested before disease and forest pests destroy its value.

But other roads are also needed on the national forests. Visitors to the national forests have increased by leaps and bounds since World War II. Last year more than 40 million people came into the forests to camp and visit. Since the CCC camps were demobilized at the beginning of the war, national forest recreation roads and trails have been virtually neglected. During World War II forest road money was spent almost entirely on timber roads. There wasn't enough left to even maintain recreation roads. That was as it should be, but now we should be rebuilding the roads that went to pieces from lack of maintenance and building many more to accommodate the thousands of additional campers, picnickers, hunters, and fishermen.

According to Forest Service records, there are approximately 119,000 miles of existing roads on the national forests. Twenty-five percent of these are recreation roads, but

only a third of them are in good condition. Twenty thousand miles of recreation roads need improving and the Forest Service estimates that another 12,000 miles of new recreation roads are needed so people can reach camping sites and hunting and fishing that is now inaccessible to families in moderate circumstances. Recreation trails on the national forests likewise deteriorated while timber access road needs were consuming forest road and trail appropriations. The Forest Service says that there are enough trails, but 20,000 miles of the mountain trails need a lot of work before they are safe for vacationists.

From the Forest Service, I learned that about \$15 million was spent from appropriated forest road funds for improving and building timber access roads in 1954. But only 5 percent of that amount was spent for improving or building recreation roads and trails. The Forest Service should have at least \$3 or \$4 million a year, just for recreation roads for several years.

On the Allegheny National Forest, in my State of Pennsylvania, we have a lot of national forest timber but since it is accessible after a fashion, we have no claim on the forest road funds earmarked for opening access roads to new timber stands. But there are thousands of people who want the timber roads and other roads on the Allegheny forest made suitable for automobiles as well as for travel by logging trucks. Those people want the Forest Service to continue building timber access roads where needed for getting out national forest timber in the West before it is destroyed by beetles and fire, but they also want a few good roads in the West and here in the East for other national forest users. Now, I might point out to the committee that 16,500 people live inside the forest; 64,000 additional people live immediately adjacent to the forest; 139,000 live in the four counties within which the forest is located; 5,125,000 live within the forest's immediate zone of influence; 47,099,000 people (Americans, Canadians not considered) live within 300 air miles—an average day's motor travel—from the approximate center of the forest. This is approximately 31 percent of all the people in the Nation. Within this area the population pressure is 222 individuals per square mile as compared to a national average of 50, and an average of 17 in the 11 Western States.

Recreation roads must receive more attention and more money or we shall have a few million national forest campers, picnickers, hunters, and fishermen on our necks. The national forests have always been open to public use and always should be. We can't discourage people from going to our national forests for recreation and to get away from their daily grind. The only other alternative is to provide funds whereby roads can be built for recreation needs. Here is one area of use which I urge this committee to give serious consideration.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, I appreciate your earnest and sincere interest in these appropriations for our forestry activities in our Nation. The amount of time you have granted for my remarks is generous indeed and reiterates your interest. This is a matter which should vitally concern every Member of Congress. We have been dragging our feet in keeping up our end of the load on these Federal-State cooperative programs of fire control, small woodland management assistance, and tree planting. Your committee, Mr. Chairman, will be doing the Nation a great service by beginning this next 50 years of forestry in America with adequate funds for Federal participation with the States in this work.

At the same time I urge continued vigilance that sufficient funds are appropriated to properly manage and harvest the resources of our great national forests.

Atomic Era Poses New Water Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article:

WATERWORKS ENGINEERING,

New York, N. Y., February 24, 1955.

To the Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We have the honor of filing with you an advance proof of an editorial entitled "The Atomic Era Poses New Water Problems," which will appear in the March issue of *Waterworks Engineering*.

This editorial bears directly on one important aspect of the new atomic energy law upon which you are scheduled to hold hearings on March 1. Since the safety of the water resources of the Nation are of vital importance to public water supplies, as well as to all other uses of water sources, we know that you will give due consideration to the public health problem to which the editorial refers.

It is essential that the great fund of scientific knowledge of the Atomic Energy Commission be augmented by the specialized abilities of the United States Public Health Service and the State health departments, now that private industry is to be licensed to utilize radioactive materials for peacetime purposes.

If we can be of further service to your committee in this matter, we are yours to command.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM W. BRUSH,

Editor.

ATOMIC ERA POSES NEW WATER PROBLEMS

What to do about radioactive wastes has been quite extensively studied and discussed, especially since the atomic bomb has become a weapon with which we must live. So far, most of the research on handling, storing, and disposing of radioactive waste materials has been carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission. These waste materials have been produced, primarily, at AEC installations where control measures have been developed and utilized to prevent the discharge of hazardous exposure substances. Because of the careful control measures taken at the Federal level, there appeared, during the early stages of atomic research and development, to be little need for any supervision by authorities at the State or local levels.

Since AEC or its agents were the sole producers of such radioactive wastes, it was sufficiently reassuring to know that this governmental body was actively working on the problem of the safe handling and disposal of these potentially dangerous substances. Now that the Federal Government has authorized the licensing of private industry to utilize nuclear products for peacetime purposes, the problem of environmental contamination takes on broader implications. The question must be raised as to whether there is the need, or will be need, under the new conditions, for other governmental agencies to become interested in the control problems which have been exclusively handled by AEC in the past.

Certainly, it is important that, at the beginning of licensing private industry to use atomic power, a sound control policy be

adopted. What are some of the basic factors in setting up such a policy?

The waterworks profession is vitally interested in such control policies because the operations of AEC installations and of private enterprises which may be handling radioactive substances will involve the use of water. This may be from both surface and ground sources, and may also involve discharge of spent waters and wastes back into the Nation's water resources. It is not surprising, therefore, that the American Water Works Association has already urged Congress to spell out, in the new atomic energy law, the responsibility of users of atomic substances to continue the same type of control which has, in the past, been provided by AEC.

The best guaranty that the water resources of the United States will not be impaired by any such uses would be obtained if the agencies most conversant with water problems are clearly given the necessary authority to control and police the proposed new operations.

What are these agencies? They are the United States Public Health Service, the State health departments, and, possibly, local water authorities. It would be desirable for the law, at the outset of the expanded program, to recognize these agencies and to make them a part of the program of controlling any radioactive hazards.

Obviously, waterworks men will turn to their State sanitary engineering organizations for information on how atomic power operations may affect their water supply, how any deleterious conditions may be detected, and what actions should be taken to protect public water supplies from this new type of atomic era hazard.

It is self-evident, therefore, for all State sanitary engineers to be kept fully informed on this new subject so that they may transmit authentic guidance to the waterworks profession.

Though it may be several years before atomic power is utilized by private industries, it is none too early to determine what legal controls should be set up and who should enforce them. It will take the cooperation of the Atomic Energy Commission, the United States Public Health Service, the various State health departments, and other recognized water authorities to formulate and implement a sound policy upon which Federal, State, and local legislation can be based. Waterworks management should be vitally interested in the development of such a plan and assist in its production and acceptance at all governmental levels.

Community Head States Spain Not Anti-Semitic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following news item which appeared in the *Jewish Advocate* newspaper in Boston, Mass., on February 10, 1955:

COMMUNITY HEAD STATES SPAIN NOT ANTI-SEMITIC

MANILA.—Newspaper accusations in the United States and Britain that Spain has been intolerant of Jews and anti-Semitic

were denied here this week by Daniel F. Baroukh, president of the Jewish community of Madrid, who is currently in the Philippines.

In a statement to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Sr. Baroukh noted that 2 years ago he was granted an audience by the Spanish Chief of State, the first such interview granted a Jew in Spain in 450 years. He said he came away from the meeting impressed with General Franco's words and message to the people of Israel.

Sr. Baroukh recalled that 2 years ago the Spanish Government gave its permission for the holding of public high holiday services in a Madrid hotel and that a Spanish Government representative attended the services, as did leading Spanish Catholics, representatives of the American Embassy, and American Jews. In a reference to the refusal to grant a permit to hold similar services in a Madrid hotel this past Rosh Hashonah, Sr. Baroukh said a mistake was committed by his secretary in Sr. Baroukh's absence.

The head of the Spanish Jewish community stressed that during the Nazi regime many Jews were saved by being admitted to Spain. He listed various other gestures by the Spanish Government toward the facilitating of religious services and instruction, and acknowledge its presentation of a magnificent collection of books for the projected Sephardic Library in Jerusalem. Sr. Baroukh said that there are now 35,000 Jews in Spain.

Lebanon, Tenn., Sends Goodwill Ambassador to the Republic of Lebanon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the promotion of goodwill among the peoples of the world has become in our modern civilization a matter of great importance, for where understanding exists, suspicion and hostility are absent.

In this connection, a goodwill Ambassador from Lebanon, Tenn., in the Fourth Congressional District of Tennessee which I have the honor to represent, is now en route to the Republic of Lebanon on the eastern edge of the Mediterranean. He is Dr. F. M. Baddour, esteemed citizen of this Tennessee city, whose parents were native of the nation of Lebanon. Dr. Baddour, as vice mayor of Lebanon, Tenn., has been joined for this visit instigated by the Lebanese Government, by the official representatives of 22 other cities of the United States which bear the name of Lebanon. His appointment as vice mayor was made as a tribute to this American citizen of Lebanese extraction by action of Mayor William D. Baird and other city officials of the city of Lebanon, Tenn.

This gesture of goodwill, Mr. Speaker, is of such importance that I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record, along with my remarks, excerpts from articles printed in the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat and concerning this visit of Dr. Baddour to the Republic of Lebanon.

The articles include the column Sense and Nonsense, written by Col. J. Bill

Frame, editor of the Lebanon Democrat, a news story concerning Dr. Baddour's departure on his voyage of goodwill, and the proclamation issued by Mayor Baird on the occasion—all of which were published in the Lebanon Democrat.

The articles are as follows:

DR. BADDOUR LEAVES BY AIR FRIDAY FOR BEIRUT MISSION

Friday will be Dr. F. M. Baddour Day in Lebanon, when the new vice mayor and special representative of the Tennessee City of Cedars leaves on a 2-week visit to the land of his ancestors, the Republic of Lebanon, at the eastern edge of the Mediterranean.

Among distinguished guests at Berry Field when Dr. Baddour leaves by air for Washington and New York will be Mayor Ben West, of Nashville, as well as a motorcade of friends and associates from Lebanon.

The vice mayor will be one of more than a dozen officials of American towns named Lebanon to be special guests of the Lebanese Government March 1 to 15.

Gifts from local industries, including representative products of Barry-Carter Milling Co., Lux Clock Manufacturing Co., Texas Boot Manufacturing Co., Lebanon Woolen Mills, and Lebanon Garment Co., were shipped to Beirut by air this week. In addition, Dr. Baddour will take gifts from the Lebanon Lions and Rotary Clubs and the Lebanon Jaycees to their brother organizations in Beirut and also gifts from the Business and Professional Women's Club.

A Bible will be sent by the First Presbyterian Church, of which Dr. Baddour is a member, for presentation to a Lebanese Protestant church.

In Washington Dr. Baddour will be greeted at the airport by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Congressman JOE L. EVINS. Senator ALBERT GORE sent his regrets that he will be out of the city Friday.

A reception is planned by the Lebanese consulate general in New York City before the American mayors leave by plane for the Middle East.

Dr. Baddour's father, the late Marion D. Baddour, came to Lebanon in 1834 from Aurson, Syria, which became the Republic of Lebanon in 1946. He was accompanied by 2 brothers, and all 3 settled in Lebanon, but the brothers later moved to Covington, Tenn. Mr. Baddour opened a business in Lebanon, which he operated until 1902, when he returned to Syria, where he met and married the former Miss Adele Haddad, of Hamanna, Syria. They soon returned to Lebanon, Tenn., and reopened a mercantile firm, which they operated until 1926, except for about 2 years, when they went back to Syria on a visit, and then opened a laundry in Alexandria, Egypt, returning to the United States in 1910. In 1923 Mr. and Mrs. Baddour moved to Hughes, Ark.

Dr. Frank Baddour was born in Lebanon, Tenn., and has lived here all of his life, except the 2 years spent as a child in Alexandria, Egypt.

He was educated in the public schools and Cumberland University in Lebanon. He received his degree in optometry from the Northern Illinois College of Optometry and has done postgraduate work at Monroe College, of Chicago; Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, Tenn.; and at Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn.

He is active in church and civic affairs, is a member of the First Presbyterian Church, Men's Club, chamber of commerce, all Masonic bodies, including Shrine and Order of the Eastern Star, Shrine Club, Camera Club, and has the distinction of holding the only honorary lifetime membership ever given by the Lebanon Jaycees and is an active member of the Lebanon Lions Club.

He married the former Miss Rebecca Jewell, and they have three daughters—Mrs.

Richard (Adele) Lykens, of Route 3, Kingsport; and Misses Glenda Ann and Patricia Baddour.

Dr. Baddour has three principal hobbies, either of which could be a full-time occupation. They are breeding fancy rabbits, peony cultivation, and cooking. For many years he maintained a peony farm near Lebanon and also operated an extensive rabbit-breeding business. He has gained considerable prestige as a cook, especially in the art of barbecuing.

Dr. Baddour has many relatives living in the Republic of Lebanon, among them being an uncle, brother of his mother, Abraham Haddad, of Hamanna. His maternal great-grandfather, Simon Haddad, was a Presbyterian minister.

SENSE AND NONSENSE

(By J. Bill Frame)

Tomorrow our new vice mayor and ambassador of good will, Dr. Frank M. Baddour, will leave on his trip to Beirut, Lebanon.

It would be an excellent gesture under any circumstances to send a representative to the country from which we derive our name. But in this instance, it is most fitting, because our representative is a descendant of Lebanese parents, and will have a particular appeal.

Nothing Lebanon has ever done will gain our town as much favorable publicity, and bring our community into needed limelight as will the action of our mayor and board of aldermen in selecting Dr. Baddour as our town's representative.

Mayor William D. Baird should be—and has been—complimented on his appreciation of the gold mine of news stories that will be used in conjunction with the trip, which will certainly place Lebanon, Tenn., in a very favorable light.

And the members of the city council certainly deserve credit for approving the plan.

Following is a bit of interesting material received by Roy Dowdy, president of the Lebanon Rotary Club, from the president of the Rotary Club of Beirut, Lebanon. This is indicative of the importance the Lebanese Government and civic organizations place on the visit of the mayors and representatives of Lebanons in the United States.

"DEAR SIR: Just 100 years ago the first Lebanese began to immigrate to your beautiful United States and now some 200,000 Lebanese are today United States citizens. We in the Middle East are proud of their record of achievement and grateful for the opportunity you have given them.

"Your Lebanon and our Lebanon have a most important thing in common, our name 'Lebanon,' which means 'White Mountain' in Arabic. On the snowcapped Lebanon Range where some of the present cedars of God have been growing for over 3,000 years, you can look down from their heights and see the blue Mediterranean below, indeed something to remember.

"Our Lebanon, from which your community has derived its name, has a long and famous tradition you will be proud to know in person. Our Phoenician alphabet from which all western languages are formed, the Biblical cities of Sidon and Tyre, up to and including some of the most modern installations in the world will give you a panorama of thousands of years.

"The current year of 1955 has been designated by the President of the Republic as 'Lebanese International Homecoming,' and we trust that many Americans of Lebanese descent and other American tourists as well will come to our shores to meet the modern Lebanese at work and at play, to see our famous historical sites and scenic beauties, and to enjoy the many special events we have planned on this occasion.

"It is with great pleasure, therefore, that the Lebanese Government extends to you, the mayor of Lebanon, an invitation to come

and visit Lebanon in the Middle East, as the guest of the Commissariat General au Tourisme, for a period of 2 weeks, from March 1 to March 15, 1955, inclusive, as a gesture of friendship and in grateful recognition of the welcome you in the United States have given all Lebanese at all times, for these last 100 years of our national association. Invitations are also going out to the mayors of the other 22 Lebanons, United States, which list is attached for your information."

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the Republic of Lebanon has invited the municipal officials of the 23 Lebanons of the United States to visit them from March 1 to March 15, 1955, in appreciation of the 300,000 former Lebanese who now reside in the United States; and

Whereas Lebanon, Tenn., has accepted this invitation and will send its duly elected vice mayor, Dr. Frank M. Baddour, on said visit to the Republic of Lebanon; and

Whereas the industries and civic clubs of Lebanon, Tenn., are sending gifts to the President of the Republic of Lebanon by the said vice mayor, who will depart from Berry Field Airport, Nashville, Tenn., at 2:45 p. m. on February 25, 1955; and

Whereas the importance and significance of this trip by the vice mayor of Lebanon, Tenn., is of great magnitude, and the city of Lebanon feels grateful and indebted to its vice mayor, Dr. Frank M. Baddour, for the giving of his time to make the trip, and service to our community.

Now, therefore, I, William D. Baird, mayor of Lebanon, Tenn., do hereby proclaim Friday, February 25, 1955, Dr. Frank M. Baddour Day in Lebanon, and humbly urge and request the people of Lebanon to express our appreciation to Dr. Frank M. Baddour for his sacrifice and service to the community and, if possible, to join the motorcade that will accompany him to the Berry Field Airport.

February 21, 1955.

WILLIAM D. BAIRD,
Mayor.

"Open Covenants Unopenly Arrived At"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the New York Times:

"OPEN COVENANTS UNOPENLY ARRIVED AT"—AN OBSERVER ARGUES FOR A REVISION OF WILSON'S SLOGAN—HE CALLS FOR A RETURN TO SECRET DIPLOMACY AND AN END TO OPEN NEGOTIATIONS THAT TURN DIPLOMATS INTO PROPAGANDISTS

(By Drew Middleton)

LONDON.—Jules Cambon, of France, who died in 1935 at 90 and who was probably the ablest diplomat of his time, once said: "The day secrecy is abolished, negotiation of any kind will become impossible." The prediction has proved startlingly accurate, although it is unlikely that even the president M. Cambon envisaged the oratorical free-for-all of the past decade—the propaganda sessions that have so largely replaced professional diplomacy.

Now a cautious return to secret diplomacy seems to be in the making. A few recent settlements by secret diplomacy are already on the books. And the way has been opened, after a futile attempt in the United Nations,

for an effort to end the fighting between Communist and Nationalist China through the channels of traditional diplomacy.

Granted that secret diplomacy—meetings in camera between ambassadors and the foreign ministers of the states to which they were accredited—was not perfect. And the world was much smaller when it was widely in use. But it is worth noting that for the century between Waterloo and the Marne secret diplomacy managed to put off a general war in Europe despite the constant shifting of alliances and national combinations and the competition among the great states for overseas empire.

From 1854 the Eastern question, which plagued two generations of statesmen, was dealt with by the cautious, painstaking efforts of the professional diplomats. The great issues and grave crises in Europe, Africa, and Asia which arose out of the development of Germany into a world power after 1870 were confined to reasonable bounds by this diplomacy. It was not a system that favored adventurers, as Louis Napoleon found, but it did favor those who sought a stable, peaceful world on the basis of live and let live. There were no righteous crusades. But there were no world wars.

Why, then, was secret diplomacy abandoned?

One reason was a disastrous misuse of the system. At the crucial time when World War I might have been averted, the Central Powers turned over the conduct of negotiations to impetuous militarists like Conrad von Hotzendorf in Vienna and earnest but loose-thinking rulers like the Kaiser. War came and many thought that it had been caused, in some mysterious way, by the machinations of the professional diplomats in secret session.

Another reason for the fall of secret diplomacy into disrepute was that either the agreements and treaties which were the product of such negotiation were kept secret in toto or important annexes modifying the body of the pact were kept from the public. When at the close of World War I treaties like the Sykes-Picot treaty of May 1916, sharing out most of Asia Minor among Britain, France and Russia, became public knowledge, there was a clamorous popular reaction against such pacts and the methods of secret diplomacy that produced them. Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Secretary, protested, "In war you will have secret treaties, and you cannot help it. Many things generally regarded as criminal are regarded as inevitable in war." But to no avail.

The revulsion against secret treaties, unwisely extended to secret diplomacy in the popular mind, helped win wide support in the United States and Europe for Woodrow Wilson's slogan: "Open covenants openly arrived at."

Consider the record of open diplomacy. It presents one salient lesson—especially since the close of World War II: it doesn't work. Under the conditions of open diplomacy in the various conferences that have been held between the representatives of East and West, the Russians could not be anything but intransigent.

The reason is that for more than a third of a century the rulers of Russia have been portrayed by their own propaganda as the omniscient and omnipotent executives of an unchallengeable governmental system. Such men cannot negotiate openly, for the concessions they might have to make would, in fact, testify that they were not omniscient and omnipotent, that their system had its flaws, that there were other governments in the world as powerful, as shrewd and as intelligent as that of the Soviet.

Thus, the Council of Foreign Ministers established by the United States, Britain, the Soviet Union, and France at the war's end proved incapable of solving any of the major issues before it. At Moscow and London in

1947 and at Paris in 1949 the Council failed to make headway on the solution of the problem of Germany's reunification, then as now the most important problem in Europe.

Berlin, Trieste, the Saar, the Austrian peace treaty—one by one, the great problems facing Europe were pigeonholed as the inability of open diplomacy to deal with them became more and more pronounced. Intransigence of the Soviet representatives, Foreign Ministers Molotov and Vishinsky, contributed heavily to the failure.

The meetings of the Council, of the Security Council of the United Nations, of the Deputy Foreign Ministers were noisy propaganda platforms rather than diplomatic gatherings. The pattern became boringly familiar. Let us say the Council of Foreign Ministers was discussing German elections. To begin, the Council was not 4 men and their interpreters. It might number 40 or 80, for each Minister was supported by advisers from his own ministry, experts on military and political matters and public relations men.

This was the pattern:

The Russian Foreign Minister rises to speak. He talks on for 2 hours and every word is translated into English and French. The speech advocates powerfully and with a wealth of similes drawn from the more obscure Russian proverbs the Soviet plan for German elections. But the speaker does not end here. He attacks the United States for supporting the Nazis in Bavaria, the British for rearming the Germans in Saxony, and the French for requisitioning German cattle.

By the time the Russian is finished the three other delegations are angry, weary, and well off the track. But the Soviet Minister's harangue is dutifully reported, giving satisfaction to his Government and joy to all the comrades the world over.

The next day the British Foreign Secretary finds that before he puts forward his country's position he must reply in detail to the Russian charges and, since he is human, add a few countercharges about what is going on in the Soviet Zone of Germany. As the meeting progresses all the Ministers are drawn into a propaganda battle. Progress is measured not by accomplishment but by the scoring of propaganda points.

Exaggerated? Not at all. This is what happened, and it went on for week after week until the good sense of George Marshall and Ernest Bevin broke it off.

Perhaps the only thing to be said for these propaganda marathons was that, as Sir William Ridsdale has pointed out, they performed a useful educational function at a time when the British and to a certain extent the American publics had to be informed of the single-minded nationalist ambitions of the Soviet Union. But there were other, less expensive ways of doing this.

The arguments in favor of secret diplomacy are powerful. Only in private can rational discussion be carried out by representatives of conflicting interests. For both East and West the limits are extended when the principle of negotiation in secret is established. Then there is no gallery to play to. One side can offer a concession without fearing that it will be seized upon by the opposition at home and used to agitate public opinion against the negotiators. The other side can consider the concession without being called traitors or spilling the facade of omnipotence. Piece by piece, a settlement can be constructed.

Such negotiations do not necessitate the strain and expense of huge meetings. The Foreign Ministers would be in touch with the negotiations through their envoys but they would meet only to approve the results or to bargain over points which were outside the competence of their ambassadors.

The main argument then for secret diplomacy is simply that it provides the con-

ditions under which diplomats can negotiate. Recent diplomatic history offers two examples of how this works.

One was the crisis that arose out of the blockade of Berlin by the Soviet Union in June 1948, which was in some ways the most dangerous of the postwar period. In the end the Russians got out of an increasingly untenable situation by diplomacy at the United Nations. But it was secret diplomacy, not open. They did not negotiate before the eyes of the cameras and the ears of reporters. Quiet talks were followed by consultation with the Foreign Ministry in Moscow and the State Department in Washington.

There is no sharper contrast between the two methods of diplomacy than the settlement of the Berlin blockade and the open diplomacy of the Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris soon after the end of the blockade. Here, again, diplomatic negotiation was replaced by propaganda, and about all the West got out of the meeting was the impression that Mr. Vishinsky could talk louder and longer than Mr. Molotov.

The second example of successful secret diplomacy was the settlement of the Trieste dispute. For 8 months in 1954 an Italian, an Englishman, an American, and a Yugoslav carried on in secret the delicate, complex negotiations that ended a problem that had plagued the West since 1945.

Two of the negotiators, Manlio Brosio and Dr. Vladimir Velebit, the Italian and Yugoslav Ambassadors in London, did not meet until the agreement was initiated. Representing the chief antagonists in the dispute, the Ambassadors communicated the positions of their nations through two tireless intermediaries, Llewellyn E. Thompson, the United States Ambassador to Austria, and Geoffrey Harrison, an Under Secretary in the British Foreign Office.

On these two cool, perceptive and experienced diplomats fell the principal burden. Individually or together, they interviewed the Italian and Yugoslav envoys, reconnoitering the two national positions. In discussions with their experts on the Trieste situation they sought the areas of dispute most susceptible to adjustment. Then, in other interviews with the Ambassadors, they slowly brought the Yugoslav and Italian positions closer together. There were concessions on both sides. There was hard bargaining. Great discretion was used. There were no press conferences. There were no inspired editorials in the newspapers.

It was unspectacular and difficult, this measured quadrille from embassy to Foreign Office to embassy. There were long messages to be composed to Foreign Ministers and in turn men sat late at their desks in Belgrade and Rome composing answers. It was tedious but effective. It provided the ultimate argument for secret diplomacy: it worked.

There is one serious qualification to any advocacy of a return to secret diplomacy and the relative stability of the 19th century. The diplomats of that era were, on the whole, products of the same general environment. They came from the upper middle class or the aristocracy. They had similar educations and tastes. They had at least one language, French, in common. Cosmopolitan by inclination and profession, they were familiar with the politics and society of nations other than their own. Above all, they had a common interest in maintaining the balance in Europe, and consequently the peace of the world.

The majority of these personal links are nonexistent among the diplomats of today. Even if the Soviet and western foreign ministers spoke French it is doubtful if in this nationalist era they would be willing to carry on negotiations in the old language of diplomacy.

Nevertheless, the trend toward a restoration of traditional diplomacy is encouraging. The prerequisite for its success is the establishment of a balance of power wherever the ambitions of the East and West clash. The lack of a power balance has been one reason for the failure to reach settlements with the two Communist powers. Such a balance rests as much on political unity as on military strength. In Europe that unity is at last in sight. In Asia it remains distant.

If secret diplomacy returns as the most effective manner of international negotiation, it is possible that the U. N., with its facilities for private consultation among delegates, will assume new importance as a clearinghouse for such negotiations. The U. N. Secretariat could be used more extensively in secret mediation between members.

What the world may hope for—in spite of Communist bluster—is that the advent of weapons far more terrible than any foreseen by the diplomats of the past will impose a common interest in preserving the peace. Indeed, the totality of destruction provided by these weapons is in itself one of the best of all reasons for a return to secret diplomacy. War now means not victory or defeat but survival or destruction for nations and peoples. In this situation another round of open conferences which would serve as no more than propaganda platforms would be worse than a waste of time, effort, and money; it would be criminal folly.

Great and trusted leaders of the West like President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill approve the idea of discussions with the East on the great political issues that divide the world. But negotiation will be impossible in these discussions if they are carried on amidst the popping of flashbulbs and to the accompaniment of public speeches. Today's requirement is open covenants unopenly arrived at.

Imports From Communist-Dominated Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a letter I have received from Mr. Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, regarding the opposition of his organization to the importation of meat products from Communist-dominated Poland:

AMALGAMATED
MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER
WORKMEN OF NORTH AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., February 25, 1955.

Hon. MELVIN PRICE,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PRICE: I bring to your attention an appalling situation which is developing through the importation of canned hams from European countries and which last year amounted to 99,163,000 pounds. The disconcerting thing about such large importations of this product is that 19,717,000 pounds reached the United States from Communist-dominated Poland.

The United States ships products to some countries, but Communist Poland is not one of them. Dollars obtained by Poland through the sale of hams in the United States

may be used by Poland to purchase in dollar-hungry third countries strategic materials, which, under current regulations, are not permitted to be exported from the United States to Communist countries.

The members of our union, as a result of this, are suffering unemployment. We find no objections at the present time to purchases of canned hams from Germany, Denmark, Holland, etc. There seems to be no excuse why hams from Communist-Poland reach our shores in such large quantities.

Very sincerely,

PATRICK E. GORMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Washington and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with leave obtained to insert my own remarks in the RECORD, I am including the following column recently appearing in 2,000 weekly newspapers in America entitled "Washington and Small Business," by C. Wilson Harder:

WASHINGTON AND SMALL BUSINESS
(By C. Wilson Harder)

Washington pundits who claim only right-wing Republicans will oppose administration's protective tariff wrecking proposal, with Democrats supporting it, apparently have not marched through Georgia lately.

Representative HENDERSON LANHAM, a Georgia Democrat, takes mighty blast at plan to turn over economy to Acheson-Dulles theories of State Department.

Representative LANHAM feels pending tariff measure would be death blow to Nation's cotton textile industry and cotton growers already feeling effects of one-worlders.

He points out published list of planned tariff reductions includes almost every item produced by United States textile industry.

Representative Lanham also points out while average hourly labor rate in United States textile mills is \$1.30, in Swiss mills it is 43 cents, in England 40 cents, France 38 cents, Italy 30 cents, India 9.5 cents, Japan 13.6 cents.

He further reports it is planned, if Congress approves current tariff-wrecking scheme, to also lower tariffs on foreign-made synthetic fibers.

Thus, plans are afoot to flood United States with foreign cottons made at wages ranging from 10 to 25 percent of prevailing United States wages but at same time, through cutting tariffs on foreign-made synthetics, it is planned to wreck United States cotton farmers even now supported by farm program.

The gentleman from Georgia even states he will ask congressional investigation on who drew up list of planned tariff slashes.

From his study, small business alone will bear brunt of tariff wrecking plans. In cotton textile industry, employing over 1,250,000, 75 percent of industry is composed of small firms who do less than 1 percent of total industry.

The Georgian also made this highly significant statement: "The American people feel that the great mass production industries of the United States are so much more efficient than foreign industries as to be immune to foreign competition. Hence we expect that articles selected for tariff reduction would include products of great super-

efficient mass production industries. They are either not on list at all, or are relatively minor items."

But he does charge through list of tariffs to be reduced Washington planners have selected for destruction many industries composed of small operators, or agricultural operators.

It is interesting that at the same time Congress is being asked to raise by law United States minimum wage rate to more than twice prevailing skilled wage rate in England.

It is also interesting to note that one of the first to testify in support of tariff wrecking was a cabinet officer who formerly headed Nation's biggest manufacturing firm which also operates branches in many of world's cheap labor nations. He was joined by Harold Stassen, whose experience in world trade has been confined to giving away United States tax billions as head of Foreign Operation Administration.

In meantime published figures show that since 1937, while United States tariffs have been slashed by 63 percent, England's have been increased by 20 percent. Thus many feel it is good they still whistle "Dixie" in Georgia instead of "God Save the Queen."

Regulation of Natural Gas Companies

SPEECH
OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed the second flanking movement in the two-pronged drive by the Eisenhower administration to sterilize the Natural Gas Act by removing natural gas companies from rate regulation. If there were any doubt that the big oil and gas corporations were the special darlings of this administration, that doubt was dissipated last Saturday when the President's Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy issued its report. Inasmuch as the 8-man committee consisted of 7 members of the President's cabinet and the head of the Office of Defense Mobilization as chairman, it is difficult to conceive that this report does not reflect the Eisenhower policy.

The report continues the administration's long record of flouting the interests of the consumers. If its recommendations are adopted, consumers will pay hundreds of millions of extra dollars into the treasuries of the big oil and gas companies in the country.

The report follows closely upon the first enveloping movement on the consumers' pocketbook which occurred last spring with the decision by the Federal Power Commission in the Panhandle Eastern pipeline case. This decision had the effect of relieving the pipeline companies owning their own reserves from the effect of rate regulation contemplated by the Natural Gas Act. The purpose of the act is to shield consumers from exorbitant charges by companies furnishing natural gas in interstate commerce and it requires the public utility concept of rate regulation, that is, a rate base predicated on actual costs. Until

last spring, the Federal Power Commission had always used this method of valuation, even in the face of Panhandle's militant contention that the current field value of its gas reserves should be considered as the base for fixing its rates. In each instance where the Commission rejected the company's contention and insisted upon regulation based on actual cost, its decision was sustained by the courts. Then on April 15, 1954, for some reason the Commission changed its mind and adopted the company's argument. It apparently preferred the dissenting opinions of the late Justice Jackson to the majority opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States. The effect of the decision on the consumer was enormous. In my own city of Chicago, as one isolated example, 1,450,000 gas users will pay an additional \$5,216,000 for their gas as a result of this decision. And its impact has not yet been fully felt inasmuch as the decision is still on appeal of the courts.

If other pipeline companies are given the same consideration as Panhandle Eastern, and there is no clear reason why they should not—if rate regulation is tied to current market price of gas reserves rather than original cost, the pipeline companies will have been taken out of effective rate regulation.

Now the report by the President's committee marks the second part of the attack on the Natural Gas Act. Essentially, the report advocates enactment of the old Kerr bill to relieve the so-called independent producers from regulation. This recommendation is in direct contrast to the action taken by the previous Democratic administration, for it will be remembered that President Truman refused to bow to the pressures exerted by the oil and gas interests and vetoed the Kerr bill.

The particular form of the committee's recommendation leads me to believe that the committee was guilty either of gross ignorance or willful deception. This is what it said:

In the interest of a sound fuel policy and the protection of the national defense and consumer interests by assuring such a continued exploration for and development of adequate reserves as to provide an adequate supply of natural gas, we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

Certainly the committee knew or should have known that the production and gathering process is now exempt from regulation. Why, then, should it attempt to tie that process in with the movement of gas in interstate commerce unless it sought to confuse the issue?

As the Supreme Court has pointed out time and again, the important point is when the gas begins its interstate journey to the gas stoves of the consumers. This may or may not be when it enters an interstate pipeline. In the Interstate Natural Gas Co. case, the court held that it began before it entered the pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the passage of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, the Supreme Court of the United States has held in

the case of *Public Service Commission v. Attelboro* (273 U. S. 83), that the States could not regulate the transportation of natural gas and electricity in interstate commerce and the sale of natural gas and electricity in interstate commerce for resale. Thus, natural gas companies engaged in interstate commerce were regulated neither by State nor Federal authorities. This void in interstate regulations became known as the Attelboro Gap. It was to fill this vacuum that the Natural Gas Act of 1938 was passed, to fill the regulatory gap beginning at the city gate and extending back to the source of the gas. If the recommendation of the committee be adopted, that gap in regulation will again come into being, to the detriment of the consumer.

Tax Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the New York Post on Thursday, February 24, 1955. It is entitled "Whose Bull Gets Hooked" and follows:

WHOSE BULL GETS HOOKED

President Eisenhower was indignant yesterday. In a rare burst of anger he denounced the Democratic proposal for a \$20-per-person tax cut next year as "the height of fiscal irresponsibility."

We don't know who steamed up the President, but surely his brain trusters should have briefed him on some recent history. For it was exactly 8 months ago that some other men came up with a plan to shave taxes \$20 a head. There was no protest from the White House; there were no cries of "irresponsibility." Conceivably the reason for the reticence was that the author of the proposal and the 45 Senators who voted for it were Republicans.

The measure was improvised by Senator MILLIKIN, of Colorado, and the Times soberly reported that it was "put forward at the urging of a group of Republicans led by Senator IVES, of New York, to balance off features of the tax bill benefiting business and recipients of income from corporation dividends."

Actually the amendment was an attempt to forestall a Democratic move to boost the \$600 basic-tax exemption. In the ensuing maneuvers both proposals lost out.

The President stands on hollow ground when he sanctimoniously deplores the Democratic tax-cut drive as a threat to fiscal stability. The tax benefits for wealthy individuals and large corporations pushed through by the administration last year were adopted in the face of an anticipated Federal deficit almost twice as large as estimated now. Moreover, as Speaker RAYBURN pointed out yesterday, the Republicans themselves have been pledging individual tax slashes next year; under the Democratic proposal, the reduction would not take effect until January 1.

There may be flaws in the Democratic plan, but certainly the idea is no more subversive now than it was when 46 Republicans voted for it a year ago. If the Democrats deserve

reproach, it is for so belatedly recognizing the merits of MILLIKIN's amendment.

To put it another way, we quote Mr. RAYBURN: "It all depends on whose bull gets hooked."

To Aid Refugee Entry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter I sent to the editor of the New York Times, which appeared in a recent issue of that newspaper:

TO AID REFUGEE ENTRY—CHANGES URGED IN REFUGEE RELIEF ACT TO INCREASE EFFECTIVENESS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

On August 7, 1953, the Refugee Relief Act became effective. Ostensibly it was to be a great humanitarian gesture to permit 214,000 refugees, escapees, expellees, and orphans to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants. It was to encourage the taking of risks for the sake of liberty. It was to point up—and again I say ostensibly—that the United States has not departed from its tradition as a land of haven.

I have charged, and continue to charge, that the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 is a dismal failure.

Some 18 months have passed since the bill's enactment, and one-half of its lifetime. Of the 214,000 allotted under this act some 19,000 visas have been granted as of January 28, 1955. In short, a little over 8 percent of the total have received the coveted visas, with the act due to expire in 1956.

I say that the law is bad, but the administration of the law under Scott McLeod is worse. The operation of the Refugee Relief Act is tangled and snarled in nightmares within nightmares, forms, questionnaires, security checks, and duplication.

MANY OPERATIONS

As it is now, we have involved in the operations of one act: The housing authorities, United States Employment Service, the health authorities, the Department of State (both domestic and in the field abroad), the Department of the Army through its investigators, the FBI, the CIA, the CIC, and the CID, not to mention individual sponsorship. In processing each application the local police files are checked and the central police files are checked as far back as is possible. Not only are the files in the place of residence checked, but in all former residences specified by the alien.

In addition checks are made on the records of the courts and the public prosecutors; records of the United States, the CIC, the FBI; embassy files, central files, and files of the Visa Division in Washington. The sponsor's background is similarly investigated.

Mr. McLeod is playing a cruel game by pitting legal paragraphs against human lives. Escapees (an escapee is one who escapes from behind the Iron Curtain into free territory) beckoned by the light of liberty have dared to cross barbed wires, risk gunfire, spent harrowing days and nights in escape from the Iron Curtain countries only to find themselves finally barred by bits of paper. You can rest assured that a real security risk has made sure that all his papers are in order, that he can answer any question, devious or otherwise; that he has provided himself with every kind of documentation. No one single

escapee has come into the United States, although provision is made for 15,000.

In one breath we encourage escapees to come over the border, then the great United States will offer haven, and in the other breath we say although you have risked your neck to come over the border you must overcome and run an impossible obstacle race to come into the United States.

THREE JOBS

Mr. McLeod wears three hats. He is administrator of security. He is head of consular affairs. He is administrator of the Refugee Relief Act. It is a physical impossibility to fill all posts properly and effectively. In the matters affecting the Refugee Relief Act and consular affairs the field officers are constantly seeking advisory opinions from Washington. I know that questions relative to the admissibility of aliens have traveled back and forth in a merry-go-round of passing the buck. If by any chance a field officer should make a decision contrary to Mr. McLeod's interpretation, then he may well find himself subjected to investigation. Hence, everything must be exact—so exact that the hopes of the alien are strangled between commas.

I have introduced a bill which, if enacted into law, will provide for group assurances by reputable voluntary agencies, thus eliminating the bottleneck of the necessity for finding individual sponsors. I have provided that the administrator of the act shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, thereby eliminating the language of the present act, which names the administrator as "the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs established under the Department of State . . ." If passed, Mr. McLeod may walk the plank. It is my purpose to remedy defects of the law and to remedy its administration by the removal of the present administrator.

EMANUEL CELLER,

Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, February 25, 1955.

A \$53 Million Kiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was my observation when abroad that many of our people in positions of responsibility over there instead of representing the interest of the United States gave the impression of being more interested in the welfare of the country in which they are located.

I commend to the House the following editorial from the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail:

A \$53 MILLION KISS

We saw a picture on the back page of the Daily Mail Wednesday showing an Italian politician kissing the hand of the American Ambassador to Italy, Mrs. Clare Booth Luce, in appreciation of the American taxpayer—you and you and you, giving the Italians \$53 million to help raise the living standards of the southern sections of Italy and of Trieste.

When is the big giveaway going to end? Haven't we seen enough waste in Italy with American money? And in France and Spain and England?

As you prepare your income-tax return for 1955, do so cheerfully with the knowledge that part of your tax money is going to Italy as an absolute gift.

How many Italians would ever know the aid came from America? When is this constant gravy train riding by Italy and a lot of other fallen empires, like decadent France, to stop? Kiss your tax money goodbye so the "Eyeties" can kiss the Ambassador's hand.

No one can show that the \$50 billion we have expended in foreign aid since the end of the Second World War has made us any friends; all reports are that the result has been just the opposite. In fact, the quickest way to lose a friend—whether nation or individual—is to stop a policy of gifts or loans after it has once been started. For it is only true of human nature that the more you give a man the more he wants; and if you give it to him long enough, he will finally demand it as his right. And in this respect, nations are no different from individuals.

Those who are our real friends now would have been just as much our friends without any foreign aid. And those who give lip-service to friendship just in order to keep the dollars rolling in would long ago have been exposed for what they are.

No one can show that Marshall aid has restored the economy of Europe. No one can show that the economic recovery of Europe would not have taken place much faster and on a much sounder basis without our aid.

In fact, the sound-thinking conservatives of Great Britain will tell you that our aid hindered rather than helped their recovery. They will tell you that the \$4 billion loan we made Britain in 1946 helped establish their Socialist Government in office, and that the succeeding Marshall aid helped keep it in office; that they would have gotten rid of this government—which drove them to the very brink of bankruptcy—much sooner had it not been for the aid we poured into them.

Alaska Road Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, January 27, 1955 marked the 50th birthday of the Alaska Road Commission. It was on that date in 1905 that the Congress created the Board of Road Commissioners for Alaska to work under the direction of the War Department. This Board, appointed by Secretary of War William H. Taft, was charged with the responsibility for location, construction, and maintenance of wagon roads and trails in Alaska. Prior to that time Capt. W. R. Abercrombie had located and constructed a military trail from Valdez to Eagle in 1901, over which mail was carried twice a month with pack-horses in summer and dog teams in winter. In 1904 the Seattle Office of the Army Engineers completed a survey for a wagon road between the same points, Valdez at that time being the northern terminus of the Seattle-Valdez military cable, and Eagle the principal port of entry into Alaska from Canada and the Klondike gold fields.

The first road board consisted of Maj. Wilds P. Richardson, 9th Infantry, 1st Lt. George B. Pillsbury, Corps of Engineers, and 1st Lt. Samuel C. Orchard, 3rd Infantry, and was directed to hold its first meeting in Skagway on May 15, 1905. Major Richardson, being the senior officer, became the first president of what has since been known as the Alaska Road Commission. The first year's appropriation was \$28,000, made available by the Congress from the Alaska fund derived from trade taxes collected outside of incorporated towns, and from liquor licenses.

Some of the earliest projects included a road from Haines up the Chilkat River to the large Indian villages of the Chilkat Valley, road from Fairbanks to the newly discovered gold camp on Pedro Creek, a tributary of Gold Stream, and short roads at Nome where gold had been discovered at and near the beaches. During this first year of the new Board, the overland route from Valdez to Fairbanks was also scouted out, utilizing the first section of the Valdez-Eagle trail between the coast and Gulkana. Based on these first-year studies of the Board, a direct appropriation of \$150,000 was made by the Congress for work in 1906, which permitted start of construction of what is now known as the Richardson Highway, joining Valdez with Fairbanks, and which for years was the only overland route into the heart of Alaska.

The major effort until the late 1920's was directed toward improvement of the Richardson Highway and construction of mining roads in the vicinity of Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Nome. Then followed, in rapid succession, the construction of the Steese Highway from Fairbanks to Circle, the Elliott Highway from Fairbanks to Livengood, the Gulkana-Nabesna Road, and the road from Anchorage to Palmer to serve the colonization project established in 1935 to farm the Matanuska Valley.

The Glenn Highway, designed to connect Anchorage with the Richardson Highway, was started in the spring of 1941 and punched through during World War II. It was the following year that construction was initiated on the Alcan Highway—now officially the Alaska Highway—through Canada and Alaska to connect with the Richardson Highway at Delta Junction, as well as the Tok Cutoff to connect the Gulkana-Nabesna Road at Slana with the Alaska Highway at Tok Junction. Following World War II, construction was initiated in 1946 on the Sterling Highway on the Kenai Peninsula and also on the Taylor Highway, linking the Alaska Highway with Eagle on the Yukon River.

In 1948, at the request of the Armed Forces charged with the defense of Alaska, an extensive program of improving and asphalt surfacing of the main highway system was authorized by the Congress and which included the construction of the important link to join Seward with Anchorage. This program, having an estimated cost of \$108,450,000, is now approximately 84 percent complete, with 812 miles of black top surfacing in place to serve the needs of

the military as well as to aid in the development of the Territory.

The present system of highways in Alaska consists of a total of 4,100 miles, of which 3,791 miles are under the jurisdiction of the Alaska Road Commission and the remaining 309 miles, located in Chugach and Tongass National Forests, under control of the Bureau of Public Roads, the road-building agency for the United States Forest Service in Alaska. The major interconnected system joining the cities of Seward, Anchorage, Valdez, Fairbanks, and the villages of Kenai, Homer, Circle, Livengood, and Chitina with each other and the Alaska Highway, totals 1,372 miles. The important Copper River Highway, now under construction, will eventually link Cordova with this primary system.

The Alaska Road Commission continued under the jurisdiction of the War Department until June 1932, when civilian personnel and operations were transferred to the Department of the Interior with Mr. Ike P. Taylor as chief engineer.

Active heads of the Alaska Road Commission, in order, included:

Maj. Wilds P. Richardson, later general, 1905-17.

Maj. William H. Waugh, 1917-20.

Maj. John C. Gotwals, 1920.

Col. James G. Steese, later general, 1920-27.

Maj. Malcolm Elliott, 1927-32.

Mr. Ike P. Taylor, now retired, 1932-48.

Col. John R. Noyes, now brigadier general, and adjutant general of the Alaska National Guard was loaned to the Alaska Road Commission for 3 years by the United States Army to head up the extensive paving program requested by the military, 1948-51.

A. F. Ghiglione, incumbent Commissioner of Roads for Alaska.

Recent years, starting with the extensive improvement and paving program, have witnessed an increase in construction by contract on those roads which are readily accessible and adaptable to that type of construction. The Alaska Road Commission still continues to open up virgin and isolated areas of Alaska with crews and equipment under the direct supervision of the Commission, following a policy of stage construction whereby length is the initial and primary purpose of a highway in a pioneer country followed by refinements as needed and warranted by economic development. A current project of this nature is the Denali Highway connecting the Richardson Highway with a system of roads in Mt. McKinley National Park. The newest approved project is a road between Fairbanks and Nenana which will be started in the summer of 1955.

Working in cooperation with the Alaska Road Commission, a Federal organization deriving most of its funds from Congress, is the territorial highway organization consisting of the territorial highway engineer and a territorial board of road commissioners with one member from each judicial division. The territorial organization calls upon the Alaska Road Commission to perform a major

part of work financed by territorial funds, thereby preventing costly duplication of effort. Mr. Irving Reed is the present Territorial highway engineer.

This oldest roadbuilding agency of the Federal Government numbers among its personnel many employees who have served the agency for 25 years or more, over half the period of its active life. Appropriate golden anniversary commemorative functions are planned during this 50th year of service to the Territory.

Lithuanian Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include resolutions unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of the Lithuanian Americans of Worcester, Mass., held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Association, Inc., on February 13, 1955. The resolutions follow:

Whereas the 16th day of February 1955 will mark the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of the Republic of Lithuania;

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a peace-loving and progressive nation, notwithstanding its loyalty to international treaties and agreements, fell victim to the unprovoked aggression and military invasion by Communist Russia and in spite of all the declarations and obligations solemnly undertaken by the great powers under the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations Charter is still subjected to the premeditated Kremlin policy of physical, national, cultural, religious, and economic destruction;

Whereas no peace and stability in the world is possible as long as that part of Europe comprising over 100,000 million people is held in captivity;

Whereas no nation great or small can today feel protected from the claim of international communism supported, as it is, by all the destructive weapons that modern civilization has devised for mankind; Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting voice its gratitude to the President, Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States of America for the support constantly extended to the cause of independence of the Republic of Lithuania, and especially for the creation of the select congressional committee to investigate the circumstances under which the seizure and incorporation of the Baltic nations by the Soviet Union took place;

Resolved, That the Government of the United States enter into no agreements which would in any way acknowledge the fruits of any past, present, or future Soviet aggression;

Resolved, That the congressional investigation into the facts and circumstances of the Soviet aggression against free nations be continued by Congress, and that decisive and energetic action on the part of our Government be undertaken in the United Nations organization to brand the Soviet Union as an aggressor against all the nations now under the Communist heel;

Resolved, That the Genocide Convention be immediately ratified by the Senate of

United States so that Soviet Russia may be made criminally responsible for the genocide perpetrated by her in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain;

Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Worcester in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, once again reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their wholehearted support of the administration and the Congress of the United States of America in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world.

MICHAEL ZEMAITIS,
Chairman.
JOHN PALUBICKAS,
Secretary.

Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 5, 1955, which includes some observations regarding those who favor public power, as against private enterprise. Much has been said lately, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains long speeches by those who advocate public power as against the American way; namely, private enterprise. Why should Government go into competition with its own citizens? And why should Government do for the people what the people can do for themselves?

Those who favor public power are very careful not to disclose the fact that TVA would soon be here in Washington before the Committee on Appropriations, asking \$100 million of the taxpayers' money to build another steam plant. When the steam plants now authorized in the TVA have been completed, 70 percent of the power generated in TVA will be steam power, and only 30 percent will be hydroelectric power. The tail will soon be wagging the dog.

Are the American people forever committed to furnish their tax money to a favorite area like TVA because the Government provided for the initial installation of hydroelectric power? Much of the steam power generated in the TVA has no relation whatever to hydropower. The editorial from the Saturday Evening Post follows:

THE PUBLIC-POWER BLOC HAS MASTERED SOME TECHNIQUES OF TOTAL CONFUSION

The strategy and tactics of the public-power bloc in respect to the Dixon-Yates contract for construction of a plant to supply electrical power to the Atomic Energy Commission bear a certain superficial resemblance to the debating methods of the Communists over an issue like Formosa. (Hold it, readers. We're not comparing public-power advocates to Communists, merely pointing out resemblances in methods of procedure.)

The first stage after the contract was signed featured a vigorous attack on the aggressive imperialists of Wall Street, who, op-

erating through the puppet Eisenhower regime, had committed a felonious attack upon the people's government of TVA. Then followed a series of revelations by former employees of the imperialist private utilities, plus efforts to brand private-utility companies as engaged in an effort to oppress the hapless colonial peoples of the TVA region. The confusion of resolutions and press releases continues, although President Eisenhower's flat statement that the Dixon-Yates contract will stand has weakened the campaign considerably.

However, just as in the United Nations, the antics of the public-power bloc have not been without effect. Thus Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, who seems to have voted for the Dixon-Yates contract when it was before the Commission, told a congressional committee later that the contract should be canceled because "something must be done to free the Commission from any connection with this cause for so much discord." Speaker SAM RAYBURN urged the Dixon-Yates group to withdraw from the contract because "this thing has created such a furor" that private-utility companies could be injured. In international disputes as conducted by the Communists, we are all too familiar with the desperation which eventually sets in, causing those who have no truck with communism to agree to almost any concessions if only the yammering will cease.

Fortunately, these tactics, like mass picketing, can produce effects quite the opposite of those intended. We appear finally to have put our back up in Asia, and, when President Eisenhower was asked at his February 2 press conference whether he had any plans to withdraw the Dixon-Yates contract, his reply was: "I do not."

Nevertheless, we can confidently expect the public-power boys to set them up in the other alley.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent who this year celebrated the 37th anniversary of Ukrainian independence on January 22. Their fervor for liberation of their homeland parallels the faith of all freedom-loving people in the hope that all enslaved nations under the Communist yoke will regain their self-determination.

The Ukraine enjoyed independence a short time before Communist domination placed them behind the Iron Curtain in 1920. However, their hopes for return to self-determination have not waned. It is important that our Voice of America continue to reach them to bolster that hope.

It is appropriate that we reaffirm our strong faith in the aspirations of the Ukrainian people who yearn for independence from totalitarian subjugation. On the occasion of the celebration of the anniversary of Ukrainian independence, all Americans joined in fervent prayer that the Ukraine and all other captive homelands will soon be free again.

Job Creation or Job Destruction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress we witnessed a political maneuver by some of our Democratic opponents to rush us into a new WPA program. This would have created a psychological effect that could have had serious consequences for our economy.

Sane judgment prevailed, and in spite of the cries of "Wolf, wolf," our factories are still humming, department-store sales continue at a high rate, and we continue to enjoy the same level of prosperity that has prevailed for several years, all without the WPA crutch.

A few days ago a new political masterpiece appeared on the scene, and without having heard witnesses present proposing and opposing arguments, the committee sent the measure to the floor of the House for action. I refer to the bill giving taxpayers a \$20 tax reduction and a similar amount for each dependent.

How they arrived at this figure as \$20, instead of \$24.50, \$29.95, \$39.98, or some other vote-getting, bargain-counter figure, is not satisfactorily explained. How is it that the Democrats, without the aid of hearings and without waiting for appropriation bills to learn what it is going to cost to run the country during the year ahead, are able to say we can give every taxpayer and every one of his dependents a \$20 tax cut, reducing Federal revenue by about \$2 billion?

We all want tax reductions. No one likes to pay taxes. But revenues are needed to keep our country strong. This administration has diligently tried to cut out waste and reduce unnecessary expenditures. It is still effecting economies wherever possible, thus seeking to reduce the need for heavy taxes.

This hastily conceived proposal has far greater involvement than affording \$20 immediate tax relief for the taxpayer. It goes beyond that, and the March 4 edition of the U. S. News & World Report contains an editorial by David Lawrence which sets forth some of the dangers of this proposal.

Mr. Lawrence's editorial follows:

JOB CREATION OR JOB DESTRUCTION?

When a political party proclaims a program of taxation based upon vote catching rather than sound economic principles, a serious question is raised as to its capacity to govern the Nation in a responsible manner if entrusted with power.

The Democratic Party in Congress came forth last week with a proposal to give every taxpayer a \$20 cut in taxes. This would cost the United States Treasury more than \$2 billion annually in tax receipts, but it could do far more damage eventually—it could start a cycle of inflation, and, as prices skyrocketed, a breakdown of confidence in the value of the dollar would ensue.

If this is a sample of what the Democratic Party has in mind in the event of victory at the polls in 1956, there will arise at once a widespread fear for the future solvency of the American Government.

It was Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party, who enunciated the principle: "Equal rights for all, special privileges for none." The plan to give a \$20 tax cut is really a proposal to grant to certain income classes a higher percentage of tax reduction than to other groups. It is a special privilege to be bestowed upon a particular group, irrespective of the economic consequences to the Nation as a whole.

The argument made by proponents of the measure is that prosperity can best be stimulated by furnishing money subsidies to certain consumers.

This was also the philosophy behind the Work Projects Administration during the depression days of the 1930's. But that policy was a failure. Unemployment remained at an unprecedented height for peacetime, and war alone came to the rescue of the national economy. It was not until 1940, when heavy-goods industries were finally given the opportunity to expand, that the unemployment figure began to drop perceptibly.

It is contended, of course, that the money saved by tax cuts will add to purchasing power. The resultant deficit in the budget, however, would have to be met by higher taxes on other income groups or by raising business taxes which are already too high.

To increase the quantity of purchasing power is futile if prices are forced upward due to lack of confidence in the purchasing power of the dollar itself. An inequitable tax scheme means a commitment to a prolonged unbalance of the whole national economy. This can only bring inflation, with its devastating effect on persons who live on pensions and fixed incomes.

What really makes America tick is a balanced economy. This means that funds must be made constantly available for investment in the expansion of business and in the replacement of worn-out equipment. Today's climate for investment, brought about by the Eisenhower administration, is the healthiest in 30 years.

Unless saving by the individual is encouraged and the fruit of his labors invested as seed money in business, there is no chance for a system of risk capital to survive. Only the Government could then provide the necessary capital. And that's the beginning of the end of individual freedom. For little by little, as state capitalism takes hold and more and more people find themselves on the Government payroll, the incentive for management to create new enterprises vanishes. Governmental restrictions on human liberty then become necessary to maintain discipline.

Why do the patriotic leaders of a great American party permit themselves to become victims of the socialistic doctrine of job destruction?

For when taxation is inequitable and men of thrift and talent are discouraged because they are taxed virtually to the point of confiscation, business enterprise falters and unemployment is the inevitable result.

Certainly, to impose taxes only on a basis of subsidy to the maximum number—without regard for the eventual good of all—is one way to liquidate the managerial class in America and to bring economic chaos, as has been the case in Russia.

Tax rates should never be determined on the basis of money grants direct to the largest number of voters. Taxes should be imposed on the basis of incentive—by means of rates that will indirectly exert the maximum influence toward job creation. That's sound economics—it's the way to deserve the vote of all groups.

The Democratic Party of today is torn between the true Democrats who wish to conserve the American economic system, and the radicals who will, if allowed to become the majority, destroy the system which has given us the strongest industrial power and

the highest standard of living any country has ever known.

Will the Democratic Party return to the dynamic conservatism of Woodrow Wilson, who in the fiscal policies of his administration maintained the principles of Thomas Jefferson? Or will the Democratic Party surrender to the insidious forces of state capitalism which seek to break down our whole economic system?

What kind of a Democratic Party are the American people to be asked to vote for in 1956?

Young Republicans for Eisenhower and Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation meeting together with the Western and Midwestern Young Republican Councils has unanimously endorsed the renomination and reelection of President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon.

Sullivan Barnes, chairman of the national Young GOP group, urged the young people of America to "spearhead a crusade dedicated to the renomination and election of Eisenhower and Nixon."

The resolution presented by the Young Republicans of California declared that "for the best interests of the United States and of our beloved party, the retention of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States and RICHARD M. NIXON as Vice President has been mandated by the people."

In discussing the resolution Chairman Barnes praised both the President and Vice President for their recognition and continued support of the Young GOP.

Over 200 Young Republicans from 35 States were in attendance at the meeting, held at the Broadmoor Hotel in Colorado Springs, Colo., on February 26, 1955.

The following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas for the first time in 20 years, the United States of America has a President and Vice President that all Americans, regardless of party, can be proud of; and

Whereas the destiny of this Nation and of the free world depends largely upon the retention and rededication of this President and Vice President in public life; and

Whereas for the best interests of our United States and of our beloved party, the retention of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States and RICHARD M. NIXON as Vice President has been mandated by the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation in open session does hereby unequivocally and wholeheartedly endorse the renomination and election of Dwight D. Eisenhower for the Presidency of the United States and RICHARD M. NIXON as Vice President; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby dedicate ourselves to the task of instigating a groundswell of public opinion for our great President and Vice President to commit themselves to this undertaking.

Beware of Strip Mining in National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I recently called to the attention of the Congress a letter which I had written to the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson. In that letter, I urged the Secretary to refuse permission to a Stearns, Ky., firm to strip mine in the Cumberland National Forest. I emphasized the fact that the issue is much greater than the 47,000 acres involved in the Stearns case, and that the decision by the Secretary would be far-reaching and, if favorable to the Stearns Coal & Lumber Co., the decision would ultimately lead to the destruction and devastation of national forests in West Virginia, Virginia, and other areas.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial from the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette. The editorial stresses that the decision will be precedent setting and of vital national interest. I hope that other Members of Congress will not be unaware of the momentous decision which is presently in the making. The editorial follows:

SHALL STRIPPERS BE ALLOWED TO DESTROY FORESTS?—THAT IS QUESTION BEING PONDERED BY BENSON

A recent hearing at Stearns, Ky., is of vital importance to the people of West Virginia. It has to do with the possibility of strip mining in national forests.

In the hearing the Stearns Coal & Lumber Co. applied for permission to strip mine some 47,000 acres in the Cumberland National Forest.

This was the climax of an action started some time ago when Stearns applied to the forest supervisor of Cumberland Forest for permission to strip the property, but was refused; the company then appealed to Regional Forester Charles L. Tebbe and was refused; then appealed to the office of the Secretary, Ezra Taft Benson. Mr. Benson appointed a board of consultants to hear the matter, and it was this board that held the hearing on January 27.

The question raised affects far more than the small part of the Cumberland National Forest involved. It affects all the national forests in the country and all the States that have national forests within their boundaries. In West Virginia it has special meaning, because West Virginia has beautiful and delightful national forests. They are among West Virginia's greatest assets.

No one knows better than West Virginians the disastrous residues of strip mining. Huge areas of the State that once added to its beauty now after being stripped present a rubble of slag and soil that is enough to sicken the heart of anyone.

The State of West Virginia has by permanent injunction stopped the strip mining of its State forests.

It is obvious that the simple act of strip mining defeats the purposes of the Weeks Act authorizing the purchase of lands for the protection of watersheds at the deep waters of important streams.

It is obvious that the only thing that may be gained is to increase the supply of coal above ground and the present situation of the coal industry would not indicate that

this would be of any benefit. In the long run it would pollute and destroy our streams, denude and destroy our forests, wash away our soil.

Mr. Secretary, the decision that you make will be of vital national interest; it will be precedent setting. Let us urge you to act to protect our watersheds, our forest lands, and our future by upholding the action of your forest supervisor and your regional forester in denying the privilege of strip mining our national forests to any and all.

Big, Phony Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion of commonwealth status for Alaska as a substitute for statehood. A recent editorial which appeared in many Scripps-Howard newspapers entitled "Big, Phony Word" nails the commonwealth pelt right to the barnyard door, which is exactly where it belongs. The editorial was as follows:

BIG PHONY WORD

So far the movement to obtain a so-called commonwealth status for Alaska, as an alternative to statehood, seems to have attracted about the same number of followers as apostles of vegetarianism. The latest Gallup poll showed 82 percent of the American public for statehood, and Alaska's friends in Congress are pushing for an early vote there.

So much nonsense on the subject has been spoken and written, however, that the origin and meaning of the term "commonwealth" evidently should be understood more widely.

It was invented as a title for Puerto Rico's unusual political status, when that island sought and obtained the maximum degree of autonomy which our system permits short of independence. Only later was commonwealth seized upon by those in Congress who had long opposed statehood for Alaska, and probably found such a purely negative attitude toward statehood increasingly difficult to defend.

It is not to Puerto Rico, nor could it be to Alaska, a steppingstone to statehood. On the contrary, Alaska (like Hawaii) is an incorporated Territory, which Puerto Rico never was, and therefore legally in the status of the Western States when they were admitted to the Union. Indeed, it is highly doubtful that Congress has the power to deprive Alaska of this status by making it a commonwealth.

Even if it has, it would seem preposterous to encourage political separatism in a Territory which has demonstrated no desire for it and which is, in the present circumstances, more vital geographically to the Nation's military defense than any State.

If Congress fails to grant Alaska statehood it should, of course, give it control over its resources and help it in other ways to strengthen its economy, in preparation for statehood. But to push it further away from us politically by making it a commonwealth would be an outrage upon the Alaskan people and nothing short of stupid from the national viewpoint.

St. David's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, there are few honors that please me so much in the course of a year than that of rising in the Congress of the United States on March 1—St. David's Day—to pay tribute to a proud, rugged, and productive strain in the American people whose ancestors were Welsh. St. David's Day is a folk holiday that is rich in ancient lore and steeped in religious faith. It has its inner appeal to all people who love strong character and the will to independence. It deserves recognition nationally. It has earned a place for itself on the calendar of significant events worthy of observance in this House because of the contribution Americans of Welsh descent have made to America's strength through the generations. And this holiday—St. David's Day—is a fitting moment for that recognition because it has a distinctive folk origin in the best sense of the word.

It expresses the vigor, the loyalty to tradition, and the love of life that is inherent in these remarkable people. In my judgment there is not an American of Welsh extraction who does not pause on this day to pay homage to what may well be termed the "patron saint" of Wales. In fact not only Americans of Welsh extraction but millions of other Americans join with their Welsh fellow-citizens to do honor to St. David. I sincerely hope we are witnessing the beginning of a celebration that, as the years go on, will become a day of national rejoicing for all Americans of whatever racial strain everywhere, a day upon which we can all join together to wish the people of Wales the best of health and the best of luck.

St. David's Day deserves a note of tribute from us all because it symbolizes the spirit of independence which is so characteristic of America's own beginnings and rules our way of life so much today. The intrepid quality of these people and their undying devotion to independence remained steadfast through the centuries, and it is this which is emphatically remembered as the Welsh all over the world join in keeping green the basic qualities of their unique culture. When Wales resisted the rule of the Norman kings in the 12th century—500 years after the death of St. David—it was their ancient saint's spirit that fired their cause. They evoked his memory in demanding an archbishop of their own, untrammelled by the domineering interference of Canterbury.

There is a fascinating mythology that has evolved through the centuries about the life of this unquestionably extraordinary historic personage. He is mentioned first in a 10th century manuscript of the *Annales Cambriae*. This reports

his death in 601. He had been a bishop and presided over the synods in Wales in the sixth century. In 1120 Pope Callistus II canonized David, and since then he has served as a kind of deeply devout and immensely moving rallying torch for Welshmen everywhere. And the language of Wales, it should be remembered, is a Celtic tongue, Celtic at one time having been spoken from the Alps in the north, to Gaul, Iberia, northern Italy, and as far east as points in Asia Minor.

The reason this story moves me so much is because my fellow Americans in the district in Pennsylvania that elected me to this seat have impressed me with the tough and loyal qualities, the steadfastness, the hard-toiling life of usefulness and patriotism that so marks Americans of Welsh extraction. In many ways this holiday expresses the joyous strength of the Welsh. And it is this strength which has fused itself into the life of our country and contributed to its greatness. For St. David's Day brings out the vitality and the eternal youth of the Welsh on a note of triumph and in a burst of song. Wherever groups of Welshmen gather they will sing together *Hen Wlad Fy Nhadau* or *The Land of My Fathers*. And they will talk, with an eloquence that is traditional, of the glories of old Wales. Whether the American whose forebears came from Wales is a leader in industry, in business, in the church, in the professions, in politics; or whether he is one of the doughty anthracite coal miners of Pennsylvania, we are bound to find in him the best of the stuff that makes a good American.

I believe that these people are so loyal to America, so indissolubly assimilated into the life and meaning of this country, because they are basically loyal, and, cleaving forever to the ancient folklore of their own racial beginnings, we know they will always—as they have demonstrated—remain loyal to the United States of America.

It is a pleasant duty and a reverent one to speak in honor of St. David's Day.

Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 18, 1955, issue of the *Washington Daily News* following approval by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the joint Hawaii-Alaska statehood bill:

THE STATEHOOD BILL

A committee of the House of Representatives has approved a bill to confer statehood on Alaska and Hawaii.

While their situations are different, Alaska being a vast and booming territory and Hawaii a small, mature one, the realities of politics dictated a single bill rather than separate ones. Unless Republican leaders are incredibly naive, they must have known when President Eisenhower first requested it that statehood for Hawaii alone will not be passed by this Congress.

The administration's feeble attempts to justify its opposition to Alaska statehood for vague reasons of national defense should impress no one. If the Defense Department needs and wants more land in Alaska it can obtain it as easily after Alaska becomes a State as now. If it can take over land in any State in the Union, and has done so many times. Its obligation to defend Alaska and the strategic importance of that Territory are precisely the same now as they would be after statehood.

We do not even see the need for the special amendment which would permit the President to set aside 40 percent of northern Alaska for military reservations, although if that is the price Alaska must pay for statehood it is willing to do so.

The most distressing aspect of the years-long controversy over statehood, in fact, is the cynical disregard by statehood opponents of the deep yearning for full citizenship on the part of the good Americans in Alaska and Hawaii and their moral right to ask for it.

We hope their long wait is nearing its end.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee)". His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

The Expanding Great Lakes Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on last Saturday, February 26, it was my pleasure to address the Antigo, Wis., Chamber of Commerce on the subject of the expanding Great Lakes frontier.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EXPANDING GREAT LAKES FRONTIER
(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

It is a privilege to address this fine chamber of commerce regarding the expanding economic frontier of America.

I want to talk to you about the future prosperity which you of Antigo and which all of us in Wisconsin will enjoy in the years and decades to come.

What we are going to do is not, however, "put on rose-colored glasses" and assume that the future will be all bright and easy.

Rather we are going to take a realistic look at the great challenge—the great opportunity which lies before us.

SEAWAY A GREAT BOOST

It is my belief that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, now scheduled to begin operations in the 1959 shipping season, will prove to be one of the most tremendous economic boosts in United States history.

It is my belief that it will be a great spur to midwestern industry and agriculture; that it will pump economic health into communities in States all along the Lakes and adjacent to those States.

POPULATION WILL SOAR IN LAKE AREA

Right now, in the Great Lakes area, 58 million people live in the 8 States having immediate access to the Lakes.

An additional 13 million people live in the 9 States which are generally regarded as tributaries, in an economic sense, to the Lakes.

We 71 million Americans will be the ones most immediately affected by the waterway. But meanwhile America's population is zooming upward. Last year 4 million babies were born.

By the normal laws of population increase, our country as a whole is scheduled to jump from 163 million people today to around 285 million people 20 years from now—in 1975.

It is my belief that because of the seaway populations along the Lakes will increase even faster than the normal proportion of increase in other States provided—I repeat, provided—we take the necessary action to assure our progress.

NEW SEAWAY WILL BENEFIT US

Fortunately, such progress already is shaping up.

The lake area is going to benefit from seaway construction payrolls immediately, construction on harbors, construction on deepening of channels (such as are provided under the Wiley channel bill, S. 171).

Then, the lake area is going to attract many new industries, requiring direct access to the deepwater ports of the world.

It is going to attract increased tourist trade.

It is going to benefit from increased integration between America's economy and the economy of our Canadian good neighbor (which is also booming).

All this is scheduled to result, and yet I believe that it is only the beginning of the bright horizons before us.

OVERALL UNITED STATES OUTLOOK BRIGHT

If in the next decade the seaway were to come about all by itself, then the promise which the future holds would not be so completely bright.

But the fact of the matter is that the seaway is but a part of the overall expanding economic horizons affecting our country as a whole.

Right now, whole new American industries are developing.

I cite but two industries: The atomic energy industry, which will probably revolutionize electric power, medicine, and many other fields; and the industry known as automation; that is, the so-called automatic factories in which electronic machines perform operations which might otherwise be performed manually.

Now, it is a fact that all of these new industries will raise problems in turn.

They will require shifting of labor from one type of job and industry to other types, and there may be temporary labor surpluses.

But, so long as new industries are being created as fast as old industries feel the impact of sometimes adverse developments, then we can be sure there will be overall prosperity ahead for Wisconsin and America.

Now, I ask you, my friends in the Antigo area: How well are you and I planning to have this community benefit from the changing economic patterns of America—patterns involving, for example, atomic energy and automatic factories?

Can you contribute here in this area—directly or indirectly—to some of the subcontracting work involved in, say, these two enormous industries?

The fact of the matter is that each community must plan its place in the coming dynamic era.

You in this audience tonight are realists. You know that we cannot here in this area try to duplicate, even in part, the factories, the facilities, the resources, the transportation of some enormous metropolis. Even if that were possible, you wouldn't want it.

What you can and should do, however, is make Antigo's unique, specialized, tailored contribution to the coming era.

That means mobilizing the best minds in this community, the best civic organizers, and doers.

It means tapping your finest engineering, business, labor, and professional abilities so as to make Antigo's fullest contribution.

GETTING IN ON GROUND FLOOR

Most of the technical developments which I am describing are not going to happen overnight. They are going to take years and

years. But the time to get in on the ground floor is now.

Recently, I have been in correspondence with an outstanding organization known as Atomic Industrial Forum, which consists of leading Wisconsin and other businesses which are planning for their atomic future.

This is the type of self-help, forward-looking organization which will help accelerate America's economic development. It is the type which is needed as we advance boldly and in a free-enterprise fashion to America's new economic frontiers.

So, too, I am hoping that in our State of Wisconsin we can, on a statewide basis, plan to attract the most modern type of industries to our State. We want industries with tremendous growth potential, industries which will need the type of skilled workers with which we in Wisconsin are blessed, industries which will need the stable, wholesome communities which we in Wisconsin have to offer.

That is why I have been in correspondence with the Governor's office, with the University of Wisconsin, and with other leading Wisconsin enterprises—private and public.

SO-CALLED NORMAL INDUSTRIES REQUIRE ATTENTION

But we don't need miracle fields, like atomic energy or automation, to assure our prosperity.

Even and indeed, especially, in so-called normal ordinary types of enterprise—manufacturing, wholesale, distribution, agriculture, we can and should plan to benefit from the St. Lawrence seaway.

WORKING OUT PROBLEMS WITH CANADA

But I want to repeat my word of caution regarding not becoming overoptimistic or going overboard, and assuming that prosperity will automatically be ours. And let me mention now that we still have to work out some seaway matters with our Canadian friends.

I want to say very frankly that there have been some differences with regard to duplicating seaway facilities between ourselves and our friends across the border. I have hope and confidence that these differences are properly going to be worked out satisfactorily. After all, there is no finer set of neighborly relations in the world than prevails between ourselves and our Canadian friends.

America tarried too long on approving the seaway. We were long overdue in coming in on the dual-nation, dual-purpose navigation and power project.

But now that we are going in, I hope that we and Canada will proceed on a basis of complete cooperation. I hope we will definitely avoid duplicating facilities and will put our respective dollars where they can be of best possible use for the good of both nations.

MIDWEST MUST PROTECT ITSELF

And just as I want America to speak up frankly in relation to her needs and those of Canada, so I want the Midwest to speak up frankly in relation to her needs.

Frankly, the Midwest has often been woefully negligent in protecting itself in the economic race.

Time after time, the Midwest has been treated like an orphan child when Uncle Sam has built new projects and poured in new Federal funds.

Time after time, the Midwest delegations in Congress have failed to work together as a team, while, by way of contrast, New England delegations or gulf coast or Northwest delegations have far exceeded us.

I don't mean to say that I want the Midwest to come "hat-in-hand" to Uncle Sam for handouts. We of the Midwest don't believe in handouts. We don't believe in looking to Washington for things which we should do and will do for ourselves.

But neither should we fail our obligations to make sure that we receive our fair share of Federal cooperation on projects in which there is a very definite national interest.

The Great Lakes connecting channels represent one such project. But there are many others which will directly benefit us.

Now, just how will the seaway affect Wisconsin?

It is my belief that Wisconsin particularly stands most immediately to gain from the seaway. Our State has probably planned more intensively for the seaway than most other States. We have been in the forefront of the battle for the seaway, and it is we who should be in the forefront of benefiting from it.

CHANNELS MUST BE DEEPENED

Our first priority must, of course, be to secure action on the legislation to which I have already referred. It is the legislation which not only I have introduced, but which numerous other Senators and Representatives have introduced—namely, to deepen the connecting channels to 27 feet. Otherwise we will not have a 27-foot deep waterway west of Lake Erie.

We can be quite sure that these channels are going to be deepened. That does not mean, however, that we should take them for granted. Actually, some of my colleagues from the South, for example, were more interested in getting Federal funds to supplement the hundreds of millions that they have poured into the gulf coast than they are interested in approving the relatively modest \$100 millions which will be necessary for the Great Lakes connecting channels.

Now, as channel work is getting under way, it is our estimate that seaway traffic will reach 52 million tons by 1965.

This tonnage will be of great aid to all of Wisconsin, to its industries, and its farmers who will be able to ship their products inexpensively across the waters.

But, I reiterate, my friends, that each community, including Antigo, should not assume that benefits will flow automatically to us, should not assume that prosperity is going to drop into our laps.

In the first place, there is stiff competition for new business all along the lake area.

QUESTIONS ON ANTIGO'S FACILITIES

In the second place, even if there were not this competition, each community cannot prosper unless it analyzes and improves its own particular facilities and resources—soundly and carefully.

And so, we should ask ourselves, as I'm sure you of this Chamber have been asking yourselves:

What is our available industry and our available labor supply?

What are the trends affecting current Antigo business?

What can we do to hold what we have and improve what we have?

What land do we have available for expanded industries?

What housing is available for increased labor supply?

How modern is the machinery in our plants?

What is our access—today and tomorrow—to other means of transportation: railroad, road, and air?

These are but a few of the important questions which must be considered before Antigo or any other community can fully benefit from the waterway.

There is every reason for faith and confidence in the future. Wisconsin stands at the threshold of a new era. I am sure that with the leadership displayed at this meeting and meetings throughout our State, we can go forward to fully benefit from this great frontier.

CONCLUSION

I have tried during this address to comment on some of the highlights of the coming era. I have tried to paint a picture which I believe is realistic and sound, and not one based upon superoptimism or rose-colored glasses, especially in relation to so-called new miracle industries.

I believe, in summary, that the seaway is what you and I choose to make it. It is not going to drop prosperity into our laps. But it is going to make prosperity available to us if we have the brains and the initiative to realize it, as I believe we will.

Very shortly, there will be published in Washington a new St. Lawrence Seaway Manual which has been prepared at my direction. It will help answer some of the many questions which I know are in your minds about the seaway. I hope that you will write to my office for a copy of it. And I hope that on my return to Washington you will always feel free to contact me. Give me the benefit of your judgment, your constructive criticism, your advice. I will be happy to hear from you always.

Thanks again for your attention and good luck to you all.

Cutting Taxes in an Effort To Catch Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cutting Taxes in an Effort To Catch Votes," which was published in the Salt Lake Tribune of February 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUTTING TAXES IN AN EFFORT TO CATCH VOTES

Before House Democrats put through their plan to cut income taxes \$20 per person, President Eisenhower described the move as the height of "fiscal irresponsibility."

That's exactly what it is, for the reduction was voted after practically no study and in the face of an estimated Federal deficit of \$2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Equally as bad, it is an example of politics pure and simple, a fact only emphasized by Democratic speeches in favor of the scheme.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN argued that the plan was "simple justice for the little fellow," an obvious reference to the Republican-sponsored tax-cut bill enacted last year which the Democrats have long and loudly contended was class legislation in that the big taxpayer benefited while the little one did not. This is a hollow claim. The Republican bill cut taxes for everyone. At the time the Democrats wanted to concentrate the cut in the lower brackets, a result they are again attempting to achieve. We wonder how many of the Democrats who voted for their tax plan last week voted against the GOP's general tax reduction a year ago.

Mr. Eisenhower skillfully unmasked the Democrats' motives at his press conference last week. Any tax cut, he said, is popular.

However, when the Government is struggling to balance expenditures with income, an ill-considered tax reduction can have the worst possible results. It is true that the 1954 cut was enacted in the face of a deficit, but it must be remembered that the cut was incidental to a general, and long overdue, revision of the Federal tax system. It was carefully drafted and was based upon extensive studies—something that certainly cannot be said of the latest Democratic maneuver.

Moreover, the Democrats did not put their cut into a separate bill so it could stand or fall on its own merits, but instead tied it to legislation requested by the administration. Corporation and excise taxes will be automatically reduced this year unless extended by Congress, and the Government cannot stand the loss of revenue. By including a tax cut and a tax extension in the same package, the Democrats hope to put the President on the spot since he will have to accept or reject the whole plan. This is an old legislative trick, but it never has been one to condone.

The Democratic plan is designed to catch votes. If it becomes law, every taxpayer will have his burden lightened somewhat, while about 5 million persons with low incomes or large families will pay no Federal income tax at all. And, of course, all taxpayers are supposed to be grateful to the party which made this possible. This may be slick politics, but it could easily boomerang once the voters realize the irresponsibility of the action.

Though we are shocked by the Democrats' victory in the House we are somewhat encouraged by the narrowness of the margin, 210 votes to 205. We hope that in the Senate, where the party division is paper thin, the natural conservatism of some Democratic leaders will defeat any similar move to play politics with Federal finances.

A Woman's Advice to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the present occupant of the Chair, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles by Miss Frances Givens, of the Detroit Times, which appeared in that newspaper on February 3 and February 7, 1955. They are entitled "What I'd Tell Congress." The articles arose from the incident when a woman attempted to speak in the House of Representatives some weeks ago. They express points of view with which I am in general agreement.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Times of February 3 1955]

It took Detroit 248 years to find room for a woman in its city council but the experiment was such a success that the second time she ran Miss Mary V. Beck found herself ahead of seven councilmen and only 1,160 votes behind the council president.

She repeated this performance in a third term which she is now serving.

She has been a practicing attorney 11 years and before that enjoyed a varied

career in social work which always concerned the welfare of children and the family.

ANXIOUS FEELING

If she could address the United States Congress she would say:

"My first feeling is one of sincere appreciation for this, my only and probably never-recurring opportunity, to address this distinguished body of lawmakers. This soon gives way, however, to a feeling of anxiety, the reason for which you may well guess.

"How can I best utilize these precious 5 minutes and yet convey to you my deep concern, shared by so many, over the state of our Nation?

"From my humble position in life, I have had opportunity to observe, in the pattern of living of the average American:

"1. The ever-increasing emphasis upon the material aspects of life."

TEMPO OF LIVING

"2. The enervating acceleration of the tempo of living in the quest for those material possessions and the attendant stress and strain upon our bodies, minds, and spirits.

"3. The ever-widening acceptance of deceptive standards by which achievement and success are measured.

"4. The growing neglect of the old, but tested and true principles, which alone can serve as the guiding posts to successful living.

"5. The continuing abandonment of the irreplaceable faith in the Supreme Being in whose Divine hands rests our destiny.

"It is evident from this, to those who will really look, that the moral and spiritual fabric of our civilization is wearing thin in many spots and has actually broken through in others, leaving large gaping holes, beyond repair. Is it not time therefore, to call into action, you, ladies and gentlemen, whom I would respectfully label the Master-Weavers?"

URGES LEADERSHIP

"Yet the strong and unbreakable fibers that you should use, if you will, in this monumental task of reweaving, must be of your own making. If you will but lead along those paths, that are clearly designated by the signposts of honesty, integrity, and unselfishness and constructed from the seemingly fragile but genuinely solid components of courage, persistence, and determination, the rest of us have no choice but to follow. Thus we will all be assured of reaching the destination of all mankind, which is human welfare and human progress.

"My words do not carry the implication that you have necessarily failed in living up to those expectations in past performance, but simply the suggestion that more than ever before you must become and remain keenly aware of that part of your responsibility."

[From the Detroit Times of February 7, 1955]

Dr. Mildred Peters, of Wayne University, who is dedicating her life to education, would beg Congress to help the Nation's children. She says:

"There is no asset as valuable to any nation as its physical resources.

"If one wishes to preserve these resources, to further them, it will be necessary for duly-elected legislatures to look at two needs that will make this possible. Otherwise, we may limit the development of a large part of the Nation."

SCHOOLS CROWDED

"One of our great needs is in the area of education.

"The increase in the number of school-children has literally pushed the schools out at the seams. The census figures have shown this will continue for a long time.

"Because of this, local municipalities have been unable to meet this need from local taxation. It would seem, then, that Federal aid in building of schools would be a temporary must.

"Without this, half-day programs, increased class loads, limited seating space, curtailment of programs, will be the state of affairs in many schools throughout the Nation."

NEED HOSPITAL AID

"I also should like to make an appeal for funds for the hospital program, particularly in the field of the chronically ill.

"The medical profession has worked to extend the life span, yet doctors and hospitals have tended to use their limited facilities to care for younger patients and emergencies.

"Congress should assist in hospital construction and research.

"Another large segment of the American public deserves the benefits of group hospitalization. They are the retired men and women whose hospital bills are largest."

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Dr. Mildred Peters is associate professor of guidance and counseling at Wayne University. She earned her AB and master's degree at Western Reserve University and her Ph. D. at Ohio State.

She spent her sabbatical as a research fellow in psychiatry at Western Reserve.

The Proposed \$20 Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Twenty-dollar Handout," which appeared in the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., on Saturday, February 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-DOLLAR HANDOUT

There are a good many ways of trying to buy the support of the voters at the expense of the Federal Treasury, but the \$20 per-person tax cut put over by the Democratic majority in the House yesterday is as crude an effort as we have ever seen. It takes millions of people off the tax rolls and gives a \$20 handout to millions more at a time when the Government is running a huge deficit. Even the 205 Democrats who voted for the cut cannot honestly contend that the Government can afford to reduce taxes at this time. At any rate, they tacked their tax reduction on to a bill to keep corporate taxes and excise taxes, which take dollars out of every man's pocket, at the same level for another year. And to make sure that it will have the maximum effort in winning votes for the Democratic ticket, they have made the cut effective next January.

This sort of tax legislation is an insult to the intelligence of the American voter. It implies that his vote is to be had for a \$20 cash handout, regardless of the fact that the inflationary forces this sets in motion may cost him even more. If the Democrats in the House had set out deliberately to prove that they are as utterly irresponsible in

financial affairs as the Republicans have charged, they could hardly have chosen a better way. The one comfort today is the probability that the Senate will have the good sense to bury the whole scheme.

Mary Lee Jurgens Runner-Up at Speech Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Clearbrook (Minn.) Leader of February 24, 1955:

MARY LEE JURGENS RUNNER-UP AT SPEECH CONTEST

Mary Lee Jurgens, who was given first place in the Clearwater County 4-H radio speaking contest a week ago, was awarded the runner-up prize at Crookston on Monday afternoon. The region contest was held as a part of the winter shows at Northwest School of Agriculture.

Two first-place selections were made at the contest in Crookston, with one of them going to eastern Polk County, to Pearl Pederson, of McIntosh.

Following is Mary Lee's oration on the topic: "What Are My Opportunities and Responsibilities Under Freedom?"

"We Americans live under a system of government that furnishes more personal freedom than any other system of government in the world.

"I, who am inclined to take my freedom in America for granted, must ask myself the questions. What are my opportunities under freedom? My answer, 'Why to be free, I suppose.' And my responsibilities? 'Well, to vote, I guess.'

"If these are the only answers I can give to these important questions, I do not deserve the privilege of being a citizen of the United States. The savage natives of Africa could be called free. The people of Soviet Russia can vote. If my country means no more to me than this I do not deserve my freedom.

"The early leaders of my country fought for the privilege of undertaking the responsibilities of freedom. They died to secure the opportunities that freedom offers. And I, to be frank, can't tell you offhand what these responsibilities and opportunities are.

"It's something to think about, not tomorrow when we will have more time, but now, for tomorrow we may have lost our freedom. Liberty is given to those who value and guard it.

"First, we must learn our opportunities so that we will value our freedom. Then we must learn our responsibilities so that we will be able to guard our freedom.

"Our opportunities under freedom are many. All citizens are guaranteed the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The section of the Constitution called the Bill of Rights assures some of the most important rights and opportunities of American citizens. These are:

"The freedom of religion, to worship as we please, in our own way. The freedom of speech, to say what we think, to freely criticize, praise, argue, express our ideas. The freedom of the press, to print and publish what we think. The freedom to assemble.

The freedom to be secure in our homes that no one may enter or search without our permission. The freedom to petition the government for help.

"These freedoms are important but our rights and opportunities are so many that they could not be listed. The Bill of Rights also says that the government has no rights except those given to it in the Constitution. All other rights belong to the people.

"Opportunities unusual in other parts of the world and at other times, are here so common they are usually taken for granted. We have the opportunity to choose our own job or field of work, to move from place to place, to go into business for ourselves. We have the opportunity to be an individual, we are not regimented into a carbon copy of every other person.

"We, the people of the United States of America are the Government of the United States of America. Each of us has the opportunity to live his own life, to develop his own talents and give to our country that which he is perfectly suited to give, whether it be criticism, leadership, or good hard work.

"Another opportunity is the opportunity of choice. Choice in hundreds of everyday things, like, what we eat, what we wear, what we read. These things mean nothing to us now but should they be taken away, we would find that they mean everything.

"These are little things. 'Unimportant,' you may say, but just try to imagine life without them.

"These opportunities are ours with but one limitation, that we do not interfere with the life, liberty, or pursuit of happiness of any other individual.

"Along with each of these opportunities goes a responsibility. Fulfillment of our responsibilities to our Government is the only way we can hope to keep our freedom.

"Our first great responsibility is in conduct. Our conduct must be such that no one would ever have any reason to take our freedom from us.

"If we would keep our freedom of religion, we must avoid religious prejudice and discrimination. If we are to keep our freedom of speech, we must use that freedom for good, not to spread lies or false rumors.

"If we would keep our freedom of the press we must avoid printing that which is untrue or harmful. If we are to keep our freedom of assembly we must see that assemblies are not riotous and do not do damage.

"Our second great responsibility is interest. By taking an interest in government we will learn more about our Government, how it functions, its history, its founders, its place in the world today.

"Through a knowledge of America's past we gain faith in America's future. Through a knowledge of the mechanics of American freedom we can better protect American future.

"The third great responsibility is respect. Respect to our Government brings obedience to its laws, and a willingness to undertake our responsibilities. A willingness when we are of age to serve jury duty, to do military service, to pay taxes. You know even that headache is our responsibility. Without money our Government could not function as it does today.

"Finally our greatest responsibility to vote. Our vote is our voice in the Government and our voice in the future of America. We must use it and use it wisely.

"These are some of my opportunities and responsibilities under freedom.

"May the realization of them make me a better citizen. May it make me more appreciative of my opportunities, more determined to undertake my responsibilities, and if need be, in the uncertain future, to struggle and to sacrifice to keep and protect my freedom."

Democratic Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the newspaper, Star and Herald, of Panama City, Republic of Panama, on February 25, 1955.

This editorial entitled "Democratic Republican," shows the way in which our great Vice President's visit was received in Panama, which is typical of the success he is meeting in his tour of the Central American countries:

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLICAN

Like his boss, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is as democratic as they come. Not only democratic but enthusiastically friendly. He likes people, all the people, all of his neighbors. He's just plain "campechano," as the Panamanians say, and for that they love him. As of today Vice President Nixon can have anything he wants in Panama. He's a regular guy.

And that, friends, is news.

From time immemorial United States Congressmen have been coming here, on Government business, on surveys, or just on joyrides, because the ride was for free. But Nixon is something else again. He's a real person, besides being Vice President of the United States.

He's like Ike, whom we all like down here in latitude nearly nine. Perhaps because Ike served here once. Or perhaps because we loved him when he came here fresh from the Allied victories overseas. Or because he and Mamie were so sweet to President José Antonio Remon C., when the late President of Panama and Doña Cecil were guests of the Eisenhowers in the White House. We in Panama like Ike and we also like his V. P. and are grateful to President Eisenhower for having sent Vice President Nixon as far as Panama so we can tell him so.

What a guy is Nixon. No formality; a cheery smile and handclasp for all comers. He does all the correct things, and with evident sincerity. He lays a wreath on the tomb of Panama's assassinated President Remon. He visits Panama's young President Ricardo (Dicky) Arias E. He tours Panama and the Canal Zone. He is always genial, friendly, smiling and he simply bubbles with sincerity. This is what the Panamanians call the don de gente (the good mixer, the faculty of being friendly, winning people's confidence).

In other words, Vice President Nixon is a "regular guy" in Panama. He has won all hearts. And so, apparently, has his golden-haired "señora", Mrs. Patricia (familiarily known as "Pat") Nixon.

If anything were needed to cement good relations between Panama and the United States—following the recent revision of the Panama-United States treaty—it was the friendly visit by the Nixons and their entourage. On the surface it is merely a friendly gesture to Panama among the other friendly gestures on the part of Uncle Sam to the nations of Central America.

But in Panama it is more than that. Panama and the United States are virtual partners in the Panama Canal. Panama gave her land (and receives rental thereon, it is true) but she gave it. And she is not only proud of giving it but benefits from

the world traffic it brings which, in some proportion, is reflected in her economy. She has tourists. She gains in international trade. Panama is doing all right. But she never forgets Uncle Sam's assistance. And Vice President Nixon represents that Uncle here today. He is not reminding anybody of the aid the United States has given Panama. He is here on a friendly visit.

Nor is Uncle Sam reminding any of the Latin American nations of any aid he may have given. He wants all these nations to be affluent, self-supporting, healthy—economically and ideologically. He wants them to be free, to stay free, to buck communism wherever it may appear in their midst.

Vice President Nixon is not saying these things as he extends the hand of friendship to all comers here in Panama. Nevertheless he must rejoice in the politically healthy atmosphere here. He must feel that, under this—as in former administrations—Panama is a loyal ally as she has been through two world wars. The Uncle can count on this youngest Republic of the Americas to stand by with everything she has and help guard this most necessary unit of all-American defense and commerce, the Panama Canal.

Drought-Relief Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time there has been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD criticisms of the handling of the drought-relief program by the Department of Agriculture. Most of these criticisms have been made by those who do not have a clear understanding of the problem or the steps taken to alleviate the hardships caused by drought throughout the country. Congress has passed several acts to help meet the distressing situation caused by drought and it has been the earnest desire of those charged with the administration of the programs to so administer them within the law as to give the greatest relief possible.

I am placing at the close of my remarks a table showing the number of cases and the funds expended through the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1955, and in the case of loans, feed, and hay programs and wind-erosion control, July 1, 1954, through February 4, 1955.

The charge has been made that the emergency credit made available to farmers in drought-stricken areas has been entirely inadequate. However, since emergency loans were first authorized in 1949 pursuant to Public Law 38, 81st Congress, a total of 157,940 loans amounting to \$212,274,468 have been made to enable farmers in designated areas to continue their normal operations. Since the inception of the special livestock-loan programs, which was authorized in 1953, a total of 5,649 loans amounting to \$49,702,328 have been made to livestock operators. Most of these loans, as well as a majority of the emergency loans, have been made as a result

of the drought conditions which have existed throughout much of the country. The following table reflects the activity under these programs by years for the country as a whole:

	Emergency loans		Special livestock loans	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
United States:				
1949	362	\$974,948		
1950	25,360	20,833,887		
1951	13,274	19,198,873		
1952	21,226	31,488,774		
1953	35,442	43,225,068		
1954	42,449	57,984,342	3,985	\$37,282,206
1955 through Feb. 4	19,827	29,568,576	1,664	12,430,122
Total	157,940	212,274,468	5,649	49,702,328

These loans have been made to farmers and stockmen who have been unable to obtain elsewhere the credit required for them to continue their normal operations and the volume of loans made is an indication that the emergency credit programs of the Department have been used fully in meeting the needs of farmers who have suffered from the drought and similar conditions.

Uniform regulations have been issued with respect to all of the emergency lending programs of the Department and these regulations apply in all of the States. The Farmers Home Administration emergency lending authorities are used in meeting the needs of small farmers as well as the needs of large operators who qualify for assistance. The refinancing of existing debts under our emergency lending authorities is prohibited. To do otherwise would not be consistent with the acts under which the various loans were authorized. Likewise Farmers Home Administration emergency lending authorities are not used to compensate applicants for the actual losses which they have suffered as a result of the drought or similar conditions. Emergency and special livestock loans were authorized for the purpose of enabling qualified applicants to continue their normal operations. Consequently, the amount advanced to each applicant is limited to what is necessary for that purpose. The amount actually advanced may or may not be in excess of the actual losses suffered by the applicant, depending upon the particular circumstances involved.

The act under which special livestock loans were authorized states specifically that such loans will be made only to those applicants "who have a good record of operations but are unable temporarily to get the credit they need from recognized lenders and have a reasonable chance of working out of their difficulties with supplementary financing." A similar restriction applies to all of the other types of emergency loans and it would not be consistent to approve a loan for any applicant in a position to obtain his credit elsewhere or to any applicant who did not have a reasonable prospect for success with the assistance of the loan. It is not intended for these loans to compete with credit extended by banks and other private lenders but

rather to supplement the credit available from those sources. When loans are made other creditors are urged to cooperate in keeping the farmer or stockman in business so that he will have an opportunity to recover from his losses and in a relatively short period return to his usual source of credit. Therefore, there is no justification or authority for making loans to applicants who are able to obtain their credit elsewhere or to applicants who do not have a reasonable prospect for success.

When loans include funds for the production of cash crops, the amounts advanced for that purpose generally are scheduled for repayment out of the income to be derived from the crops produced. Loans are scheduled for repayment in this manner as it is the generally accepted principle that creditors advancing funds for production purposes are entitled to the first claim upon the income produced. In situations in which an applicant's prospective income will be abnormally low because of the drought or other conditions or when his expenses will be abnormally high for similar reasons, provision is made for the scheduling of amounts advanced for annual recurring expenses over a period longer than 12 months.

In general, there have been two chief criticisms of the agricultural conservation program.

First. Fair prices of conservation materials were discontinued.

Second. Green manure, small grains, and so forth, were limited to land shifted from production of crops because of acreage allotments.

The determination and posting of the maximum fair price at which ACP would purchase materials—in this case seed—for conservation work was required under law until enactment of Public Law 690, 83d Congress. It then became permissive and could be used whenever and wherever it was apparent that a maximum was needed to prevent unjustifiable increases in prices of conservation materials or services. Instructions were sent to States by the Acting Secretary, September 3, 1954, canceling existing fair prices and giving instructions for their re-establishment where needed. Conditions for establishing were:

First. Supply through local sources inadequate to meet anticipated demand.

Second. Inadequate supply will result in commercial prices that are excessive in relation to such demand.

In drought areas there was a special practice (F-3). This practice permitted use of cost-sharing for cover crops without regard to the shifting of acreage from other crops. The rate of cost-sharing for this practice was determined by the State and county committees as that rate necessary to obtain adequate performance under prevailing conditions without regard to the 50 percent of cost provision.

In order to further alleviate the drought situation where 1954 funds were not adequate, authority was given to open the 1955 program in the late summer and fall of 1954 with the use of funds allocated for the 1955 program.

On January 27 and 28 a conference was held here in Washington, attended

by one representative from each of the drought States. In most cases, prior to January 27, representatives of the Federal agencies had conferred at the State level in order to enable their conferee to reflect the thinking of all agencies.

Several times during the conference here the statement was made to the effect that the emergency drought measures carried out in 1954 under the agricultural conservation program were most helpful and no doubt more productive of lasting good than any of the other emergency measures.

The statement has been made that the present emergency feed program is inadequate in that farmers, particularly the small farmers, cannot obtain sufficient relief.

The present emergency feed program was designed to utilize the regular channels of trade to the maximum extent practicable. Aside from the general policy that private channels of trade should be used insofar as practicable, there were other compelling reasons for utilizing the type of program. It was clearly the intent of Congress that feed grains should be placed in the farmers' hands as rapidly as possible. This type of program was designed to take advantage of the feed grains in dealers hands and elsewhere in the pipeline so that farmers could obtain feed without any delay.

It is probable that at least a month's time was saved on the average as compared to delivering feed direct to farmers from CCC stocks. It was also realized that to furnish feed grains to farmers in designated areas gratis would tend to greatly disturb the national price structures by offering incentives to obtain feed in large enough quantities to permit resale at a profit. It was felt that the subsidy rate when coupled with the provisions for credit and the provisions of the hay program would make it possible for farmers, both large and small, to retain their basic herds.

It has been suggested that the Department should furnish CCC stocks of feed grains or seed direct to farmers for the purpose of planting pastures. This type of program was also considered but the same delays could be expected in placing the feed grains and seed stocks in farmers hands as outlined above. Furthermore, to furnish these direct to farmers would be putting the Government in direct competition with the long-established channels of trade.

Large supplies of hairy vetch have been held by CCC and a stock of 28 million pounds remains in inventory. These seeds have been and are, at the present time, offered for sale at \$12.65 per hundred pounds. CCC sold several million pounds of hairy vetch in fall of 1954 at the above price, which is the market price in wholesale carlots.

The crimson clover seed held by CCC was mostly acquired from the 1953 crop in February and March of 1954. This seed was sold by CCC at prices that returned to CCC its total cost in the seed and this action kept the price of the seed to the consuming farmer much lower than would have been the case had CCC not owned the seed.

The alfalfa seed owned by CCC amounted to 37 million in January 1954. This seed had been offered at \$37.50 and \$43, which is more than CCC costs for nearly a year with few sales. It was reduced \$35 and \$40, which is the support price at which it was acquired. These prices are market prices for carlots in producing areas as is evidenced by the fact that CCC has at present 7,700,000 pounds and sales are not active.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree with me that Congress has wisely provided ways to alleviate a serious drought situation that has extended all the way from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic Ocean. It is my belief and I think will be concurred in by most Members of Congress, that the hardships of drought have been very grave and that they continue to be a threat to a great many com-

munities throughout the Nation. It may be that additional legislation will be required. However up to the present I think you and Members of Congress from these States will agree that the drought relief program as authorized by Congress and administered by the Department of Agriculture has been of untold help in relieving a most distressing situation.

United States Department of Agriculture drought program (fiscal year 1955)¹—Loans, feed, and hay programs, and wind erosion control (July 1, 1954, through Feb. 4, 1955)

States designated under Public Law 875	Loans						Feed and hay assistance						Allocations to States for emergency wind erosion control measures under the 1954 agricultural conservation program ⁴
	Production disaster		Economic disaster		Special livestock		Emergency feed program ²				Commitments for advances to States under hay distribution agreements ³	Number of counties	
							Purchase orders issued to farmers	Hundred-weight of feed	Dealers certificates issued				
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount			Number	Amount			
Alabama	581	\$562,510	23	\$38,425	15	\$44,085	21,256	1,398,699	3,958	\$972,330	\$500,000	58	
Arkansas	244	293,985	1,119	1,442,430	118	103,365	134,541	4,099,431	10,253	2,770,369	500,000	69	
Colorado	209	395,350	28	66,080	168	1,566,285	10,848	1,210,256	1,875	654,125	500,000	24	\$2,900,000
Georgia	753	1,532,580			10	34,815	15,533	1,500,654	3,086	929,604	500,000	124	
Kansas	66	64,265	380	614,015	76	814,265	26,338	2,234,072	4,030	1,442,187	500,000	43	4,100,000
Louisiana	197	192,835	299	252,910	2	750	13,217	504,089	1,324	262,444	500,000	28	
Mississippi	517	686,050	687	821,335			31,812	1,540,317	3,787	862,678	500,000	58	
Missouri	477	618,490	1,023	944,295	263	382,950	121,713	3,889,597	9,400	2,643,444	500,000	82	
Nevada	3	6,525			9	232,735	587	151,874	145	95,570	500,000	14	
New Mexico	72	122,405	118	289,370	175	1,669,655	4,885	795,101	914	497,360	500,000	19	1,600,000
North Carolina	702	673,490	1,129	1,456,251	1	1,600	10,177	354,359	883	195,385	500,000	39	
Oklahoma	110	103,610	707	881,351	140	1,062,585	180,930	6,777,364	16,196	4,166,641	500,000	77	550,000
South Carolina	2,184	1,906,780	1	160	1	3,000	13,421	723,766	2,033	365,307	500,000	46	
Tennessee	105	67,030	253	161,760	10	8,800	42,210	2,334,196	4,725	1,461,497	500,000	90	
Texas	2,445	4,476,222	4,759	9,506,546	492	4,082,471	176,824	9,080,242	19,463	5,665,833	1,000,000	127	4,000,000
Utah					16	406,526	781	135,323	110	75,280		9	
Virginia	12	29,700	38	30,595	5	40,400	2,700	166,799	167	44,667	500,000	33	
Wyoming	23	32,355	1	2,500	23	371,640	7,054	1,350,239	1,589	732,743	500,000	19	
Other States	387	987,266	175	560,105	134	1,574,195							
Total	9,087	12,451,448	10,740	17,117,128	1,664	12,420,122	820,987	38,125,348	83,918	23,977,364	9,000,000	959	13,150,000

¹ This report covers the States in which counties are currently designated as drought disaster areas for emergency feed and hay assistance. A separate report is available, as of June 30, 1954, covering activities under the drought program in the fiscal year 1954.

² This reflects activity under the 1954 feed program. In addition, there were obligations of \$79,500 for Colorado and \$491,500 for New Mexico incurred in the fiscal year 1955 under the 1953 feed program which was terminated in these 2 States as of July 15, 1954. The cost of the subsidies under the 1954 program is being borne by Com-

modity Credit Corporation pursuant to sec. 301 of Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.); the administrative costs are being borne under Public Law 175 funds.

³ Charged to the balance of \$15,257,747 of the \$50 million appropriated to carry out sec. 2 (d) of Public Law 38, as amended by Public Law 115, 83d Cong.

⁴ Represents allocations made from the \$15 million provided by the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954. An allocation of \$180,000 from these funds was also made to Nebraska.

The Alabama Coosa River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, during the 83d Congress legislation was authorized to permit the building of five hydroelectric dams on the Coosa-Alabama Rivers system, and it has long been evident that a 9-foot channel should be constructed from Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. This improvement is in great demand and should be done at the time the dams are being constructed, by providing for locks on the dams and by dredging these rivers while the hydroelectric dams are being constructed. This would result in great savings to the Federal Government. In order for this work to proceed in an orderly, economical, and efficient way, a new survey of the river should be made by the Corps of Engineers, and I am especially grateful that a public meeting has been called under

the sponsorship of Mayor W. A. Gayle, of the city of Montgomery, the chamber of commerce of the capital city, and the Coosa River Improvement Association.

On Saturday, March 5, 1955, public officials, businessmen, industrial leaders, and others of the cities and towns which will be affected by this improvement will meet in the city of Montgomery for the purpose of organizing a movement to begin work on this important development. An outstanding engineer, Lieutenant General Pick, United States Army (retired), will address the group at its luncheon meeting.

I have prepared a statement on this important development which gives the background and history of the improvements that have been made, and of the efforts that have been put forth in the past to bring about the realization of this highly important development. The statement is as follows:

THE ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER BASIN

THE RIVER

The Alabama-Coosa River is one of the principal rivers of the Southeast extending from the Blue Ridge Mountains of northwest Georgia and southeast Tennessee southwestly across the Piedmont Plateau to the low-

lands of the gulf coastal plain in Alabama and draining an area of 22,800 square miles.

The river basin has all the natural and climatic resources essential for economic progress. It has a moderate climate with an abundant but well distributed rainfall. It has fertile soil. It has many of the basic raw materials within its soil, so essential for future industrial progress. The human resource—an adequate supply of labor—is also available for industrial progress.

The potential hydroelectric development of the river basin is great. At the present time, there is an installed capacity of 564,000 kilowatts of hydropower in the 6 plants owned by the Alabama Power Co. together with the Allatoona plant built by the Corps of Engineers. This past session of Congress (83d) Public Law 436 was enacted which will permit the Alabama Power Co. to construct an additional 5 dams on the Coosa River and which is expected will add 360,000 kilowatts to the Alabama Power Co.'s capacity; these dams are to be constructed within 10 years from the date of the commencement of construction of the first dam.

At the present time there are frequent floods in the river basin and though they are not severe, they cannot help but retard the economic growth of the basin. About 526,000 of the acres are subject to overflow which could be avoided by the construction of certain flood projects in connection with the development of the dredging of the river

and the construction of the proposed dams and hydroelectric plants.

HISTORY

The development of the Coosa River has been the subject of study by the Corps of Engineers for the past 80 years. The Corps of Engineers of the Army first began investigating and reporting on the practicability of improving the Coosa River for navigation in 1870. The Corps of Engineers made a study of the Alabama River in 1875. The first improvement was a series of locks and dams in the Coosa River to enable shallow-draft navigation to reach Rome, Ga. The first really significant step toward overall basin development in the Alabama-Coosa River system was the 308 report made in 1934. This report recommended a system of locks and dams on the Alabama River and on the Coosa River above the existing power dams, and locks in the power dams. It also recommended a 9-foot deep channel for navigation upstream to Rome, Ga., 650 miles above Mobile, and additional power.

The feasibility of several dams for power on the tributaries was also investigated. A system of levees was built at Rome to control floods, and another flood-control project has been built at Prattville, Ala. Great progress was made when the Allatoona Dam and Reservoir was built on the Etowah River, 48 miles above Rome.

In 1941 the Corps of Engineers submitted a report recommending the adoption of a comprehensive program of development of the basin's water resources in accordance with plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers with such modifications thereon from time to time as seemed advisable. This was adopted by Congress and approved by the President in 1945 and is the present authorization for the Corps of Engineers' program.

The 83d Congress enacted Public Law 436 to permit the Alabama Power Co. to construct five dams along the river.

OUTLINE OF LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The Corps of Engineers 308 report was made in 1934. It presented a long-range plan for development of the river. (H. Doc. No. 66, 74th Cong.)

House Document No. 414, 77th Congress recommended a comprehensive project including a deeper channel for navigation.

Hearings held on Alabama-Coosa River in the 77th Congress before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. (November 5 and 6, 1941.)

Hearings held in 78th Congress:

1. Before House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, October 19-20, 1943.

2. Before Senate Committee on Commerce, April and May 1944. (Held on H. R. 3961.)

The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1945: It authorized appropriations for the implementation of the plans as set forth in House Document No. 414, 77th Congress.

Public Law 436, 83d Congress authorized the Alabama Power Co. to build a series of dams on the river.

THE FUTURE OF ALABAMA LIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER

One of the firmest cornerstones of Alabama's future lies in the development of the great resources of the Alabama-Coosa River Basin. This promising future can be attained only by the eventual development of the Alabama and Coosa Rivers and the long hoped for and dreamed of 9-foot deep-water channel from Rome, Ga., to Mobile.

The fulfillment of the dreams Alabamians have had for this magnificent river basin for these many years would provide a significant contribution to the defense bulwark of our Nation—allowing for the fast, safe, yet inexpensive movement of vital defense elements such as petroleum, chemicals, pulp, ore, and building materials; it would provide economic advantages to the industries already in the area through lowering their

operating costs; and it would attract new commerce and industries to develop the abundant natural resources within the river basin.

The present shallow depths of the Alabama River generally limit commerce to small movements of gravel, sand, logs, and pulpwood. The Alabama and Coosa Rivers must be channeled because of the advantages which will accrue to Alabama and its people, the Nation, and its citizens.

RESOURCES OF THE RIVER BASIN

Industry

Textiles: Cotton processing is important; silk and rayon knitting are prominent. There are approximately 130 textile mills employing about 43,000 workers.

Steel and iron: There are steel and iron mills in the river basin towns of Gadsden, Anniston, and Rome which use coal and iron ore mined in the surrounding area. This industry employs about 10,000 men in 33 plants.

The vast Cahaba coalfield of St. Clair, Bibb, and Tuscaloosa Counties which produce great amounts of coal would be made available if the coal had the advantage of reduced transportation rates afforded by river transportation. The same situation would be true of the great Warrior coalfield lying in the counties of Walker, Blount, Cullman, Winston, Marion, Fayette, and Tuscaloosa.

The steel mills would use Venezuelan iron ore and ore from other foreign countries coming into Alabama through the port of Mobile, thereby giving the counties served by the Alabama-Coosa, an equal and fair chance with the counties served by the Tombigbee and Warrior system which is now being made navigable.

Paper: Paper manufacture consumes vast quantities of water, involves a difficult waste problem, and requires low-cost, dependable, bulk transportation to and from the mill. The waters of the Coosa River plus the nearby supply of pulp has aided in the success of the Coosa River Newsprint Co.

Chemical: In the river basin there are approximately 64 establishments engaged in the manufacture of chemical products, including fertilizer plants, the Childersburg powder works, and cottonseed-oil mills.

General: There are about 70 concerns of the glass, clay, and stone group of industry which are engaged in the manufacture of cut stone, marble, building brick, and tile.

Agriculture

The abundant rainfall and fertile soil make farming desirable in this area. About 40 percent of the population is engaged in agricultural pursuits. Cotton, corn, peanuts, potatoes, velvet beans, and cattle raising are the most important.

Mineral resources

The Alabama-Coosa River Basin acreage contains many valuable minerals; bauxite, Selma chalk (for cement), clays, coal, arsenic ores, fluxing materials, fuller's earth, gold, lead graphite, granite, marble, slate, mica, ochre, lime, manganese ore, iron ore (both brown and gray), gravel, sand, silica sand, and asbestos.

At the present time because of the high transportation costs, only clay, coal, marble, lime, iron, gravel, and sand are being produced. Decreased water transportation costs would undoubtedly make it more profitable to mine bauxite, cement, coal, iron ore, fluxing materials, fuller's earth, graphite, and manganese.

Human resources

There is an adequate labor supply in the river basin—much of it due to the influx of war workers, many of whom stayed on. The number of workers has also increased due to the movement of new industries into the area.

It is interesting to note that populations demonstrate a tendency to follow water. In

northern New York State where water transportation on the New York State barge canal system parallels the railroad, the population is $5\frac{1}{2}$ times greater than the population in southern New York which has only railway service. Almost three-fourths of the 100 largest American cities are either sea, Great Lakes, or river ports with rail connections. Take the case of Houston, Tex., 50 miles from deep water in the Gulf of Mexico. In 1910 Houston's population was 78,000. Today it is 600,000. The city is next to the largest port in the Nation, second only to New York, and this is due to the dredged ship channel from the gulf to Houston.

THE ADVANTAGES OF WATER TRANSPORTATION

In recent years, freight business on the Nation's waterways has been increasing between 10 to 15 percent a year; in 1953 the waterways, excluding Great Lakes, transported 6 percent of the total ton-mileage. Traffic on the inland waterways has nearly tripled since 1946. Over the past 20 years, ton-miles have increased on the inland waterways at the average rate of 3.25 billion a year. On the Mississippi, traffic rose from 36 million tons in 1942 to 80 million tons in 1953.

The greatest advantage water freight has over other methods of transportation is cost. The average cost of railroad equipment to move 15,000 tons of freight would be \$3,220,551. The average cost of equipment to move 15,000 tons of freight on the inland waterways would be \$930,000. In the 22-year period ending June 30, 1948, the transportation savings on the 15 largest and most active waterways, as computed by the Army engineers, totaled over 2.5 billion dollars.

As another example, take the shipment of a ton of wheat from Minneapolis to Knoxville. By rail it costs \$17.69 but by water costs only \$5.55.

This is why new industries moving south every day would prefer to settle along the banks of a river where it can take advantage of the low costs of water transportation rates. In the first 3 months of 1954, 85 waterside development projects—all costing over \$100,000 and some well into the millions—were announced. Within the last 2 years over \$3 billion in new plant investments has been made along the banks of the Ohio River and its tributaries.

In 1952 the midcontinent of the United States surpassed the industrial East as a producing area—and why? Because industries have been leaving the East and settling along the inland waterways. It should be remembered that the railroads serving the river-port cities have also benefited by thousands of additional car loadings from industry and by greatly increased movement of in- and out-bound consumer goods and passengers.

ALABAMA'S FUTURE LIES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALABAMA-COOSA RIVER

Full development of the Alabama-Coosa River would bring the river-basin area adequate hydroelectric power for industrial purposes; employment for its people; cheap water-rate transportation; freedom from floods; and would provide wonderful recreational areas for its people to enjoy. The river and its basin possess all the natural resources of people, water, and minerals, and all it needs is the direction of man in order that this area can make a significant contribution to the national defense and general economic progress of the State of Alabama and the entire Nation. Every dollar spent will bring more than its own value in return. It is estimated that the river and harbor and flood-control program accomplished to date by the Corps of Engineers has returned to the Nation more than \$2 in value for every dollar expended.

I would like to urge that the State of Alabama and the Federal Government jointly pursue the full development of the Alabama-

Coosa River, including a 9-foot channel from Rome, Ga., to Mobile, Ala. Such an undertaking would be beneficial not only to the immediate people and industries within the river basin but to Georgia, Alabama, and to the Nation.

I would like to encourage the State of Alabama and the Federal Government to undertake this project at the same time that the Alabama Power Co. is building five dams along the river in order that the work might be coincided and accomplished with the least amount of cost. Perhaps the State could assume the responsibility for building the docks in the various ports under the already established State Waterways Commission. The cities could also participate in the construction of such docks and warehouses. The counties and State jointly could contribute to the building of access roads to service the ports. The Federal Government would dredge the river and build the channel, and work on the flood-control installations.

Alabama should no longer ignore the bounty of this magnificent river system. Alabama must act now.

Trees and Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Asheville (N. C.) Citizen of February 1, 1955:

TREES AND MEN

In the mountains it is often possible to see the forests for the trees.

The lush woods grow all around us. They are celebrated in verse, song, and book. They are the resource of a three-quarters of billion-dollar Tar Heel industry. To name the trees that grow in North Carolina from the subtropics of the southeast coastal islands to the fir-clad high mountains would take more space and breath than we have at hand. The tree is the prop and pillar of a whole scheme of civilization.

It was only 50 years ago today, however, that these truths really impressed themselves on the country at large. For it was on February 1, 1905, that President Theodore Roosevelt established the United States Forest Service.

Western North Carolina's share in these auspicious beginnings was immense. And its stake has grown. The first USFS Chief Forester, Gifford Pinchot, received much of his training on Biltmore Estate. The estate was also the site of the first formal school of forestry (then a European monopoly) in America. The Pisgah Forest Experiment Station began in a couple of tents at Bent Creek and grew at length into the Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, with eight experimental forests and a corps of researchers including men with worldwide reputations. The present Chief Forester, Richard E. McArdle, is a graduate of this renowned project, and E. L. Demmon, of Asheville, is president of the Society of American Foresters. We can indeed see the woods. And the trees. And the men.

T. R. defined forestry simply as "the preservation of forests by wise use." Today the Forest Service has grown to an organization of 6,700 permanent employees administering 115 national forests which yield each year

5 billion board-feet of lumber grown under scientific management plus research of immeasurable value to American industry.

The beginnings were small, like the seedling, and now the harvest is prodigious. In half a century the slashing, criminal waste of forest exploitation has been turned back into channels of wise use. America is the richer for it. And it is eternally in debt to the Forest Service and its band of dedicated men, conspicuous for their humility and a distinctive character (if you know your forester) that seems somehow aged in the woods. A happy birthday all around.

Dixon-Yates Versus the Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Florence Herald, Florence, Ala.:

DIXON-YATES VERSUS THE TAXPAYERS

One argument against the proposed Dixon-Yates power contract that seems to stand out above all others is the gross injustice to the taxpayers.

When the TVA was established some 22 years ago it offered the people of the Tennessee Valley an economical supply of power on a partnership basis, that is, the Government to produce it at wholesale rates, the people to buy and distribute it. It has proven to be an amazingly efficient and business-like arrangement that has been mutually acceptable to the TVA and the people. The Government is being paid back for its investment which it will still own after it is entirely amortized.

Dixon-Yates is the reverse of this. It would make the TVA dependent upon surrounding private utilities and would tax the people to pay for some of these private utilities (as in the case of Dixon-Yates). The people would pay for the facilities which Dixon-Yates would own after 30 years, and they would pay twice as much for these facilities as compared with the same amount of power furnished by TVA.

Just what Mr. Eisenhower hopes to gain by the Dixon-Yates deal is hard to see. It appears that in view of Russia's progress with atomic weapons we have lost much valuable time in settling the issue of who is to furnish the power for this vitally important plant. To brush aside the largest and most successful power-producing agency in the world in favor of a newly formed and untried private concern cannot be a course charted by other than political reasons.

Just why the Government's Atomic Energy Commission should have been placed in a position where it would have to bargain for power is a mystery. Oak Ridge was adequately served by TVA and so were hundreds of other large industries in the valley during the critical war period. There have been no complaints about the TVA's ability to deliver power.

The fact that Uncle Sam's atomic-energy plant would require some 600,000 kilowatts that TVA could not spare was known in 1953. It was then that the Bureau of the Budget and the AEC made the acquaintance of Messrs. Dixon and Yates and began negotiating for some sort of a power deal that would leave TVA out.

That this secret courtship succeeded is evidenced by the fact that TVA's proposal

to build the Fulton steam plant was quickly nipped in the bud.

Despite the President's order that the Bureau of the Budget and the AEC make a full disclosure of the Dixon-Yates deal the people are still unaware of all the facts in the story back of the proposal.

It should be told.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by Post No. 290, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Nanticoke, Pa., and a resolution adopted by the 12th District of the American Legion. These refer to an identical bill introduced by Congressman TEAGUE, of Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, which I hope will receive the attention of the committee. Following this resolution, I include two other resolutions adopted by Post No. 290 concerning World War I veteran pensions and an auditorium for the Veterans' Administration hospital at Wilkes-Barre:

Whereas the American Legion is a leader in the field of unselfish service closely akin to rehabilitation; and

Whereas this field is child welfare; and

Whereas the American Legion has achieved universally recognized leadership in this field of service to children of deceased veterans; and

Whereas the American Legion sponsored legislation on child welfare has sought the cooperation in their passage through the friendship of members serving the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas Legionnaires of the 12th district, Luzerne County of Pennsylvania, maintain its courtesy toward and appreciation toward the action of their Congressman in the 11th Congressional District for his introduction of a bill granting educational benefits to children of deceased veterans as outlined in such bill: Therefore be it

Resolved, That district 12, the American Legion, Luzerne County, Department of Pennsylvania, comprising 40 American Legion posts and representing more than 13,000 veteran Legionnaires of the Great Wars, commends the splendid efforts of Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, 11th Congressional District, United States House of Representatives, for his introduction of a bill in the House of Representatives establishing an educational-assistance program for children of servicemen who died as a result of a disability incurred in line of duty during World War II or the Korean service period in combat or from an instrumentality of war.

NANTICOKE POST, No. 290,

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

OF THE UNITED STATES,

Nanticoke, Pa., February 15, 1955.

Subject: H. R. 3589, sponsored by Representative FLOOD.

Whereas it has come to the attention of Nanticoke Post, 290, VFW, that H. R. 3589 is to be considered by the 84th Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the provisions of H. R. 3589 are extremely salutary for the benefits of orphan children of deceased veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Nanticoke Post, 290, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars go on record to urge Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD to press with all his vigor and exceptional ability for the passage of said resolution at the 84th Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the House of Representatives of the United States and to Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

A. SAVUKINAS, Commander.
LEONARD E. GAWFOURLIS,
Adjutant.

NANTICOKE POST, No. 290,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Nanticoke, Pa.

Subject: World War I veteran pensions.

Whereas a man's service to his country in the Armed Forces can never be measured in dollars and cents; and

Whereas those veterans who served in World War I have now passed the age where they are desirable as new employees; and

Whereas we feel that no one who has served his country valiantly in the Armed Forces should be left to the relief agencies for care in their old age: Be it hereby

Resolved, That you, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, join forces with those who desire to aid in providing a suitable pension for those of World War I to aid in the final days of their lives.

A. SAVUKINAS, Commander.
LEONARD E. GAWFOURLIS,
Adjutant.

NANTICOKE POST, No. 290,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Nanticoke, Pa., February 14, 1955.
Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of the post on January 23, 1955, it was expressed that the facilities of an auditorium were badly needed at the VA hospital to provide recreation for those who are being treated there. Adequate entertainment is always necessary for adequate mental and physical rehabilitation. So, therefore, we are taking this opportunity to inform you that we would like to have your support in trying to see that such facilities should be provided for our sick comrades while they are being rehabilitated. Any other help that we might give you in bringing this matter to the proper authorities will be dispatched to you immediately at your request.

Sincerely,

LEONARD E. PAWLOWSKI,
Adjutant.

The Congressional Salary Issue

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the provisions in the bill H. R. 3828 which will increase the salaries of Members of Congress by \$10,000 per year, and I shall vote "no" on this bill when it is considered in the House of Representatives.

I shall also vote "no" on any proposal to increase congressional salaries when so many of our people are overburdened by heavy taxation and so many persons are struggling to support themselves and their families on reduced incomes due to the agricultural depression and industrial unemployment.

I realize that many cogent arguments can be made in support of some salary increases for Members of the legislative branch of the Government, but the amount of salary increase specified in the bill H. R. 3828 for Members of Congress seems to me to be very extravagant.

I am well aware that the cost of living has increased substantially since 1946 when the present congressional salary schedule was established. However, the cost of living has not increased by an amount sufficient to warrant the very substantial salary increase carried in this bill.

The portion of the bill which relates to the salaries of judges of Federal courts and United States attorneys, I believe should have been considered separately and apart from congressional salaries.

From the information I have, judicial and attorneys' salaries are presently far too low and I have no objection to the parts of the bill which relate to salary increases for Federal judges and United States attorneys.

A New Voice Is Heard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of Members of the House to an editorial that appeared February 24, 1955, in the Salt Lake Desert News and Telegram concerning the thoroughness and studiousness the freshman Congressman from Utah, HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, has brought to Washington. Too often the cost of our price-support program has been masked in a tangled maze of columned figures. Congressman DIXON is to be commended for bringing them out in the open where they can be seen by all. The editorial follows:

A NEW VOICE IS HEARD

An old tradition dictates that freshman Senators and Congressmen, like small children, should be seen and not heard. When a comparative newcomer does make his voice heard above the multitude, he had better have something to say which is well worth listening to. Otherwise he is more than likely to be acutely embarrassed.

Representative HENRY ALDOUS DIXON, Utah's brandnew Congressman, made his voice heard from coast to coast last week. Judging by the reaction—and by a close analysis of what he said—the "Freshman's" speech was well worth listening to. It is causing a lot of embarrassment, all right—but not to the man who made the speech.

Supporters of the much-debated rigid 90-percent parity agricultural price support had told a House committee that the price-

support program had cost only \$20,700,000 over the whole 22 years of its existence. They had the figures to prove it—impressive figures, taken from a statistical table presented by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson himself.

Dr. Dixon made a close analysis of the figures which had been offered and their source. He found the quoted figures on the official chart, all right, and sure enough they represented the total of the column entitled "Price Support Programs." But, with his educator's typical thoroughness, he didn't stop there. A little further checking showed that the column title had been rather loosely used. Actually, that column represented cost of "Nonrecourse commodity loans and purchase agreement programs," just one of the factors making up the cost of "price-support programs." When the table was correctly read, and all of the cost elements added in, the total 22-year cost of agriculture price supports added up to a staggering 5 billion dollars-plus, or just 240 times the amount that had been cited by the veteran Congressman who had been trying to win support for the rigid price-support programs.

House veterans—especially those directly embarrassed by Representative Dixon's careful analysis—may not appreciate the Utah "Freshman's" disregard for tradition. But the taxpayers—whose sensitive pockets can readily feel the difference between \$20 million and \$5 billion—definitely do.

Schools for War Babies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, which now has before it consideration of the President's program for Federal aid to education, I believe the article which appeared in the February 28, 1955, issue of Newsweek and written by Raymond Moley will prove of interest to my colleagues.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article:

SCHOOLS FOR WAR BABIES (By Raymond Moley)

There is grumbling among school people about the pallor of the gray in the President's school-building program. There are loud cries from politicians like Senator HILL about the lack of pork under the gray. For these reasons the President's suggestions seem modest by comparison with what might have been. Nevertheless, there is an apologetic tone in the President's explanation of the reasons why he has bypassed the constitutional principle of local responsibility to which he has so often paid fervent tribute.

There is something fearsome in the multitude of war babies grown to school age which overwhelms even the strictest constitutionalists. The late Senator Taft was once induced to sponsor a bill for Federal aid to education. His defense of the bill in the Senate was not in the best Taft tradition. When he was asked by a colleague how the Federal octopus was to be kept out of local school affairs if Federal money were given, he answered that the bill contained all the words which he could muster to prevent such an invasion.

He knew quite well that words are not enough. For lurking in the shadow of every Federal dollar, wherever it may go, is a Federal bureaucrat. If it is Federal money, the Federal Government is responsible for its use.

On this constitutional background the President's program must be evaluated. Since it represents a distinct advance of Federal authority over the already depleted powers of the States and local communities, there should be a clear answer to two questions: What and where are the needy communities? Is there any other way consistent with traditional State responsibility to get the money for the building that may be necessary?

The plan itself hardly matches the ballyhoo about a \$7 billion school plan. Maybe it will be \$7 billion, maybe not. It will be sure to cost Uncle Sam more than a billion over 3 years and maybe 2. Whether \$7 billion will be spent by everyone concerned nobody can know. The financial plan is fourfold.

1. The Federal Government would buy \$750 million over 3 years of the bonds of districts which have not reached their borrowing limit.

2. The Federal Government would match State money to pay interest on bonds issued by school-building authorities (which would be public corporations) organized for the purpose. These authorities would rent the buildings to school districts too poor to build their own schools.

3. For districts too poor to participate in either of the foregoing plans the Federal Government would provide \$200 million in grants over 3 years.

4. The Federal Government would provide \$20 million over 3 years toward administrative expenses for the foregoing.

The plan would give a great deal of discretion to the United States Commissioner of Education and if he were an economical person devoted to the principle of State responsibility he could keep Federal spending to a minimum. A provision in the bill would lift his financial transactions above review by any other government official. This is mischievous nonsense.

There is no evidence in the President's message, nor in the other documents and statements issued by the administration in support of this plan, that a truly careful appraisal of the real needs and the financial resources of the local districts has been made. To a large degree the administration seems to accept expert estimates of beneficiary States and districts. We are asked to accept a figure more or less pulled out of the air with the assurance that after it is authorized by the Congress, the administration will in its discretion spend it wisely. Nor has the administration faced the fact that by returning to the States and local government such a tax as is now levied upon amusements, school needs could be met by the States and districts without Federal help.

Also the President might have waited to hear from his own Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which has a very competent task force under the chairmanship of Dr. Adam Bennion, of Utah. It has prepared a good report on this subject.

Federal School Aid Unnecessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial entitled

"Federal School Aid Unnecessary?" It appeared in the Huntsville Times of February 25, 1955:

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID UNNECESSARY?

Some governmental reports make sense. Others do not.

A prime example of the latter is the report made recently to President Eisenhower's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, saying that Federal aid is not necessary for the construction of new schools. The States can afford to spend more of their own money, according to the study group which made the report.

Since the news story quoting this report made no mention of exceptions, we must presume the report meant all types of Federal aid, including aid for areas where Federal installations have caused abnormally heavy and sudden increases in school populations.

We know little about the financial conditions of other States, but we are well acquainted with Alabama.

Where would Huntsville be now, educationally speaking, without Federal aid? Huntsville High School, Terry Heights Elementary School, the new West Huntsville Elementary School were all made possible only with Federal funds. And we are still crowded, with little local or State money available.

The same conditions apparently exist all over the State. Nationally speaking, there is an estimated shortage of 300,000 classrooms, with the shortage growing more acute.

Spend more State money? What money? Strenuous efforts have been made for several years to find enough money just to raise teachers' salaries. They have been unsuccessful.

Of course, taxes could be increased. But, ask a housewife or a father, who must feed and clothe his family on an average income, how much money he has left over which might go for taxes. It's hard enough for most folks to make ends meet now.

We take no issue with the desire to be independent of Federal aid. But to say that aid is not necessary anywhere is exhibiting an amazing degree of blindness.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the continuing plight of the peoples who have been enslaved by communism. One of the nations which has been so enslaved is Lithuania, a proud country which had known independence for only a short time before it again fell under the Russian yoke. I would call the attention of the Congress to the thoughtful and worthwhile resolutions which were recently passed by the Linden, N. J., branch of the Lithuanian American Council in commemoration of the 37th anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence:

Whereas 37 years have passed since the Council of Lithuania, meeting at Vilnius, the historic capital of Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, proclaimed to the world the determination of the Lithuanian people to embark upon an independent life; and

Whereas for Lithuanian-Americans it was a source of pride and satisfaction to observe the progress of the independent Lithuanian Republic in managing its affairs, raising the welfare of the people and elevating their cultural and educational standards; and

Whereas intolerable conditions now prevailing in Central and Eastern Europe, including Lithuania, are of grave concern to Western democracies, including the United States of America, since peace and stability are impossible without participation of that area, comprising a population of more than 100 million inhabitants, now separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Linden, N. J., convened under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council, Linden branch, to commemorate the 37th anniversary of Lithuanian independence, being mindful of the gravity of the present international situation and concerned over the fate of the Lithuanian nation, now pledge our loyalty and cooperation to the Government of the United States, and record our gratitude and appreciation to the President, the Secretary of State, and to the Congress of the United States for their support of the cause of a free Lithuania, and for having authorized a congressional investigation into the facts and methods of Communist aggression as experienced by Lithuania and other unfortunate nations; be it further

Resolved, That we appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and to the Congress of the United States to (1) develop a foreign policy to defeat the forces of international Communist conspiracy, and restore sovereignty to Lithuania and other Soviet-dominated countries; (2) use all possible means to protect enslaved peoples from genocidal destruction and preserve their hope of eventual liberation; and (3) have the United States Senate promptly ratify the Genocide Convention so that Communist perpetrated crimes against humanity may be properly recorded and officially noted for prosecution; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles; to the Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH and the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE; and to the Representative from the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
President.

VLADAS TURSA,
Secretary.

LINDEN, N. J., February 14, 1955.

Milk a Bargain as Source of Protein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record an article by Mr. Herb Jacobs, farm writer for the Capital Times of Madison, Wis.

Mr. Jacobs' article summarizes very well the fact that milk—particularly nonfat dry milk—commonly known as powdered milk—is one of the best sources of protein. He further proves,

with figures, milk and dairy products are the most economical buy for budget conscious housewives.

Following is Mr. Jacobs informative article which I commend to my colleagues for their consideration:

(By Herb Jacobs)

How would you like to buy the body-building foods for your family on the basis of the cost per pound of proteins they contain? Proteins are the building blocks out of which the body is largely made, from the mighty biceps of a weight lifter to the lustrous hair and peace-bloom skin of a Hollywood starlet.

The red stuff in meat, the white stuff in milk, and the clear part of a raw egg, for instance, are all the building block proteins—but if you were buying them just for their proteins, 1 variety would cost you more than 5 times as much as another.

It's important to Wisconsin too, because the dairyman, via milk, produces about half of all the animal-origin protein in this country—and the experts say he's selling it for about half what it is worth.

For Wisconsin that could mean a \$500 million per year increase in prices received by farmers for their milk.

But the protein price chart also affects consumers. Since the animal-origin proteins all have about the same body-building value, a housewife anxious to get the most for her money could shop around among meats, dairy products, and eggs to get the best buy in proteins. For instance hamburger contains about 16 percent protein. If the hamburger sells for 41 cents a pound, the price of a pound of protein in hamburger form would be \$2.02. On the other hand, pork chops, with a protein content of 13.3 percent, run up to \$5.47 per pound of protein in pork chop form, if the pork chops are selling retail at 79 cents per pound.

By contrast, the best buy for the housewife would be nonfat dry milk powder, if she were looking for a cheap form of protein for her family. At 40 cents a pound, and with a protein content of 35.6 percent, the protein in the dried milk would be costing only 97 cents per pound.

These figures are from the January 15, 1955, retail protein price report of the Protein Economics and Research Council, W. Lincoln Way, Route 3, Ames, Iowa.

Here is part of a protein price chart which the council is seeking to have newspapers throughout the country print weekly for the shopping guidance of housewives:

Harry C. Andrews, a former atomic scientist who worked for years with the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., is director of the protein council. He declares that the council's studies show that about 60 percent of the housewife's food dollar goes to buy protein.

"By using the protein price chart, a family of 4 can cut from \$200 to \$300, and sometimes as much as \$400 from its yearly food budget, and eat better while doing it," Andrews insists.

Andrews has been roving the Midwest in recent months, telling his protein cost story to newspaper editors, agriculture departments, and nutritionists. He looks forward to the day when stores will advertise a "best protein buy" just as they now advertise bargains in meat, poultry or other foods. Some newspapers are now publishing the weekly protein price charts for the guidance of consumers.

"That white stuff in milk is valuable," Andrews says, thinking as much of the farmer as of the consumer. "Wisconsin milk protein production of 500 million pounds per year is actually worth from \$500 million to \$1 billion per year more than we are getting, compared to other proteins of similar quality."

"Each year the dairy industry in the United States produces at the farm level about as much protein as that consumed in the form of all beef, pork, veal, lamb, mutton, poultry, fish and eggs combined. This is a whale of a lot of protein."

"Wisconsin and Iowa together produce about a third of the high quality animal protein, with Wisconsin estimated as being the top net producer."

Andrews adds that there is a bright future for Wisconsin's dairyland in the trend toward reducing diets, "because a reducing diet is really a more adequate protein diet."

The Protein Economic and Research Council is a nonprofit organization studying production and distribution of food resources, with particular emphasis on protein. Andrews thinks more widespread information on protein costs and availability would aid in defense stockpiling.

The question of buying foods on the basis of their protein content price is a difficult field, comments Dr. C. A. Elvehjem, dean of the University of Wisconsin graduate school, who is widely known for his studies in nutrition. Listing of the protein content of foods in terms of the price of the protein has considerable value, he said, but he pointed out that other factors also enter the picture, such as taste, mineral content, and other nutritional elements.

National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial, together with certain letters from J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., in support of House Joint Resolution 231, to proclaim a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week.

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,

Toledo, Ohio, February 24, 1955.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am enclosing for your information an editorial which is sufficiently informative so that anything I could try to add would be superfluous.

Entitled "How Would You Answer," it is written by V. H. Laughner, editor, Modern Materials Handling Magazine.

I feel that it has a direct bearing on the effort to obtain recognition for the material handling industry and profession and would request that it be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a means of aiding the establishment of a National Material Handling Week.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL, A. M. H. S.,

National Secretary, Westinghouse

Electric Corp., Meter Division.

NEWARK, N. J.

HOW WOULD YOU ANSWER?

If your son, about to enter college, were to ask you advice about a career in industrial engineering—and particularly in materials handling—what would you tell him?

Would you think of the many years you spent trying to sell management on the production and distribution savings possible through efficient handling, and advise him against subjecting himself to such frustration? Would you say that any engineering degree is a stigma, and that management looks on any technical man as necessary to the business but a little peculiar personally? Would you point to the 5-year-old car in the garage, the mortgage on the house, and the money you must borrow to put him through school—and tell him with some bitterness that salary scales in his contemplated profession are lower than those in many other professions?

Then, as we heard a man in the field do recently, would you cite other irritants associated with your work, like never being able to forget it after hours? Would you tell him that few engineers, particularly in the materials handling field, enjoy any professional recognition, that their next door neighbors never understand what they really do, and care even less, that the technical societies to which they belong do a wonderful job of keeping them abreast of technical progress, but nothing to improve their take-home pay and professional standing?

And after expounding on these themes for some time, would you tell him to study law, take business administration, or even be a veterinary, but to stay out of engineering?

Or would you tell him that the demands on industry for more and better products at lower cost will be greatly intensified by a growing population in the next few decades, that the men in production and distribution who were responsible for making us the most powerful Nation in history are now on the threshold of retirement, thus creating a void that he and others like him must fill, that management in the years ahead will have to depend far more on the "savvy" of the specialists not only to start but to stay in business, that with this increased dependency will come bigger salaries and greater professional recognition? Would you chart the tremendous importance of the professional societies and explain to him that they can provide the foundations for growth, but that each individual must, in the final analysis, be responsible for his own future?

Would you try to impart to your son the necessity for technical progress if we are to survive, and the great satisfactions that will be his by contributing his share?

Food	Retail price	Percent protein	Price per pound of protein paid by consumer
Beef:			
Chuck roast..... pound.....	\$0.54	16.2	\$3.07
Hamburger..... do.....	.41	16.1	2.02
Round steak..... do.....	.94	17.6	5.17
Cheese:			
Cottage (box) 12 ounces.....	.24	19.5	1.63
Cured cheddar..... pound.....	.65	25.1	2.19
Chicken: Frier, ready to cook..... pound.....	.53	15.2	3.38
Fish:			
Haddock, frozen fillet..... pound.....	.50	18.2	2.74
Salmon, canned pink..... pound.....	.53	20.5	2.49
Lamb, leg..... do.....	.69	15.0	4.31
Milk:			
Evaporated (can)..... quart.....	.22	3.5	2.48
Fresh, whole..... quart.....	.40	35.6	.97
Nonfat, dry..... pound.....	.79	13.3	5.47
Pork:			
Chops..... do.....	.64	14.7	3.73
Ham, whole..... do.....			

If he were to ask you, how would you answer? What would you say?

V. H. LAUGHNER,
Editor.

AMERICAN MATERIAL
HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, February 25, 1955.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am enclosing for your information some programs which will demonstrate the interest in the material-handling field.

On February 17-18, 1955, a 2-day conference on material handling was held at West Lafayette, Ind., cosponsored by Purdue University and the Indianapolis Chapter of the AMHS. This is the fifth annual Purdue material handling conference.

On March 10, 1955, an all-day material handling workshop seminar will be held at the Melbourne Hotel, sponsored by the St. Louis Chapter of the AMHS, St. Louis, Mo.

On March 16, 1955, the fifth annual material handling forum will be held at Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J. Cosponsored by Stevens Institute and the New Jersey Chapter of the AMHS, in cooperation with the Material Handling Institute. Attendance at the event for the 4 previous years has never been under 100 persons and has been over 150.

Dr. Jess H. Davis, president, Stevens Institute; Prof. James R. Bright, Harvard University; Mr. James M. Wallace, manager meter division, Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Mr. F. C. Wier, superintendent, material handling, Timken Roller Bearing Co., will be the principal speakers in the morning sessions. The afternoon will be devoted to 10 separate panel discussions.

The forum, seminar, or conference type of meeting is used by the material-handling profession and industry to spread the accumulated knowledge of the latest techniques and developments in the field. Meeting on the common ground of interest in the subject, the executive, the engineer, the vendor, and user of equipment, as well as the professional educator, discuss problems and solutions objectively and without restraint.

The programs listed here are only a small part of the hundreds held each year. It is significant that two are being held for the first time, proving the value and the interest in these sessions.

I would like to request of you that this information be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an indication of what the colleges and the material-handling industry and profession are doing voluntarily to broaden the knowledge of those desiring information and as a part of the effort to have declared a National Material Handling Week.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL, AMHS,
National Secretary, Westinghouse
Electric Corp., Meter Division,
Newark, N. J.

Problems Confronting Manufacturers of Power Lawn Mowers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Edwin F. Ringer, vice president of the Foley Man-

ufacturing Co., Inc., Minneapolis, Minn., regarding the serious problem confronting manufacturers of power lawn mowers.

I wish to call to the attention of the Members of Congress how at times—with the best of intention—impractical provisions are incorporated in the law that make it impossible for industry to meet its requirements without severe penalty. Mr. Ringer's letter follows:

FOLEY MANUFACTURING CO., INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 28, 1955.
The Honorable ROY W. WIER,
Congressman from Minnesota,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WIER: The purpose of this letter is respectfully to request your consideration and assistance on a general problem confronting manufacturers of power lawn mowers.

Our company is a Minnesota corporation doing business in Minneapolis, Minn., which manufactures and sells power lawn mowers.

We urge your active support of H. R. 3712 introduced into the House of Representatives by Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH, of Wisconsin. This bill would remedy the hardship and inequity to which many manufacturers were subjected when, last April, they were involuntarily made an agent of the Federal Government for the purpose of refunding to their dealers floor stock credits arising from the reduction in excise tax.

You will recall that in April 1954 Congress reduced the excise tax on power lawn mowers and on certain other commodities from 10 percent to 5 percent, and, by section 3416, Internal Revenue Code, provided for floor stock credits and refunds for such inventory as dealers may have had on hand for resale on April 1, 1954. Such refund was effected by provision for refund by the Federal Government to the manufacturer who had reimbursed its dealers holding unsold mowers, and who had filed a claim for credit or refund in the Internal Revenue Service no later than August 1, 1954. Since August 1, 1954 fell upon a Sunday, the claims actually had to be in the hands of the Internal Revenue Service by Friday, July 30.

While the bill reducing excise taxes was passed and became effective April 1, regulations of the Internal Revenue Service (T. D. 6072) prescribing procedure for floor stock refunds were not issued until June 3 and, because of the intervening weekend, did not reach most manufacturers until Monday, June 7. The manufacturer, therefore, had only 38 regular working days for processing the vast amount of paper work in handling the properly substantiated inventories from dealers and wholesalers and in preparing and filing the manufacturer's claim for credit or refund with the Internal Revenue Service.

The specific things which the manufacturer was compelled to attempt to accomplish within this limited 38-day period were as follows:

1. Analyze a rather complicated Internal Revenue Service regulation;
2. Prepare and have printed appropriate forms for reporting April 1 inventory of mowers;
3. Distribute the report forms to its wholesalers, and insure that such report forms were further distributed to the dealers of each of its wholesalers;
4. Each dealer and wholesaler then had to identify and also report on the forms their April 1 inventory of unsold mowers;
5. Such completed report form then had to be passed up the chain of distribution from dealer to wholesaler for appropriate endorsement and finally to the manufacturer;
6. The manufacturer at its risk had to determine the adequacy of each form, both as to the taking and reporting of inventory and

as to execution; allow valid claims of its wholesalers; and make reimbursement thereof not only by the trade practice of credit memos but also by the actual mailing of refund checks prior to July 30; and

7. The manufacturer then had to prepare his Quarterly Excise Tax Return and Claim for Refund in each case asserting claim against the Government for the total amount in which it had previously reimbursed its wholesalers. Such manufacturer's Quarterly Excise Tax Return and Claim for Refund—in order to be allowed—had to be in the hands of the appropriate Internal Revenue Service office by Friday, July 30.

The existence of several stages in the chain of distribution—from manufacturer to wholesaler to dealer—severely aggravated the burden of the inventorying, reporting, and paperwork.

Manufacturers—particularly the smaller ones—who were unable to process the paperwork in the limited time prescribed, were placed in the following dilemma:

(a) They could either not handle many thousands of dollars of valid claims from their customers; or

(b) They could attempt to handle all valid claims from their customers at the risk or late filing of the manufacturer's claim against the Government and the late mailing of refund checks to customers—either of which inadvertent delinquencies would result in the rejection of the manufacturer's claim against the Government.

Our company is a small business. We attempted to handle as many valid claims of our customers as possible, within the limited prescribed period. Our office force, however, was unsuccessful in processing the added paperwork involved.

As a result, our company inadvertently mailed certain refund checks to certain wholesalers as late as August 9 in remittance of credit balances created by the allowance of their valid claims. The examining agent from the office of the District Director of Internal Revenue has rejected our company's claims in the amount of \$1,862.50 because of our unintentional 9-day delay in mailing certain refund checks to certain wholesalers.

Our company acted in good faith in attempting to comply fully with the provisions of the statute by refunding to all of our wholesalers tax money to which they were entitled. We feel very keenly the inequity of the above penalty, which is particularly burdensome upon us as a small company.

The above situation is one in which many manufacturers of power lawn mowers now find themselves. We therefore urge your active support of H. R. 3712, which would remedy the above hardships by extending the deadline of August 1, 1954, for the filing of floor stock credit and refund claims to July 1, 1955.

Sincerely,

EDWIN F. RINGER,
Vice President,
Foley Manufacturing Co.

National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter from J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Ma-

terial Handling Society, Inc., together with an editorial which appeared in the February issue of *Modern Material Handling*:

AMERICAN MATERIAL
HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,

Toledo, Ohio, February 24, 1955.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

Subject: National Material Handling Week.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I am enclosing, as part of the program, an editorial from the February 1955 issue of *Modern Materials Handling* magazine entitled "Kudos and Bows."

Written by V. H. Laughner, editor, it is a graphic account of the phenomenal growth of the materials-handling function in the past 3 decades.

Please note the reference to the "\$2 billion" worth of equipment and component parts sold by the material-handling industry in the year of 1954. Five times that of 5 years ago. Almost double that of the machine tool builders.

That material handling is accepted as an art and sciences would seem to be an established fact based on these figures. Yet, this tremendous dollar figure is not even dignified by our own Government as a basic industry, but classified as "general industrial equipment."

There is much yet to be done, in recognition, in education, in industry and in research and development.

The advances made to date are history. It is in the advances still to be made, in safety, in economy, in the elimination of the human being as a substitute for mechanical handling, wherein lies the greatest benefits to our civilization.

I would request of you, in the furtherance of this effort, that this editorial be inserted into the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, feeling that the message contained is of value to the program.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary.

KUDOS AND BOWS

The cover on this month's issue of *Modern Materials Handling* is the first of a four-color series that will be published monthly throughout the coming year.

Actually, this cover is a symbol of progress. It symbolizes not only our progress but that of the entire industry and of every man connected with it. It furthermore is an indication of the importance that industry today places on efficient handling of materials and of in-process and finished parts.

This was not always so. Just a few years ago, the title of materials handling engineer was scarce indeed. Then, more attention was given to almost every other phase of manufacturing and distribution. At best, the development of efficient handling patterns was considered of tertiary importance and met with suspicion by many managements.

In those days, too, the companies making materials handling equipment were just on the threshold of tremendous growth. For the most part, they were small, had few design engineers and, with but some exceptions, had yet to formulate their current policy of underwriting research on a large scale. But they had faith in the future, they did not stint on their products, and they promoted materials handling with the zeal of crusaders. These companies grew and are growing as the field and the men in it grew and are growing.

In 1954, over \$2 billion worth of equipment and components were sold by the materials handling industry—five times that of just 5 years ago and almost double the dollar volume done by the machine tool builders

last year. Men who are in the field have increased in stature and are being given the recognition that has long been their due. No further proof is needed that industry now recognizes the tremendous savings that are possible through adaptation of better handling methods, or that the rate of progress will accelerate, not decelerate, in the future.

We are proud to have grown with the field. Our progress, like yours, has not been easy. Investment rather than tricks, study rather than superficiality, hard facts and not half truths have been the cornerstones on which we have built.

We will in the future, as we have in the past, publish the news, write the articles, and describe the new products that in our opinion will be of maximum benefit to you. We shall look upon this and future covers as symbols of that pledge, as well as evidence of progress.

But it's you who should take the bows, you who should accept the kudos. For ours is but the symbol, while yours has been the accomplishment.

V. H. LAUGHNER,
Editor.

Fair Prices for Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the *RECORD*, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

Joint resolution memorializing the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress to support measures promoting fair prices for agricultural commodities in the national interest and recommending policies to strengthen the family farm system

Whereas an expanding economy should be the goal of the State and Nation in order to provide the best use of our total resources, and such an expanded economy is impossible because substandard farm income results in loss of income, purchasing power, property values, retail sales, employment and industrial activity, and this effect upon the general prosperity will be accentuated in 1955 and 1956 if the farm price level is lowered; and

Whereas the present farm program does not meet the needs of the Nation because it actually tends to widen the gap between farm income and farm operating costs, and because the laws do not now provide adequate price protection on dairy products, poultry and eggs, and cattle and hogs, commodities which are so vital to the economy of a diversified farming State like Minnesota; and

Whereas the continuation or worsening of present farm price levels will mean widespread and bitter economic distress for farm families of Minnesota; impair the ability of these families to stay on the land; make it increasingly difficult for young people to take up farming; have serious repercussions in our rural communities upon the trade centers, schools, churches, and REA systems built to serve the present population; and have a severe effect upon the tax base of our townships, school districts, counties, and the State and make it difficult for these units to meet the necessary costs of Government; and

Whereas below parity farm income is hindering farmers from making progress in retiring their debts, in keeping up with needed replacements and repairs on their farms, and in carrying on necessary soil conservation measures on their farms; and

Whereas it is a disservice to the people as a whole, for anyone in agriculture to confuse and divide farmers and consumers, to set one type of farmer against another, to discredit farmers and the farm program, to fail to use available funds and authority in the face of critical farm price collapses, and to risk economic havoc in the country through policies which intentionally force down the level of farm prices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the President and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to enact and maintain an effective farm program by—

1. Providing mandatory price supports to assure full parity returns to producers of all major farm commodities, using whatever methods may be most practical; either direct support measures such as loan programs, production payments, purchase programs, and promotion of exports, or a combination of these methods. As far as possible, self-regulating, and self-financing support systems, using excise or processing taxes and tariff levies similar to those used to finance the sugar and wool support programs should be used. Pending the adoption of such a comprehensive farm program, the Secretary of Agriculture should be directed by Congress to effectively use his available funds and authority to prevent disastrous price breaks in the markets for commodities which do not now have mandatory supports.

2. Promoting balanced production through a balanced system of price supports. In the event of acreage controls, there should be a compensatory increase in price-support levels. Incentive payments should be made to encourage soil-conservation practices upon acres diverted from crop production in order to more effectively stabilize our visible farm reserves and build up a reserve of soil fertility and to encourage soil conservation. It should be the policy that land diverted under a production control program be planted to grasses and legumes and that no crop be harvested on these acres and that supplemental pasturage of this land not be permitted.

3. Establishing a definite national policy on the size of food reserves which should be carried in the national interest.

4. Providing for greatly expanded research programs to study the farmers, marketing and pricing problems, and to develop new uses and new markets for farm products.

5. Providing adequate funds for operation of the farm programs, including Commodity Credit Corporation, crop insurance, soil conservation, farm credit, and for the REA.

6. Continuing an integrated Federal program of soil conservation and soil-building through the Agricultural conservation program and the soil conservation service, and opposing moves to dismember the programs into separate State programs.

7. Directing the Farmers Home Administration to liberalize its lending policies to meet present-day credit needs by (a) long-term real-estate loans at a lower rate of interest, (b) production-type credit at more reasonable rates of interest and on longer repayment schedules.

8. Providing for measures to encourage greater consumption of our abundance of food and to promote the use of this food to improve the diet of America's aged, its school children, its low-income groups, and those in institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States, be requested to foster the participation of individual family type farmers in the

development, administration, and conduct of farm programs by (a) safe-guarding the right of farmers to elect their own farm committees, (b) restoring the authority of these committees to manage the programs at the local level, (c) appointing typical family type farmers as a majority on all advisory groups on farm problems, (d) conducting a nationwide farm policy review through the farmers-elected committees. Within our State such a review should be conducted in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and the commissioner of agriculture, dairy and food; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States set a course of farm policy in line with the above recommendations; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States be requested to take the lead in working for a full parity price support program and in placing the entire matter above partisan politics. We commend our Minnesota Senators and Representatives who have supported such a program; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota, and to each member of the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Girl Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD a statement about the Girl Scouts of the United States of America. I know that all Members of the Congress are familiar with the fine work that is being accomplished by the Girl Scout organization. However, I feel it is appropriate that we give special recognition to this worthwhile group and take note of some very interesting facts about the Girl Scouts.

During the week of March 6 to 12 the Nation will observe Girl Scout Week. As the organization of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America begin their 43d year, there are 2,350,000 girls and adults registered as members of the organization. In my own State of South Dakota there are well over 6,000 Girl Scouters.

South Dakota is known as the Land of Infinite Variety, because we are blessed with a variety of terrain and activities that are ideal for outdoor enthusiasts. Anne L. New, director of public information for national headquarters of the Girl Scouts, informs me that the State and National parks in South Dakota will no doubt be visited by many Girl Scouts during the coming camping season. I know that all of the other States will also experience considerable activity by the Girl Scouts as they develop resourcefulness through camping and outdoor living.

I like the Girl Scout theme for 1955, which is "Believe, Belong, Build."

Girl Scouts believe by knowing their country's history and traditions, by constantly renewing their promise to God and their country, by adhering to the Girl Scout laws, which emphasize the spiritual foundations underlying our society.

Girl Scouts belong by entering into scouting's free association of girls and adults, by learning through actual experience to accept people on the basis of their essential worth, by enjoying the personal satisfactions of belonging to a group with worthy objectives and a constructive program of learning by doing.

Girl Scouts build as each girl in scouting develops her own best capacities under the guidance of trained and devoted adults, as she explores her community and its resources and contributes to community welfare in line with her growing experience and ability, as she learns the duties and responsibilities of citizenship and strives to achieve the Girl Scout goal of becoming a happy, resourceful individual who is willing to share her abilities as a citizen in her home, her community, her country, and the world.

Some 10 million women have enjoyed Girl Scout experiences and certainly the training they have received through the organization has helped them to be better citizens. The Girl Scout organization is helping to build a strong America, and it is fitting that this Congress give the Girl Scouts recognition and support.

Reservists Show Their Mettle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the Evening Tribune newspaper, of San Diego, Calif., under date of October 28, 1954:

RESERVISTS SHOW THEIR METTLE

Among San Diego's most welcome guests in many days have been the members of the Fleet Reserve Association at their convention here. More than one comment has been heard on the dignity and decorum with which the reservists conducted themselves.

Their behavior is understandable. Men freed from the curbs of Navy discipline remain a self-controlled breed, a credit to the service that trained them, to themselves, and to all of us.

And then comes a disturbing note. These men might have still been in active service, a backbone of career men keeping the Navy alert and powerful. But they are lost to Navy activity because of many ill-considered policies that have chipped away at the rewards for active duty.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, told the reservists that many Members of Congress now are aware that they must set up better pay rates and provide greater benefits for members of the Armed Forces to hold capable men.

Various proposals for action to this end await consideration by the next Congress. They would stand an even better chance if all its members could have seen the Fleet Reserve Association as San Diego saw it this week.

De Valera Approves Joint Talks Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks concerning the proposal of Mr. Costello, Premier of Ireland, to engage in mutual discussion of problems between the Republic and the officials of the six-county government in Ireland. In the February 18 issue of the Irish Times appears an article giving the reaction of Mr. Eamon De Valera, former Premier of Ireland, to the proposal suggested by Mr. Costello.

The complete harmony of viewpoint of these two opposing leaders of the Irish Republic is indicative of the universal opinion held by the Irish people concerning the demand for the unification of their island country. Mr. De Valera shows a complete accord with Mr. Costello regarding the desirability of mutual talks concerning the various problems, which must, of necessity, arise between the two areas of the country. He also pointed out the impossibility of any agreements being reached on the matter of mutual defense between Great Britain and Ireland, so long as partition continued.

During the course of his address before an audience in Manchester, England, Mr. De Valera concisely set forth the difficulties underlying any consideration of the question of mutual defense between Great Britain and Ireland. He also very forcefully pointed out that the principle by which those in the six counties demanded separation from the rest of Ireland, applies equally to the majority in Tyrone, Fermanagh, Derry city, South Down, and South Armagh, where that majority desired to be separated from the six counties and reunited with the Republic. If the principle is valid in justifying the cutting off of the six counties from the rest of Ireland, then certainly that same principle is equally valid in cutting off these additional areas from the six counties and returning them to the Republic of Ireland from which they were forcibly removed.

The resolution which I have presented to this House, House Resolution 32, would aid in bringing about the mutual discussions and amicable settlement of the border problem in Ireland. The urging for such a solution, which favorable consideration of my resolution would provide, could well prove a determining factor in achieving an end to partition in Ireland.

The article reporting Mr. De Valera's reaction to Mr. Costello's proposal, as

well as the article reporting on Mr. De Valera's speech in Manchester are being made a part of my remarks, because I feel that both articles are of genuine interest to the Members of the House. They are as follows:

NORTH-SOUTH TALKS PROPOSAL ENDORSED BY MR. DE VALERA

Mr. Eamon de Valera, T. D., said in London on Wednesday that a meeting between the Governments in Dublin and Belfast was an obvious step, which should be taken. But on the question of defense talks, he said that the Irish people could be relied on to take the necessary measures. There was no possibility of discussing this subject while the country remained divided.

Mr. de Valera said this is an interview with a representative of the Yorkshire Post. He was commenting on an interview with Mr. Costello published in that newspaper, and in the Irish Times yesterday, which quoted the Taoiseach's readiness to meet Lord Brookeborough, and on a leading article in the Yorkshire Post.

The report of the interview quotes Mr. de Valera: "I am particularly glad to see a paper like the Yorkshire Post showing an interest in this question, which is of fundamental importance," and goes on: He added that the attitude of Britain and of its publicists when the question of the partition of Ireland arose and was discussed, was: "Oh, it's a matter for the Irish themselves. If only the Irish would agree among themselves."

"You seem to want to have it both ways," Mr. de Valera commented. "When there's a possibility of Irish agreement you say, 'We must have something to do with it.' If that's your attitude you must share the responsibility for the continuance of partition. Those of us who have been dealing with this matter over the past years feel that this shows a little of the old imperial approach. It is the wrong way."

"The way to get good relations between the two countries is to admit that the question of Irish policy is a matter for Ireland. There should be agreement on matters of common concern between the representatives of Ireland, on the one hand, and the representatives of Britain, on the other. That's the way to get a lasting result. When approached in that way you have the goodwill of both peoples with you."

"If there are aspects of the defense of the two countries that are of common concern, then the Irish people through their own parliament and in their own interests can be relied on to take the measures considered necessary," he said. "There is no possibility even of discussing this while our country remains divided."

"Mr. Costello has indicated the willingness of his Government to be represented at such a meeting," he said. "The question now is, what is Lord Brookeborough's attitude?"

(Mr. de Valera was in London to attend the funeral yesterday of Mr. John Dulanty, the former Ambassador to Britain.)

REPUBLIC'S ATTITUDE

Mr. Eamon de Valera, T. D., addressing the Manchester branch of the Anti-Partition League in Manchester last night, said he was glad that important papers such as the Yorkshire Post, had shown themselves interested in the question of partition and about what steps might be taken about the reunification of the country. He recalled that Mr. Costello had expressed his willingness to meet the representatives of the six-county government. What one wanted to know now was what would be Lord Brookeborough's attitude.

As far as the people of the 26 counties were concerned, their first objective must be

to secure unity with the rest of the country. Until this objective was achieved, they could not regard national independence as having been attained.

The question at the moment was to secure independence, rather than confederation or how to preserve it. If independence was secured, then the people of all Ireland would have the same anxiety to preserve the nation's independence as other nations, and would naturally be ready to consider what steps they might take, in cooperation with other countries, to make their independence secure. An All-Ireland Parliament, completely free, would be able to consider what steps it might take with Britain and other countries towards mutual defense. Defense policies could not usefully be discussed under existing circumstances. That was also the position largely during the last war. If there was to be any reconsideration of Ireland's attitude in a possible future war it could only be done by a united Ireland.

Mr. de Valera told his listeners that the Yorkshire Post had stated that certain British interests were paramount, and that the claim of Britain to use Irish ports, etc., would have to be maintained. "Britain cannot have it both ways," he asserted. "If this attitude is taken up, Britain must accept her share of the responsibility for the continuation of partition, and cannot wash her hands of it. The claim put up by the Yorkshire Post cannot be admitted. It savors of the old imperialism which we experienced in the past."

Referring to the attitude of those in the six counties who wanted to remain separated from the rest of their fellow countrymen, Mr. de Valera said that the principle on which they demanded separation would equally apply to the majority of the people, of say, Tyrone, Fermanagh, Derry city, South Down and South Armagh, who desired to be separated from the Belfast Parliament and to be attached to the 26 counties. At present the majority in those areas were being held against their will, and coerced to remain under a jurisdiction to which they would not willingly submit.

Forest Service's Role in Our Past and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SHUFORD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Asheville (N. C.) Times of February 1, 1955:

FOREST SERVICE'S ROLE IN OUR PAST AND FUTURE

It was 50 years ago today that the Forest Service was created in its present form in the United States Department of Agriculture. The purpose of this special Federal agency was, and still is, to see to it that all land in our national forests be devoted to its most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people.

The Forest Service has had a colorful history marked by many great achievements. Justly proud of its record of significant work for the country, the Forest Service has planned an elaborate observance of its golden anniversary in order to publicize and promote its objectives. In this observance and in the Forest Service's program no part of

America could have more genuine interest than western North Carolina.

There are two vital reasons for this deep and enthusiastic local and regional concern for the welfare and work of the Forest Service. One is that an exceedingly large part of our vast mountain wonderland is made up of national forests which are major factors in the section's economy, both industrially and for recreational purposes. The other reason is that, from its earliest beginnings until now, the Asheville area has contributed mightily to forestry conservation and development by supplying trained leaders in this professional field and by serving as a key base of operations for study and experiment.

When the Forest Service came into being its first Chief Forester was Gifford Pinchot, who got much of his training and inspiration for that great post while handling forestry development problems on the Biltmore estate for George W. Vanderbilt. One of the results of Pinchot's early work here was the establishment of the Biltmore Forest Forestry School.

Later, graduates of that school contributed much to the development of enlightened forestry programs in this section and throughout America.

A National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the following letter from J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., together with an editorial entitled "Dubious Yankee Ingenuity."

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,

Toledo, Ohio, February 24, 1955.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: I have sent to you an editorial entitled "Dubious Yankee Ingenuity."

I would, in the interest of this program, request that this be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a means of bringing to light one of the reasons we have sought your aid in the establishment of a National Material Handling Week.

It graphically tells the story of a modern factory, with tremendous investments in machine tools, yet with "little red child's express wagons" used as devices for the handling of materials.

That some managements will spend thousands for machine tools to reduce by split seconds the stroke of a punch press or the cycle of a machining operation, but will blithely ignore the real savings in time, in men, and in profit dollars by using "little red wagons" or something equally inept, is a fact which cannot be ignored.

Money spent in manual handling, and the man-hours involved, are forever lost "down the rathole of shortsightedness and poor planning, and not 1 penny or 1 hour can ever be regained. The investment, however, into mechanical handling produces "profit dollars" every hour of every day after installation.

I trust you will consider this editorial as valuable to the effort, in that it cites a condition which should not be ignored.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL, A. M. H. S.,
National Secretary, Westinghouse
Electric Corp.

NEWARK, N. J.

DUBIOUS YANKEE INGENUITY

A couple of weeks ago, we took in a conducted tour of a few of New England's great industries. It was the 6th annual research tour, sponsored by the New England Council.

Visiting industrial plants is no novelty to us, but doing it under the precise schedules and able management of American Express was a new experience. We liked it.

We also liked most of what we saw. Being a Connecticut Yankee by birth, we were proud to see that rigor mortis had not set in as we feared it would, years ago, when we left our home site for greener pastures. In fact, from what we've seen and heard, we're fondly nurturing the belief that the Yankees are tooling and gearing up for a strong return to the industrial leadership they enjoyed in the days when father wore knee breeches.

But all is no roses. The boys up Nor'East still have a long way to go just to catch up with other industrial areas.

Their problem is not one of quality or quantity. On both of those counts they rate high. It is a problem of handling—the movement of raw, in-process, and finished goods.

In some cases, handling is primitive; 4 men slowly struggling with a load that easily and speedily could be handled with a fork-lift truck and 1 man. In other cases, handling has advanced a generation but still is makeshift. Just to prove that we're not too critical, here's just one frinstitute:

One plant visited evoked much admiration from our group about the excellent production processes, controls, and tools in use. As we approached one department, our guide pointed with great pride to a large production machine; a \$30,000 investment that promised to pay big dividends. But, as we moved on, we almost tripped over a child's metal express wagon. For a moment, we stared at this incongruous sight—fearfully suspecting, yet not believing, that this battered toy with bent axles and misaligned wheels might be used for . . . (perish the thought.)

As our group moved on, timidly and furtively we slipped the question to the guide. In a matter of fact and nonchalant manner, he replied. We were dumbfounded.

A minute later, as we moved along in a daze, another member of our tour, traveling with another group, rushed up to us. "Want to see something special in the way of materials handling equipment?"

Before we could answer, he pulled us into an adjoining bay and pointed—to another child's express wagon.

May we suggest that the New England Council tackle materials handling as its next collective research project? We can promise immediate as well as long range benefits.

A. W. GREEN.

Taxes and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, Fred Maytag II, who is director and chair-

man of the taxation committee, National Association of Manufacturers, as well as president of the Maytag Co., of Newton, Iowa, spoke before the NAM at their meeting in New York in December of 1954. I have read his speech with great interest and commend it to other Members of Congress who seek the enactment of legislation to keep our Nation free and strong. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Maytag's speech entitled "Taxes and America's Future." He points out that under the 5-year plan his committee recommends, bringing tax rates down to 35 percent, there would be no actual loss in revenue to the Government, because of increased yields resulting from growth in the economy. He contends that instead of whittling away at the tax base, it will strengthen it. He deplors the present high rates of individual and corporate tax, which he insists inflict penalties on initiative and success and actually threaten survival of our way of life.

The speech follows:

TAXES AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

Since I last spoke to you from this rostrum, a year ago, the Internal Revenue Code has been thoroughly revised. The enactment into law of H. R. 8300, otherwise known as the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, will stand as one of the major achievements of the 83d Congress. This new code contains many important changes of great benefit to all taxpayers. I want to pay high tribute to the leaders, both on Capitol Hill and in the Treasury, who labored so long, so diligently, and so skillfully to bring about this achievement.

But that is not the subject of my address. What is past is prologue. Instead of looking backward, I propose to look ahead to the problems and opportunities of the future.

Our association has a new tax program, developed by its taxation committee and approved by its board of directors. Within the program is an orderly 5-year plan for substantially reducing the high and discriminatory rates of Federal income tax. I believe it is one of the most important plans our association has ever developed, because its adoption would greatly lessen the tax discrimination which now impedes economic progress. Today it is my responsibility—and my great privilege—to present this plan to you and to release it publicly for the first time.

But I have another purpose in my remarks. I want to pose the basic issue of tax discrimination itself. It is time for responsible American leaders, in and out of business, to face squarely this fundamental problem which is the root of 95 percent of our tax difficulties, and join the issue with those who, for cynical political reasons, or sincere but misguided philosophical reasons, favor continued discrimination.

The hour is late.

Not just because 9 years after World War II, individual tax rates have receded little from the wartime peak, and the corporate rate has risen 12 percentage points.

Not just because the \$7 billion tax reduction this year, except for repealing the excess-profits tax, hardly touched the problem.

Not just because the great postwar inflation, which concealed the economic evils of the discriminatory rates, has run its course, and fully competitive conditions have returned to the economy.

Not just because the promise of a more abundant life for a rapidly growing population is at stake.

Not just because sound tax policy is essential to our future military security.

¹ Congress of American Industry.

The hour is late for all these reasons, but it is later still because we businessmen, individually and collectively, through our companies and firms, our trade associations and chambers of commerce, our service clubs and professional organizations, have been too complacent to join in a consistent effort to define the issue, pick a common target, and work together to achieve a fair and equitable tax structure.

No wonder, then—

That we debate phoney issues and propose tax reforms which seek to ease the effects rather than eliminate the causes.

That we elect and reelect politicians who bleed for small business but support a tax structure conceived by Karl Marx to liquidate the middle class.

That so few of us recognize that the true meaning of "ability to pay" is proportional taxation, not progressive confiscation.

No wonder, then, that we have a tax structure which destroys ambition, penalizes success, discourages investments to create new jobs, and may well turn a nation of risk-taking entrepreneurs into a nation of softies who place security above opportunity.

Too often we businessmen have been more concerned with the immediate and localized effects of our tax structure than with its basic principles. Too often we have quarreled among ourselves about who is to be taxed, and when we have agreed it has frequently been on some mitigating device or gadget to soften the harsh effects of the high rates instead of meeting the main issue. We have thus permitted the opposition to divide and rule. While they accused us of seeking tax loopholes, we have been indifferent to the devices by which they have diverted the debate from the underlying issue into one bypath after another, until the one important question has been lost in a deep thicket of socialist dialectic.

The hour is late, but not too late. There is no excuse for our hesitating any longer. With all the strength of equity and logic on our side, and with the urgent need for taking the tax shackles off economic progress, the initiative is ours if we have the courage to take it. It's time to put the opposition on the defensive. It's time to make a direct frontal assault on this tax system which was taken out of the book of Karl Marx and has no proper place in a free America.

If we fail to force this issue, we will have only ourselves to blame.

With the future welfare of all Americans so obviously linked to the growth of a healthy industrial system, who can contend that corporate rates of over 50 percent do not impede investment, discourage initiative, and retard the creation of new jobs for the million persons per year who are being added to the labor force? It should be obvious to even the simplest intelligence that a continuation of these rates will bring about economic strangulation.

Anyone who contends to the contrary is in the position of the man who fell off the roof of a 10-story building and, as he went past the third floor, shouted, "I'm doing all right so far."

The situation is even more obvious, the story more simple, with respect to the progressive individual income tax. You can tell the story as well as I. This tax strikes hardest at the small-business man, the new business, the little unincorporated enterprise which yearns for growth. You can cite the rates—not just the 91 percent top rate, but the steep progression which reaches 50 percent at \$16,000 of taxable income.

You can equip yourself with illustrations. You can get familiar with the book by Harvard's Professor Sanders called *Effects of Taxation on Executives*, which presents a moving drama of instance after instance in which high rates have frustrated human incentives.

You can appeal to common sense with such hypothetical examples as telling your sales force: "I'm going to put new commis-

sion rates into effect. The harder you work, the more sales you bring in, the lower your rate of commission is going to be." Any manager who would be so stupid ought to have his head examined; yet that is exactly what our Government for years has been saying to every taxpayer.

When you put the progressive tax structure in this perspective I think you will be surprised at the people who will hear your story through and be convinced, especially when they learn what few now realize—that the high rates produce so little revenue that the whole progressive structure could be wiped out for the same cost as raising exemptions \$200. In other words, if you were to wipe out the entire superstructure of progressive rates and leave only a 20 percent tax across the board on all taxable income—and mind you, we are not advocating this—it would raise as much revenue as if you left the rate structure exactly as it is and gave every taxpayer an additional exemption of \$200.

So much for the issue; now for the plan.

In the time available to me I can present it only in outline. To get its full flavor, to understand the underlying facts on which it is based, and to be prepared to meet the opposition, you must read the whole program.² Please do. Letting George read it won't make you a salesman, and in this campaign everyone of us must be a fully equipped salesman.

When members of your committee and your staff studied the problem of discriminatory rates we were confronted by two stubborn facts.

The first is that with the Federal budget now some \$14 billion below the last Truman budget, reductions in expenditures will not come as easily in the future.

The second is that programing for relief from the high rates on a year-to-year basis has proven to be a futile procedure.

These facts led us to one simple conclusion—that we should stake out a claim to the tax-reduction opportunities which come from the increase in the tax base and the rise in tax receipts resulting from the growth of the economy. In other words, we would recapture the revenue coming from the operation of the growth factor and use it exclusively to reduce the discriminatory rates; we would extend the plan over a period of years until moderate and bearable rate levels were reached.

We have confidence that putting this plan into effect will provide the best guaranty that the economy will continue to grow. We are convinced that an established plan—with specific goals at the end of a set period—will provide the maximum benefit, because the confirmed promise of further relief in the future will compound the stimulation provided by current reductions. We tentatively set our target date 5 years ahead and, interestingly enough, the various parts of the plan fell neatly into place within this time limit.

The plan assumes no anticipation of general increase in revenue requirements over the next 5 years. The present Federal revenue is approximately \$60 billion annually. Our basic assumption is that this can be used as the measure of maximum revenue requirements until the goals of the plan have been achieved. The question, then, is: If we hold revenues at \$60 billion, how many dollars would become available as a result of the growth factor for reducing the excessive rates?

Economic growth over the greater part of the past half century has averaged about 3 percent per year. If we project this growth into the future and apply it to the Federal tax structure, we determine how many revenue dollars are available to reduce the rates.

On this basis, we find that if the rules are not changed, total revenues will gradually increase from \$60 billion per year to about \$69 billion at the end of a 5-year period. In deciding to use this \$9 billion as the measure of potential reductions, we have two reasons for being sure of our ground. The first is that, because of the composition of the tax structure, the tax base and hence tax revenues tend to grow somewhat faster than the growth in the economy as a whole. The second is that contemporary economists are projecting a possible rate of growth of up to 4½ percent over the next decade or so.

Turning now to the rate structure, we find that both the top individual rate and the top corporate rate can be reduced to 35 percent with an apparent revenue loss of only \$8.4 billion, which is one-half billion less than the amount conservatively estimated to be available.

The reduction in the individual income tax would be the least costly. This is because, contrary to popular opinion, the progressive element of the rate structure is by far the least productive of revenue. Let me illustrate. The Government, this fiscal year, expects the individual tax to yield about \$28½ billion. Our figures show that a little more than \$24 billion, or 84 percent of this, will come from the basic rate of 20 percent which is paid by all taxpayers on the first bracket of income. Only about \$4½ billion, or 16 percent, will come from the entire progressive element of the rate structure. This is why we can achieve such a drastic reduction in progression with so little effect on revenue.

We, therefore, propose the making of five annual reductions of 16 percent each in the progressive element of each rate bracket—with each reduction computed on the original element rather than on the declining balance. This would reduce the entire progressive scale proportionately and would bring the top rate down to 35 percent at the end of the period. The eminent fairness of this approach is obvious. All income taxpayers would receive the same percentage reduction of their tax burdens which result from progression.

The relationship between rates and revenue is quite different when we come to the corporate tax. Each percentage point of the combined rate produces the same amount of revenue. But, the base of this tax, corporate profits, is relatively small, so it takes high rates to produce large revenues.

In determining the goal for corporate rate reductions, we are mindful that many problems of tax administration and corporate management would largely disappear if there were approximate equality in corporate and individual rates at moderate levels. With a plan to bring top individual rates down to 35 percent, it is apparent that we should set the same goal for corporate rate reductions.

This means cutting 17 percentage points from the present combined corporate rate of 52 percent. The first step is insistence on the reduction of 5 percentage points in the normal tax, which is scheduled for April 1, 1955. Then in each of the succeeding 4 years, there would be a further reduction of 3 percentage points bringing us to a combined rate of 35 percent.

At the end of the 5-year period the annual revenue loss from these reductions would be \$4.7 billion in the corporate tax and \$3½ billion in the individual tax. This makes a total apparent revenue loss, as I mentioned earlier, of slightly more than \$8.4 billion for the plan as a whole—a loss which would be more than offset by the increased yields resulting from growth in the economy.

The most amazing thing about this plan is that it achieves so much at so little cost. Instead of whittling away at the tax base, it will strengthen it. Instead of grasping all tax reduction opportunities, it leaves the field

wide open to apply all reductions in expenditures to reducing other taxes.

We specifically recommend that, during and after accomplishment of this plan, additional opportunities for tax reduction be largely used to bring down the first bracket rate of the individual tax—which would provide the greatest direct benefit to the greatest number of taxpayers. We are convinced that achievement of our plan would have such a buoyant effect on the economy, and so strengthen the revenue base, that over the years there would be more, rather than less, opportunity for reduction in this 20-percent base rate.

With an issue and a plan, we are ready to operate. We can hope that leaders and groups representing all segments of American life will join us in promoting this proposal. Yet, regardless of who joins us, we have the responsibility to see the issue through. As businessmen, we are custodians of an economic system which has provided more of the good things in life for more people than any other system known to man. From our own experience, we know that the high and discriminatory rates of individual and corporate tax inflict a great penalty on initiative and success; that they undermine the capacity of the Nation to provide the venture capital which is the lifeblood of a free economic system—thus we know that the survival of our very way of life is threatened.

Despite our responsibility, however, we will not avoid being accused of self-interest. Our motives will be suspected in some quarters. I truly believe, however, that our goal is attainable and that we should secure an increasing number of converts to our cause. I hope we will find that support for the present discriminatory system, and opposition to fair and reasonable rates of income tax, has been based more on cynical opportunism than on an actual desire to persecute and harass the productive forces of the Nation.

Nevertheless, the soapbox orators of the left will pull out of the bag all the old tricks—the emotional phrases designed to beguile and becloud the basic issue. We will hear much of the phrase "ability to pay" as it has been distorted and twisted by muddled thinking.

We may have thrown at us the old charge of "tax relief for the greedy but not for the needy." In all probability we will have to deal with the new and ingenious phrase "the trickle-down theory of tax relief," coined in the heat of the debate over the 1954 tax legislation.

This latest phrase is a vicious and presumably deliberate distortion of the economic process of saving and investing. The result of this process is not to trickle down, but to lift up. The saving of part of what we have produced, and its investment in tools to provide more jobs, has lifted this Nation to unparalleled heights of industrial strength. It has provided a standard of living which is the envy of the world. Should fabricators of this kind of economic libel prevail in dominating tax policy in the critical period ahead, we will indeed, have reason to fear for America's future.

The constant association of responsibility to pay taxes with economic status has set class against class. It has created gulfs of mistrust where bridges of understanding should exist. It has led to the imposition of punitive taxes on the numerically small, but economically indispensable, segments of a free capitalistic society—taxes, which if continued, could destroy the society itself, not just the capitalists. That's just what Marx intended.

We have a long way to go.

Hopefully, I say to you, the way can be shortened. It can be shortened if the leaders of both our great political parties decide there is more to be lost for the Nation, which they all love and serve, than there is to be gained for the respective parties, by

² May be obtained from National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

continuing the stalemate over high and discriminatory income tax rates.

There is no partisanship in devotion to the cause of keeping our Nation free and strong.

There is no partisanship in dedication to the endless promise of our free enterprise system.

Crippling tax rates cast a long shadow over the fulfillment of that promise. The Nation is faced by a peril which transcends party lines. We need statesmanship which also transcends party lines.

Hoover Commission Latest Report a Blow to Many Existing Veterans' Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the new Hoover Commission report to the Congress on personnel and civil service, in effect, is a repeat of the job and the recommendations made some 4 years ago by the original Hoover Commission.

Certainly the position taken in this new report is a repeat performance so far as the basic rights of veterans are concerned, inasmuch as the recommendations propose a further whittling away of the vital veterans' preference rights under existing law.

Foremost among the recommendations again put before the Congress, is the abandonment of the rule of three, the means by which initial selection for jobs in the Federal service has traditionally been made. The substitute offered would be a rule of five, which plainly means there will be no veterans' preference of any consequence—a system of select any and pass over others. A further recommendation is made for the elimination of the numerical rating and the present register system—the substitute offered being some loose device called the category system.

The Hoover Commission would also limit veterans' special appeal rights and otherwise whittle away at the statutes.

The recommendations in this regard should again be defeated. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, along with my remarks, an editorial entitled "Hoover Commission Latest Report a Blow to Many Existing Veterans' Laws," which appears in the current issue of the National Tribune-The Stars and Stripes, a publication of the veterans of the United States.

The article is as follows:

HOOPER COMMISSION LATEST REPORT BLOW AT MANY EXISTING VETERAN LAWS—CALLS FOR REDUCTION IN COMPENSATION FOR SOME SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES—WOULD DENY HOSPITALIZATION TO NONSERVICE GROUP AND ASKS FOR PROMISSORY NOTES FOR CARE IN CERTAIN CASES—HOSPITAL PROGRAM CUT

The Hoover Commission last Sunday night released its special study on the vastness of Federal health and medical services, and recommended radical surgery of such services.

The Commission's economy knife was directed chiefly against medical services of the

Veterans' Administration, but other medical programs such as those of the Armed Forces, Public Health Service, and other Federal arms also would be overhauled and curtailed.

The report, which deviated considerably on some major points from the recommendations of the Commission's medical task force which spearheaded the study, recommended:

That VA hospitalization and other medical services be confined only to service-connected ailments, and to those veterans with nonservice-associated illness who are truly indigent—and are proved to be so needy they can't go elsewhere.

That even needy veterans with non-service-associated illnesses be required to sign some non-interest-bearing promissory note, obligating them to pay for their hospitalization or other medical care at a future date should their financial state improve.

That the whole VA system of disability pension ratings for service-connected infirmities be made more realistic to the effect of such disabilities on earning capacity. (The Commission cited, as example, that present VA practice allows 30 percent disability, with pension of a minimum of \$50 a month, for amputation of a great toe in service-connected cases.)

That there be more cross-servicing between the military hospitals to better fill some hospitals and eliminate others now only partially filled. Thus, sailors would be admitted to Army hospitals; soldiers might go to Air Force hospitals and, in general, admissions would be made for convenience rather than according to the kind of uniform the patient wears.

That merchant seamen patients be no longer eligible for care at public expense. These seamen are now cared for at 12 Public Health Service hospitals at a cost estimated by the Commission's medical task force at about \$12 million a year.

That all plans to build any more VA general hospitals, excepting those actually under construction or contracted for construction, be withdrawn. This would forever kill the hopes of those fighting for a new VA hospital for the Washington area.

To effect many of its major recommendations, the Commission urged creation of a Federal Health Advisory Council to coordinate Government medical policies and oversee systematic cross-servicings among the 66 administrative units now having medical functions.

The Commission also asked the Government to develop a voluntary, contributory system of medical and hospital insurance for its civilian employees, rather than provide the medical services and hospitalizations in Government institutions.

The report complained that Federal agencies have assumed more and more responsibilities for complete or partial health and hospital care until they now service some 30 million Americans. The cost of such servings, the report noted, now exceeds \$4 billion, including \$2,030,000,000 for disability allowances under "a cumbersome system which breeds inefficiency and huge waste."

Unless something is done, these costs and coverages will increase, it was stated in the Commission's report.

The medical report is the latest of a series the Commission is making on Government reorganization. An earlier medical task force for the first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government made similar findings, in March 1949, on "enormous and expanding Federal medical activities, devoid of any central plan."

The report similarly complained that in addition to the wastage, the Federal medical services also drain off physicians and dentists from private practice. In 1954, the newest medical task force estimated, more than 6 percent of the active medical per-

sonnel in this country was employed by the Government.

The Commission's report is scheduled to be presented to Congress this week and since it touches on so many controversial points it is certain to meet many objections from legislators.

One, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, a nonveteran, who also is a member of the Commission, filed the sole Commission dissent, which accompanied release of the report and recommendations.

Congressman HOLIFIELD called the report recommendations "wholly unrealistic," and said he was opposed to curtailment of any hospital and medical facilities "in the face of impending civilian defense needs."

The Commission's report differed radically from that of its own task force in the recommendations for medical care of veterans with non-service-connected ailments. In effect, the Commission recommended a form of "means test" of financial ability to pay. These veterans, in non-service-connected illnesses, who could pay for part or all of VA hospitalization costs, would have to do so. Others would have to sign obligations for future payments, if they could afford this repayment in the future.

The task force, however, had recommended a form of GI bill of health rights which would offer veterans free care for even non-service-connected illness occurring within 3 years after separation from the service. After that, except for service-associated ailments, veterans would be on their own.

As now practiced, the Commission said, veterans with non-service-connected disabilities can get VA care only if beds in VA hospitals are available, and only if they sign a statement of inability to pay for such care. However, the Commission pointed out, the Veterans' Administration is prohibited by law from challenging such can't-pay statements.

On the task force's 3-year limit on VA hospitalization rights, the Commission said it believes that "the sentiment of American people is that a sick and really indigent veteran should be provided care in a Veterans' Administration hospital." But it recommended that the can't-pay statement should be verified by VA investigators, and that VA be authorized to collect wherever such statements are not substantiated.

"It is difficult to believe," the Commission said in its report, "that all of the approximately 369,000 such veterans given care last year were actually unable to pay for at least part of their hospital and in-patient medical care."

Lincolnite Lodge, No. 567, Slovene National Benefit Society, Favors Supporting, Strengthening, and Expanding REA, TVA, and Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed a letter I received from the Lincolnite Lodge, No. 567, Slovene National Benefit Society:

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., February 23, 1955.
Representative PETER F. MACK,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACK: The Lincolnite Lodge, No. 567, Slovene National Benefit So-

ciety, with an adult membership of 104 persons, went on record unanimously, February 20, 1955, as follows:

"We call upon our two Senators and Congressman PETER F. MACK, to support, strengthen, and expand REA, TVA, and public power."

We hope to hear from you soon, and learn where you stand on the above questions.

Sincerely,

JOE G. BRINOCAR,
President.

AUBURN, ILL.

ADAM BUNEVICH,
Secretary.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

Eisenhower's So-Called Power Partnership Reverses Half a Century of Public Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the principle of low-cost public power with preference to municipalities and other public agencies has been stated at least 13 times in acts of Congress dating from 1906. In other words, for almost 50 years the Federal Government has consistently followed a policy of selling publicly produced power at the lowest possible rates, giving preference to municipalities and public agencies. Furthermore, that has been the policy of the executive agencies in the generation and sale of electric energy during all of that time, including the present administration up to and including the issuance of the power statement made by the Department of the Interior with the approval of the President in August of 1953.

The adoption of the so-called power partnership program therefore is a reversal of almost half a century of power policy in the Federal Government. It is a complete reversal of the low-cost power principle and a complete abandonment of the preference to municipalities and other public agencies. If this new policy is adopted and put into effect, there will be no more low-cost public power, and public agencies will no longer be able to secure such power on a preference basis, or at all.

The reversal of this historic policy in the Federal Government will have the effect of turning over for the exclusive benefit and profit of the private power monopoly the major yet-to-be-developed hydroelectric resources of the Nation. The huge investments of the Federal taxpayers in these great projects will be in a large measure handed over for the profitable use of the private utilities.

It gives the private utilities the benefit of the Government's low interest rate on the storage features of these projects used for power—no doubt the power companies would be glad to have the Federal Government build the storage features on all their projects on the same basis.

This would enrich the treasuries of the private utilities but it will leave the general public without the benefit of a low-cost power supply. The private power monopolies, operating with what amounts to a guaranteed profit on their investment, will be able to charge the power consumers whatever price they choose to fix or can wrangle from the various State agencies established for the purpose of regulating power rates. In my opinion, this is exactly the opposite direction to which the American people want to go.

CVP PROJECT CITED

An example of how this policy will operate can be readily seen by asking what would have happened if such a power-partnership principle had been applied in the construction of the Central Valley project. Under those circumstances, the private power company would have built the powerhouses at Shasta and Keswick, paid the Federal Government a price for storing the water in Shasta Dam, and then distributed and sold the power at its established commercial rate throughout its service area in California. There would have been no low-cost Government public power for the farmers in the irrigation districts in California, or for the Federal installations and the municipalities using that power at the present time. There would have been no low-cost public power in the market with which to compare the rates of the private utility, thus forcing a more favorable contract as has been done for the city of Redding. There would be no power to operate the pumps at the delta to lift the water of the Central Valley project to the San Joaquin Valley, unless the Federal Government turned around and bought some of its own power back from the private utility for that purpose, presumably at a much higher rate than is presently being charged the farmers of the San Joaquin Valley for the use of power. The revenues from power which presently are used to subsidize the irrigation development in the San Joaquin Valley would be nonexistent. In short, the Central Valley project would never have been built and today would not be serving the needs and growth of the State of California.

Even a more dramatic example is the possible application of this principle on the power development on the Columbia River. Great industrial development has followed the low-cost available power in the Northwest; however, had private power companies taken over the development of these powerhouses, the cash receipts they paid to the Federal Government for storing the water would be returned to the United States Treasury and the power would have been sold on the market at the going commercial rate. The great aluminum plants that contributed so much during the Second World War would not have grown up around that kind of a power market.

PUBLIC POWER AN ASSET

There is little real distinction between the taxpayers and the power consumers of an area. Everybody who turns on a light pays taxes in one form or another,

and everybody who turns on a light pays a light bill. Low-cost public power produced in this area is a rebate on taxes to every consumer who turns on a light. If that public power is turned over to a private utility, the light consumer pays the commercial rate and the private power company puts the profit in its pocket. Low-cost power is an asset in every area in which it is produced and distributed. History has shown that the volume of use of electricity and industrial growth rises in proportion to the reduction in power rates. That has been true not only in the Northwest, but in the TVA area. Turning the powerhouses on the proposed Trinity River project over to the P. O. & E. Co. is an assessment against every man who uses an electric light or electric power in his business in this whole area.

While belaboring the partnership idea at home, and calling on the local people to build their own projects, no such philosophy is being advocated or put in effect overseas. We are committed to spend nearly \$2 billion—1.7 billion—for irrigation and power developments in foreign lands. This compares with roughly two and one-half billion—\$2.4—spent in over a half century in this country. Not one penny of this foreign expenditure will be repaid, principal or interest, while here at home repayment is becoming the main test for new projects. Why has our Government agreed to give away nearly as much for irrigation and power development in 6 years of the Marshall plan as we spent in 50 years of reclamation here at home? Obviously because it is a good thing for the economies of those countries we are trying to help. I am in favor of doing a little something for America too as we go along—and without a lot of argument about partnership, and how soon the project is going to pay back to the last penny.

PROGRAM INCONSISTENT

But the inconsistency in this administration's clampdown on irrigation and power development does not end there. The projects under construction in Europe today with your money are all for power—nothing for irrigation—a million one hundred and fifty-five thousand and kilowatts—1,155,000 kilowatts. If anyone suggests that the Federal Government here build a steam plant, a howl goes up to high heaven. But in Europe most of the power being built is steam power—900,000 kilowatts of it, only 255,000 in hydroelectric power. We have had knockdown and dragout fights over the Federal Government building transmission lines, but in our foreign aid program we build not only the transmission lines but the distribution systems as well.

Is this "creeping socialism" here at home, and something good and beneficial in foreign countries? The answer is no—it is good for those countries, and it would be good for us. But here we have a well-healed power lobby that picks the pockets of the power consumers in order to poison their minds with false propaganda.

Report of Presidential Committee Regarding Supplies and Reserves of Coal, Oil, and Natural Gas for Defense and Peacetime Requirements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, early in July 1954 a group of Congressmen representing the soft coalfields in eastern United States visited the White House and conferred with President Eisenhower regarding depressed conditions in the industry that were having adverse effects on the railroads and related industries.

After our conference with President Eisenhower the Chief Executive appointed an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, Arthur Flemming, was designated as chairman with the heads of the following agencies serving as members: Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, the Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

The White House directive respecting the committee's assignment included the following specific statements:

At the direction of the President the committee will undertake a study to evaluate all factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources fuels in the United States, with the aim of strengthening the national defense, providing orderly industrial growth, and assuring supplies for our expanding national economy and for any future emergency.

The committee will review factors affecting the requirements and supplies of the major sources of energy including: coal (anthracite, bituminous and lignite, as well as coke, coke tars, and synthetic liquid fuels), petroleum, and natural gas.

The committee has been aided greatly by an able and representative task force appointed pursuant to the President's instructions. The committee's recommendations are set forth as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE REPORT ON ENERGY SUPPLIES AND RESOURCES POLICIES

INTRODUCTION

The importance of energy to a strong and growing economy is clear. As conditions of supplies and reserves of coal, oil, and natural gas change and as both defense and peacetime requirements come more clearly into focus, the bearing of Government policies upon energy needs reexamination.

What degree and kind of public regulation is appropriate to the present situation and future outlook? What trade policies for energy supplies will most effectively express the overlapping national needs for adequate protectable supplies in case of war and for encouragement of economic growth of this country and friendly countries elsewhere in the world? What steps may be taken to improve the economic position of the coal industry, now seriously depressed, without penalizing competing industries, as a means of enhancing the ability of that industry to contribute to the national defense? More particularly, should specific changes be made in tax, freight rate, research, Government purchasing, or other policies in the energy field?

These and other policy questions press for careful review and decision.

On July 30, 1954, the President established an Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy. The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization was designated as chairman and the heads of the following agencies served as members: Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, the Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

The White House directive respecting the committee's assignment included the following specific statements:

"At the direction of the President, the committee will undertake a study to evaluate all factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources fuels in the United States, with the aim of strengthening the national defense, providing orderly industrial growth, and assuring supplies for our expanding national economy and for any future emergency.

"The committee will review factors affecting the requirements and supplies of the major sources of energy including: coal (anthracite, bituminous, and lignite, as well as coke, coke tars, and synthetic liquid fuels); petroleum and natural gas."

The committee has been aided greatly by an able and representative task force appointed pursuant to the President's instructions. The committee's recommendations are set forth below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Natural gas regulation

We believe the problem of natural gas regulation should be approached from the viewpoint of assuring adequate supplies and the discovery and development of additional reserves to support such supplies, in the interests of national defense, an expanding domestic economy, and reasonable prices to consumers.

To secure these objectives, it is essential to give due consideration to (1) the operations known as the production of natural gas, (2) the transportation of gas in interstate transmission lines, and (3) the distribution of gas in municipalities. Individual companies may engage in more than one of these activities. Each operation of such companies should be treated by like criteria according to its appropriate industry function.

In the production of natural gas it is important that sound conservation practices be continued. This area of conservation management is under the jurisdiction of State conservation commissioners. In the interest of a sound fuels policy and the protection of the national defense and consumer interests by assuring such a continued exploration for and development of adequate reserves as to provide an adequate supply of natural gas, we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line.

The interstate transmission of natural gas by the interstate transmission lines and the subsequent sale of such gas for resale is a public utility function and should be under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission. In considering the certification of new lines and applications for increased rates based on new or renegotiated purchase contracts, the Commission should consider, in order to provide protection for the consumer, not only the assurance of supply but also whether the contract prices of the natural gas which the applicant has contracted to buy are competitively arrived at and represent the reasonable market field price, giving due consideration, in the interest of competition, to the reasonableness and appropriateness of contract provisions as they relate to existing or future market field prices.

The several States or their political subdivisions should continue to provide the public utility regulation of distributing com-

panies in accordance with usual utility practices.

Thus the complete cycle of natural gas production, transmission and utilization will be appropriately regulated: the production and conservation of natural gas by the State conservation commissions; the interstate transmission of natural gas by the Federal Power Commission; and the distribution by the local public utility commissions.

2. Sales below cost by interstate pipeline companies

The basic principles regarding the regulation of natural gas and the use of alternative energy resources should be as far as possible that of free choice by the consumer and free and fair competition among suppliers. This, it is confidently thought, will provide most effectively for the assurance and flexibility of energy supply, both for economic growth and strong security readiness. But sales either for resale or direct consumption below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges which drive out competing fuels constitute unfair competition and are inimical to a sound fuels economy.

The committee recommends, therefore, that appropriate action be taken that will prohibit sales by interstate pipelines either for resale or for direct consumption, which drive out competing fuels because the charges are below actual cost plus a fair proportion of fixed charges.

3. Eminent domain for natural-gas storage

The power of eminent domain for the acquisition of surface and mineral rights for the development of underground storage reservoirs should be granted subject to appropriate safeguards to protect the public safety, including the mining industry.

4. Crude oil imports and residual fuel oil imports

An expanding domestic oil industry, plus a healthy oil industry in friendly countries which help to supply the United States market, constitute basically important elements in the kind of industrial strength which contributes most to a strong national defense. Other energy industries, especially coal, must also maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output should that become necessary. In this complex picture both domestic production and imports have important parts to play; neither should be sacrificed to the other.

Since World War II importation of crude oil and residual fuel oil into the United States has increased substantially, with the result that today these oils supply a significant part of the United States market for fuels.

The committee believes that if the imports of crude and residual oils should exceed significantly the respective proportions that these imports of oils bore to the production of domestic crude oil in 1954, the domestic fuels situation could be so impaired as to endanger the orderly industrial growth which assures the military and civilian supplies and reserves that are necessary to the national defense. There would be an inadequate incentive for exploration and the discovery of new sources of supply.

In view of the foregoing, the committee concludes that in the interest of national defense imports should be kept in the balance recommended above. It is highly desirable that this be done by voluntary, individual action of those who are importing or those who become importers of crude or residual oil. The committee believes that every effort should be made and will be made to avoid the necessity of governmental intervention.

The committee recommends, however, that if in the future the imports of crude oil and residual fuel oils exceed significantly the respective proportions that such imported oils bore to domestic production of

crude oil in 1954, appropriate action should be taken.

The committee recommends further that the desirable proportionate relationships between imports and domestic production be reviewed from time to time in the light of industrial expansion and changing economic and national defense requirements.

In arriving at these conclusions and recommendations, the committee has taken into consideration the importance to the economies of friendly countries of their oil exports to the United States as well as the importance to the United States of the accessibility of foreign oil supplies both in peace and war.

5. Petroleum refining capacity

The Departments of Defense and the Interior should have studies made by their staffs and expert advisers as to the adequacy of present and prospective refinery capacity, both as to amount and dispersal, as well as other factors, to determine the need for any measures to maintain refinery capacity necessary for defense purposes, particularly the capacity operated by small, independent refineries.

6. Tax incentives

(a) Present tax provisions on coal, oil, and gas production have been an important factor in encouraging development of energy sources at a pace about in keeping with demand. Further analysis and study by the appropriate branches of the Government should from time to time be made to review the amount and method of making such allowances to maintain proper relationships with continuing changes in other features of the tax law. Any changes which may be proposed in the future must be analyzed in terms of their probable effect on development of domestic resources needed for economic progress and national defense as well as the fiscal and tax policies of the Government.

(b) Retroactive tax legislation and special relief provisions should be avoided.

(c) Accelerated amortization should be used only to insure the maintenance of a sound mobilization base for energy supplies.

7. Research and development program for coal

We recognize that coal is a great national asset and endorse a cooperative study to determine what research and development could be undertaken. The coal industry and both Federal and State Governments should participate in this study and its cost.

8. Unemployment and business distress in the coal industry

We recognize that serious unemployment and business distress exist in the coal industry and recommend that the Interdepartmental Committee on the Soft Coal Industry be continued for the purpose of developing for Cabinet consideration specific action programs to alleviate these conditions.

9. Coal freight rates

In order to maintain coal's vitality as an instrument of national defense by improving currently its ability to compete with other fuels, the railroads, by voluntary action, and, in the absence thereof, the Interstate Commerce Commission, by compulsory order, should adjust freight rates to the extent necessary to remove the excessive and disproportionate contribution that coal rates are making to meet the cost of other unprofitable services of the railroad industry. Train load rates should be established to reflect the lower costs of such service.

10. Coal exports

(a) The Government should urge foreign governments to reduce unreasonable discriminatory restrictions against imports of United States coal.

(b) The Government, when making foreign loans, should use its best efforts to ob-

tain provisions to prevent discrimination against United States coal. Discrimination would be judged to exist when United States coal imports are disallowed despite its availability at costs no higher than foreign coal.

(c) The Government should expedite efforts to establish credits through the Export-Import Bank to foreign banking institutions in countries where there is reasonable prospect of repayment so that American coal exporters can offer more competitive payment terms to foreign customers.

(d) Where United States coal can be supplied competitively with other available coal, the Government should use its best efforts to enlarge the participation of United States coal in the foreign aid program.

(e) The Government should compensate for higher shipping costs when incurred as a result of the requirement that 50 percent of all shipments be in United States ships at fair and reasonable United States market rates.

11. Mobilization requirements for coke

The Committee believes that present and prospective rates of shutdown and dismantling of slot-type coke ovens will leave inadequate coking capacity to support full mobilization production of steel and other essential wartime industry.

On the basis of national security, coke requirements can only be met if the Office of Defense Mobilization is directed to prepare plans to make the necessary arrangements and tests to expand coke production rapidly in the case of an emergency.

12. Government fuel purchasing policy

In working out a more consistent and equitable coal purchase policy, the following steps should be taken:

(a) The Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act should pursue his present policy of making determinations of wage standards applicable in the coal-producing areas and should establish these standards at the earliest practicable date.

(b) The Government agencies should, to the extent practicable, purchase not less than 75 percent of their estimated annual coal requirements on a contract basis.

(c) All Government agencies purchasing coal should, prior to and after the award of the contract, verify the quality of the coal offered and supplied to the agencies.

(d) All Government contracts for the purchase of coal should contain appropriate escalator clauses which protect the buyer and the seller.

(e) In instances where it is not possible for a Government agency to take all the coal for which it has contracted, the deficit should be apportioned equitably among all participating contract suppliers without penalty to the Government.

(f) Coal suppliers should be required to submit, along with their bids, proof of their ability to produce the requirements at the times specified.

(g) All coal suppliers to the Government, regardless of size, should comply with the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

(h) All transactions with the Government relating to coal purchases and supply should be public information.

(i) The domestic fuel purchasing policies set forth above should be applied to purchases of coal by companies acting as agents for the Federal Government, as well as to purchases made direct by Government agencies.

Prior to the purchase of any fuel by a Federal Government agency having a large annual use of fuel, that agency should request advice from the Office of Defense Mobilization as to how this purchase can contribute to the maintenance of a strong mobilization base within the domestic fuels industry. The Office of Defense Mobilization should be directed by Executive order to develop a mechanism for accomplishing this objective.

Tolerant of Our Fellow Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following well-prepared news item from the Revere Journal, Revere, Mass., Thursday, February 24, 1955, which merits the attention of each Member of Congress and people of all nationalities and creed:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

This week has been set aside as Brotherhood Week to foster the spirit of tolerance and good will. Thousands of words will be written, thousands more spoken on the theme that prejudice, antagonism, racial and religious hatreds cannot flourish in this country.

The week will pass. The words, spoken and written, will make little impression. Those who are prejudiced, those who practice racial and religious discrimination, will continue as they have in the past. Good will and tolerance will be nice-sounding words, nothing more.

There is no intention here to decry the efforts of the individuals and groups who are working unselfishly to bring about a better understanding between people of different races and creeds. They are to be highly commended for their work.

Brotherhood Week, however, is a mere gesture, 1 week in the long year in which people are reminded that they should be more tolerant of their fellow men. Those who believe in the equality of man do not need the yearly reminder. Those who preach and practice intolerance and prejudice are not moved by it.

Who wants to be tolerated? Tolerate means to endure, as a pain or hardship. Is that sufficient?

Jefferson declared that all men are created equal. That may be, but it is foolish to say that all men go through life equal. The accident of birthplace is considered important to many. The color of a person's skin makes a great difference. The manner in which a person worships God—the same God—often brings abuse and prejudice.

It doesn't seem possible that here in America, where a peace-loving people has been drawn into two world wars and a third combat in Korea because it couldn't remain indifferent to wanton cruelties, intolerance exists. It doesn't seem possible that prejudice and hatred are so rife that an annual publicity campaign is needed to unmask it.

Revere is so free of prejudice that those who are fortunate enough to live here find it hard to believe that it exists in a dangerous degree in a country that, for more than a century and a half, has been a refuge, a haven for the oppressed and persecuted of other lands.

There is no doubt, however, that this prejudice has assumed alarming proportions no farther away than sections in Greater Boston. It has blazed forth in Milton just as Brotherhood Week is being observed. It has come out into the open where men and women of decent and honorable principles can see it in all its hideousness and lend their efforts to crush it as they would a venomous snake.

If, because of their faith, the Jews are maligned and abused today, is it not probable that the Catholics and others of minority creeds and races may be the chosen victims tomorrow? Another Ku Klux Klan may

spring from this poisonous nucleus, unless stamped out, to burn its fiery crosses on the hills of New England. Crosses that, like the symbol of Nazism, corrupt the Cross of Christianity, deathless personality of Him who died on Calvary that the sentiment of equality, understanding, and sympathy might bind humankind together in a true brotherhood of man.

There is but one way to combat prejudice and religious hatreds and that is by education. Education taught in the homes and in the early grades of the schools when children are young and impressive. Parents have a responsibility in teaching their children that the color, race, or creed of a person is of less importance than his character.

Prejudice is the mangy whip of cowardice. Very few are they who have the courage to admit intolerance. Even though it be the blackest lie, the apostle of prejudice will loudly proclaim that he is free from racial or religious hatreds.

To preach brotherhood is not enough. It must be taught to the young. It must be practiced by men and women throughout the year. Until we accept this priceless virtue of equality we cannot truly call ourselves Americans.

Resolutions Approved by the Illinois State Legislative Committee of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks at Its Fifth Biennial Meeting, Held at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed a letter I received from the Illinois State Legislative Committee of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, together with three resolutions unanimously approved by this committee at its fifth biennial meeting held at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago on January 22-23, 1955:

FEBRUARY 18, 1955.

Hon. PETER F. MACK, JR.,
United States Representative, 21st Congressional District of Illinois, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MACK: At this committee's fifth biennial meeting, held at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago, on January 22-23, 1955, the attached three resolutions were unanimously approved by the delegates in attendance. These delegates (1 from each of the more than 200 local lodges in Illinois) represent some 50,000 members of our organization who reside in this State.

The following descriptions are quite brief as I believe you will find the resolutions self-explanatory:

Resolution No. 4, on Public Law No. 199: We oppose the repeal of this law. As you know, Representative BROVILL has already caused the introduction of H. R. 73, a bill designed to repeal Public Law No. 199. We are opposed to the passage of H. R. 73.

Resolution No. 5, on the question of a minimum wage: We favor a minimum-wage law of at least \$1.25 cents per hour.

Resolution No. 26, on the diversion of mail from railroads to trucks and planes: We oppose this diversion of mail from the railroads.

In behalf of our more than 50,000 Illinois members, I am requesting your support in carrying out the intent of these resolutions.

With appreciation for all past courtesies, and with kind personal regards, I am

Yours truly,

EARL G. QUINN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTION No. 4, SUBMITTED BY ARTHUR W. POST, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, LAKE-SIDE LODGE, No. 2219

Whereas Public Law No. 199, a law to readjust size and weight limitations on shipments entered as fourth-class parcel-post mail, went into effect January 1, 1952; and

Whereas, this law was instrumental in reducing the unfair competition which the Railway Express Agency had suffered through Government-subsidized parcel-post service; and

Whereas this has resulted in an increase in express traffic and reduced unemployment among involuntarily furloughed express members; and

Whereas, our members now employed by the Railway Express Agency have a greater feeling of security in their positions; and

Whereas, the mail-order firms and other heavy users of the subsidized parcel post service were instrumental in having legislation introduced in the 83d Congress, which if passed would have repealed Public Law No. 199; and

Whereas, these same interests will undoubtedly bring about the introduction of legislation designed to repeal or amend Public Law No. 199 in the 84th Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Legislative Committee, in regular session convened, this 22d day of January, 1955, go on record as being opposed to any legislation designed to unfavorably amend, or bring about the repeal of, Public Law No. 199; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois.

RESOLUTION No. 5, SUBMITTED BY ARTHUR W. POST, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, LAKE-SIDE LODGE, No. 2219

Whereas the cost of living has risen steadily during recent years; and

Whereas this high cost of living has reduced countless thousands of our working people to a miserable economic status; and

Whereas the present 75 cents per hour minimum wage is entirely inadequate to meet rising living costs; and

Whereas an increase of the minimum hourly wage base to at least \$1.25 is most necessary to alleviate the sufferings of these people now forced to exist on the starvation minimum wage of 75 cents per hour: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Legislative Committee, in regular session convened, this 22d day of January 1955, go on record as supporting the policy of the American Federation of Labor in requesting the 84th Congress to adopt the base of \$1.25 per hour as the minimum wage and to extend this law to cover millions of workers now exempt; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois.

RESOLUTION No. 26, SUBMITTED BY EARL G. QUINN, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE, LODGE No. 188

Whereas there is a growing tendency on the part of the Post Office Department to divert more and more mail to trucks and planes; and

Whereas the railroads have invested millions of dollars in buildings and equipment to handle the mails; and

Whereas the railroads are required to accept the mail and transport it at the direction of the Postmaster General; and

Whereas many thousands of railroad employees, coming under the class and craft of employees represented by this brotherhood are seriously affected by the diversion of the mails and are being deprived of their employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Legislative Committee, in regular session convened, this 22d day of January 1955, protest this diversion where reasonable rail facilities exist for the transportation of the mails; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our grand president, George M. Harrison, and to all United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Illinois, calling their attention to this serious condition and soliciting their assistance to correct this constantly growing threat to the investment of the carriers and the jobs of the employees.

Weapons Fail To Replace the Human Factor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article that appeared in the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., under date of February 13, 1955:

WEAPONS FAIL TO REPLACE THE HUMAN FACTOR—PROPOSED MILITARY PAY RAISE WILL HELP BOOST MORALE, ENCOURAGE REENLISTMENTS

Despite tremendous scientific advancements, the human factor still determines the success or failure of almost any military maneuver.

Our fighter planes may have the ability to run rings around the Russian MIG's. But they will be shot down if the pilot's ability does not measure up to his aircraft.

Our Navy is equipped with the latest in electronic equipment, and some ships even depend upon Buck Rogers-like rockets for firepower. But unless the fleet has trained men to maintain and operate the equipment, they will be of little more value than the cannons of John Paul Jones' day.

The human factor cannot be ignored even though the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Army thrive on a scientific age.

Thus when Congress considers the military pay-raise bill, it has under study a program essential to the security of the United States. Without a pay raise and an improvement in other benefits the human factor—the morale of our men—will suffer severely.

Insufficient pay for experienced men and the decline in military benefits since 1948 have to a large degree accounted for tremendous turnovers in the military forces. The result has been damaged morale among those men who have stayed in the service, and the costly loss of skilled military manpower.

The service must be made more attractive if it is to retain its efficiency. Those who sacrifice for their country must not be made to suffer because of a failure to consider their problems adequately.

The immediacy of the problem was reflected in the testimony of Navy Secretary Thomas before a House Armed Services Subcommittee:

"It is alarming to note that the Navy over-all reenlistment rate has fallen from 24 percent in fiscal 1954 to 9 percent in the first quarter of 1955," he commented.

The Navy case is not isolated. Only 11.6 percent of the Army personnel reenlisted in 1954 as compared with 41.2 percent in 1949.

It actually costs the Nation money to skimp on military pay and services such as adequate dependents' medical care. It costs \$3,200 for the basic training of each replacement for a man leaving the service. It costs \$2,000 to \$5,000 more for training in technical skills. And the need for these techniques increases almost daily.

A man who is worried because of uncertainty over the medical care of his family or over whether his pay will cover the essentials at home is unlikely to function at top efficiency. Off Formosa or any other area where our Armed Forces are today, this could be disastrous for both the individual and the Nation.

The Folly of Low Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the *Chelsea Record*, Tuesday, March 1, 1955, which points out why we must maintain reasonable tariffs to protect our industries and our workers from the competition of cheap foreign labor:

TARIFFS, OPTICS, AND SECURITY

Recently, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, Henry S. Woodbridge, vice president of American Optical Co., spoke on pending legislation to change the Federal tariff structure. Points he raised were vital ones, particularly to people in communities where there are optical plants. Chelsea is such a community, with an American Optical Co. plant at 80 Heard Street.

Mr. Woodbridge opposed the proposed change in tariff regulations which would reduce import duties and thereby increase the flow of optical goods, particularly instruments at present, into this country from foreign sources. The proposal, basically, calls for a 3-year extension of the reciprocal agreements, with the President having the authority to reduce duties by 5 percent each year for 3 years.

Imported microscopes and other instruments already present a serious situation for American Optical Co. and all other instrument makers. West Germany, Italy, England and Japan already are sending items to this country in ever-increasing numbers. For example: In 1947, imports represented one percent of the total microscope sales in this country. In 1954 the same figure was 44 percent. Because of the far lower wage scales and living standards in those countries, these imports far undersell domestic products. This, naturally, reduces the volume of the optical business, and the number of jobs in the industry.

The question Mr. Woodbridge raised was: If the optical industry in the United States is eliminated by foreign competition, who will make the necessary instrumentation in the event of a national emergency? If overseas sources of precision optical apparatus should be cut off—as they have been twice in recent history—where would the United States find

the workers to make the lenses and prisms necessary for range-finders, bomb sights and fire-control equipment?

Skilled workers in these fields are not trained in weeks or months. It takes years. If there is no civilian industry—no place where these workers can earn a living at their trade—there will be no skills available if an emergency arises.

An amendment to the proposed bill has been submitted by the industry. It calls only for investigation by the Defense Mobilization Board of circumstances which might threaten national defense or public health with findings and recommendation to be sent to the President for suitable action.

Congress will, eventually, be influenced in this matter by the thinking of the people. Industry has expressed its opinion. People who do likewise may be helping to protect themselves—and their country.

Statehood This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the February 23, 1955, edition of the *New York Times*:

STATEHOOD THIS YEAR?

The cause of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is not being helped by the evidently divided opinions on the subject within the administration. The State Department is in favor of the admission of both, the Secretary of Defense says Alaska should remain a Territory for the present, the Secretary of the Interior says he personally favors admission of both but with a reservation regarding Alaska, and the President has been in favor of admitting Hawaii but cool toward Alaska.

Furthermore, the congressional approach has confused the issue more than it has clarified it. During the last Congress the House approved statehood for Hawaii, but the Senate tacked Alaska onto the same measure, with the result that no bill on this subject was passed by both Houses. The explanation for this congressional maneuvering is that the Republicans want to admit Hawaii but the Democrats seem determined that neither Territory will be admitted unless both are. Now, with the new Congress, the tug-of-war has begun again, but in somewhat different form.

This time it is the House Interior Committee that has approved a joint Hawaii-Alaska bill with the novel provision that 40 percent of northwestern Alaska may be reserved by the President for military purposes. It has always been the contention of this newspaper, which favors the admission of both Hawaii and Alaska, that the two areas should be handled entirely separately. There is no logical reason why they should be linked, except from the standpoint of partisan politics. However, the prospects for both together do look brighter for this session, inasmuch as the resistance to the joint bill last year came from the House, but this year it is a House committee that has taken the initiative in offering its own joint bill.

The amendment reserving up to 40 percent of northwestern Alaska for military purposes was added to the bill in committee after it was reported that President Eisenhower would veto it without this provision. We see no reason for objection to this amend-

ment, which is reminiscent of the proposal Governor Heintzelman of Alaska made last April that statehood be granted only to the southeastern half of the Territory. There have been differing views as to the effect of statehood on Alaska's military position; but this amendment ought to set at rest all serious doubts on that score.

Prepare To Begin Work on Beardstown's New Seawall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Journal, of Springfield, Ill., under date of February 27, carried an article dated at Beardstown, Ill., February 26, to this effect, and I quote:

Prepare To Begin Work on the Beardstown's New Seawall.

Beardstown, Mr. Speaker, is in Cass County, Ill., and in the 20th Illinois District. Representing that area, it was my privilege to introduce a bill for the original authorization for this work which is just starting as outlined in the Illinois State Journal.

Many years ago at the expense of the city of Beardstown and the State of Illinois, a so-called seawall was constructed. It is my understanding that at that time, the engineers stated this wall was constructed 28 feet and would be high enough to hold back any flood water of the Illinois River that might come in the future. This did not prove to be correct. In 1943, when the Illinois River was at flood stage this same seawall had to be sandbagged to a height of over 32 feet. Even then, their situation was so precarious that older people and children were evacuated from the city.

Last year, the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee included funds to start this project which is just now beginning to take shape. The budget this year has additional funds recommended to be allotted for further construction. The total cost of this project, Mr. Speaker, is estimated at \$3 million. This is to protect a city of over 6,000 people, factories, flour mills, railroad shops, churches, schools, and homes. It is justified in every way.

I simply wish to take a few moments before the Congress to personally thank the United States Army engineers in Washington, in Peoria, and in the Chicago office for their help and cooperation. I wish to thank the Civil Functions Subcommittee for their fine cooperation as well as the full Appropriations Committee. I wish to thank the entire membership of the House for agreeing to the authorization and the first appropriation.

I am doing this, Mr. Speaker, knowing full well that the citizens of Beardstown agree with my statements here today in thanking the House in their behalf for what they have done.

PREPARE TO BEGIN WORK ON BEARDSTOWN'S NEW SEAWALL

BEARDSTOWN, February 26.—Work of driving the sheet piling, which is a preliminary to the beginning of construction of the new seawall here, will start Monday. Several men started unloading the several large loads of piling Wednesday and 10 men will be on hand Monday.

The Peoria Barge Terminal Co. has the subcontract for putting down the piling. The Myers Construction Co., which has established offices at Main and Jackson Streets, has the contract for building the \$3 million wall.

House Democrats Put Politics First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following editorial taken from the Des Moines Register of February 23, 1955:

HOUSE DEMOCRATS PUT POLITICS FIRST

Now that the House has passed the indefensible \$20-a-person tax-cut bill, it's up to the Democrats in the United States Senate to demonstrate that the party isn't completely irresponsible with respect to the Nation's fiscal and tax policies.

We think they will. Democrats like Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, will do their best to see that this purely political tax plan does not become effective. They must recognize that it not only would be bad for the Nation but it also would be bad for the Democratic Party.

The House vote was partly explained—but not excused—by the fact that Speaker SAM RAYBURN got mad at some of the attacks on Democrats and at some of the arguments used by Republicans. But a good record of Democratic cooperation on foreign policy and on such issues as the reciprocal trade treaties doesn't justify playing unadulterated politics on a tax plan of this kind.

This tax proposal isn't designed to correct any inequities in the tax structure, nor is it designed to stimulate business. It is inconsistent with demands of many Democrats for increased defense spending. It has no relationship to revenue needs and expenditures. It would increase deficit spending and invite inflation.

If the \$20-tax-cut plan were standing alone—and on its merits—there wouldn't be so much reason to worry about it. The President could kill it with a veto in the event both the House and Senate approved it.

But the plan isn't standing alone or on its merits. It is attached to an important revenue-producing proposal. The \$20 cut wouldn't go into effect until January 1, 1956. The tax bill, however, must be passed by March 31 or lower corporation and excise taxes automatically go into effect. The purpose of the tax bill is to see that the Government doesn't lose some \$2 billion revenue. That purpose would be defeated by including the \$20-tax-cut plan in the bill—and it also would be defeated by a veto of the bill.

So it is very important for Senators to recognize that the responsibility of trying to keep the Nation's economy sound is, like the Nation's foreign policy, a nonpartisan objective. It shouldn't be endangered by trying to win some votes with a \$20 handout.

H. R. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 the House passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to which I was opposed and voted against because of the domestic market being faced with cheap foreign articles that are imported into this country in direct competition with our industries. Our industries are suffering from the lack of markets, and this ultimately produces unemployment.

My position is well fortified through a news article from the Escanaba Daily Press, a daily newspaper published in my congressional district. The article sets forth conditions that exist in a small industry of the 11th District of Michigan.

Under permission granted, I include the article entitled "Cheap Foreign Plywood Is Threat to United States Industry," and that it become a part of the RECORD so my colleagues may be informed as to how cheap foreign products are threatening small industries in the United States of America:

CHEAP FOREIGN PLYWOOD IS THREAT TO UNITED STATES INDUSTRY

The American hardwood plywood industry, taking an alarmed look at the rising tide of unfair import competition, is asking that tariff concessions be modified and quotas imposed on imports of hardwood plywood.

The story of the import plywood problem and its effect upon the industry in Escanaba, Gladstone, and throughout the Nation was told recently in Escanaba by R. D. Behm, Chicago, director of the trade-promotion program for the Hardwood Plywood Institute. Behm talked to the Escanaba Rotary Club, where he was introduced by Russell Lee, Birds Eye Veneer Co. official.

Behm reported that the domestic industry is being seriously injured by tariff reductions that have resulted in a sharp rise in imports.

LOST 300 JOBS

"The imported plywoods are being sold in America at unfair prices much below those required by domestic producers to remain in business," Behm noted. He said the Hardwood Plywood Institute cited these facts in an application for an investigation by the United States Tariff Commission.

The application to the Tariff Commission to modify tariff concessions on cheaply produced foreign plywood and impose quotas on imports will be heard in Washington on March 22.

Birds Eye Veneer Co. and Northwestern Plywood and Veneer will be among members of the Hardwood Plywood Association represented at the hearing. These 2 local industries, together with related woods and sawmill operations, have lost an estimated 300 jobs to the community because of the cheap foreign imports.

The mounting volume of imports, according to the application, has decreased domestic producers' share of the American market, depressed domestic prices, and caused substantial unemployment and wage losses among American plywood workers.

IMPORTS CLIMBING

Tariff concessions were made in 1936, 1949, and 1950, the application pointed out. The

last revision provided for reductions of up to 50 percent from the rates prevailing in 1949.

Detailing the results of the lowered duties, the application asserted that—

Imports rose from 63,362,000 square feet in 1950 to 220,424,000 square feet in 1953, an increase of 348 percent. They have continued to climb in 1954, amounting to 133,750,000 square feet in the first half of the year, compared with 98,831,000 square feet in the corresponding period of 1953. This represented a gain of 35.3 percent. Third quarter totals recently released show imported plywood amounting to 124 million square feet against domestic production of 177 million square feet.

Japan, which accounts for 57.4 percent of the imports, boosted its shipments to this country by 506 percent last year, as compared with 1952. Finland, the second-largest exporter, registered a gain of 583 percent.

FLOODING THE MARKET

Shipments of domestic producers, on the other hand, dropped from 451,663,000 square feet in the first 6 months of 1953 to 337,043,000 square feet in the first half of this year.

In 1951 the ratio of domestic hardwood plywood on the domestic market was 12 square feet to each square foot of imported plywood. By the first half of this year the ratio had shrunk to 2.5 square feet to one. Currently, the rate is closer to 1.4 square feet to one.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the price index for hardwood plywood declined from 108.4 in 1953 to 101.9 for January and February 1954. The price index for all commodities, however rose from 110.1 in 1953 to 110.8 for January of this year.

HUGE WAGE LOSS

A survey of 43 domestic plywood plants, among the industry's total of 142, revealed that employment was 19.3 percent lower in the first quarter of 1954 than in the similar period of 1953. The reduction in hours worked amounted to 26.8 percent.

Estimated wage losses to American workers as a result of this curtailed output was \$2 million. Extension of the same rate of reduction to the entire industry would indicate a total wage loss of \$5 million to \$3 million for that period.

The Institute's membership accounts for about 60 percent of the total domestic production of market hardwood plywood, according to the application.

While Canada is among the larger plywood exporting countries, the application said, production costs of Canadian manufacturers do not permit them to sell at prices comparable to the unfair prices charged by Japanese and Finnish producers.

Eleven-Year-Old Girl Gains Recognition for Work in Scientific Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Miss Lucy Ehrlich, of 100 Thayer Street, New York City, an 11-year-old girl, has recently been notified that her work in scientific research is worthy of recognition and accordingly she received a plaque for her remarkable collection of insects.

Lucy is the granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leo Ehrlich, old and dear friends of mine, and both they and I are very proud of her.

I took it upon myself to write to this gifted youngster in congratulations and good wishes for her achievement, and in encouragement of her continued interest in science. I wrote to her as an indication of the recognition that I think is due to those young Americans who, by their devotion to science, are strengthening our country and contributing to a more informed world.

Letter to a Pro-Communist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by Stewart Alsop appeared in his column Matter of Fact in the New York Herald Tribune of February 27, 1955. I direct it to the attention of our colleagues:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

LETTER TO A PRO-COMMUNIST

Was the recantation of self-confessed liar Harvey Matusow carefully stage managed by the Communists? There are signs that it was. For example, as noted in a previous report on the Matusow turnabout, Cameron & Kahn, the publishing firm which is sponsoring the Matusow confession, has a decidedly pro-Communist coloration. And because it bears on this point, it may be worth reproducing, slightly shortened, a letter from this reporter to Publisher Albert Kahn, written after a telephone conversation some 10 days ago:

"DEAR KAHN: When I talked to you on the telephone the other day, you declined to say whether you were a Communist. You said you would take the fifth amendment if asked this question by a congressional committee. And you indicated your true political position in other ways. Accordingly, I think I ought to make my own position clear in the matter of Harvey Matusow's self-exposure, and the issues which it involves.

"It is fashionable nowadays to say that McCarthyism is the greatest threat to American freedom. This may be so, but the fact remains that McCarthyism owes its existence to American communism. Communism, moreover, presents a most serious issue to those who respect our liberties, however much this issue, to the delight of the Communists, has been distorted by McCarthy and those who ape him.

"The issue is this: Should we grant full political rights to those who owe their first allegiance to a potential enemy? On the telephone, you denied that your first allegiance was to the Soviet Union. Maybe so. But as I said on the telephone, only a fool could doubt that the first allegiance of the disciplined, hard-core Communist belongs to Russia, and not to his own country. Therefore, the issue posed above is a real one which needs to be answered. To anyone sensible of the American traditions it is as prickly and difficult an issue as there is.

"Anyone so sensible, for example, will defend against all comers your right, or anyone else's right, to take the fifth amendment. McCarthy's public contempt for this con-

stitutional safeguard is subversive, in the real sense of that word. But this does not mean that it is necessary to admire the motives of those who take the fifth amendment.

"When I made this point to you on the telephone, you complained that people who are not Communists, and so swear under oath, are likely to be jailed for perjury. Asked to name one such, you cited your friend Clinton Jencks, of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. Now it may be that Jencks was not a formal member of the Communist Party when he swore that he was not a Communist, to comply with the Taft-Hartley law. And there is also no doubt that Matusow lied about Jencks on the witness stand. But this is no sort of evidence that Jencks has actually changed his true political allegiance.

"And there is a most real and present danger in the control of labor unions by those who owe their allegiance to another country. The danger was greater, to be sure, when the Communists, in 1947 and 1948, almost succeeded in seizing control of the CIO—and I am proud that my brother and I played a part in exposing that effort. But the danger is still real.

"This leaves unanswered the question of how to deal with this danger of communism in a free society without creating a greater danger. But one thing I am sure of. Nothing plays more into Communist hands than for the Government to accept the word of any ex-Communist like Matusow who happens along. In taking at face value the testimony of such a man—and he is not alone—without a serious attempt to examine his credibility, the Justice Department and the congressional committee were inexcusably at fault.

"Your taking the fifth amendment will not excuse the fault. Nor, indeed, will the fault be excused if it turns out that the whole Matusow turnabout was carefully planned by the Communists, as I am rather beginning to believe it was. Your Communist friends may think that they have brought off a major coup. But they will be wrong.

For—if only the Congress and the Justice Department have the courage to undertake a serious examination of the new profession of the ex-Communist political informer—Matusow's self-exposure will in the end be good for the political health of the United States. And anything that is good for the political health of the United States is hardly in the long run to the advantage of communism.

"Yours sincerely."

Perhaps two footnotes to this letter need to be added. First, in all fairness it should be said that Kahn vehemently denies that there was any Communist plot to exploit Matusow. Second, a few days after this letter was written, Kahn did take the fifth amendment.

School Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed a letter I received from Mr. Charles Romani, assistant superintendent of schools, Bond County Community, Unit No. 2, Greenville, Ill.:

BOND COUNTY COMMUNITY,

UNIT NO. 2,

Greenville, Ill., February 28, 1955.

HON. PETER F. MACK,

Congressman, 21st Congressional District, State of Illinois.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in protest of the proposed \$16-million cut in Federal school-lunch appropriations for the next school year. As school-lunch sponsor of our school unit I am definitely interested in improving child health by means of the school-lunch program. This cannot be done if funds are cut eliminating section 6 commodities. Commodities such as canned fruits, canned vegetables, citrus products, and peanut butter are necessary in preparing attractive and well-balanced meals for schoolchildren.

The justification offered for this cut by the Secretary of Agriculture is unrealistic and misleading. There will not be enough surplus commodities distributed next year to offset the loss of section 6 commodities. We can't operate the program on promises. Distribution this year is running behind that of last year and there is no reason to believe that it will be increased next school term. More than likely it will be reduced because the only surplus commodities that the Department of Agriculture has on hand and can count on for next year are dairy products and fats and oils.

The Department of Agriculture's estimate of the value of surplus commodities to be distributed for the past 2 years has been too high. During the school term 1954-55 their estimate was at least 60 percent too high.

The program cannot stand a cut. I would appreciate any help that you may give in seeing to it that there is no Federal reduction in the school-lunch program.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES ROMANI,
Assistant Superintendent.

Ernest Hemingway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in 1954, a coveted honor was awarded to a distinguished native of Oak Park, Ill., when Mr. Ernest Hemingway received the Nobel prize for literature. Another tribute, which I am sure was warmly appreciated by Mr. Hemingway, was occasioned by the announcement of this award.

This tribute came from a group of outstanding Pan-American scholars and educators, assembled at the bicentennial conference of Columbia University on Responsible Freedom in the Americas, and was the result of the only resolution approved by the conference. Six former presidents of Latin American Republics were participants in the conference, Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, of Colombia; Dr. Eduardo Santos, of Colombia; Dr. Galo Plaza, of Ecuador; Dr. Ricardo Alfaro, of Panama; Dr. Otilio Ulate, of Costa Rica; and Dr. Carlos Davila, of Chile, who is now secretary general of the Organization of American States.

The conference approved a resolution submitted by Dr. Jorge Manach, of Cuba, which called for a commendatory message to be sent to Mr. Hemingway, and

the following message was sent in behalf of the conference:

By awarding Ernest Hemingway the literature prize for 1954, the Nobel Prize Committee has rendered a well-deserved tribute to a great novelist whose works have reflected with virile energy a passion for liberty and justice, a love of the heroic in man, and a generous concern for human suffering. Assembled on the occasion of the bicentennial conference of Columbia University on Responsible Freedom in the Americas, writers and teachers of both Americas send their congratulations to the great author of *The Old Man and the Sea*. In their behalf this message is sent.

The Economic Position of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the *Diario Las Americas*, a bilingual newspaper published in Miami and which covers all of Latin-America, under the date of Saturday, February 19, 1955:

THE ECONOMIC POSITION OF THE AMERICAS
Amidst the fluctuations of hemispheric politics which seem to be reaching a climax of anxiety, we have to note an ever more pressing problem: The true situation of the economy of the Americas following the conference at Rio de Janeiro.

On many occasions we have referred to the urgency of raising to the point of efficient and rapid labor, the cooperation of the United States in Latin America. At no time have we insinuated gifts which the majority repudiates, but rather we have referred to loans made through the Export and Import Bank. In the past, we have said that this institution has an enormous responsibility in its hands, the importance of which will have repercussions in the whole future of the Americas. Many times we have pointed out, that the operations of the Export and Import Bank up to the present, have represented profits for the United States in all sectors. Profits derived from the interest in its money, profits for United States citizens who carry out the projects financed by the loans, profits for the industry of this country which is assured of a Latin American market despite its high prices.

The Export-Import Bank appeared to have a great opportunity after the Conference at Rio de Janeiro. A policy of ample credit and above all, fast handling methods, seemed to be in the offering for the hemisphere. Up until now, judging by the information we receive from Latin America, such a policy does not seem to be in full swing. At least public opinion in the Americas, has not heard any reports which would change certain conclusions about the bank's operations being still restricted by underground forces governed by higher authorities.

Our editorial comment is the result of the considered opinions of distinguished Latin Americans who, in Washington and in their own countries maintain that, up until now, the small and less developed countries are still encountering serious difficulties in obtaining loans from the Export-Import Bank for essential projects, such as highways, electrification, airports, etc.

In conclusion, we want to say that the Export-Import Bank at the present time

is one of the most important agencies of the United States Government. Many millions of the citizens of this hemisphere, who need opportunities for development through loans and not gifts or gracious concessions, have placed their hopes in it.

To liberally open the reserves of the Export-Import Bank is to comply with an obligation toward a strong sector of United States taxpayers who, without the aid of that Government agency, will see themselves displaced from the large Latin American markets. It is not a case, then, of merely complying with the offer of the United States delegation in Rio de Janeiro, but rather of satisfying a pressing need of hemispheric subsistence.

Block Ike Plain Is Brainchild of Economic Planners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, there are people in this country who sincerely believe that the free enterprise economic system is no good and should be replaced either piecemeal or entirely by some form of state socialism.

Why, when all evidence points to the fact that our present system of free enterprise is the greatest system ever devised by the mind of man for his own betterment, these people persist in their beliefs is a mystery to me. They need but look at the result of state socialism wherever it has been tried to see physical evidence of its inadequacies.

An interesting article in the current issue of the U. S. News & World Report detailing the deterioration of Britain's defenses observes that the quantity and quality of that Nation's armaments went into immediate decline during her post-war flirtation with socialism. Under the socialistic scheme of things neither peacetime nor wartime items flowed into Britain's economy as they did under the free-enterprise system.

Nevertheless the economic planners in this country are determined in their efforts "to halt and reverse the Eisenhower administration's counteroffensive on behalf of private enterprise and less government dictation" as is set forth in the following column by Ray Tucker:

HALT IKE PLAN WELL DESIGNED

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—The most unpublicized conflict at Washington today concerns the attempt of the so-called economic planners of New Deal stamp to halt and reverse the Eisenhower administration's counteroffensive on behalf of private enterprise and less Government dictation.

Opponents of Ike's milder measures have two main objectives: They do not expect to enact their more advanced and radical proposals at this session, awaiting possible return to power in 1956 or 1960. They plan to expand or to kill off his offerings.

They do not want them to be given even a temporary trial lest the success of the measures check their movement for Government intervention and operation in almost every field of human activity.

"ECONOMIC POULTICES"

They argue, for instance, that Eisenhower proposals on Federal aid to health, education, and highways are mere economic poultices. The most spectacular example of the conflict in philosophy is illustrated by the quarrel over Washington's contribution to improvement of national health.

Ike wants the work to be done by private insurance companies with minimum financial assistance from the Government. The "planners," who resemble the British Fabians that led Britain step by step into a Labor-Socialist regime, demand compulsory health insurance. They would finance their bedside scheme along the lines of social security—namely, by direct payments from everybody's pay check.

If Ike's plan is adopted and gives promise of success in its initial stages, their alternative will lose its appeal. There is nothing so difficult to defeat as demonstrated success in politics.

Similar strategy has been applied to the farm problem. Ike believes that flexible price supports will maintain farm income, lower retail prices, dispose of surpluses. The planners still insist on the Brannan plan, with Uncle Sam paying the difference between the market price and the higher Government-financed support figures.

PRIVATE EXPANSION PLAN

Likewise with power. As in the Dixon-Yates contract, the White House seeks to limit the Government's investments and operations in this field, as well as in atomic developments. President Eisenhower advocates private expansion to a maximum degree under a partnership of local, private, and Federal interests.

His enemies demand continued Government production of power, although Uncle Sam and local political units now generate about 20 percent of the Nation's electricity.

The planners want Washington aid in obtaining contracts for a guaranteed annual wage. They demand higher minimum-wage levels, to be policed and enforced by NLRB and the Labor Department. They insist upon greater control of credit by Treasury and the Federal Reserve System.

They urge a vast public-works building blueprint after the pattern of Roosevelt-Ickes-Hopkins programs in the depression. They shout for far larger foreign-aid funds, with the United States economic reforms aboard.

AIM TO DEFEAT IKE'S COMPROMISES

Although recognizing that fulfillment of their dreams and ambitions under Republican rule is impossible, the liberals' main aim is to keep alive agitation for their schemes. When they recapture the White House and Congress, they hope to transform them into reality. Meanwhile, they must defeat Ike's milder compromises.

Ironically, they may get help from GOP conservatives on Capitol Hill, who think that Ike is too radical. They refuse to recognize his program as a holding action.

Expulsion of Russia From the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting to the House of Representatives an editorial entitled

"Why Russia Should Be Expelled From the U. N." by David Lawrence, editor of the U. S. News & World Report. This editorial strikes me with peculiar force and the thoughts contained therein should receive our most careful attention. It seems to me that the Communists have abused the privilege of being members of the United Nations to the point that we can serve the free world best by expulsion. I, therefore, find myself in hearty agreement with the thoughts in this editorial.

WHY RUSSIA SHOULD BE EXPELLED FROM THE U. N.

(By David Lawrence)

Much of the trouble in which the free governments of the world find themselves today is due to a failure to steer by the compass of moral principle.

Governments that appease the aggressor go from the frying pan into the fire as they build up complications for themselves by their successive retreats.

The indictment was summed up succinctly last week by Secretary of State Dulles when he said:

"The United Nations Charter of 1945 binds 60 nations to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force. But there has been armed aggression in Korea which was promoted by Soviet Russia, and later Communist China was found guilty of armed aggression there."

The world for some time has known about the repeated violations of the U. N. Charter by the Soviet Union. The principal evidence was furnished by its own representative, who publicly boasted to the U. N. in March 1953 that the Soviet Union had supplied armaments to the Red China government throughout the Korean war. In that war more than 33,500 American boys were killed and 103,000 wounded.

The Soviet Union, moreover, gave military assistance to Red China notwithstanding the fact that in February 1951 the Peiping government was formally declared by resolution of the U. N. to be an aggressor. The Moscow Government ignored the U. N. warning that all members should refrain from rendering assistance to the aggressor.

The act of aggression is even more flagrant because it has been directed against the armed forces of the United Nations itself.

The United Nations is still in a state of war with both the Communist Chinese and the Communist government of North Korea. An armistice has been signed, but no treaty of peace has been consummated. Nevertheless military aid to the aggressors from Soviet Russia continues. Russian-built MIG's are commonplace in the skies of Korea.

This is in the face of the plain language of article 2 of the Charter, which provides: "All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action."

The United Nations Charter specifies exactly how offenses of a traitorous member shall be dealt with by the other members. Article 6 reads as follows:

"A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

It will be argued, of course, that the Security Council would not so recommend because the Soviet Union could block such a step by exercising her veto in the council. The fact is, however, that the Soviet Union, being a party to the dispute, would have no right to vote at all. Article 27 of the charter

covers that point by declaring that decisions of the Security Council shall be made by an affirmative vote of 7 members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members, provided, however, that "a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting."

It has been contended that the Soviet Union had obligations under a treaty with China to come to the assistance of that country on the basis of an offensive and defensive alliance. But article 103 says:

"In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the members of the United Nations under the present charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present charter shall prevail."

The charter declares that membership in the United Nations shall be open to "peace-loving States" willing to accept the obligations of membership. The Soviet Union, however, has disregarded its obligations to the U. N.

By aiding Red China and North Korea, which are at war with the United Nations, the Soviet Government has forfeited its seat in the U. N. That seat should be declared vacant by a formal resolution. It would constitute notification to the people of Soviet Russia that their government had demonstrated its incapacity to fulfill international obligations, and had become a menace to peace-loving nations. The kind of government a nation chooses is its own affair, but only up to the point where such a government does not become a threat to world peace.

Some day, when a free government arises in Russia, the seat in the U. N. declared vacant could be awarded to such a new government. But today the Moscow regime must be expelled if the United Nations is to retain the respect of the world as an organization obedient to law—the words of its own charter.

**American Good Government Society
Honors Hon. Howard W. Smith, of
Virginia**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955**

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend, on Tuesday evening, February 22, 1955, the third annual George Washington awards dinner of the American Good Government Society.

The American Good Government Society was formed in 1942 for the purpose of fostering good government in America and to reinspire a wide and deeper appreciation of the American political system, through a clearer understanding of it.

This organization is endeavoring to bring to our citizens the realization of the importance of maintaining our Government as it was founded and set up under the Constitution. It is rendering a real and important service to the country.

In 1952 the society established the George Washington awards that it presents to outstanding citizens who have rendered distinguished service beyond the call of duty to good government in America.

It has presented two awards for each of the past 3 years. In 1953 the society honored Senator HARRY F. BYRD and the late Senator Robert A. Taft. In 1954 the recipients were the Honorable Herbert Hoover and Gov. Allan Shivers, of Texas. This year, the society honored the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH, Member of the House of Representatives from Virginia, and Gen. Robert E. Wood.

I am most pleased that the outstanding services that Representative SMITH has rendered our Nation are being recognized by the presentation of this award.

"Judge" SMITH, as he is affectionately called by his colleagues and many friends, is one of the outstanding statesmen of America today. He stands for and represents the highest ideals in public life. He is one of the most beloved as well as one of the most influential Members of the House of Representatives. He is admired for his keen intellect, his ability to grasp a situation quickly and for his determination to do what he thinks is right and best for his country regardless of the political consequences. All of us love and admire him for the statesmanship he has exhibited down through the years and join with the society in its description of his virtues set out in the award which is as follows:

HOWARD WORTH SMITH, statesman, lawyer, farmer and banker, has served the public well for more than 30 years—as judge and as Representative in Congress, becoming chairman of the Committee on Rules in the 84th Congress.

Among his notable achievements are the Smith Act of 1940, which declared the law under which Communist leaders have been convicted, and the constructive investigation of the National Labor Relations Board which led to the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

Law is the eternal sense of justice of the community. Law is because law was, unwritten, unfolding and growing as man moves slowly toward civilization. Spurious edicts, pretending to be law but not law at all, are struck down when the law is restored.

In any early restoration of law the wisdom of Judge SMITH will be a vital influence. We can rejoice in numbering this Virginia gentleman among the Nation's most illustrious sons.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I herewith include the address delivered by the Honorable HOWARD W. SMITH on the night of February 22, 1955, when the American Good Government Society bestowed upon him its George Washington good government award:

The basic ground rules of good government upon which our Republic was founded was the principle that matters of controversy between the States and relations with foreign governments should be delegated to the Federal Government, while the solution of all domestic and local problems should be reserved to the respective States.

It was the guiding principle of the framers of our Constitution.

It was the very heart of the contract between the Thirteen Original Colonies as expressed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It was implicit throughout every word, every sentence, and every paragraph.

It was summed up so that "he who runs might read," in the brief words of the 10th amendment: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor

prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

When that amendment was adopted, as the last and final clause in the Bill of Rights, the American people meant it. The great bulk of the American people, regardless of party affiliation, mean it just as earnestly today.

The difference is that the framers of the Constitution were painfully aware of their recent wrongs that required remedy. As the country grew and prospered, the people became neglectful and indifferent to the basic principles of government that brought about that growth and prosperity.

A spirit of slothful indifference replaced alert determination. Today we have reached a point of centralized government that has swallowed up the reserve states rights. We have transferred the administration of justice away from home into the strange and far away hands of the Federal Courts.

The legislative department has usurped the power to deal with a multitude of local problems reserved by the Constitution to the States and in doing so has delegated to the executive department the power to fill in the details of administration by regulations having the force and effect of law. While the Chief Executive confronted with a huge and overwhelming mass of administrative detail has, in turn, delegated the power to make regulations to sundry minor executives not elected by or responsible to the people.

Each such departure from constitutional standards has directly or indirectly deprived the citizen of some constitutional liberty until today the individual American citizen is gradually being placed under compulsion and his daily life and activities controlled by the judgment of the Federal courts, the acts of Congress, and the edicts of the executive department to an extent never remotely conceived by the authors of the Constitution.

Today we have what might be called government by delegation of authority.

Local communities have delegated to State legislatures local problems that could best be solved at home, in return for a mess of financial pottage from the State legislatures.

The State governments have delegated to the Congress problems that could be best solved at home by the States, in return for handouts from the Federal Treasury of their own money. Congress, in turn, catching the spirit of the times, has passed out the appropriations from money derived from taxes imposed upon the citizens of the States and exported to Washington to be, in turn, doled back to the States after deduction of an appropriate but substantial toll. Along with the appropriations and as a condition, go laws curtailing the freedom of the citizen, and then the whole impossible mess is turned over to the Executive to administer, abdicating to him the legislative power to make regulations having the effect of law, a violation of which subjects the citizen to criminal penalties in the Federal courts. But the end of delegation is not yet. The President delegates the authority given him by Congress to the heads of departments and agencies. They, in turn, delegate it to the heads of bureaus; and to whom the bureaus delegate the actual writing of these regulations or laws, only God knows.

Congress finally found it necessary to provide for a daily publication known as the Federal Register, in which the executive departments are required to publish each day all new regulations which now control the lives and activities of our citizens.

I mention this for the information of the unwary citizen, who may prefer what freedom he still enjoys to a Federal jail house, with the advice that he peruse the Federal Register along with his daily paper.

On top of this whole mess of delegation, administration and confusion sits the judicial department, the ultimate and final arbiter of our constitutional rights.

So when the Supreme Court speaks the final word we all, including the present spaker, relieve our blood pressure by exercising our remaining constitutional prerogative of abusing the court.

What is the remedy?

There is only one.

Congress reflects the will of the people. The will of the people is transmitted to Congress by those who make the loudest noise, and the most convincing threats of political reprisal.

Until and unless the great mass and majority of our thinking people awaken to their responsibility and assert their demands for sound and constitutional government and a return to the constitutional limits upon the functions of the Federal Government, we shall continue the present policy until some time, some sad day, we find that we have gone too far to retrace our steps.

In a democracy a people get the kind of government they deserve.

If they think little, they deserve little. If they do little about it, they get little results.

If the present trend of government away from the sovereignty and the reserved rights of the States is wrong, as I believe it is tragically wrong, it will continue wrong as long as a slothful and indifferent people remain impervious to, and neglectful of, the danger signals flying all about them.

Misquoting Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune should enlighten some of our oratorical statesmen who quote our first president so frequently on American foreign policy:

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL

Washington's warning in his Farewell Address against "permanent alliances" (Jefferson later used the term "entangling alliances") is often stressed in February 22 orations by the isolationist group. A conservative Republican rally in Chicago on Lincoln's Birthday this year brought forth attacks on the United Nations and a charge that American foreign policy is no longer American.

Actually, the isolationists take Washington's phrase out of context in order to fit their purposes. In averring that "Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation," Washington was warning at the time against a specific danger, not setting a future policy for the Nation. His concern was over the wedge driven between Americans by the French Revolution.

All Americans had hailed the Revolution with joy at first. Washington had accepted the key of the Bastille, the police fortress stormed by the French populace, as a "token of the victory gained by liberty." But as the French revolt developed excess after excess, conservative Americans turned sharply against it.

Most Jeffersonians managed to keep some sympathy with it, however. They denounced the Jay treaty with England as taking sides against the ally which had aided us in our own rebellion against England. And Washington, appalled at the invective poured on his aged head, saw the house of America divided against itself.

That was the setting for the Farewell Address. It was written, further, in consultation with Alexander Hamilton. Washington sent him a rough draft of his proposed speech. Hamilton returned a completely new draft, later added some further suggestions from Mt. Vernon. And though the manuscript Washington finally sent to the printer was in his own handwriting, the style was Hamilton's and there's no way of telling which of its ideas were Washington's and which were Hamiltonian.

Washington of course knew the value of foreign alliances. He knew the value of French aid to the Colonies during the American Revolution. It does discredit to his stature as Chief Executive to use his own words as argument against America taking its place in the family of nations.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial on Brotherhood Week published in the East Side News on Saturday, February 26, 1955:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

This is Brotherhood Week. It is sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It is dedicated to the ideals of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It is seeking to exemplify these ideals in our daily lives.

Brotherhood is the crying need of our day. It was the question which Malachi asked his people 2,500 years ago: "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us all? Why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, profaning the covenant of God?"

Whether we are protestants, Catholics, or Jews, whether we are black or white, or whether we came from the first or sixth generation, we are all members of the brotherhood of free Americans.

Tolerance thrives in the sunlight. It is a word of healing. It is the finest fruit of man's struggle to grasp the torch of liberty. It believes in the humaneness of our humanity. It marks the elimination of class distinction. It symbolizes the freedom of the soul.

Here is a story of the glory of American brotherhood at its best. It is the grandest story of heroic sacrifice. It is the saga of the transport Dorchester, which appeared in the American Weekly.

There were four chaplains on board: A rabbi, Lt. Alex Goode; two parsons, Lt. George L. Fox, and Lt. Clark V. Poling; a priest, Lt. John P. Washington.

They handed out the lifebelts to keep the bodies of the men afloat. They spoke words of cheer to keep up their courage. They saw the lifebelts run out. They gave away their own. They were last seen kneeling together on the sinking ship.

They were praying in three language. They were praying to the same God. In English—"Our Father, who are in heaven, hallowed by Thy name." In Hebrew "Schma Yisroel Adonay elehenu Adonay echod" (hear, O Israel, the Lord is thy God, the Lord is one). In Latin, "Miserere mei Deus, secundum magnam misericordiam Tuam" (have mercy on me, O Lord, according to Thy mercy).

Four God-loving souls who preached the glory of God and the brotherhood of man in their simple lives and humbly testified to their convictions by their undying deaths. "Greater love hath no man."

Travel where you may on a thousand battlefields. Travel where the delicate poppies carpet the earth with rich, red blossoms. Travel where the glistening white stones rise above the flower-strewn mounds. There you will see, side by side, one beneath the star of David, one beneath the cross of Christianity.

They have fought together. They have bled together. They have worshiped together. They have died together, so that we may live together.

Let no racial or creedal fissure undermine our American foundations. Let us hold fast to the faith of the Founding Fathers. Let us hold fast to the ideals of our origin. Let us hold fast to the moral values which are the fiber of our national character.

Let us cherish the thought that we are Americans. Let us keep the light burning that made our country great. Let us have a unified feeling of one flag and one nation. Let us remember that in God's rainbow there is no favored tint. Let race lines and creed lines and all lines vanish. Let America march forward as one great brotherhood with undivided ranks toward the dawn.

If we build in clay, it will be subject to the storm of time and the wind of the ages. If we build in brick, it is destined to crumble under the atmospheric pressure of the heavens. If we build in iron and steel, it is destined to flow as water before the smelting processes of the universe. If we build in marble, it will not last forever. But if we build in the humane spirit of common brotherhood we build for eternity.

Nomination of Lt. Gen. Alexander R. Bolling, United States Army, for the South's Hall of Fame for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the nominating remarks made by Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., United States Army, retired, when he nominated Lt. Gen. Alexander R. Bolling, United States Army, commanding general of the Third Army, for a place in the South's Hall of Fame for the Living.

Both General Gillem and General Bolling are distinguished Americans and rank among the great military leaders of our time. General Bolling presently commands the United States Third Army and General Gillem commanded the Third United States Army prior to and at the time of his retirement:

NOMINATION OF LT. GEN. ALEXANDER R. BOLLING, UNITED STATES ARMY, FOR THE SOUTH'S HALL OF FAME FOR THE LIVING

(By Lt. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem, Jr., United States Army, Retired)

With reference to nominations for the South's Hall of Fame for the Living, I would like to place in nomination the name of an outstanding American soldier and citizen: Lt. Gen. Alexander R. Bolling, United States

Army, commanding general, Third Army, Headquarters, Third Army, Fort McPherson, Ga.

In presenting the name of this distinguished officer, I have taken under consideration the factors which are set as criteria for selection in this group. It is my considered opinion that the man whose name I am presenting for this recognition meets in every way the requirements for the honor.

It has been my privilege to know personally the candidate and to have had his invaluable assistance and professional advice during the European campaign of World War II.

General Bolling served under my command throughout the battles incident to the defeat of the German Army. During these campaigns he was commanding general of the gallant 84th Infantry Division, which was an important element of my XIII Corps in Belgium, Holland, and Germany.

I found him to be possessed of all the characteristics of a real leader in war and peace. Recently I have enjoyed his friendship in the twilight years of the so-called peace, which we have been experiencing since the defeat of Germany and Japan.

He has, during the past 2 years, served as commanding general of the famous Third Army, with headquarters at Fort McPherson, Ga.

As commanding general, he has had the responsibility of directing the induction, training, and administration of thousands of young American men and women, for the area of his command encompasses the seven Southeastern States of the Nation.

His human qualities have gained for him and the Third Army a host of friends not only in Atlanta but throughout the South.

He has made an outstanding contribution to the progress of this critical area by his understanding of, and solution of, problems involving the military and civilian.

I have been informed that after his retirement later on in the current year, he is contemplating the establishment of a permanent home in the city of Atlanta.

It is my belief that Lt. Gen. Alexander R. Bolling, United States Army, is eminently fitted for inclusion in this category of Famed Americans, and I so recommend his nomination for this honor.

Nebraska's Birthday

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Nebraska's birthday. Eighty-eight years ago, on March 1, 1867, President Andrew Johnson signed a proclamation making the State of Nebraska one of the United States, the 37th State in the Union. It is interesting to note that the Nebraska statehood bill is one of the few statehood bills vetoed by a President.

On March 21, 1864, the Congress passed a law defining the boundaries of the Nebraska Territory and setting up the machinery for creating the State of Nebraska, which was subsequently approved by the President on April 19, 1864. The people of the proposed State called a constitutional convention, adopted a constitution and a formal government and transmitted these items to the Congress.

The Statehood Act was passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, but was vetoed by the President because he felt that a provision in the act might be construed as infringing upon the right of the new State to regulate the voting and other fundamental rights of its citizens. The Congress then reconsidered the act, and overrode his veto and Nebraska was admitted on the condition that the embryonic State assure the Congress and the President that there should be no denial of the elective franchise and all other fundamental rights of persons within the State by reason of race or color. The territorial legislature was called into session and on the 20th of February 1867, enacted its assurance accordingly. President Andrew Johnson then, on the 1st of March 1867, issued his proclamation declaring Nebraska a State. Thus, in the strife-torn years immediately following the Civil War, we find the formal beginning of the State of Nebraska.

There are many factors that have contributed to the greatness of our State, but the two most important are its land and its people. From 1867 until 1950 our population has grown from 50,000 to 1,325,510; and our land has been developed from the native unbroken prairies, even then rich with life-giving grasses, to the highly cultivated irrigated farm grounds that lie in the valleys of the many Nebraska rivers.

The exploration and settlement of Nebraska is one of the striking chapters in the history of American expansion, one without parallel. It is a story written in adventure, in toil, in tragedy, and reward. Archeological expeditions have uncovered considerable evidence of the presence of prehistoric man in the State, indicating that man existed in this area from ten to twenty thousand years ago. The deep soil deposits have preserved some of the finest prehistoric animal and reptile specimens yet found on the North American continent.

At the time of the coming of the first white men, the Nebraska territory was inhabited by the Indian tribes, who moved across the Great Plains as the food supply shifted from place to place. The first white men to visit this region were 30 Spaniards under the leadership of Francisco Vazquez Coronado, who came into the territory on a foray from the Rio Grande in 1541. French fur traders began to venture up the Missouri River about 1700, and in 1739 the Mallet brothers, with a party of eight Frenchmen, named the Platte River and traveled nearly the entire length of the State on a journey from the Missouri River to Santa Fe.

During these years, ownership of this little-explored and richly abundant territory was a source of struggle between France, England, and Spain. The reports of the early French explorers, glowing with praises of this wonderful new empire, awakened the imagination of the French as to the possibilities of this "most marvelous region upon the face of the earth." France moved upon the Nebraska region from two directions—from the North, following the founding of Quebec in 1609, and from the South with the founding of Biloxi on

the Gulf of Mexico in 1700. By the year 1720, Spain and France had become rivals for possession of this vast region west of the Mississippi River; the Spanish had settlements in the Rio Grande Valley and in Texas; the French in the Mississippi Valley. At the close of the Seven Years' War, France ceded all her claims east of the Mississippi River to England, and all claims west to Spain. Nebraska was thus a part of the Spanish province of Louisiana from 1763 until 1801, when Napoleon bought it back from Spain. Even before the new provisional governor could arrive to take up control of his domain, war broke out between France and England. In financial desperation, Napoleon changed his plan and sold the entire province to the new American Republic for \$15,500,000; and at an imposing ceremony in the Great Square on the river front in New Orleans on November 30, 1803, the Nebraska region became American territory with Thomas Jefferson as her president.

Almost before the ink was dry on the purchase agreement, an American expedition started to explore the area of the Louisiana Purchase. Lewis and Clark were the commanders of this initial exploratory adventure, and in the 2 years of their expedition, 1804-06, skirted the Nebraska territorial boundaries. Five years later, the Hunt party of Astorians touched Nebraska on their way to Oregon, and in 1813 seven of the party crossed the mountains and followed the North Platte to its junction with the South Platte, and thence along the Platte to the Missouri River. Manuel Lisa, who built a permanent fort in 1812 about 10 miles north of the present Omaha post Office, was probably the first white settler and the first to engage in farming in Nebraska. In September 1819 Major Long established Fort Atkinson upon the site of the present village of Fort Calhoun in Washington County, and the 1,000 people who came to live there built the first school library, brickyard, sawmill, and grist mill in the State.

The missionary period followed the establishment of a permanent fort in Nebraska. While the missionary work among the Indians of the State did not generally convert the tribes to Christianity, still the story of missionary work among the Indians filled the space of 40 years in the history of Nebraska with a heroic record and with more valuable information upon the elements of life in this territory at this time than is derived from any other single source.

With the settlement and beginning of development of Nebraska, the pioneers again looked to the westward toward the lands that lay beyond the Continental Divide. Nebraska was the avenue for the crossing. The rich grasslands provided the food to sustain the animals, and the abundant water supply and wild game provided the means of survival for these hardy adventurers. To Nebraska belongs the honor of first pointing out to the American Nation a natural, practicable roadway across the mountains, binding the western shores of this great country to the rest of the Nation.

Several trails were developed. Of all the old overland trails crossing Nebraska,

each with its story written deep into the lives of the men and women in the record of the westward march of the American people, the Oregon Trail was the first and the most famous. The Trail began its career in 1832, and by 1840 had become a well-traveled road, a great traveling city flowing 2,000 miles from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

The migration of the Mormons from Florence, now a suburb of Omaha, in the spring of 1847, brought into existence the great Mormon Trail, which traversed Nebraska and merged at Fort Laramie with the established Oregon Trail.

An increased interest in quicker, more adequate transportation naturally followed after the establishment of these wagon routes to the West. The Nation was divided by the extreme pressure of commercial interests of the North and the South, each pushing to construct the first Pacific railroad. Farsighted leaders of both areas grasped the strategic position of the Nebraska Territory as the natural route for the railroad to the west coast, and voices in many quarters became loud in a demand for the organization and recognition of the Nebraska Territory. In his annual report, dated November 30, 1844, Secretary of War William Wilkins recommended the formation of a territorial government, but it was not until May 30, 1854, after several bills had been introduced and nearly all the controversial issues of the day were debated, that President Franklin Pierce signed the Kansas-Nebraska bill into law.

In only a few years the movement for statehood was started, and on April 19, 1864, the Nebraska enabling act was passed and approved. Nebraska's statehood, as had her Territorial establishment, was to be delayed and greatly influenced by the stark national issues facing the Congress and the people during those times. Local factions were divided over the slave-free question, and controversy developed over the problems of governmental expense which would be created if Nebraska was to become an independent State, so it was not until 1866 that a constitution and a form of State government were framed. The statehood bill finally passed after long and bitter debate, over Presidential veto, when the Nebraska Legislature adopted laws repudiating slavery in the new State.

Settlement and growth of this new Territory had been slow during the Civil War period and years before, although the foundation for growth had been laid by the Congress when it enacted the free-homestead law in 1862. On the date this law became effective, January 1, 1863, Daniel Freeman took out the first homestead in the United States, on Cub Creek, in Gage County, Nebraska. Since that time, over 1 million homesteaders over the United States have received more than 120 million acres of land from our Government, and more than 100,000 homesteaded and lived in Nebraska. These settlers came from New England and New York, Michigan and Illinois, and from the war-torn States of the South. More and more settlers came from many countries across the seas.

The Irish settled in Holt County in 1874 and Greeley County in 1877. Germans settled Madison, Stanton, and Thayer Counties between 1867-70. Swedes settled in Polk and Saunders Counties about 1870 and Phelps and Burt Counties about 1880. Bohemians founded communities in Knox, Colfax, Saunders, and Saline Counties about 1870. A group of Hollanders settled in the southern part of Lancaster County about 1875 and extended their settlements into Clay and Hamilton Counties. Danish, Swedish, Bohemian, and Polish communities were founded in Howard and Valley Counties. French settlements were made in Richardson, Nemaha, Antelope, and other counties. The seeds of greatness of Nebraska's people were brought in from a score of different States and from a dozen different foreign countries; but, once these seeds took root in Nebraska soil, the product which grew from them became Nebraska's most valuable asset—courageous, hard-working and sincere American citizens.

The several homestead laws, the free homestead law of 1863, the Timber Culture Act, and the Kinkaid law, have been instrumental in opening the lands of Nebraska to the agricultural development and cultivation now so prevalent in our great State, and the railroad brought great progress by transporting settlers into the State and farm commodities from Nebraska to the other States of the Union.

Over the many years, one of the significant achievements in the State's history has been the development of irrigation in the North Platte Valley. Local individual initiative and the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 helped these farmers turn much of the dry land into a true Garden of Eden, the Quivera for which Coronado searched when he and his small band of explorers first entered this territory. Scottsbluff, one of the most important and fast-growing cities in Nebraska, owes much of its expansion to the development of irrigation from the North Platte River and its feeder streams. The sandhills area grazes most of the State's 5 million beef cattle, and we look with pride on the industry that provides much of the world's beef supply and foundation stock for cattle herds in all quarters of the agricultural world.

Nebraskans are justly proud of the progressive, efficient, and economical record of their State government. The State constitution, adopted in 1920, contains a provision prohibiting the State to contract any indebtedness in excess of \$100,000. The State has no income tax and no sales tax, and in 1934 the people adopted an initiative proposal to create the unicameral legislature, a novel experiment in the field of lawmaking bodies.

Many Nebraskans have brought credit to the State and the Nation with their contributions to literature, art, and music; and to the military and political science of the world. Writers such as Willa Cather, Bess Streeter Aldrich, Mignon Eberhart, Louise Pound, Hartley Burr Alexander, Keene Abbott, and Mari Sandoz; poets such as the beloved John G. Neihardt, poet laureate; musical composers such as Thurlow Lieurance and

Howard Hanson; great military leaders such as John J. Pershing; artists such as J. Laurier Wallace, Elizabeth Dolan, Kady Faulkner, Robert Gilder, Dwight Kirsch, and Dale Nichols; and political giants of their time such as William Jennings Bryan, J. Sterling Morton, Charles G. Dawes, and George W. Norris, have helped bring fame and recognition to the State, and have left their works as a heritage to the people of our time. Our State Capitol, the creation of Bertram Goodhue, stands as one of the outstanding architectural achievements of the age, a fitting monument to the men and women whose courage and vision built a prairie land.

No tribute to the great State of Nebraska would be complete without pause to pay homage to the 47,801 sons who served, and the 1,000 who died, in World War I; and the 128,000 men and women who served, and the 3,655 who died, in World War II.

One of the most able portrayals of Nebraska is contained in a description of the great seal of Nebraska, adopted by the legislature in 1867:

The eastern part of the circle to be represented by a steamboat ascending the Missouri River; the mechanic arts to be represented by a smith with hammer and anvil; in the foreground, agriculture to be represented by a settler's cabin, sheaves of wheat, and stalks of growing corn; in the background a train of cars heading toward the Rocky Mountains, and on the extreme west, the Rocky Mountains to be plainly in view; around the top of this circle, to be in capital letters, the motto, "Equality before the law," and the circle to be surrounded by the words, "Great seal of the State of Nebraska."

"Equality before the law," "Honesty before men," "Reverence before God"—these are the precepts that have made Nebraska great during her 88 years as a State; these are the precepts that will keep Nebraska great as long as our free Nation endures.

Peaceful Coexistence With Soviet Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following very interesting address by Mr. George Brady, chief editorial writer for the Boston American-Record, Boston, Mass., on the subject of communism, which he delivered at the fourth annual spiritual Sunday observance of the greater Lawrence postal employees on Sunday, February 27, 1955, at the Central Junior High School, Methuen, Mass.

Mr. Brady, a well-known journalist, has been connected with several large newspapers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He is a student of international affairs and has specialized in the work of educating his readers and listeners to the danger of communism

and its effects on the United States. I know that all Members of Congress are aware of the spread of the communistic doctrine, and know that they will appreciate the expression of Mr. Brady on this most important of all subject matters at the present time.

We hear a lot of talk nowadays about peaceful coexistence with Soviet Russia. The slogan hits me every time I turn on my radio or television or open the pages of my daily newspaper. It is supposed to be a new version, a modern adaptation of the old aphorism, "Live and let's live." But is it?

I don't know who devises or dreams up these slimy slogans, as the late William Cardinal O'Connell used to call them, but I am sure that the inspiration for them does not come from angels and saints or from living persons destined to be angels and saints.

How can an honest, decent, God-fearing, God-loving American coexist in peace with murderers, assassins, blasphemers, torturers, and individuals who boast about their total denial of individual human dignity.

He can't, of course.

If he could achieve such a peaceful coexistence, his heart would be as black as the murderers, his soul as damned as the blasphemers, and his hands as bloody as the torturers.

Such an American would be no better morally than the debased people of the Middle Ages who went into the Black Forest of Germany to perform indecent rites at midnight and to offer their souls to Satan. Those self-damned individuals sought material gain on earth and for that they were willing to barter away all eternity. They were apostles of expediency. They cared only for the present and were not concerned with the morrow. So do the people who preach and practice peaceful coexistence with Russia in this supposedly enlightened year of 1954.

The slogan of peaceful coexistence is fastening on the public mind in a drum-beat sort of way, beginning softly, slowly, subtly, and increasing in tempo and force.

We shall hear a great deal more of these tom-toms of peace in the immediate future, for this is the new turn in the Communist propaganda line, but it is new only in the sense that it is being used again.

Actually, it is an old and highly effective trick out of the Kremlin's book of tactics. It is employed whenever time is needed—time to consolidate gains after a period of conquest, time to appease the long-suffering slaves of the Moscow tyranny, time to subdue the captive nations and wring out of their inhabitants, with force and violence, the last sparks of patriotism and revolt.

Twice in the memory of every person in this room, the trick has been employed by Moscow with spectacular results. We swooned to the siren song of peaceful coexistence in 1933 when we granted recognition to the minority government of Russia and thus saved that government from being overthrown and destroyed.

We closed our official eyes to the fact that priests and nuns, peasants and kulaks had been murdered by the millions for the crime of believing in God, to the evidence that churches and synagogues had been perverted into museums for the godless, to the knowledge that every Christian and Judiac ideal and principle had been ridiculed and reviled.

We protested but feebly when the men in the Kremlin, in brazen violation of their own written pledges, deluged our country with malicious and lying propaganda, infiltrated our schools, colleges, and labor unions, and did their utmost to foment a revolution.

We chose to look the other way when the Soviet Embassy in Washington became the center of a spy ring, frequently by traitorous and treasonable Americans whose names and

identities are too well known to all of you to warrant a recital by me.

We lulled ourselves into believing or hoping that trade with the murderers and blasphemers of Russia would fatten our pocketbooks and bring on an era of enduring prosperity after the long depression. Of course, the Red currency might be gory with the blood of the innocent, but that did not matter to us, not much anyway.

We wanted business. We wanted trade. We wanted what we called normalcy. We wanted early riches. So did the self-damned men and women of the Middle Ages who surrendered their ideals and compromised with the Devil in Germany's Black Forest. Let's not add hypocrisy to our sins by saying that we were different.

A dozen years later the ruse worked again by wheedling from the United States and the Western World the fateful concessions of World War II that made Soviet Russia the only real victor of that conflict.

We had seen Josef Stalin enter into a treaty with Adolf Hitler—a treaty that was to produce the most horrible, most costly and most needless war that mankind had known.

We deluded ourselves into believing that the men in the Kremlin were democratic peace-lovers, and there are people in journalism, in radio and even in the United States Senate today who went so far as to liken Stalin and his murderous clique to Washington, Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln. And the great tragedy of our country is that those very people are controlling our national destinies at the present moment.

We sent Soviet Russia \$13 billion in materials and supplies through lend-lease and other slick and sly political arrangements.

We mortgaged our economy to transfer Russia from one of the most backward agrarian nations in the world to one of the most highly industrialized.

We opened our homes, our schools, our factories, our laboratories and our hearts to military observers who flocked to our shores from Russia with espionage and destruction in their hearts.

We did not have to open our churches to them, because they were not interested in God or His goodness or greatness.

And when the war was over, including that part of the war in the Pacific which Russia had shunned until 5 days before its termination, we sat down at the peaceful coexistence table with Stalin and surrendered to him, millions of God-fearing, God-loving men, women, and children in Poland, Czechoslovakia and other unhappy lands.

There were 180,000,000 persons behind the Iron Curtain up to that time.

Now, due to the pacts of Yalta, Potsdam, and the Korean and Indochinese surrenders, there are 800 million.

Never before in all human history was there such a giveaway of human lives, or human souls, or such a betrayal of all that is decent and divine.

The great danger of our era is not the atomic bomb or the hydrogen bomb, although I would be the last person in the world to disparage or minimize the potentialities of the split atom. It is well within the realm of possibility, and even of probability, that a minor conflict such as the Formosa dispute may touch off an atomic war that will utterly destroy nations and turn back the clock of human progress a thousand years.

But I do not anticipate quick devastation of this type. The results are too obvious, too apparent to all governments, and no government provokes or promotes a war unless that government believes it has a reasonable chance to emerge victoriously.

Rather I look for wider, greater, and more frequent use by Russia of the provenly successful weapon of peaceful coexistence. Why worry about an enemy's body if you can capture his soul? Why resort to armed

force if mental ingenuity will accomplish much more?

Who then are the dangerous people in America? Who is most likely to succumb to the Communist propaganda of "you live your way and worship God while we go our way and do our utmost to destroy God"?

The most dangerous people in America are those who have no real belief in God and who are concerned only with pleasure, wealth, power, and pride. When you go to your church on Sunday morning and see an empty seat and tell yourself that the person who should be in that seat is negotiating a business deal, or playing golf or making political hay in the hope of getting a position of power and prestige, beware. The person who puts his own ambitions above his obligations to God is the kind of person who will turn a ready and willing ear to the music of peaceful coexistence with tyranny, brutality, and blasphemy.

And let us not forget that no less an authority than the Federal Council of Protestant Churches has stated that 60 million Americans never attend a church, never say a prayer, never read the Bible. If so many people can dismiss God so conveniently in normal times, it is illogical and inconsistent to assume that they will have much moral resistance when the choice is between standing up for God and sitting down and allowing God's sworn enemies to expand and grow stronger.

If we are going to win this cold war, if we are going to preserve and perpetuate our democratic institutions, if we are going to retain our freedom and liberty, we must place less emphasis on materialism and expediency and more emphasis on God and His Divine Word. Our churches, not our atomic bomb stockpiles, are our real arsenals; and those college professors, smart-aleck businessmen and pompous writers and editors who speak disparagingly of our churches are our real enemies.

These people are doing exactly what the Russians did a quarter of a century ago. Give them enough encouragement and they will be with the Russians, body and soul, a quarter of a century from now.

God is indeed a mighty fortress in these atheistic times; and if we are to survive, the hymn that wells in our hearts must be—

"Onward Christian soldiers, marching as to war
With the Cross of Jesus going on before."

What Is Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial published February 23, 1954, for which Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., awarded Griffin Daily News Editor Quimby Melton, Jr., its George Washington Honor Medal. It was the second medal the foundation has awarded Editor Melton. He won the first for a similar editorial published in 1951.

In this connection it is interesting to note that Mr. Melton is a distinguished veteran of combat service in World War II. He participated in practically all of the battle engagements in the southwest

Pacific area from New Guinea through the recapture of the Philippines, and was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action. While he was serving in the southwest Pacific area his only brother, Lt. Fred Melton was killed in Europe. He, therefore, knows the cost and the price that must be paid for freedom. He believes in it and is not paying mere lip service to its principles. It is, therefore, with especial pleasure and pride that I include his prize-winning editorial in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WHAT IS FREEDOM?

(By Quimby Melton, Jr.)

In the world fight of the free against the slave, America is attempting to tell what freedom is, and it is a difficult task.

How can you describe vision to a person blind from birth? How describe a symphony to one who has never heard? How describe God to an atheist?

Words are feeble when applied to a thing as glorious and as basic to Americans as our freedoms. We sense them, we realize them, we know they are ours. It is impossible for us to imagine life without them, because they have been our since birth, our priceless heritage since the 18th century when Americans declared themselves to be free men whose freedom stemmed from the Lord God Almighty who created them and whose freedom could not be abridged by mere man though he called himself emperor, potentate of king.

This belief that man was created free by the Almighty God is the basic foundation of all American's freedoms and from this belief stems all the other beliefs which by right are ours.

Since God created man and endowed him with freedom, it follows without question that man has the right to worship his Creator as he pleases, a basic right of all Americans. Here in Spalding County, for example, there are dozens of denominations and religious sects, all seeking to persuade people to worship God as they are convinced He should be worshiped. But note that they seek to persuade, not to force, because no denomination regardless of its zeal can force anyone to follow its beliefs. Nor can any individual or group prevent any person from worshipping as he pleases, be it in the church, the synagogue, the cathedral or in the stillness of his heart in his own home or in a field.

Pursuing the basic principle of freedom further, it is apparent that since God created man and endowed him with freedom, and man and not God created government, a government exists solely to serve the people under its jurisdiction. It was created by them and for them and they were not created by or for it. Thus it is their servant and not their master. Furthermore, since God created all men and men created governments no man has the right to set himself above his fellowmen and to proclaim himself their master. Hence the theory of dictator nations is incorrect at the very beginning and dictatorships are built upon a theory as flimsy as a bubble of soap.

The fact that government is a servant of the people makes it obvious that the people by right should choose those who govern them and that the twin rights of free elections and secret ballots are theirs. And since a people cannot choose wisely unless they are informed, the rights of a free press and speech, the right to assemble, the right to petition for a redress of grievances are theirs.

Again since the government is a servant and not a master, the people are entitled to the services of the government as a protector against infringement of our individual rights, protection against nations and indi-

viduals which would take them from us. This, of course, entails responsibility as well as privilege because the protection can come only from collective action and requires such things as military service.

In communistic nations, the people serve the state instead of the state serving the people. So there is no right to own private property which is basic with us. There is no right to move about freely at home and abroad as we do. There are none of the legal protections which are ours such as the right to prompt trial by jury, habeas corpus, freedom from arbitrary government regulation and control and the right to contract about our affairs. There are none of the personal rights and privileges such as privacy of homes and person, choosing our own callings and the places we wish to follow them, bargaining with employers and employees, engaging in business, competing for a profit and bargaining for goods and services in a free market.

These things are so fundamentally ours that we think of them little more than we think of the air we breathe. But to Americans, life is just as inconceivable without freedom as it is without air.

What, then, is freedom? It is a fundamental part of people who realize that God created them and that they in turn created government as their servant, not as their master. It is as much a part of us and just as intangible as the souls which set us apart from the mechanical men and women with lusterless eyes and no hope in their hearts and whose sole purpose in a mechanical sort of life is to serve the state which is their master and which owns them body and soul.

Thirty-seventh Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to include in the Record a resolution unanimously voted by the Lithuanian Americans of the city of New Haven. The commemoration of Lithuanian Independence Day offers not only a display of the fearlessness, courage, spirit, and perseverance of this fine nation, but also it is a tragic reminder to us of the free world that the Soviet tyrants will stop at nothing in their fanatic obsession to annex the entire globe. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY VOTED BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF THE CITY OF NEW HAVEN, CONN., AT THE OBSERVANCE OF THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA, HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN-LITHUANIAN COUNCIL, AT THE ST. CASTOR HALL, ON THE 27TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1955

Whereas in 1940 Soviet Russia, in vicious conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all the treaties and obligations solemnly underwritten by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and, against the will of the people, annexed her to the Soviet Union, and, in 1944, following the defeat of the German armies on the eastern front, again took over that country in complete disregard of the wartime policies and obligations to which the Soviet

Union was cognatory with the United States and other allies of World War II;

Whereas for almost 15 years Lithuania, one of the Baltic nations, has borne the yoke of slavery, as a result of the brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Kremlin conspirators are constantly trying to seduce the free nations to enter into agreements with the Soviet Union in hope of splitting their common defense efforts and gaining their tacit consent to the status quo of enslavement of millions of people under the heel of international communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this gathering of American citizens of Lithuanian descent of the city of New Haven pledge their wholehearted support of this great country's efforts to achieve lasting peace and justice in the world, and urge the Federal Government of the United States to respond to the demands of this crucial time in initiating a positive and dynamic political program against the international Communist conspiracy; be it finally

Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of New Haven, once again reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their wholehearted support of the administration and Congress of the United States in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world.

MATHEW VOHETARTIS,
President.
MARY JOKUPAITIS,
Secretary.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.

The Booker T. Washington Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement by Rev. S. R. Johnson, Jr., of Salisbury, N. C., which appeared in the *Journal and Guide* of Norfolk, Va., on February 6, 1955, and also the *Carolina Times*, of Durham, N. C., on February 19, 1955:

THE BOOKER T. WASHINGTON MEMORIAL

It has been reported to me through the columns of several newspapers that the B. T. Washington Memorial Birthplace Foundation, Rocky Mount, Va., has folded its arms and the founder now seeks to blame failure for this proposed project on the noncooperation of Negroes.

Nothing that begins wrong will end up right. From the very beginning as one who has followed this project it got off on the wrong foot. Some few years ago while working as a reporter for the *Journal and Guide*, a Negro weekly newspaper at Norfolk, Va., I was assigned to the coverage of the auction sale of the now reported defunct site of the Booker Washington birthplace.

On that dreary afternoon all kinds of mystery surrounded the purchaser of the site who outbid the late Thomas C. Walker, noted Negro lawyer, of Gloucester, Va., who along with Lee Wald, retired businessman of Rocky Mount, Va., and Conrad Martin, a banker of Danville, Va., and several others who were interested in the sale hoping that the Negro Organization Society of Virginia might develop the site not for commercial purposes,

but to develop it as a shrine to the noted educator.

It was the thinking of Mr. Walker, Lee Wald, and others that the State of Virginia along with the society would contribute to the development of this shrine.

This dream was shattered by Mr. Phillips and several other mystery figures who were unknown in Franklin County. During the auction the Phillips' interest offered a skyrocket bid that was almost unreasonable considering the land. All who were present were amazed and wondered as to what was taking place but no one could get any information. At the close of the sale Mr. Phillips presented a check drawn on a bottling company for the amount of \$500 as a downpayment. When asked what was to be done, those who inquired were told they would be surprised. No, they weren't surprised, but by now it seems as though Mr. Phillips is.

Mr. Walker left the sale brokenhearted and went back home outdone. For it was his conviction that outside interests had come in to exploit the name of Booker Washington to ride to national fame.

While in the capacity of a reporter, I was assigned to the dedication of the site that was later to be used as a memorial. On that day noted statesmen from Virginia came to hear a race orator who stood on the Franklin County Courthouse grounds in Rocky Mount, Va., telling of the life of Booker T. Washington.

It always seemed strange to me how people would be allowed to roam the streets peddling the United States silver for a profit that bore the image and name of Booker Washington. I was living in a big Virginia city (Norfolk) and saw peddlers going from place to place selling half-dollars for a dollar. What became of this profit?

On a recent visit to the memorial site one would not be too impressed to see incomplete buildings, rundown grounds, and a dull post office that had received so much publicity. What became of the profit? Was this a stab in the back at those who are doing a good job at Tuskegee? There ought to be a lot of explaining. The Negro race must not be blamed because one man made a failure and now seeks a way out.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

Testimonial to Hon. Warren R. Austin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Vermont Jewish Communities staged a testimonial to Ambassador Warren R. Austin in recognition of his historic contributions to the cause of world peace and to the establishment of Israel.

The occasion was highlighted by the presentation of a scroll marking the establishment of the Warren R. Austin Forest.

Ambassador Austin long championed the State of Israel and the Vermont Jewish Communities have most fittingly commemorated his labors by the planting of a forest in the soil of this land.

Mr. Speaker, in times of international crisis when others stood confused, alarmed, and vacillating, Ambassador Austin was a tower of strength confidently facing each challenge with firmness and resolution. His calm courage stilled the feeble voices of fear and pessimism and his unceasing devotion to the ideal of world peace will be remembered as long as history is recorded.

Some time ago it was my pleasure to visit Israel as a member of a study mission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The achievements which the Israelis have made during the brief period of their independence are most impressive. I had the feeling while there that I was observing a vigor characteristic of people who enjoy the blessings of liberty and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD the addresses which were given during the testimonial to the Honorable Warren R. Austin. These are as follows: Address by Rabbi Max B. Wall, address by His Excellency Ambassador Abba Eban, presentation of scroll to Warren R. Austin, and address by Warren R. Austin.

ADDRESS BY RABBI MAX B. WALL, OHAVI ZODEK SYNAGOGUE, BURLINGTON, VT., JANUARY 30, 1955

Reverend colleagues, distinguished guests, and friends, I deem it a great privilege to be able to serve as chairman for this afternoon's testimonial activities. My good friend, Saul S. Spiro, chairman of the Warren Austin Forest Committee, should have been the chairman this afternoon and I wish to thank him for his remarkable efforts in helping to make this meeting a reality.

We are gathered here to pay homage to a dear and beloved neighbor who is one of the most distinguished statesmen of our generation.

I wish to talk of a man and of a forest. The man is well known to us as a neighbor who takes pride in his family, his

friends, his record of service, and his apple orchard. How do we measure the stature of a man or of a people; surely not with a ruler by inches or feet.

The stature of Warren R. Austin dwarfs the Green Mountains from which he went forth into the world. He is tall because he has the far look—the vision—the inextinguishable confidence that holds forth the promise of peace and justice, freedom and rebirth for all men.

In the Senate and in the United Nations, he served the best interests and high purposes of our Nation and of the peoples of the world. He was always the symbol of that unswerving undiscourageable granite type Vermonter who makes no compromise with injustice, who is the upholder of the weak and the protector of the helpless.

It was in 1938 that Senator Austin went to the Holy Land for a tour—to see for himself what was going on in Palestine; and when he returned, his admiration and respect for the people and the land was not kept secret. In newspaper articles and in public statements as well as in private correspondence, he described with enthusiasm the effort of a small people that was trying to rebuild its ancient homeland and rebuild itself in the process.

No doubt he must have felt a certain kinship with the pioneers in Palestine; for he was an American—he knew from his history, as he knew from his very being, what it means to be able to live in peace and freedom enjoying the fruit of one's own hard toil. His Christian upbringing and faith supplied him with the memory of ancient promises to a people too long tempest-tossed and friendless, promises of a return and rebuilding. He recalled with profound gratitude the blessings of heart and mind that resulted once when people and land were united. I am sure he prayed that the builders would rebuild and that the homeless would return and that children would once again play on the long neglected and sorely abused soil of Eretz Israel.

How fortunate for us who dreamed of Israel reborn that this devout spirit and courageous statesman represented our Nation in the United Nations during those hectic days of 1947 and 1948. How happy he must have been to speak forth along the lines which were to lead to the establishment of the State of Israel. The role that our Nation played in the establishment and recognition of the State of Israel was in the words of the Herald Tribune, Saturday, May 15, 1948, "the only one which was consonant with American traditions." The voice that spoke our country's mind came forth with confidence and power because the man who spoke did not merely fulfill orders. He was realizing a dream.

To this man, undeterred by threats of reprisal and boycott, we owe a debt of gratitude which can merely be expressed but not paid.

Therefore have we joined together and dedicated a living testimonial, a forest, to this man. It will grip the soil of Israel and hold it firm. It will fight the ravages of 2,000 years of heartless destruction and will remind people of an American whose heart was big enough to reach around the world.

This forest will remind us of the many bonds and invaluable links between our country and Israel. For our country borrowed from ancient Israel's quarry of faith—the Bible—the stones upon which to build its future. "Thou shalt proclaim liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabit-

ants thereof." And Israel of today took from our political heritage the essence of our great Declaration of Independence. We who are conscious of the shared spiritual heritage between our country and Israel are confident that the hand that built so well will continue to be the hand that upholds and supports.

We hope that the efforts of our own beloved friend to bring peace to the Middle East will meet with continued support from those who guide the destiny of our country. May we exert our influence to bring a real peace and with it an opportunity for both Arabs and Jews to live in brotherhood, each one enjoying freedom, prosperity, and peace.

We dedicate this forest planted in far-away Israel in loving and heart-felt tribute to a man—may it bring with it the blessings of old to a land and an area of the world in need of peace and plenty. May he, whose name it will bear, live to see the fruits of his efforts to bring about a better world. May he be as the psalmist of old described, "And he shall be like a tree planted by streams of water that bringeth forth its fruit in its season, and whose leaf does not wither, and in whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper."

The man and the forest—long may they live and blessed may they be.

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY AMBASSADOR ABBA EBAN, BURLINGTON, VT., JANUARY 30, 1955

Rabbi Wall, Your Excellency Governor Johnson, Ambassador and Mrs. Austin, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, a generous and graceful impulse has arisen in the Jewish communities of this mountain State. You have gathered here in tribute to a fellow citizen whose voice has carried the name of Vermont in accents of dignity and peace across the continents and oceans of the world.

There is a good foundation for your pride, and a fine sense of propriety in your method of attesting it. It has occurred to you in a flash of brilliant intuition that after many years of unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States and in the United Nations, your honored guest could not be granted anything more enjoyable or original than the opportunity to come here and listen to a lot of speeches. This reminds us of the new spirit of diplomatic life. Diplomacy was traditionally associated with qualities of reticence. Behind a silent exterior our predecessors in the diplomatic craft were assumed to harbor an invisible abundance of wisdom and knowledge. In this age of television and of diplomacy by conference all that is changed. An ambassador today might well be described as a man who can approach any international question with an open mouth.

But if our voices must be heard, they could not be uplifted in a higher cause than that which brings us here together in affection and fraternity around Warren R. Austin, Senator and Ambassador of the United States. At the end of the Second World War his statesmanship and eloquence, which had until then been in the service of his State and country, became a potent weapon in a universal cause. We all remember the poignant hopes with which our suffering generation accompanied the establishment of a universal forum dedicated to international peace. The world has risen battered from the ravages and anguish of the war. Millions of human beings had been its vic-

times. Vast areas had been devastated. But the worst terrors of the recent conflict were obscured by the fearful vision revealed by the blinding explosion of Hiroshima. Man, by his conquest of nature, had made warfare a transgression which this planet could no longer afford.

This new dread reinforced the passion with which we began to dream of a world society in which sovereign states would be bound by the restraints and sanctions that guard us against indignity, dispossession, and assault.

Amidst these high hopes and grim anxieties there gathered in San Francisco the representatives of the world's sovereign states who founded the United Nations as the bulwark of man's eternal hope of peace.

It is customary in some circles to describe these high hopes of 1945 against the disillusionment and disappointment of the succeeding years. It has become a fashion to describe the achievements of the United Nations in terms of failure and frustration. I would address to you a warning against such an erroneous judgment. True, the great alliance upon which the United Nations was established soon fell apart. The intrinsic conflict between the doctrines of freedom and the theories of totalitarianism reflected itself in the field of international relations. Thus there grew up this widening chasm which has divided the free world from the world of totalitarianism in the arena of international politics. As a result the organs of the United Nations were paralyzed and frustrated. Their beneficial interventions in the cause of peace were obstructed by disagreements and vetoes.

Yet it would be an error to generalize this failure into a basic disillusionment. Anyone who imagined that world society could spring into existence overnight in a single spasm of history was seriously misguided. Surely a cause so vital as this deserved the opportunity of trial and error, of victory and defeat. All expansions in the sense of community have been difficult and slow. First, the family alone recognized mutual obligations toward its members. Later the sense of community spread from family to tribe, from tribe to village, from village to city, from city to state, from sovereign State to the great systems of federal government such as that which is so inspiringly expressed in your own Constitution. The last and most crucial victory for the expanding sense of community has still to be achieved. This is all that the United Nations means—that there should exist between sovereign states the same kind of relationships of law and of mutual respect that exist amongst citizens and groups within the framework of our individual States. So long as we can see a progress, and evolution toward that goal, the United Nations is no failure, and its record should not be written in terms of despair.

Even against the background of global conflict the United Nations has many glittering inscriptions upon its banner. In 1948 and 1949, during which our guest of honor led the deliberations of the Security Council and of the General Assembly, international conciliation brought an end of warfare to three parts of the world, in Indonesia, Kashmir, and in the Holy Land. Then in 1950 there came the most vital and significant step of all. For the first time collective resistance to aggression was organized in Korea beneath the banner of a universal organization. If there ever comes a time when the habits and restraints of law prevail in international relations, men will look back upon the United Nations action against aggression in Korea as one of the authentic points of climax in the history of civilization.

The United Nations has also enriched and broadened the concepts of economic and social cooperation. Its efforts have been illu-

minated by sudden flashes of inspiration, such as that which enabled us a few months ago to adopt a unanimous program in the General Assembly for harnessing atomic energy to peaceful ends.

In all the achievement of the United Nations for many years Ambassador Austin was America's voice, and, therefore, the voice of greater stature and influence. And amongst these achievements one stands out with special radiance. This was the sudden emergence of the Jewish people to sovereignty upon its ancestral native soil. The Jewish people had been the greatest victim of the Nazi holocaust. Six million of our people had perished in Europe. Out of the darkest depths of man's divided nature there had sprung at the throat of the Jewish people the most violent hatred which had ever distorted the spirit of man. This was the lowest ebb in the fortunes of our people in the 4,000 years of continuous history. Yet as the nations of the world gathered in San Francisco, they faced a deep moral danger—that all peoples would be established in freedom—except the people which needed it most. Every country would be given its area of sovereignty and liberty, except the people which had been the chief target of totalitarian fury. If the world society had been built on this discrimination its moral character would have been indelibly stained. From this reproach the world purged itself by the great process which began in 1947 and carried itself forward in the ensuing years. The world, represented in the United Nations said, "Just as it is right for the Arab States to possess and enjoy their unlimited resources of political and natural power, their multiple influence in international councils, just as it is right that Arab emancipation should be carried out in such lavish measure, so it cannot be wrong for the Jewish people to enjoy the peaceful possession of its small but cherished home." There was to be freedom and sovereignty for both the peoples of our ancient region, for Arab peoples within the shelter of their vast domain, and for Israel in the land which it had immortalized in ancient times. This was the mature judgment of international equity.

So many unique circumstances came together here to mark the establishment of our State as an event conceived in the highest dimensions of human history. First it was a victory of faith against all the calculations of chance. There were no conditions which would lead a rational man to believe that the reestablishment of the Jewish homeland was still possible. Yet in a moment we passed from a world in which the establishment of a free Israel seemed inconceivable to a world which seemed inconceivable without its existence. This event is a crushing argument in the great discussion between the sovereignty of faith, the belief in the human will as an active agent of history, against the fatalistic deterministic doctrines of history which see the human being as the passive and helpless object of historic processes.

It was also a rescue of a people at the lowest ebb of its fortunes; an opportunity to restore to our land its ancient fertility as described in our Hebrew literature "the perfection of beauty, the joy of the entire earth."

It was an exercise in democracy; we have planted in the continent of Asia, dominated by dictatorships and tyranny, a sanctuary for the democratic way of life based upon the principle that government derives its just power from the consent of the governed. Finally, Israel's rebirth gave a new dimension of completeness to the international community. I often reflect that the family of sovereign nations is also the family of the human cultures and civilizations. There are some 30 states in our midst which, whatever their attitude toward formal religion, symbolize the Christian ethic and ideal.

Fifteen countries are dominated by the heritage of Islam; 3 or 4 new sovereignties in Asia uphold the Buddhist system of thought and life. There is no lack of states which adhere to the materialistic doctrines. But until 1949, 1 voice alone was missing, 1 voice did not have expression, could not respond to the challenge of statehood, society, and international relations. This was the original Hebrew voice. When we reflect upon the influence which the Hebrew mind has exerted on the course of human history its absence from the family of nations was surely an intolerable paradox.

Thus by our admission to the United Nations proposed and sponsored by Warren R. Austin on behalf of the United States, a new dimension was given to the world community. A new voice—the oldest voice—was added to the symphony of freedom.

Here I have briefly recounted the events which gave to Israel's rise a stature beyond our physical limitations. The Security Council, despite its limitations in other areas, powerfully influenced the new pattern of international relations in the Middle East.

First it localized and curtailed hostilities in 1949 and confirmed the armistice agreements which govern the rights of Israel and the Arab States. Second it initiated Israel's membership, thus completing the structure of our international status. Third, in 1951 it established, in the case of the Suez Canal, the principle of nonbelligerency and discredited the theory of a continuing state of war.

By these acts the Security Council laid the foundations for normal political relations in the Middle East.

It was my privilege to work with Mr. Austin in each of these discussions. His statesmanship was pervaded by deep stirrup of conscience. How could any American who drew his roots from this green soil fail to be inspired by the memories which Israel evoked? Israel, like America, was a land of immigrants opening its doors to the dispossessed. Israel, like America, was a land of pioneers. Israel, like America, was a country of tolerance and diversity, united so many creeds and backgrounds into the unifying discipline of a new nation. Israel, like America, was devoted to democracy, with its conception of personal and social freedom. America, like Israel, acknowledges allegiance to the laws of individual rectitude, social justice, and universal peace, first proclaimed by immortal voices in the hills and valleys of Israel, and later to become the heritage and consolation of all mankind.

Is it not natural, therefore, that our two countries have trod so many roads together and that many of the chapters of American-Israel relations have been written in the United Nations?

These thoughts, these memories of many advance and some setbacks crowd in upon me at this moment as I come to bring the gratitude of my government to one who helped to strengthen our country's early steps upon the universal stage. The State of Israel is now nearly 7 years old. It is a full member of the world community. Year by year it strengthens its foundations, increases its economic strength, intensifies its industrial activity, reinvigorates its undying devotion to the achievements of mind and spirit, sets an example of dynamic progress to its region and its continent. It has become recognized and befriended by many countries and people. We are grateful to them all. But we would be less than human if we did not have a special place in our hearts for those who befriended us when we were alone, those who went with us in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown. Such a friendship, deep and enduring, belongs from us toward your honored citizen and guest. Ambassador Austin was the father and pioneer of the American tradition in the work of the United Nations. He moved with strength

and dignity in high issues of conflict and conciliation. He has written his name on many great debates of this generation. Yet, I believe that as he looks back, he will find no greater spiritual satisfaction than that belonging to his role in assisting this small but venerable people to reassume its place of freedom in the family of nations after the torments and anguish of 2,000 bitter years.

We are a small people, we have no decorations or orders of chivalry: We can therefore bestow upon your guest the only honor that is in our power; we have written his name in green words of trees upon the landscape of our country. Perhaps in so doing we have endowed him with a precious immortality. This is a people which writes its history with an eternal pen. Nothing that ever happened to our country and our people have ever been forgotten. Therefore, as this forest casts its shade over our hallowed land, may Ambassador and Mrs. Austin derive the deep proud satisfaction of knowing that their names are established with honor upon a grateful and incomparable soil.

**PRESENTATION OF SCROLL TO WARREN R. AUSTIN
BY DR. ARTHUR GLADSTONE**

As president of the Vermont Jewish Council, I am indeed grateful to Mr. Saul S. Spiro, the chairman of the testimonial, for having given me the honor of making this presentation. Dr. Weizmann, a world-renowned Zionist and the first president of the State of Israel, once said that it is characteristic of the Jewish people to forgive and forget its enemies but to remember its friends.

So, today, Vermont Jewry is acting in the tradition of the Jewish people in honoring a friend; and we are indeed honored to play this part in the drama of perpetuating the name of Warren R. Austin in the Holy Land. I, therefore, wish, on behalf of the Jewish communities in Vermont, to present this scroll to Ambassador Austin, which reads:

**"JEWISH NATIONAL FUND FOREST IN TRIBUTE TO
WARREN R. AUSTIN**

"For his manifold, invaluable services to mankind, his outstanding contribution to the cause of freedom and democracy.

"In everlasting gratitude for his glorious part in the historic drama of the restoration of Israel, when, as United States Ambassador to the United Nations, he threw the power and influence of America on the side of the creation of the State of Israel, thus aiding in the fulfillment of the prayerful hopes and aspirations of countless Jewish generations.

"This scroll is presented marking the establishment of the Warren R. Austin Forest which the grateful Jewish community of the State of Vermont is planting in his honor, forever linking his name with the soil of Israel.

"In witness whereof we have subscribed our names and affixed our seal on the 30th day of January 1955 (the 7th day of Shvat 5715).

**"JEWISH NATIONAL FUND OF AMERICA,
"MENDEL N. FISHER, Executive Director.
"HARRIS J. LEVINE, President.
"SAUL S. SPIRO,
"Chairman, Jewish Communities,
State of Vermont."**

ADDRESS BY HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

Dr. Gladstone, very distinguished and esteemed gentlemen and ladies, I wish that the time could be given to us to eulogize the names of all of you. I feel that I have not in many years seen such a galaxy of distinguished people as I face today in this audience, and on this stage. Thank you all who are here in this magnificent synagogue center, and thank you the Vermont Jewish communities and the Jewish national fund. Your noble award of a Warren R. Austin Forest planted in the soil of Israel will pro-

mote peace through the United Nations among all people. My gratitude is too great for adequate expression, but if there is not time for more than this, I am determined to tell you the experience that Mrs. Austin and I had in seeing and understanding that faith is the real power in Christendom and in the whole world. For countless centuries there has been a covenant with God that there shall be a promised land for the chosen people. In the 20th century before Christ, "By faith Abraham sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise" (Hebrews, 11:9). Though constantly repeated covenants and promises were declared in sacred testaments, yet the fulfillment had not arrived until after a tremendous concentration of the faith of the Jews effected it, and brought it on—almost like a miracle—in a moment—as it were.

Now I lack the time to tell the full story, but this I must do. I must repeat these thoughts which Mrs. Austin and I inscribed while we were touring the Holy Land. We were studying Palestine under extremely difficult conditions, for a terror existed in that part of the world. Then and there we felt these conditions which are, I believe, the proof of the faith which was strong enough to achieve an independent state based on the venerable prophecy. This was after a great world war, when thought of the promise was cherished by the Jews. Already Jews and Zion began to aspire for a political state; not merely a national home for Jews—not merely a center of spiritual and cultural achievement. Dr. Weizmann, at Paris in 1919, at the Conference for Peace, spoke of the home that was considered at that time under the proposed mandate should be a state which is Jewish, wholly Jewish, as Jewish as America is American, or England is English. Later, in 1922, the point was made again by a great historian, a great statesman, Hughes, the Secretary of State of the United States, in a letter to Lord Balfour. He called the "home" the Jewish state. So, through modern times, we find the ideal of the fulfillment of the faith in a state, not merely a home in somebody else's state, but a state, an independent state.

We wrote down the following as we were traveling home:

"It is undeniable the vigor and self-discipline on the part of the Jewish immigrants and a determination to redeem the land of their forefathers and to erect a home for their race in the promised land have achieved miraculous transformations. Deserts have become forests, swamps have become orchards and vineyards. 'Milk and honey' has become again descriptive of that part of the land cultivated by the Jews. Health for Jews and Arabs alike has been promoted by the purification of the water and amplification of its supply. Drainage, sewage, and other hygienic works, especially the health centers and the excellent hospitals and dispensaries operated by the Haddassah, have materially improved the lives of the inhabitants. The infant mortality rates have dropped sharply. Educational facilities are widely developed, culminating in excellent universities, both Jewish and Arab. Palestine boasts a high per capita school budget in the Near East.

"The political and economic issues involved in the reconstruction of the Holy Land under the mandate compelled the attention of American public opinion (1936). In addition, the monumental example set by the Jews of Palestine of obedience to constituted authority and exercise of self-restraint under terrific provocations during the prevailing terrorism justifies a sympathetic interest in the promotion of a national home for the Jews by all friends of humanity and peace."

Much more I would like to add to this, but I must shorten what I have to say.

The ambition for a state was the perfectly natural irresistible effect of that dynamic power which the Jewish pioneer brought to Palestine. It cannot be measured by yardsticks of economics though they were very important. Four hundred and fifty million dollars of capital had been brought in through Zionist people, and others, to Palestine at that time, in 1936, and constructive use made of it in agriculture and industry, and public works and services, and the budget showed adequate surplus. I don't know how much more since then. It had tremendous implications to the welfare and the power of the Jewish people. Now then, under the mandate, it was impossible to create a political state. Nevertheless, as soon as the mandate was terminated, immediately, on May 14, 1948, when the Jews were relieved from the limitations of trusteeship, a political State of Israel was declared, and almost forthwith the Government of the United States recognized that political State of Israel.

Thereupon commenced that period of conflict and debate which followed in the Security Council. And there we found indeed a great champion of freedom, of righteousness, of execution of the Security Council, which has been maintained and glorified since that time, Ambassador Abba Eban. Within 2 years after the problem was presented to the United Nations, the State of Israel was born, without a major war; fighting had been stopped, and the way paved for lasting peace, in an area where all previous efforts at peaceful settlement had failed during 30 years and bloodshed.

I must close by saying that it was a great honor to me to be associated with such a wonderful statesman and cultured gentleman as Ambassador Eban. I sat near him throughout the great debate in the Security Council which resulted during the period of 2 years, ending in 1949, with the adoption of four armistice agreements signed between the new State of Israel and its Arab neighbors. Simultaneously, a United Nations Conciliation Commission began mediation for a settlement in the Holy Land.

And now while the world still remains in a problem of how it is to maintain peace all over the world, how we may promote it, I must say that I am still of the opinion that faith is the only real way of arriving at that goal. I want to announce publicly that I have that faith myself, that is so beautifully expressed in these words by Samuel Longfellow:

"Thy hand in all things I behold,
And all things in Thy hand."

The Leading Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following broadcast: CBS RADIO PRESENTS THE LEADING QUESTION, FEBRUARY 27, 1955

Participants: HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, House Un-American Activities Committee, and Hon. William F. Tompkins, Assistant Attorney General in charge of Internal Security Division.

They will give their answers to the lead-question: "How effective are former Communists as witnesses?"

Moderator: Dwight Cooke.

Producer: Nancy Hanschman.

Mr. COOKE. How effective are former Communists as witnesses?

Well, gentleman, recent events have raised this whole question of how effective former Communists are as witnesses, and for that matter, how useful they are and how desirable they are.

Of course, I suppose the item of news which has spurred interest in this overall subject has been the recent testimony of one Harvey Matusow, who has now, before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, testified that he has been a perpetual and habitual liar, and I believe he was involved in testifying against some 160 persons by name.

Other witnesses also have changed their minds, or decided what they said was not so.

Does this mean, Congressman WALTER, that most former Communists should not be depended on as witnesses?

Mr. WALTER. Of course it does not. To my mind it indicates that the anti-anti-Communist drive is succeeding.

Mr. COOKE. Wait a minute, a double negative is takable, but the pro-Communist drive then—

Mr. WALTER. That's it exactly. It's technically called the anti-anti-Communist drive, Mr. Cooke, but I certainly feel that the American people are quite fortunate in having people who are willing to make the sacrifices that they do make, in order to learn about the machinations of this conspiracy, willing to come forward and assist the agencies of Government in exposing this international conspiracy.

Mr. COOKE. Well now, Congressman Walter, are we not talking simultaneously about two different groups of people involved here now? First, the former Communist, like Harvey Matusow; and, second, the Americans who never were Communists, but who infiltrated into the Communist movement so that they would help the United States against it.

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. COOKE. Do you also have praise for the first group, the former Communists themselves?

Mr. WALTER. I find it very difficult to bring myself around to praising anybody who, at any time, was a member of an organization that had as its purpose the overthrow of this Republic. However, they have apparently seen the light and are willing to atone for the dreadful mistakes that they made.

Mr. COOKE. So far we have only heard from the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. TOMPKINS, how about the executive branch?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Mr. Cooke, I'd like to say this: first of all you must remember that former Communists have given very valuable testimony concerning the revolutionary principles of the Communist Party; and you should also bear in mind that their testimony has been subjected, in each instance, to extended and intensive cross-examination by highly competent counsel.

Some of their cross-examination has lasted for several weeks. Now, the testimony of these witnesses, furthermore, has been weighed by numerous American juries, and it has been found credible.

Now, so far the 85 defendants that we have tried for conspiring to violate the Smith Act, and for, and in one membership case which recently terminated here in Chicago, 82 have been convicted.

Now, I can't give you a more convincing yardstick of these witnesses.

Mr. COOKE. These witnesses being carefully tested before you present them all, as part of the case?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Very definitely so. In a preparation for a case, a host of reports have to be digested, a lot of material has to be correlated, the witnesses have to be interviewed, and you must remember that in many of these cases the witnesses are

going back many years, searching their recollection.

Now, some of them may have notes from the time that they were members of this Communist conspiracy, but others are searching back maybe 10 or 12 years.

Mr. COOKE. And yet, gentlemen, I can hear some of your listeners say, "I have been reading about a character called Harvey Matusow. He says he was a liar when he testified to the things which helped cause court decisions and jury decisions to be made in one way or another. What kind of a witness was he then, or what kind of a witness was he now?"

Mr. WALTER. Well, maybe I could answer that best, Mr. Tompkins, because I heard Matusow testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities, and it seems to me that before I mentioned his testimony, it might be well for me to point out what that committee does in order to attempt to establish the credibility and honesty of the witness before its called.

In the first place, and, General, may I say that we call on the Department of Justice for information? Is that revealing any secrets?

Well, we obtain a report from the FBI, and its judgment as to whether or not a witness is responsible and trustworthy, reliable, and honest.

Then we turn to the other agencies of Government concerned with people of this sort, and direct the same inquiry to them. Then the witness is interrogated in executive session by an investigator or counsel for the committee.

Then a report is made to the committee, as to whether or not in the judgment of the person who was charged with the responsibility of making this preliminary inquiry, this person is trustworthy.

The committee then acts, usually on the recommendation of the investigator or the attorney.

Now, that's exactly what happened with Matusow. We were of the opinion that the man was trustworthy and reliable. His story to the committee was absolutely straightforward. I saw nothing in it to indicate that it was colored, and having had the experience of trying literally hundreds of cases in the courts, and knowing something about witnesses, I felt positive that this man was telling the truth.

And, let me tell you, Mr. Cooke, I am convinced that he did tell the truth when he testified before our committee.

Subsequently, we heard stories about his recanting, we called Mr. Matusow a second time, took his original testimony and asked him questions on the original testimony, and he reaffirmed everything that he had said originally.

Now, and that is why I am thoroughly convinced that the fellow is now an emissary of the anti-anti-Communist movement, because when he said that he didn't tell the truth before our committee, then I say it was then that he lied.

Mr. COOKE. So in other words you believe now that Matusow is lying in order to help the Communist Party by impugning witnesses who've testified against people they claimed were Communists.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Cooke, not only to aid the Communist Party, but in order to try to prevent justice from being done in the cases of those conspirators who were convicted and are faced with the serving of terms in the penitentiary.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Mr. Cooke, and Congressman WALTER, I'd like to point out one very fundamental fact: People say why do you have to use these witnesses, and I'd like to quote a very famous jurist, American jurist, Judge Learned Hand, speaking for the court of appeals in the famous Dennis case, wherein the judge said:

"Courts have countenanced the use of informers from time immemorial in cases of

conspiracy or in other cases when the crime consists of preparing for another crime. It is usually necessary to rely upon informers or accomplices because the criminals will almost certainly proceed covertly."

Now, the Communists and some of the Soviet apologists and some of the left-wingers have attempted to connote something evil in the term "informer."

In other words, they have tried to cast a shadow over every one of these witnesses who will come forward and testify for the Government.

Now, a second thing that I think you should be mindful of, in the country today, there is an article that appeared in the January 30 issue of the Denver Post, and it was a very blunt announcement that the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, and I think all of us know what kind of an organization that is, and that it was expelled from the CIO—

Mr. WALTER. May I interrupt, Mr. Tompkins, for the benefit of those people who don't know what it is, let me say categorically that it is a Communist-dominated union.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Thank you, Congressman.

The International Union, at any rate, announced publicly that they were going to start a drive to discredit Government witnesses who were appearing against Maurice Travis, the union secretary-treasurer, who is awaiting trial in Denver's Federal District Court.

They have made no bones about it, that they are going to use every means to discredit the Government witnesses.

Mr. COOKE. In your statement—

Mr. WALTER. Well now, may I interrupt at that point?

Mr. COOKE. Go ahead.

Mr. WALTER. And isn't it a fact that this same union has purchased 6,000 copies of Matusow's book, which is now on the presses?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Congressman, if you will accept that amendment, it's gone up. I think it's closer to 10,000 right today.

Mr. WALTER. Well, of course it will go up, as is necessary to maintain this man.

Mr. COOKE. Well now, a minute ago Mr. Tompkins used a phrase I would like to have him expand a little bit.

You have been stressing how you believe people like Matusow are an attempt to impugn witnesses which help you convict Communists.

You used the phrase, Mr. Tompkins, "Communists," and I don't remember it specifically, it doesn't matter, and left-wingers, something to that effect.

Would you like to expand that last part of that phrase a bit, because—

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, the only way I can expand it is this: We expect to see the Daily Worker come out and denounce these witnesses, but we are very, very much mystified at some apparently respectable writers who have been carrying on a consistent campaign to discredit; and I might say some of these writers had an advance copy of Mr. Matusow's book.

Mr. COOKE. Are you thinking of a certain columnist specifically who said he'd read it, and every page had been signed by Mr. Matusow?

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's correct.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I might inform you gentlemen that I have a copy of the book here, with me, and I brought it over just because I thought that at some time or other in this discussion with the distinguished Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States somebody might raise the question about the loyalty of this man at any time.

And I think that right at the very beginning he makes it very apparent that he has always been a Communist, in addition to his testimony before the Senate the other day, when he questioned whether or not there

was any international conspiracy; but here is what he says in his book:

"My second act of political agitation was a violent one. I threw a rock through the window of the Young Communist League headquarters in my neighborhood. I knew nothing about communism, and cared less, because communism was bad and I feared and hated it.

"I lost my fear while in Europe when I met my first Communists face to face, two members of my infantry company were party members and, to my great surprise, I liked them.

"On occasion I went to Paris and there I met a number of French Communists. I found I respected them. They had all been active in the underground movement, fighting on the same side, in the same war, and for the same cause that brought me to Europe."

Now, gentlemen, I submit that as exhibit A of my charge that this man has always been a Communist, because if that isn't the Communist Party line, then I don't know what the Communist Party line is.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, I think the Congressman and I have very, very strong suspicions that Mr. Matusow had no such book in mind until he fell afoul of the Communists. I think that one of the publishers of his book pleaded the fifth amendment when questioned before a Senate committee last year in Boston.

Mr. COOKE. Not about this book, though?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Not about this book, no; the book was not in being then, I don't believe.

I think it's also interesting to note, in connection with Mr. Matusow's testimony now, in which he repudiates his testimony concerned with Clinton Jencks, an official of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Union. It's interesting to note that Mr. Matusow now has retracted his testimony, and I'd like to cite this as an example of whether his present retraction is in good faith.

When a Senate committee had a hearing, I believe it was out in Salt Lake, Mr. Matusow testified that Mr. Jencks, I believe, was a member of the party.

When Mr. Jencks was confronted by Matusow, put under oath and asked whether he was a member of the party, he pleaded the fifth amendment.

Now, I don't think it takes much reasoning to come to the conclusion as to why he pleaded the fifth amendment, and as to whether or not Mr. Matusow was then telling the truth.

Mr. WALTER. Now, General, right at that point, may I ask you this: A number of people have minimized the importance of pleading the fifth amendment. Of course, I recognize the fact that there are some people who have firm convictions about testifying; but don't you—hasn't it been your experience in checking over the people who have used the fifth amendment, that they are Communists and have a Communist background, and are using the fifth amendment instead of admitting that they are Communists?

Mr. TOMPKINS. Oh, I think that's absolutely correct, Congressman WALTER.

Mr. WALTER. Well, it's very interesting to me, in examining Matusow's testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities with respect to a youth organization. He named a number of people, and I say to you quite frankly that we have subpoenaed these people, not for the purpose of corroborating Matusow's testimony but for the purpose of establishing by other means the fact that these youth organizations against which he testified are, in fact, Communist organizations.

And it would be interesting to me to see how many of the people we've subpoenaed will plead the fifth amendment.

Mr. TOMPKINS. I think you will have quite a large group of them, Congressman.

Mr. WALTER. I am sure we will.

Mr. COOKE. There is one point I wanted to clear up, Congressman WALTER:

Are you suggesting that anyone who pleads the fifth amendment, namely, that says "I will not answer the question, because it would in some way criminally involve me," is, therefore, necessarily assumed to be a Communist?

Mr. WALTER. No, sir; nothing further from the truth. However, it's important, insofar as the Committee on Un-American Activities is concerned, to bear this in mind: That the people who have advanced the fifth amendment, have pleaded the fifth amendment, to use the vernacular, are people that we know are Communists.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, let me clear up one point, Mr. Cooke, in view of the question you just asked Congressman WALTER: Just remember this, you cannot plead the fifth amendment unless you have a reasonable apprehension that a truthful answer will incriminate you or expose you to a criminal charge.

Mr. COOKE. You can't plead it on matters of, so to speak, faith and conviction, that you don't believe that a committee has any right to ask you the question, and therefore you are not going—

Mr. TOMPKINS. I don't think you have any legal ground, so to plead it.

Mr. WALTER. That's right.

Mr. TOMPKINS. And these people are well advised by counsel, they have them outside grand-jury rooms, and next to them at hearings, and next to them at trials.

Mr. COOKE. So that a counsel says, "You can't—look here no matter what your conviction is here, you cannot plead the fifth amendment unless you have something to hide."

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's correct.

Mr. COOKE. Now, let me say—

Mr. WALTER. Wait a minute; I want to interrupt you at that point.

Mr. COOKE. We have two lawyers, and here we go.

Mr. WALTER. No, it isn't "here we go"; but you are overlooking this, Mr. Tompkins: Some of the members of the legal profession—I don't call them lawyers—you know there is a distinction between a member of the bar and being a lawyer—

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's right.

Mr. WALTER (continuing). But some of these members of the profession that you and I are members of, and are proud of, are the kind of characters who would attempt to prevent congressional inquiries from taking their full course, and would impede their work by advising their clients to hide behind the fifth amendment for no reason at all except that they, the lawyers, were desirous of preventing the truth from being known.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Congressman, you are absolutely right. I intended to bring out that point, sir. It's been my experience, in many cases, that you can pick any name out of the air; I've picked famous ballplayers, prizefighters, and people sitting next to me in grand-jury rooms, and the Communists have taken the fifth amendment.

Now, in other words, let me make this clear, and the Congressman, I think, has already made it clear—they don't plead the fifth amendment in good faith.

Mr. COOKE. All right; thank you—

Mr. WALTER. Well, I think the most dramatic instance of that comes from my own community, where a man came down here to testify—came to Washington to testify before a Senate committee—and he was approached in the Senate by a member of the bar who has appeared in a great many of these cases, who offered him his services. This man said he didn't have a lawyer, didn't want a lawyer, because he was going to tes-

tify, and this member of the Washington bar advised the man to plead the fifth amendment, which he did; he went back home to Easton, Pa., and lost his job as a steelworker.

Mr. COOKE. Mentioning Pennsylvania brings up another case, Mr. WALTER.

So far, the only witness we've mentioned by name here has been Harvey Matusow. There was a woman who testified in a hearing before the FCC, I believe, she testified first linking the owner of this television station with Communist activities, and then later retestified and said all that was false.

Where does she fall into the general picture here?

Mr. WALTER. Well, I'm afraid that the FCC has gotten around to the point where a general investigation of its activities is indicated. I couldn't imagine anybody calling the kind of a witness this woman apparently is, and giving credence to her testimony.

Mr. TOMPKINS. You want to—you brought in the name of another witness now, Mr. Cooke, and I want to bring in the name of still another one that I know the Congressman is familiar with.

Mr. COOKE. I didn't name her, but I referred to her.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, I will mention one right now that some of those who seek to undermine the Government's program have attacked—Paul Crouch. They attacked Paul Crouch for his testimony in the Philadelphia Smith Act case which was concluded here last summer. They claimed it was at variance with the testimony that he gave in the Harry Bridges case on the west coast, when he was asked did he know 98 different names, in rapid succession.

Now, let me say this: The Government could have corroborated Mr. Crouch's testimony in Philadelphia with another witness, but for reasons of security we can't, you know, always use all witnesses at a given time, for reasons of security that witness was not used; but I want to make this very clear, that Mr. Crouch's testimony in Philadelphia could be corroborated.

Mr. WALTER. Why was it necessary? One of those witnesses up there, one of the defendants up there, admitted that he was a Communist, but he said it wasn't a crime.

Mr. TOMPKINS. That's exactly right—

Mr. WALTER. Now, they are going to try to impeach Crouch's testimony because he testified against a man who admitted he was guilty.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, of course, as you know, Congressman, the Communists and their supporters want to confuse and mislead the American people.

Mr. COOKE. There's one area you gentlemen, I know, are interested in, we haven't had a chance to focus on.

Mr. WALTER mentioned it for a minute, and that's the area of witnesses who have gone into the Communist Party for you, or gone into other organizations to infiltrate and then report back. There are people who have accused them of being tattlers, spies, un-American, all kinds of things.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, that term "tattlers" reminds me of my own hometown newspaper where the editor describes a great patriotic American's testimony as tattling.

I want to tell you that it takes a great deal of courage to do what these people have done, to go into the Communist Party, lead the kind of lives that they lead when they are in it, only in order to make a contribution to the preservation of our institutions; and I think that they are deserving of a great deal of credit.

They are really the unsung heroes of this cold war.

Mr. TOMPKINS. Well, that's exactly right. I want to reiterate what the Congressman has said about these citizens who—he and I, I know, feel very strongly—are patriotic citi-

zens. For example, one of these informants had to discontinue attending his church functions because of the antagonism shown toward what were believed to be his Communist activities. The children of his neighbors were not permitted to play with his boys and girls because their father was considered a Communist.

Now, when they come and testify, editorials—they have gotten editorial support and help in everything. Now, why is it that certain people now see fit to call them "stool pigeons"?

I disagree.

Mr. COOKE. All right, gentlemen; thank you for being with me today and giving us the benefit of your knowledge and your experience in this very tricky subject of former Communists as witnesses for the Government of the United States.

A New Field of Federal Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following from the March 1955 issue of the Guaranty Survey, published monthly by the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, entitled "A New Field of Federal Regulation":

A NEW FIELD OF FEDERAL REGULATION

A question of prime importance with which Congress will be called upon to deal at this session is the economic status of one of the country's major industries—the production of natural gas. Shall the competitive and hazardous business of natural-gas production be regulated as a public utility, or shall it be allowed to operate under the rules of private competitive enterprise? The continued vitality and growth of this dynamic industry, and of others as well, may hinge upon the answer.

The question arose suddenly last June as the result of a Supreme Court decision. By a vote of 5 to 3, the Court ruled that the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which gives the Federal Power Commission authority to regulate sales of gas for resale in interstate commerce, applies to sales by independent producers to interstate pipeline companies. Section 1 (b) of the act reads: "The provisions of this act . . . shall not apply . . . to the production or gathering of natural gas." For 16 years it had been generally supposed, and the Commission itself had repeatedly ruled, that this exemption covered sales by independent producers and gatherers—that is, producers and gatherers not affiliated with the interstate pipeline companies. The Court's decision, which reversed one of the Commission's rulings, upset this established belief and the practices based upon it.

STRUCTURE OF THE NATURAL-GAS INDUSTRY

The natural-gas industry is divided into three parts. Gas is sold to consumers by local utility companies, which are regulated by local commissions. The utilities in turn buy the gas from the interstate pipeline companies, which are regulated by the Federal Power Commission. Both of these divisions of the industry are recognized as public utilities—natural monopolies—and there is no serious question as to the propriety of regulating them as such.

The third division of the industry is the discovery, extraction, purification, and gathering

of natural gas for sale to the interstate pipelines and other buyers. This business is radically different in its nature from the transportation and distribution divisions. It is done by thousands of vigorously competing companies, large and small, most of them independent of the pipeline companies. These producers operate under a wide variety of conditions. Their costs are highly variable and often cannot be determined, since natural gas is commonly found with oil and a single set of costs applies to both. The business is exceptionally hazardous, because it involves costly drilling operations, most of which produce no gas or oil. The drilling of a well often costs \$100,000 and may cost up to \$1 million, and 8 out of 9 wells, on the average, prove to be dry holes.

Large amounts of natural gas are sold locally by producers, and the abundant supply of cheap, efficient, and convenient fuel has greatly stimulated industrial development in and around the gas-producing areas. The rest of the gas is delivered to the interstate pipelines for distribution throughout the country. Some of these pipelines are more than a thousand miles long, and their aggregate mileage far exceeds that of the railroads. All but four States are now served by natural gas, and the fuel now provides nearly a quarter of the country's total energy supply. About 21 million homes use straight natural gas, and another 4 million use a mixture of natural and manufactured gas. About 15 million homes are heated by gas, and the number is increasing by about 1 million a year.

PROTECTING THE CONSUMER

The production of natural gas has been regulated by the States for many years with a view to conserving a valuable and limited natural resource. Federal regulation, on the other hand, is designed to protect consumers against exploitation. This was the primary aim of the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which placed interstate pipelines under the regulatory authority of the Federal Power Commission. The specific exemption granted by the act to the production or gathering of natural gas was in line with the basic premise underlying a private-enterprise economy, namely, that effective competition is the best protector of consumers' interests, and that governmental regulation is necessary and proper only in cases where effective competition is impossible or impracticable. Public utilities in general operate under exclusive monopolistic privileges granted by governmental charters, and in return for these privileges they must submit to dictation of rates and, in effect, limitation of earnings by governmental commissions.

The production of natural gas, however, is as far from monopolistic as an industry could well be. If gas production is a proper object of regulation in the consumer's interest, what industry is not?

The case for regulation to protect the consumer becomes even weaker when it is considered that the price received by the producer is, in most cases, a small part of the price paid by the user. The ratio varies with distance and other factors, but on the average it is estimated that 90 cents or more of the consumer's dollar pays for transmission and distribution, and only 10 cents goes to the producer. This striking disparity is, of course, no reflection upon transmitters and distributors, whose costs are heavy and whose rates are regulated. It means, however, that even if producers should give away their gas the saving to most consumers would be relatively small.

THREATENED DAMAGE

The strength of the opposition to Federal regulation of natural-gas production is based upon the belief that it is not only unnecessary but positively detrimental. Gas men are convinced that their industry cannot thrive in a public-utility environment. The

cost of drilling dry holes cannot be capitalized and hence cannot be made the basis for rate regulation by conventional methods. Exceptional risks can be taken only when there is a reasonable prospect of corresponding rewards to the successful. Unless these risks are taken, new natural-gas reserves in sufficient amounts cannot be found. Proved reserves are even now at an all-time low in relation to the rate of current use. The effort to give the consumer protection he does not need could have the effect of gradually diminishing his future supply.

The threat to the consumer is further increased by the fact that producers now have a strong incentive to escape Federal regulation by selling natural gas locally. Already consumers in areas adjacent to natural-gas fields are using four times as much gas in relation to their total power needs as are consumers elsewhere. Federal regulation may be expected to widen this disparity and, at the same time, promote the industrial development of these local areas at the expense of the rest of the country.

As for producers, they will be caught between two types of regulation aimed at two different objectives. There may well be a clash of jurisdictions, placing the producer in a position where he cannot comply with one without violating the other. Moreover, artificially low prices are undesirable from the viewpoint of conservation, for they encourage the use of an exhaustible natural resource for purposes in which other fuels can be used and might be more economical in a regime of free markets.

If the threat of dwindling interstate supply is borne out by experience, the unit costs of transmitters and distributors would seem almost certain to rise, necessitating higher rather than lower prices to the consumer. If the effect upon supply is sufficiently serious, local utilities throughout the country will have no alternative but to resort to manufactured gas, with further increases in costs and prices.

Some of the steps taken by the Federal Power Commission under its new authority have been drastic. Prices to the pipelines have been "frozen" as of June 7, the date of the Court decision, and producers have been forbidden to discontinue service without the Commission's approval. Both of these orders run contrary to the terms of many existing contracts. It has long been customary to sell natural gas under "escalator" clauses providing for regular schedules of price increases. Many contracts also contain "escape" clauses voiding the agreement in case of Federal regulation. The Commission's orders, therefore, in effect constitute a seizure of property and a denial of the right to withdraw from a type of business that may have become undesirable. They invalidate the terms of long-standing contracts upon which untold millions of dollars have been invested. It would be difficult to dispute the contention of spokesmen for the industry, who declare that no more sweeping invasion of private rights by political authority has ever been attempted in the United States except in time of war or national emergency.

The industry has reacted vigorously. The Supreme Court has been petitioned to review its decision. The Commission has been requested to reconsider the validity, necessity, and practicality of its orders. Congress is being asked to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to establish beyond doubt the exemption of independent producers and gatherers from its provisions. (Such an amendment was passed in 1950, but was vetoed by President Truman.)

The immediate loss and injustice to natural-gas producers are serious enough, but the questions involved in Federal regulation strike even deeper. An increasingly vital industry is threatened with creeping paralysis. A precious natural resource is exposed to the risk of artificially induced wast-

age. Consumers face the prospect of effects on price and supply exactly the opposite of those intended. Worst of all, the whole concept of free competitive markets is under attack. If natural-gas production is subject to Federal regulation, no segment of industry entering into interstate commerce is logically exempt. What Congress is being asked to do is not merely to rescue an important industry and its customers from the risk of grave injury, but to reaffirm a basic principle of American politico-economic philosophy.

City of Chicago Objects to Legislation Which Would Exempt Independent Producers of Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution of the City Council of Chicago:

CITY OF CHICAGO,
LAW DEPARTMENT,
City Hall, February 28, 1955.

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress, House Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your attention is respectfully solicited to proposed amendments of the Natural Gas Act to exclude so-called independent producers of natural gas from the category of natural gas companies subject to regulation. It was strenuously argued in the case of *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Wisconsin* before the Supreme Court of the United States that the Natural Gas Act was not intended to apply to producers of gas who sold their product in the State in which the gas was produced even though delivery was made to a pipeline for transportation and sale in interstate commerce. The Supreme Court held that such sales by producers are sales in interstate commerce and that such producers are natural gas companies within the purview of the Natural Gas Act and subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

It is now urged that natural gas when produced is a commodity similar to wheat and other produce and to timber, coal, ore, and oil which are sold in the open market free from price regulation; that natural gas in the field should likewise be free from regulation. The forests and produce of the land must be differentiated from the mineral resources which cannot be replenished or restored when consumed. These mineral reserves constitute the primary wealth of the Nation and the public has such vital interest in their products that they are inherently subject to Government regulation for conservation and necessary use. The necessity for regulation of traffic in such products depends upon the degree of freedom of the channels through which they can be brought to the market for ultimate consumption, as well as upon the balance of supply and demand.

Under our pattern of dual government jurisdiction, and in accordance with long established tradition, the States have assumed control of production of natural gas to prevent waste and rapid depletion of the resources within their respective boundaries and the local distribution of gas for con-

sumption. The United States Congress has undertaken to regulate the production and transmission of natural gas for interstate commerce to protect the ultimate consumers from economic pressure incident to virtual monopoly of the interstate channels for distribution of the gas.

The producers of gas are primarily engaged in the production of oil. They explore the country for oil and may discover gas, which, but for the demand of distant consumers developed by investors in interstate transmission facilities, would be burned up or carried away by the winds. They are not interested in the security, comfort, or convenience of posterity, or, for that matter, in the welfare of the present generation. They are bent upon immediate exploitation of all the oil and gas which they can sell in the present advantageous market with preferential taxwise consideration for depletion. Since oil and gas are competitive fuels the producers can control the price of both if the gas can be sold without regulation. Hence, they have organized an unprecedented lobby for exemption from regulation of the price of natural gas produced for sale in interstate commerce, advancing incompatible arguments, in support of their right to a free competitive market price, that it will stimulate exploration for gas to supply the demand and encourage conservation of the resources in the natural gas fields.

The corporate authorities of the city of Chicago, in behalf of its million consumers of natural gas, having evaluated the special interest of the producers, who are now subject to regulation under the Natural Gas Act, their incompatible interest in the sale of both oil and natural gas, and their spurious and inconsistent arguments against the interest of the consumers, as well as the interest of investors in other natural gas companies, which the Natural Gas Act is designed to protect, passed a resolution opposing any action of Congress to nullify the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that independent producers of natural gas for sale in interstate commerce are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

A certified copy of the resolution of the City Council of Chicago is herewith transmitted.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH F. GROSSMAN,
Special Assistant Corporation Counsel.
Approved:

JOHN J. MORTIMER,
Corporation Counsel.

RESOLUTION ON EXEMPTION OF INDEPENDENT PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS FROM REGULATION BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Whereas more than 1 million homes in Chicago are dependent upon a supply of natural gas from the Peoples Gas System for cooking, and many of them for other domestic uses, such as water heating, refrigeration, and space heating; and

Whereas the Peoples Gas System is an integrated system of interstate natural-gas companies and the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. the sole distributor of gas in the city of Chicago and said system is dependent in great measure upon a supply of gas purchased from so-called independent natural-gas producers who have heretofore been free to sell their gas at prices affected by competition between natural-gas pipeline companies seeking a supply of natural gas to satisfy their respective customer demands; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently determined in the case of *Phillips Petroleum Company v. Wisconsin*, that independent producers are natural-gas companies within the purview of the Natural Gas Act and are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission to prevent unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory

prices for natural gas produced and sold in interstate commerce; and

Whereas the oil and gas interests in the United States have initiated a nationwide campaign through the press and other media for enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to exempt producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission so that they may exact from those who supply gas for ultimate consumption in the homes of Chicago and elsewhere the highest price obtainable by the incidence of competition among the pipelines for their sources of supply; and

Whereas such competition and competitive prices will rapidly increase the cost of gas for domestic uses in Chicago and elsewhere and will inevitably increase such cost as to restrict the normal use of gas necessary for the health and comfort of residents of Chicago: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States be fully informed of the consequences of such legislation and that the corporation counsel be and he is hereby directed to use all proper means, and to make such representations to the Congress of the United States, to prevent the enactment of legislation exempting producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,

County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of that certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Wednesday, the 26th day of January A. D. 1955.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 16th day of February A. D. 1955.

LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
Chief Clerk.

Alaska Steamship Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an outline of the history of the Alaska Steamship Co. Today this fine shipping concern, whose headquarters are in Seattle, the gateway to Alaska, begins its 61st year of service to our great and growing Territory in the north.

The matter follows:

March 3 marks the completion of 60 years of Alaska Steamship Co. service to Alaska. With the sailing from Seattle of the motorship *Square Sinnet* scheduled for March 4, the Alaska line will have commenced its 61st year.

Organized in the rough and tumble nineties, Alaska Steamship Co. served Alaska through the gold-rush period. It carried cargo to Skagway before the White Pass and Yukon route was constructed, to Seward before the Alaska Railroad came into being, and into Valdez when the Richardson Highway was a trail.

Seattle was but one of a number of Puget Sound ports serving Alaska in 1895. Most of Alaska traffic was carried by vessels headquartered in San Francisco. There had been a number of gold discoveries in Alaska and the demand for shipping to the north land

was brisk. Charles E. Peabody, the father of Capt. Alex M. Peabody, the present president of Puget Sound Navigation Co., together with Capt. George Roberts, G. H. Lent, and C. E. Taylor, citizens of the Puget Sound region, figured that a Puget Sound-Alaska steamship operation should pay off and announced plans for a service to southeastern Alaska.

The immediate response was not encouraging. The Pacific Coast Steamship Co., the major carrier in the trade, slashed passenger fares to all northern points. First-class tickets were cut from \$52 to \$20, second class, from \$30 to \$10, as chronicled by the Tacoma Ledger of January 22, 1895. "The supposed objective," the story said, "is to cut out the new steamship line to Alaska."

J. A. Johnson, superintendent of the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. left no doubt. "We are going to have the travel, if we have to pay premiums to passengers to induce them to ride with us," he said.

Nevertheless on January 28, 1895 with \$30,000 capital Peabody and his associates organized the Alaska Steamship Co. at Port Townsend. They purchased the 136-foot 450-ton steamer *Willapa* and set a bimonthly schedule from Seattle with the initial sailing date of March 3.

Six days before the first scheduled departure the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. slashed freight rates from \$11 to \$3 a ton as reported by the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of February 28, 1895. But the alterations on the *Willapa* were completed and she sailed as scheduled with a full complement of 79 passengers and a capacity load of cargo. The Alaska Line was in business.

Two years later, on July 17, 1897, the steamer *Portland* of the Pacific Steam Whaling Co. arrived in Seattle with a ton of gold from the Klondike. That news, flashed around the world, sparked a stampede of thousands intent on getting to the gold fields. The demand for transportation became intense. In order to help meet it the Alaska Line purchased and placed into service the now historic steamers *Rosalie*, *Farallon*, *Dirigo*, *Dolphin*, and *Jefferson*.

While gold activity in Alaska continued at a high pitch another metal, a base metal, entered the life of the Alaska Steamship Co. The Guggenheim interests had acquired a number of copper properties in the Prince William Sound area and to insure adequate transport for their ores and concentrates they purchased the Northwestern Steamship Co., organized as a result of the Nome gold strike in 1899. This company served Prince William Sound, Seward, Cook Inlet, Alaska Peninsula, and the Nome run. Three years later, on January 1, 1908, the Northwestern Steamship Co. and Alaska Steamship Co. joined forces as the Alaska Steamship Company of Nevada under the presidency of Charles E. Peabody. This extended the service of the Alaska Line to include all Alaska routes.

The combined fleet of the enlarged company numbered 18 vessels, including the steamers *Victoria*, *Dora*, *Edith*, *Orizaba*, which later became the *Northwestern*, and the ore carrier *Seward*.

The Alaska Steamship Co. transported thousands of prospectors to and from the gold fields and millions of dollars in gold, but from 1908 until the copper mines became exhausted in 1938, copper from Kennecott and Latouche provided the only substantial year around traffic that moved from Alaska. This haul helped to sustain the Alaska line through good years and bad when other companies were bowing in and out of the trade. In all about 70 companies did, and for good reason. The Alaska trade is considered one of the most difficult. In 1947 during a discussion of the death of operators in the trade by a congressional committee investigating Alaska shipping,

George Talmadge, of the United States Maritime Commission, in response to a question from Congressman Willis W. Bradley, said:

"Sir, I personally asked at least 25 principal steamship companies if they could possibly be induced, under any circumstances, to enter the Alaska trade. Replies ranged from a horselaugh to nuts. That generally is considered as one of the least desirable trades any one would want to be in."

The trade is seasonal, emphasized by rigorous winters and characterized by a one-way haul situation. Stretching along Alaska's prodigious coast line are many ports to be served, only a fraction of which are able to offer the 500-ton-call inducement required in other United States trades. Any ship's master will tell you Alaskan waters are among the most hazardous. Disasters were frequent in the pre-radar days. While these figured strongly in the changes in the composition of the Alaska Line fleet, Alaska Line vessels also figured in some noteworthy rescues. Probably the most outstanding involved the steamer *Cordova* while under the command of Capt. Thomas Moore. She was at Nome on September 20, 1914, when a distress call came from the revenue cutter *Tahoma*, sinking off Kleka Island. She had hit an uncharted reef. The *Cordova* steamed 1,900 miles, running as far west as Attu Island to rescue 66 crew members. The 29 others were picked up by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey ship *Patterson*.

Altogether during the Alaska Line's 60 years of service, the company has lost 18 ships through marine casualties. Three of these occurred during World War II, which otherwise proved to be a costly period for Alaskan operators.

A combined fleet of 43 ships of 83,252 tons served Alaska in 1942 when the Government War Shipping Administration took over the operation and requisitioned the vessels of the owners: Alaska Steamship Co., Alaska Transportation Co., Northland Transportation Co., Santa Ana Steamship Co., and a number of salmon packers. In most cases these ships were reassigned to the owners as agents to operate where, when, as, and how the Government directed. On this basis the Alaska Line operated their ships and about 50 additional which were assigned them for operation in supply of the military throughout the world.

Long identified with Alaska through their salmon-cannery interests the Skinner & Eddy Corp. of Seattle purchased the Alaska Steamship Co. from Kennecott Copper Corp. In 1944 and Gilbert W. Skinner became president.

Although the war in the Pacific ended in August 1945, vessel operating costs in the Alaska trade had skyrocketed to the extent that the Government found it necessary to continue this operation 3 years more. When finally returned to private account in 1948 only 6 ships of 25,000 tons remained. Forty-seven ships of 58,000 tons had been lost to the trade through war and marine casualties, requisitions for title and the sale of obsolete bottoms.

The operators now faced greatly inflated costs and the problems of vessel replacement. As a consequence by January 1, 1949, 6 months after the end of Government service, all prewar operators except Alaska Steamship Co. had pulled out of the trade.

The Alaska Line inaugurated a program of improvement. Their vessels were among the first to be outfitted with radar. They moved their headquarters to the spacious modern pier 42 terminal facility. They purchased 4 Liberty ships and 1 Knot type coastal freighter. In each of the Liberties portable 'tween decks were installed to facilitate handling the large volume of Alaskan packaged cargo. The floor of the vessels' holds were paved like a city street to permit rapid movement of fork-lift trucks employed in the company's unitized cargo program.

This program was inaugurated in 1952 with a few hundred containers used exclusively on the southeastern Alaska route. The Alaska Line now has 10,000 containers in service and more on order. They range in size from a 60 cubic foot collapsible type to refrigerated trailer vans of 2,000-cubic-foot capacity. The growth of this service, which now includes all principle areas of Alaska, is attributed to the savings to shippers in handling, packaging, and marking, and the protection against pilferage, loss, and damage.

The most advanced type of container service, a searail operation, is now receiving intensive study by the company.

In October 1953, Gilbert W. Skinner died and his son, D. E. Skinner, who had been vice president and general manager of the line since 1950, succeeded his father to the presidency. Melville McKinstry is vice president and general manager; R. C. Anderson, executive vice president; R. J. Behnke, vice president and treasurer; and Albert L. Cahill, secretary.

For many years the Alaska Line has maintained agencies throughout Alaska to assist Alaskans in meeting their transportation problems and to handle essential ship's business. These agencies are located at Ketchikan, Wrangell, Petersburg, Juneau, Haines, Skagway, Sitka, Cordova, Valdez, Seward, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Homer, Seldovia, Kodiak, and Nome.

One of the early carriers in the coastwise passenger service, the Alaska Line was the last American line to withdraw from this business. Mounting costs and other problems that had kept passenger service deep in red ink since the end of World War II led to its suspension in October 1954. Now Alaska Steamship Co. completes its 60th year of Alaskan operations and begins its 61st specializing in cargo transportation, which has been the backbone of its activity from the start.

Officials of the company point with pride to the extra years of passenger service they were able to provide to Alaska beyond the time when all other American coastwise passenger operations had been suspended. They also add up their record of cargo-handling improvements since the war and say that Alaska can expect more of this in the future.

Package Freight Service on Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Congress of the United States to support measures to restore package freight service on the Great Lakes

Whereas the Congress of the United States under Public Law 856 enacted by the 81st Congress, provided that certain surplus vessels could be reconverted for use as package freighters on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the vessels which were so reconverted were not used for the purpose intended because of the outbreak of the Korean war, but were assigned to the carrying of iron ore; and

Whereas prior to World War II package freight was a major Minnesota industry. In excess of 700,000 tons of freight were

shipped to and from the port of Duluth during the last year that package freighters operated on the Great Lakes. Included in said shipments from the State of Minnesota were approximately 64,000 tons of butter; 6,000 tons of buttermilk; 12,000 tons of cheese; 28,000 tons of cream; 6,000 tons of eggs; 45,000 tons of dressed poultry; 170,000 tons of flour; 107,000 tons of mill products; in excess of 18,000 tons of wool; 19,000 tons of lumber; 3,000 tons of paper products and in excess of 40,000 tons of manufactured metal products; and

Whereas this trade benefited every segment of the Minnesota economy including the great agriculture and manufacturing industries; and

Whereas the discontinuance of this trade not only has adversely affected our agriculture and manufacturing industries, but has caused substantial unemployment in the maritime industries at the head of the Great Lakes; and

Whereas the restoration of package freight service on the Great Lakes not only will substantially contribute to the well-being and growth of Minnesota industry, provide a market for products grown and manufactured in Minnesota, both at home and abroad, but will also help reduce unemployment and more importantly will provide a stepping stone to the maximum use of the facilities of the port of Duluth for international trade when the St. Lawrence seaway has been completed; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring. That the President of the United States, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effect the restoration of package-freight service on the Great Lakes; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Adopted by the house of representatives, the 1st day of February 1955.

ALFRED F. JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
G. H. LEAHY,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
Adopted by the senate, the 11th day of February 1955.

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
President of the Senate.
HY TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.
Approved February 18, 1955.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Indefinite Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the House a very disturbing situation which has arisen in my district in connection with the new civil-service appointment system, referred to, I believe, as the career conditional appointment system, which went into effect in January.

On the surface the technical features of this program point to a definite im-

provement of the system. However, as is so often the case, when put into practical operation many grave inequities immediately become apparent. I am referring in particular to the unfortunate position in which over 1,000 employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard have been placed through no fault of their own. Many of these employees, having a record of from 3 to 8 years' continuous employment in the yard and with excellent performance records, now find themselves with an indefinite classification, and as such will fall victim to the first reduction in force that comes along, simply because at the time of employment the civil-service register had either been exhausted or was not established. Conversely many other employees with much less length of service and perhaps a lower efficiency rating have been classified as career conditional or in some cases given career status, with all the benefits and protection attendant to these categories.

I have received scores of letters protesting the arbitrary enactment of this new system. Many of the authors of these protests are known to me personally as fine craftsmen and would represent a serious loss to the defense effort should they fall victim to this ill-conceived order. I am asking the Civil Service Commission to review this program to the end that these glaring inequities be corrected.

As further proof of the disturbed condition of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, I offer by way of explanation an editorial entitled "Indefinite Status," which appeared on Friday, February 25, 1955, in the Salute, a weekly publication of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard:

INDEFINITE STATUS DISCUSSED

The retention of PSNS employees junior in length of service to shopmates who recently received reduction-in-force notices has given rise to questions about the regulations that authorize this apparent inequity.

In January the Civil Service Commission directed the Navy to replace the indefinite system of appointment with the career system. Under the new regulations indefinite employees who had been hired from the civil-service register were automatically converted to a career or career-conditional status. Other indefinites who may have been hired for similar work but were hired instead by recruiting (off the street), remained in an indefinite status and with lower retention rights. Because indefinite employees are in the lowest retention status they are usually the first to be affected by a reduction in force.

Prior to the adoption of new regulations the Civil Service Commission made no distinction between persons hired off the register and those hired by recruiting. During the Korean buildup registers were exhausted and many employees were hired off the street.

When notice of the new regulations was received the shipyard took every step possible to convert indefinite employees to career or career-conditional status. The conversion procedure requires that the indefinite employee who did not receive appointment from the register must now file and be within reach for appointment before he can be changed to retention group II.

The shipyard is doing little hiring at present and as current registers have many outside applicants it is not expected that conversion of all indefinite employees will be accomplished in the near future.

Los Angeles County School Shortage Expected To Grow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the Los Angeles Times for Monday, February 28, is set forth an article on the important shortage of schools in southern California. I was very sure its contents would be of great interest and information for all of us in this great legislative body, who are naturally and properly concerned about the subject of education in our great Nation and the shortage of schools and consequently the shortage of the full educational opportunities for the American children in our Nation.

The article follows:

SCHOOL SHORTAGE EXPECTED TO GROW—BUILDING CZAR PREDICTS THAT BY 1957 50,000 MORE WILL GO HALF-TIME

(By James Hubbart)

Nowhere in the country is the problem of classroom shortages more acute than it is in the sprawling Los Angeles school system, where about 38,000 youngsters at present are attending school part time.

And in the words of Virgil M. Volla, the district's new building czar: "If you think we've had it up to now, just wait another 5 years."

Volla estimates that an additional 50,000 pupils will have been affected by half-day sessions by 1957 at the present rate of expansion.

NEED 3,400 MORE ROOMS

The projected enrollment for the city schools in 1960 is 523,151 children—an increase of about 144,000 over this year. Volla says it will take 3,400 new classrooms to house all these youngsters.

To finance this construction the voters will be asked to approve a \$133 million bond issue in April—the third such measure since the stork sweepstakes started in 1946.

With all its woes, however, the future for Los Angeles is considerably brighter than it is for the neighboring smaller districts.

RED TAPE BLAMED

"Money has never been our chief worry," says Volla. "The voters of the district have always responded to the need and we have no reason to believe they won't do it again."

"There are three other reasons why our building program has lagged behind the enrollment—red tape, educators themselves, and our failure to tool up for the job."

Volla, an outspoken realist who has some resolute ideas on how schools should be built, now has command of the entire operation. What he says goes.

But this was not always so. For 9 years the process functioned with divided responsibility and little in the way of a clear-cut policy. Everybody had a piece of the action.

PLANS OFTEN REVISED

"We had to get our preliminary plans okayed by supervisors and assistant superintendents, all of whom had different ideas," Volla relates.

"Teachers and administrators would be forever coming in with last-minute changes—an extra door here, more shelves there—until it got so the architects were drawing the plans over and over, trying to please everyone."

"Educators, by and large, are not very good business people. They're always changing

the curriculum and teaching methods to keep up with the latest trends. So when they hear of an innovation in classroom design they want to try it out right away. Thus we haven't been able to get uniformity."

Dr. Alexander J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools during all this indecision, was every inch an educator and a confirmed idealist.

Stoddard was proud of standing up at school-board meetings and saying, "Nothing is too good for our youngsters. They deserve the best, so let's see that they get it."

Stoddard demanded bigger and better classrooms with all the newest instructional improvements. With him the best possible educational opportunity for the child was the primary consideration.

He was a devout champion of the junior college system, and the idea of erecting an \$800,000 football stadium and auditorium at East Los Angeles Junior College was attributed to him.

VETOED BY VOTERS

The reasoning behind this was that starting with the stadium would naturally inspire the people to build a fine school around it.

But the voters crossed Stoddard up in the 1952 election by rejecting the junior college bond issue. The result: ELAJC students are still studying in war-surplus shanties in the shadow of one of the prettiest stadiums in town.

"High ideals are the life blood of education," Volla agrees, "but in these abnormal times, ideals have to be compromised. To build schools in a hurry, you have to cut corners."

Besides the time-consuming deference to the wants of educational theorists, Los Angeles must join with 2,000 other California districts in having its plans and specifications approved by the State division of architecture, an agency which is hard pressed to handle the crush of business.

CITY O. K. NEEDED

On top of that, city and county planning commissions must pass on the plans, and building permits must be issued. More months drift by.

"We start out with a school designed to house 900 pupils," says Volla, "but by the time it's finally completed, there are 1,200 kids knocking on the door."

Buying land for a new school also takes up valuable time. It has to be surveyed and it must go through escrow. If a condemnation proceeding is necessary, it takes even longer.

Perhaps the most classic example on record is the school system's purchase of the Watts Junior High School site. They've been buying up the land—lot by lot—for more than 2 years. And the chore isn't finished yet. Owners of some of the parcels can't be located.

Despite the obstacles, Los Angeles has accomplished what is nationally recognized as a remarkable job in keeping up with the expanding pupil population. Approximately 55,000 children have been taken off half-day sessions since 1948.

Volla believes that with a better coordinated program he can do even better. The board of education had enough confidence in him to promote him to assistant superintendent at \$16,000 a year.

"We're aiming for more standardization of classrooms, and whole schools where possible—at least everything above the foundations," he reports.

"Portable buildings which can be moved from place to place can be used more advantageously. And the possibility of building schools with prefabricated sections has barely been touched.

"Simplification of the rules and regulations would help us more than anything. We still

have to submit for State approval a separate set of plans for each school. That the plans may be identical doesn't matter. And even if we reuse our plans, the law says we must have supervision of an architect each time. All that wastes time and money.

"And why can't we have a uniform building code for schools instead of a different set of ground rules in every community?"

Volla's formula is to streamline everything, eliminate the frills and approach schoolhouse construction on a mass production basis.

It remains to be seen whether this view can be reconciled with the almost traditional opposition by teachers and their organizations, and even by whole communities, to austere, look-alike schoolhouses.

"We're asking teachers and principals to help us by getting along with the bare essentials," Volla says. "The classrooms they'll have to work in won't be educational showplaces, but they'll do.

"Remember, the more refinements you put into a school, the longer it takes to plan and build it."

Volla figures he'll have to make some iron-handed decisions in the task ahead and say "no" to a lot of people. He doesn't expect to win any popularity contests.

Says he:

"Maybe that seems hardballed, but I happen to believe that even a tent on full-day session is better than an ideal classroom on a half-time basis."

Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the other day it was my privilege to include in the RECORD the speech of one of the four national co-winners of the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Broadcasters. The young lady who was among the top winners of the contest, in which over a million young Americans participated, is Miss Catherine Styles, an exchange student from New Zealand, who is making her home this year in Minneapolis.

It is unfortunate that more of these essays are not available to the public. It must have been a hard job for the judge to select only four out of the thousands of splendid statements revealing so thrillingly the thoughts and aspirations of young Americans today.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the contribution to this contest by Ralph Marlatt given as a speech in the District of Columbia contest in which he received honorable mention. He is a senior at St. John's College High School here in the District.

The speech follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Ralph J. Marlatt)

I speak for democracy as Americans have always spoken for democracy. Our land and our people have a rich heritage in democracy. The basic principle was written into the first American declaration that "all men are created equal." Americans believed it then, Americans believe it now. It is this belief and our constant endeavor to follow the pre-

cepts of liberty, equality, and justice which have made it possible for us to grow into a great and powerful nation.

Democracy was not presented to us by our founding fathers already shaped and fashioned. True, they did guarantee that men should enjoy the "certain unalienable rights."

However, the first step in securing these rights meant that Americans were willing to go to war, to fight and die to preserve those rights for themselves and their posterity.

It is significant that all America's wars have been fought, not for conquest, not for gain, nor for the purpose of enslaving other peoples, nor adding new territory, but to preserve democracy and to guarantee the freedom of men everywhere.

In the day of our fathers, Americans fought and died in three wars, not on our soil, but in far-distant lands and they, too, fought and died for democracy. And wherever men have challenged tyranny and injustice and the threat of enslavement, Americans have fought alongside them. For Americans believe that all men in all lands are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with the right to be free.

As we have been willing to fight for democracy in war, so we have been willing to live for democracy in peace. America has welcomed men of all faiths, all religions, all creeds, and we have said to them, "here you may seek a haven, here you may worship according to your mind and heart."

Because we spoke for democracy we wanted all men to be equally prepared to make for themselves a better life and so we established a great school system. And from our schools, public and private, have come capable scholars, learned scientists, great industrialists, men of business, poets, singers, writers, and inspirational leaders in all fields of endeavor. We speak for democracy in our schools.

When we provided for freedom of worship and freedom to learn, we then gave man another freedom, freedom of opportunity. Into our vast industrial system went the heart, the mind and the sinew of democracy, and our factories were developed, our great cities came into being, and our productive farms stretched across 3,000 miles of rich and fertile land. It is not mere poetry when we sing of our shining seas and towering mountains; these are songs of democracy and they speak for democracy by which free men have conquered the seas and the mountains and the great plains and have drawn from the bounties of nature food and fiber for a land which now boasts of more than 160 million free men.

So from our Founding Fathers dream of democracy we fashioned this structure we know today as America. But the job is not yet complete, nor can it ever be complete so long as there is one man on earth who is not free. Democracy offers us a daily challenge, the challenge to keep it alive. For democracy is a living principle and must grow and expand or it dies. We have not yet created a perfect land, but the essence of democracy is that we have the opportunity to keep striving for perfection.

In speaking for democracy today I speak not only for Americans, but for the millions of human beings who are enslaved. Our democracy can never be secure, nor can we ever truly enjoy the blessings of liberty while millions are behind an iron curtain. Speak up, then, you who claim to believe in democracy, speak up on your streets, in your community, in your State, and in your Nation. Speak up by accepting the responsibilities of citizenship and demanding that all men are given freedom of opportunity in this land of ours and throughout the world. The ultimate victory of democracy will be when each man stands up and declares without fear and without qualification, "I speak for democracy."

Burley-Type Tobacco**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Tobacco of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, it has come to my attention that the burley-type tobacco program is not operating as it should or as the Congress had contemplated it would under the present program.

As a result of this, the representatives of burley-tobacco growers from the several States involved recently held a meeting and have made a number of recommendations to strengthen and improve the tobacco program.

In addition to this, our subcommittee held a joint meeting today with the Tobacco Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Representatives of the Department of Agriculture testified before us and made certain recommendations of proposed changes in the law so as to improve the present tobacco program.

The recommendations were as follows:

The Department recommends five changes in legislation:

1. The act be amended to permit re-determination of the 1955 national marketing quota and State and farm acreage allotments for burley tobacco on the basis of data now available.

2. The rate of penalty on the marketing of excess tobacco be increased from 50 percent to 75 percent of the average market price during the previous year.

3. Amend the act to provide that any acreage of tobacco harvested in excess of the allotted acreage for any farm for any year shall not be considered in the establishment of the allotment for the farm in succeeding years.

4. Amend the act to require a reduction in the acreage allotment next established for a farm if any person connected with the farm causes, aids, or acquiesces in filing or causing to be filed any report with respect to the acreage of tobacco grown on the farm which the county committee determines to be false.

We wish to direct the committee's attention to another serious problem which applies only to burley tobacco. That relates to minimum allotments. We estimate that about 64 percent of the 320,000 farms having burley allotments have allotments of seven-tenths of an acre or less. If this minimum is maintained, it will necessitate drastic reductions in the allotments above the minimum. It is suggested that the committee may want to give careful consideration to the many problems relating to minimum farm acreage allotments.

5. There is one other suggestion we have, which does not apply to burley tobacco since growers have consistently approved quotas for 3-year periods. However, on some other kinds of tobacco, quotas have been approved 1 year and then disapproved for the next year. We recommend that the act be amended to eliminate the provision whereby growers may vote for quotas either for 3 years or 1 year and provide for voting only on the question of quotas for 3 years. This proposal does not apply to burley tobacco where growers always approve quotas for

3-year periods. This would eliminate the expense of establishing allotments and conducting referenda in areas where growers are opposed to marketing quotas. Further, it would prevent losses to Commodity, since a sound price-support program cannot be operated on an in-1-year and out-the-next basis.

Let Us Fight Against Multiple Sclerosis**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, for all of us concerned with the health of the Nation, there is a problem of vital urgency—and that is to control the disastrous effects of the crippling disease, multiple sclerosis.

In thousands of households there are young mothers and young fathers stricken with disabling multiple sclerosis. This means that there are mothers who cannot take care of their homes—guide their children—play with their children. That there are fathers who must cease being breadwinners; who are unable to assume their role as the head of the family unit. This also means that there are young men and women throughout the land—some in college, who are forced to give up their education; some just starting on careers they are unable to pursue; because they have been afflicted with MS, which is the popular abbreviation for multiple sclerosis.

Multiple sclerosis is indeed a matter of pressing import to the Nation for, at this time, the cause and cure of this insidious disease are unknown. It attacks mostly young adults in the prime of youth—those between the ages of 20 and 40—the very best, the most productive years, of any person's life, and it strikes at the very heart of the basic foundations of our society—the home and the family.

Let me try to explain for a moment, for those of you who may not understand the nature of this mysterious illness, just what this is all about. I have tried to find out for myself and I will speak in terms which I have understood, as a layman, from my discussions with doctors who have specialized in this field.

Multiple sclerosis is a disease of the central nervous system. It gets its name from the fact that multiple, or "many," sclerosis, or "scars," form in certain areas of the brain and spinal cord. This results in what may be likened to a short circuit, nerve impulses which usually pass through the central nervous system are blocked by scar tissue which has formed on nerve covering. Then we have the usual symptoms of the disease which may be: paralysis in hands, arms, and legs; blurred or double vision; staggering gait; garbled speech; loss of personal functions. A victim of MS may have one or all of these distressing symptoms. The ordinary dignities with which most of us are privileged—such as washing ourselves, dressing ourselves, taking a walk around the block, reading

or watching television—all these private necessities, pleasures, and privileges are often denied sufferers of multiple sclerosis. Some victims are ambulatory; some are on crutches or in wheelchairs; most severe cases are bedridden. There are about one quarter of a million victims of MS in the country.

Because MS is usually progressive, and thus far incurable, it presents a problem of care and financial stress which always goes with chronic long-term illness.

I am glad to say that all is not black in this picture. Something is being done across the Nation to help the victims of multiple sclerosis. In 1946, with the founding of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, an intensive program of research and patient-care service for MS sufferers was begun. Today the society is a vast organization with some 65 chapters throughout the United States, all supported by public funds. The society is a clearing houses in MS for all up-to-date scientific and self-help information for patients and physicians.

Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, this year, as in the previous year, is honorary chairman of the campaign to raise funds for this very important and worthy organization. In this respect, Mrs. Eisenhower is a real helpmate to her husband, for our own Mr. President has been a staunch ally in helping Congress to appropriate funds for continued and expanded aid in the fight against chronic neurological, crippling illness. President Eisenhower has made magnificent strides throughout the country in the field of rehabilitation of the disabled. The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped has worked with nonprofit health organizations, such as the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, in spurring the public's support and industry's support in the help to our disabled.

There is much reason for hope in the multiple-sclerosis problem. Leading scientists in universities and laboratories throughout the land and beyond its borders are engaged in intensive research—about 45 projects in all—to find the answers to the cause and cure of multiple sclerosis. Clinics for the rehabilitation of multiple-sclerosis victims are in operation, teaching independence and self-reliance to the severely handicapped. All this heartening work is being done under the guidance and support of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, which in turn is dependent upon public funds and governmental appropriations in order to sustain and expand its promising work.

Each year the Government appropriates funds to the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness. This vast Institute, which is conducted by our foremost research scientists, is at present investigating the causes and treatment of multiple sclerosis. It is one more example of hope in dealing with this problem.

I urge all of my fellow Congressmen to give serious thought to the ways in which each of us, in our own way, may help in the fight against crippling multiple sclerosis. Perhaps we may serve on special committees, perhaps we may be

able to fight for bigger and better appropriations in the war against crippling neurological diseases. To be sure, it is, as they say, "all for the good of the country."

Former Diplomat From Country Now Behind Iron Curtain Says Exiles Rejoice in United States Stand on Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by the eminent columnist, Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

SEES CAUSE FOR REJOICING IN UNITED STATES STAND ON FORMOSA

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Much to my surprise, the foreign ex-diplomat welcomed me with a broad smile.

"Sit down. What shall it be—a cup of tea, whiskey, vodka, slivovitsa."

E. A. M. Has somebody back home left you a fortune?

F. E. D. If he had, the Communists would have been in possession of it long since.

E. A. M. Other good news, perhaps?

F. E. D. Good news from Formosa.

E. A. M. What's happened?

F. E. D. Can't you see—the American Government is standing up to the Communists in the matter of those off-shore islands.

E. A. M. What's so startling about that? Did you think we were going to invite them to take the whole Far East?

ANOTHER MUNICH

F. E. D. No; but I expected another Munich—a sellout.

E. A. M. Now, come. We stood up well enough in Greece, at Berlin, and in Korea, though we ought to have united that country by force. We have strengthened the Middle East and gained ground in Iran.

F. E. D. Yes, but you let the Communists keep half of Indochina, and you yourself think they may get the rest.

E. A. M. The Communists got north Vietnam all right. But we made the concession not to them but to our European allies.

F. E. D. Precisely. But at Formosa, your administration is standing up both to the Communists and to your allies. Believe me, that is good news for all of us exiles.

E. A. M. I fail to see how disputes among allies can help you much.

F. E. D. In the short run they do not help us. Especially not when, as usual, you Americans give in. But in the long run, there will be no peace for the world and no liberation for captive countries until the American administration does what is right, regardless of war-shot and trembling allies in Europe.

E. A. M. Come now. They aren't that bad.

DEPTH OF FEAR

F. E. D. They are worse. What you do not realize—you Americans—is the depth of fear and cynicism to which the West European countries have sunk. You talk of stopping communism, and perhaps one day you will. Your allies talk only of preventing war.

To prevent another war they are ready—indeed, eager—to feed other countries and peoples piecemeal to the Communist wolves.

Of course, they do not like to see communism grow. But if the choice is between handing over another five, ten, or 50 million foreigners as slaves to communism and having a war, they will gladly hand over the foreigners.

Some of us exiles believe they will not even fight to defend themselves. I do not go so far. But I can tell you, they will continue throwing victims to the Soviet wolves until you stop them.

Now it is the Chinese offshore islands you must make Chiang give up. Tomorrow, if you yield the islands, it will be Formosa itself. Next time, what remains free of Indochina—South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Then—why not?—Thailand and Burma. And so on, right back to their own countries.

E. A. M. You exaggerate.

BLACKMAIL

F. E. D. Not a bit. See how they are trying to blackmail you into surrendering the islands. A great English newspaper has the nerve to write that Americans must choose between keeping those islands and having West Europe as an ally.

Ignominy could go no lower. During the last war you saved West Europe. You might have simply defeated Japan and let Hitler conquer Russia. Where would West Europe be?

And now because you are drawing a line in Asia, they have the nerve to blackmail you with loss of their precious support. Tell them to go jump and see how quickly they will change their tune. For, without you, they are goners, lacking both the power and the will to resist.

E. A. M. I understand the feeling of you exiles whose countries were seized by the Soviets. But do you think your peoples are willing to pay for their liberation by another world conflict worse than any ever seen?

F. E. D. Willing? They are eager. Here—see these letters. What is more, if you make communism stronger, you will have a war as sure as tomorrow—unless your allies can induce you to surrender.

No; you have been losing—on balance. But now in Formosa you are standing up against both enemies and allies. We exiles do not know if it will last, but while it does, it looks wonderful.

Here, have a slivovitsa. To freedom.

A Prayer for Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that a piece of mail comes to our desks that is worthy of general attention. Today such a rare thing occurred to me and I want to share with you a prayer that is being said for President Eisenhower by a worthy lady from my home city of Long Beach, Calif.

The lady is Mrs. Lillian Marshall. I know of no one who has a greater love for our country than Mrs. Marshall, nor do I know of anyone who holds her public officials more strictly accountable for their responsibility to govern wisely.

To the best of my knowledge, Mrs. Marshall is a member of the Democratic Party.

This is her prayer:

A PRAYER FOR OUR PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Dear Heavenly Father, I am not asking anything for myself, but I wish You would help our President. He is so kind and good—and tries not to hurt anyone. You know he always thinks of his country before his party.

I get so tired of these selfish politicians who want to harm him in the public mind.

He depends so much on You for guidance, won't You please, dear Lord, give him some extra help.

Often the lawmakers' hearts who think first of themselves or their party. Put into their hearts more tolerance and love for their country.

We did not elect them just because they were Republicans or Democrats. We elected them because we thought they would do the right thing. But now some are acting very badly.

Thank You for all Your goodness to me. Amen.

Focus on Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 25, 1955. I am very proud of the work being done by New York City and State in assisting the aged.

FOCUS ON OLDER PEOPLE

The number of older people in our midst and the proportion of the population they represent have grown with such sensational rapidity in the last decade that a social crisis of extreme urgency has now developed, with far too little action being taken to cope with it. The articles by Edith Evans Asbury, ending in this issue, have documented this beyond a doubt. They have also focused public attention on what is being—and should be—done to meet the situation.

At the core of the problem is a central fact, recognition of which is essential to the success of all remedial effort. The most effective preventive—and often cure—for all old age is activity. And the more useful it is the better it is. Employers have a special, and growing, obligation to keep older workers employed as long as they are able to do some useful job. Also the age barrier to finding new employment needs breaching.

The elderly whose health limits their activities present other problems which urgently call for action. Experience has proved that many in this group can do much more than they—and those who care for them—think they can. And doing more has often great therapeutic value. But for those who find it impossible much more can and must be done—and far less expensively than now. Home care seems by far the best. Where this isn't feasible care as much like home as possible is needed. Boarding and nursing homes, public and private, increasingly serve the elderly who must have continuous supervision; but more are urgently called for and the shortcomings of many of the commercial type need stricter regulation.

Old people now in hospitals, and those who must be sent there in the future, present still more problems to be met. Apparently a large percentage of them are there without

any valid medical excuse and often only because there has been no other place to send them.

Fortunately, both New York State and city authorities are well aware of all these problems and are working valiantly to meet them. Examples are the day centers of the welfare department and the adult counseling centers of the health and welfare departments in Kips Bay and East Harlem. Bills are in the Albany hopper to stimulate golden-age clubs, remove antiage legislation and promote jobs for workers over 45. All such efforts deserve public recognition and support, for the age of the more aged is upon us.

Final Determination of Partition Is Termination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday and the day previous I inserted with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some articles which had appeared in the Irish Times on February 17 and 18. I was not surprised to find that the statements by Mr. Costello and by Mr. De Valera, leader of the opposition to Mr. Costello in the Irish Republic, did not meet with approval in the government of the Six Counties. The absolute refusal to discuss the matter of partition is typical of the attitude of the leaders of government in the northeast section of Ireland.

In the absence of Viscount Brookeborough, Six County Premier, who is now visiting at government expense in Australia, the Acting Prime Minister, Mr. Brian Maginness, Q. C., who is the minister of finance for the Six Counties, replied to Mr. Costello's proposal. Mr. Maginness asserts that his government is not prepared to discuss partition since he considers it a fait accompli and thus finally determined.

I can readily appreciate why the leaders of government in the Six Counties are not prepared to discuss partition, inferring that it has been finally determined. They well realize that from the very beginning the idea of partition was that it should be put a temporary expedient, that it would not be possible for the Six Counties to hold themselves aloof from the rest of Ireland and that ultimately they would of necessity be re-joined to the other counties of the country. They would like to think that the matter has been finally determined because they know that the final determination of partition can only be the termination of partition.

In order that my colleagues may have the complete picture in this discussion I am including in these remarks the statement by Mr. Maginness, acting premier, which I have taken from the Irish Times. In answer to this statement I am also including the reply of Mr. Costello, Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland, which appears in the Irish In-

dependent for February 19. These two articles are as follows:

[From the Irish Times]

STATEMENT BY NORTHERN IRELAND ACTING PREMIER

The Acting Prime Minister of Northern Ireland and Minister of Finance, Mr. Brian Maginness, Q. C., made the following statement last night in Belfast:

"In the temporary absence of Viscount Brookeborough my attention has been called to a statement made to a Yorkshire newspaper by Mr. Costello, who is reported to have said that he is prepared to meet the Prime Minister of Northern Ireland to discuss matters of common concern. Mr. Costello further stated that this could 'create greater good will and prepare for a saner view that might ultimately lead to a climate of opinion in which the end of partition could be discussed.'

"The Government of Northern Ireland has repeatedly expressed its desire to maintain friendly relations with the Government of Eire, and demonstrated its readiness to meet representatives of that government on matters of mutual benefit to the inhabitants of the two areas.

"But the Government of Northern Ireland is not prepared to discuss partition, a matter which has been finally determined.

"So long as the Eire Government is prepared to accept this position, there is no reason why the two governments should not discuss matters of common concern at any time.

"The Northern Ireland Government would never regard partition as an obstacle to co-operation in any work which is for the good of the people of north and south.

"It must be clearly understood, however, that this would not imply any change in Northern Ireland's constitutional position as part of the United Kingdom.

"This has been made clear by Lord Brookeborough on many occasions.

"The acceptance of this principle by the government and people of the republic would help to generate and develop a better feeling between the two areas.

"At the same time, it must be strongly emphasized that the harboring in Eire of persons who have carried out armed raids in Northern Ireland largely prevents the attainment of this desirable end."

[From the Irish Independent]

TAOISEACH REPLIES TO MR. MAGINNESS—GOOD WILL THE AIM IN ENDING PARTITION

"The only way by which the partition of Ireland can be finally determined will be by its ending," said the Taoiseach, Mr. Costello, commenting on the statement published yesterday by Mr. W. B. Maginness, Acting Prime Minister of Northern Ireland. "Our aim is to insure that such an ending will be achieved with mutual good will," he added.

"If," said Mr. Costello, "a literal interpretation were to be given to last night's statement by Mr. Brian Maginness it would mean that no arrangements of mutual benefit or concern could be entered into between ourselves and our fellow countrymen in the north unless we had previously accepted the position suggested by him that partition was a matter which had been finally determined.

"Such an alleged principle or condition was not implicit or recognized in the discussions or agreements ultimately reached concerning the River Erne, the Great Northern Railway or the Foyle Fisheries. Such a position would be impossible of acceptance by an Irish government. I hesitate to think that Mr. Maginness realized the full implications of his statements.

"If he really intended so to define the attitude of himself and his colleagues, informed and detached public opinion would pass a severe judgment on those responsible for such an unreasonable attitude. If such an approach were to be tolerated in connection with the many tense and dangerous international problems which afflict nations and peoples today nothing but disorder and possibly ultimate chaos could be expected to result. Mr. Maginness and his colleagues would do well to ponder on the great contribution which a united Ireland might give to the solution of some of those problems.

"The only way by which the partition of Ireland can be finally determined will be by its ending. The forces tending to break this unnatural barrier, though they may appear to be slow moving, are nevertheless, inexorably at work. Our aim is to secure that such an ending will be achieved with mutual good will, so as to bring peace and harmony between and benefit for all classes and creeds, north and south."

Integration in the District of Columbia Fire Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think we can all agree that the District enjoys as fine a Fire Department as any city in the country and this is due in no small measure to the inspirational and intelligent leadership of Fire Chief Millard H. Sutton. Chief Sutton is not only a man who knows all about the business of firefighting but he enjoys a rare intelligence and a devotion to duty which is extraordinary. He is a born leader, commanding the respect of the men under him, and a man of superb courage as his record fully testifies. Therefore, I am glad to insert in the RECORD a statement—in which I fully concur—he made before the Subcommittee on Police, Firemen, Streets, and Traffic of the House Committee on the District of Columbia during hearings held on H. R. 3573, relating to integration of personnel in the Fire Department.

STATEMENT OF FIRE CHIEF M. H. SUTTON, MARCH 2, 1955

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that the integration of personnel in the Fire Fighting Division of this Department is in the best interests of both the Department and the taxpayer.

Immediately prior to the integration order of September 18, 1954, there was a surplus of 14 colored firemen assigned to the 5 colored units. Since we operate on an overall authorized quota of personnel, we had a corresponding shortage of 14 men in white units. The salaries involved amount to \$61,341 and will increase eventually by the additional cost of automatic and longevity increases provided by statute. The services of these colored men were not actually needed in the colored units and they were not available for service in other units due to the policy of segregation. Under the present integrated policy their services are being utilized to the maximum degree, thereby making possible a better distribution of available manpower to meet the needs of the service. From

a fiscal standpoint, no other policy can be justified.

Under a segregated policy, members assigned to colored units do not receive the diversity of experience that is available to members assigned to white units. There is only one colored truck company, no colored rescue squads or fireboat. Consequently, members assigned to colored engine companies, with the exception of those assigned to the one housed with the colored truck company, have a very limited practical knowledge of fire-fighting evolutions and techniques associated with truck companies. None of the colored firemen have an opportunity to gain experience in duties incident to evolutions or techniques employed by rescue squad or fireboat units.

A fireman's efficiency is measured by his ability. This ability is developed by the practical knowledge and confidence he acquires in the day-by-day performance of duties incident to the protection of life and property. Members denied this all-round experience can never achieve a degree of efficiency approaching the maximum.

As head of this Department, I consider it my duty to afford equal training facilities to all members so that when emergencies arise on the fire ground there will be no unnecessary loss of life or property resulting from inexperience.

I am aware that at this time the policy of integration is not popular with some members of the Department and that its adoption created opposition. However, I feel that this opposition must be subordinated to what I consider to be the best interests of the Department from both fiscal and efficiency viewpoints.

I am opposed to the provisions of H. R. 3573.

High Priority for Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to insert an editorial from the Kansas City Star of January 17, entitled "High Priority for Water":

HIGH PRIORITY FOR WATER

Beyond any doubt the greatest problem facing Kansas since the white man ebowed out the Indians is more efficient use of its water. The driest 3 years on record dramatize the need. Scores of Kansas cities are showing deep concern over whether, a few years hence, present facilities will provide enough water for general use and growing industrial expansion. Some cities, notably Topeka, already have been notified that they can expect no more large industries until they can guarantee a greater permanent supply of water. The problem is national in scope.

It is time for straight thinking. Stripped of all emotionalism, the quandary simply is for an intelligent people to provide means for retaining more of the rainfall in Kansas rather than permit it to run off in flood waters to the sea.

All the other phases—flood control, watershed treatment, soil conservation, and soil rebuilding—are only parts of a huge basic program.

This realization slowly is dawning on the State. A fact-finding committee has just completed an inventory of the State's water supplies as far as present information goes.

It has recommended to the legislature the creation of a permanent State agency to coordinate the work of four existing agencies and plan a program for land and water use.

That Gov. Fred Hall is acutely aware of the critical nature of the problem was pinpointed in his message to the legislature. He spoke of the future development of the State "threatened by drought and the lack of water" * * * and "such a program should have the highest priority" * * * "no time to waste."

The Governor called on the legislature to create a State agency which would report its recommendations to the session next January. He expressed his belief that the State has full responsibility in cooperation with the Federal Government, for establishing a sound policy for the use of land and water resources.

As he outlined the policy, it includes research, soil conservation, protection measures, and "small dams and large dams where economically sound to the economy of the State."

While the State is making its studies, the Federal programs for flood control and irrigation should go right ahead. All are needed.

The people of Kansas will support any reasonable program to conserve water. This is the stage of research and appraisal of the facts. The sooner the State can get a plan of action the better for its long-range welfare.

Presidents' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been granted me heretofore so to do, I am pleased to present for your information, and that of all the Members of this great legislative body, further information about Presidents' Day, which is March 4, 1955.

The text of the letter hereinafter set forth to me from Mr. Hal Fischer of Compton, Calif., in the great 23d District, he being the director of the Committee for Presidents' Day, I am sure you will find interesting and informative.

Also, I am pleased to include in these remarks from the Committee for Presidents' Day, so ably headed by Mr. Fischer, two further documents.

Likewise, I am pleased to express my appreciation to our distinguished Chaplain, Bernard Braskamp, who on Friday, March 4, 1955, will again graciously offer special prayer for Presidents' Day:

COMMITTEE FOR PRESIDENTS' DAY,
Compton, Calif., January 22, 1955.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As you know, Presidents' Day was supported by 41 Governors of States in 1954. This year, through the guidance of Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby and Dr. Little, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we now have the vigorous support of most of the chief State education officers. They are advising their schools, via their State education publications, of the activities of Presidents' Day. A moderate estimate of the national picture indicates that Presidents' Day will be observed on March 4,

1955, in at least 100,000 schools over the Nation. They will participate in many activities, such as on the enclosed suggested-activities sheet, and hundreds of original ones as well.

On Washington's Birthday, February 22, some of the children from the great 23d Congressional District will appear on the Art Linkletter House Party, coast-to-coast TV and radio on the Columbia Broadcasting System. These children will be students of the George Washington Elementary School of Lynwood, and they will be dressed as Presidents and their wives. They will be questioned on various presidential facts about the Presidents they represent.

We would greatly appreciate if it could be arranged again this year for prayers for the President of these United States be offered on the opening of the House on March 4, 1955. It would be appreciated also, if the prayers might be prefaced with "On this day in honor of all our Presidents, as the youth of our Nation searches back into the lives and deeds of our Presidents." Our reason for this to pinpoint the especial reason for the prayer, and also to help the day. I am going to write to our Members of the Senate to see if the same may be done in the Senate on this day.

Presidents' Day is now listed in the Special Days, Weeks, and Months pamphlet of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Many chambers of commerce in the country have written to the Compton Chamber of Commerce for more information to help the day. We have received many inquiries from research organizations and calendar companies asking for more details.

You know, Congressman DOYLE, we hear a lot about juvenile delinquency these days, and sometimes I wonder if we should not properly label it "adult delinquency," which it most properly is. If we adults do not properly instill the ideals of our great democracy into the seedlings and show them the beautiful road of the American way of life, how can we expect other than the wanderings of youth because of boredom? Many of our very young children do not know that the America of yesterday was not, television, radio, railroads, pictorial newspapers and magazines, telephones, etc. Questions on Presidents' Day are, "How did Washington look on television?" and "Did Jackson fly to Washington in a jet for his inauguration?" Children are amazed that some of our Chief Executives were once schoolteachers, tailors, country lawyers, etc. And this revelation shows the promise and the opportunity of America. The ancestral backgrounds of the Presidents show that an American can work from the wrong side of the tracks to our highest office of service to the Nation. Many teachers and parents have told me that their students have continued studies of a special President or Presidents for the rest of the year, and not just for Presidents' Day. We need more planting of ideals in children's minds and less curing of rotten apples.

You will receive shortly one of our Presidents' Day awards, which we hope you will like. It is a small token of our appreciation for your great assistance with the day.

Mrs. Fischer joins me in offering our very best wishes to you and Mrs. Doyle for an abundance of health and happiness.

Cordially yours,

HAL FISCHER,
Director, Committee for Presidents' Day.

SUGGESTED ACTIVITIES FOR PRESIDENTS' DAY STUDENT BODY ACTIVITIES

Poster displays; events in the lives of Presidents; assemblies to hear speakers with an emphasis on character development and qualities needed to be an Executive; musical programs with songs popular during the terms of the Presidents; games, such as

Guess the President, with classes guessing from facts or costumes; short talks by students on "The President I Would Like To Have Been," giving the reasons; class discussions on the changes in our Nation between our first and our present President, such as transportation, communication, mode of living, etc.

CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

Art work on bulletin boards; costumes of the periods of the Presidents; making of a Book of Presidents by each class or entire school, with pictures, poems, cartoons, stories, etc.; English biographies of Presidents; schoolpaper coverage of the day; write notices for school bulletin; class or assembly skits; debates; discuss desirable personality traits for leaders; games; write and mail letters to the President (they are answered by the White House and possibly the President); ancestral backgrounds of Presidents, showing America as the great melting pot; discover contributions of other nations to American culture and tradition.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Study the Constitution, with emphasis on the executive branch; growth of influence of the executive branch; collect pictures of Presidents; list our Presidents and accomplishments of their times; study attitudes toward our Presidents from the cartoons and editorials of their times.

Awards will be made for best entries received by the committee by May 1 each year.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the office of the President of the United States of America is the highest and most important that a citizen may attain, and it is the living and working symbol of the American flag and our Constitution; and

Whereas free peoples everywhere today face their greatest trials for the survival of their democratic way of life, which makes it incumbent upon citizens of this Nation to accept their just responsibilities in preserving the general welfare of this land; and

Whereas religion is our most vital asset, as it was with our Founding Fathers, and it is essential to remember and reaffirm our faith in God and our system of delegated authority under him:

Now, therefore, as Governor of the State of —, I do hereby proclaim March 4 as Presidents' Day in and for this State, and urge that prayers be said in all churches and places of worship for the President of the United States of America, and urge that the opportunity be given our schoolchildren to acquire a better understanding of the American way of life by studying the lives of our Presidents and their wives and presenting special programs appropriate to the observance in the schools of this State on this date.

Graham Dad's Day Operation Big Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, a new and most encouraging note was injected into military life last Saturday, February 26, when the Graham Air Base at Marianna, Fla., held open house for the parents and wives of air cadets who are undergoing flight training at that excellent Air Force contract school. While attention is called to this particular function which was an outstanding success, it is only one of many innovations intro-

duced into the cadet-training program by W. H. Graham, president of Graham Aviation, the contractor. He has made Graham Air Base a model activity of its kind in the country. Letting the parents see firsthand how their sons live and train is a fine thing and brings about a better understanding and appreciation of the objective. Our own Rev. Dr. Braskamp, beloved Chaplain of the House, was among those privileged to attend, with Mrs. Braskamp, and to observe their own son in training.

A report of the event by Al Thomasson, staff writer for the Florida Times-Union, is completely explanatory and most worthy of reading. It is reproduced herewith:

GRAHAM DAD'S DAY OPERATION BIG HIT (By Al Thomasson)

GRAHAM AIR BASE, MARIANNA, February 26.—An air of expectancy pervaded the campus at this air pilot training mill Thursday afternoon, while activity geared itself to an upcoming event which included the awaited arrival—unusual as it may seem—of an airplane.

Some special cargo—fathers.

They were coming in from all over. The expected chartered airliner was bringing in parents of enrolled cadets from the New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania area.

Others were driving in from other States—one from as far away as Idaho. He had heard about the program and notified authorities he would be here.

Many of them came only from surrounding States, to see this new and exciting environment which had captured the time and fancy of their sons.

WIVES, CHILDREN ALSO PRESENT

Wives of married cadets also came, some leading or cuddling wide-eyed youngsters.

But primarily the dads showed up. Among those from nearby: A. E. Crowley, Sarasota; J. Roy Summers, Bristol; George F. Schofield, Miami Springs; A. E. Markette, Sr., Douglas, Ga.; and Gaspar Bua, Tampa.

About 60 came for the weekend program arranged by W. G. Graham, president of Graham Aviation Division of Pittsburgh Institute of Aeronautics.

Graham runs the civilian operated school which trains pilots for Uncle Sam's Air Force on a contractual, cost-plus fee basis. "We are in the pilot-training business professionally," general manager Martin Gracey pointed out. He explained how this saves the Government money, while at the same time offers a stable, efficient cadet training program.

And this modern cadet training life has something over the World War II stuff. That is possibly one thing which attracted some of the dads here this week. They probably couldn't believe the tales about the nice apartment-type living quarters, the food, recreation facilities, climate, and—most of all—that a course in aviation could take a man through so many sciences, both in the classroom and in the air.

Graham thought the dads were long overdue such a visit. He arranged for them to get a good cross-section of a day or two in the life of the modern pilot training course.

STUDENTS FOR A DAY

He made it so they could actually join in and become student pilot themselves, at least for 1 day.

On the agenda: greetings from Gov. LeRoy Collins. The Governor met the group in one of the academic rooms where he insisted they all keep their seats while he made the rounds, making the acquaintance of each personally.

Operating on a tight schedule, the alarm wristwatch on Governor Collins arm went off as he shook the hand of J. D. Anthony, of Dahlgren, Ga. Anthony's consternation was

quickly smoothed as the Governor explained what had happened, relating how a similar incident had halted a basketball game a few nights before when the players mistook the noise for a time-out buzzer.

Next the guests were saluted by the Drum and Bugle Corps, witnessed formal retreat and attended a dinner with sons. Later they were welcomed by top Air Force officers.

Next morning: proud fathers posed with swelled-up cadets near a T6 trainer plane stationed in front of flight operations. Dads followed flyer-to-be sons right to flight lines. After sons took off for scheduled flight instructions, fathers were toured over base facilities.

A formal parade honored the fathers today and tomorrow a highlight will be at the base chapel with the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, Washington, D. C., delivering the sermon. The Reverend Mr. Braskamp is Chaplain of the United States House of Representatives, but he had something in common with all the visiting dads. His son is 2d Lt. Bernard Braskamp, Jr., stationed at Graham with the 3300th Pilot Training Squadron.

Shortly after the services will come the flight line send-off by Marianna citizens and officialdom, and the guests will be on their ways home.

While here each father has acquired a better picture of "Graham." Each has found his son in good hands and undergoing the finest in Air Force pilot training.

Operation Dad's Day can be termed a popping success.

National Material Handling Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following communication which I have received from J. Wellington Hall, national secretary, American Material Handling Society, Inc.:

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING
SOCIETY, INC.,

Toledo, Ohio, February 28, 1955.

Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. RODINO: It is with the deepest sense of appreciation of your efforts in behalf of the material handling industry and profession, that I note your resolution, House Joint Resolution 131, introduced in the House of Representatives, requesting a National Material Handling Week.

I would like to inform you of the reaction to your effort.

I have before me a letter, written by C. W. Henkle, president, Industrial Truck Association, who says in part: "Mr. Van Brandt, managing director, has forwarded your letter and I want you to know I feel sure that the Industrial Truck Association would heartily endorse this movement." He further states, "Anything of this kind, which is for the good of the entire industry, would unquestionably receive our wholehearted support."

The Industrial Truck Association is an organization of manufacturers of material handling equipment, specializing in gas and electric powered industrial trucks. The objectives of the associations are to advance the material handling profession and industry, to cooperate with other societies for the dissemination of technical and statis-

tical information in the field of material handling and to maintain a high standard of performance and quality from the manufacturers within their organization.

Mr. William C. Farley, president, the Association of American Railroads, states in his letter, "The railroads are one of the largest material handling organizations and, of course, are intensely interested in any methods or means that will tend to improve this important phase of their activities. The Association of American Railroads is glad to endorse a National Material Handling Week."

This organization, composed of class I railroads of the United States, maintains divisions for operations, maintenance, terminal switching lines, statistics, advertising freight and passenger traffic rates, telephone and telegraph, construction, signals, motor transport, containers, public relations, legislative research, car-exchange rules, accounting procedures, etc. Maintains the Bureau of Railway Economics and the Bureau of Explosives. Cooperates with National Association of Shippers and Transportation Association of America.

Herbert H. Hall, chairman, material handling division, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, states, in his letter: "The Material Handling Division of ASME was formed in 1920 and since that time has been active in furthering the application and disseminating of information regarding material handling. You can count on the support of ASME."

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers is this year celebrating the 75th year of its founding. Its membership now consists of some 40,000 members, approximately 90 sections, and 125 student chapters. There are 23 professional divisions.

L. West Shea, secretary, the Material Handling Institute, writes, "We shall be glad to cooperate in this program and will be interested in hearing of the progress being made."

The Material Handling Institute is an association of manufacturers composed of several sections which include gas and electric powered industrial trucks, hand trucks, wheels and casters, conveyors, hoists, monorails, pallets, and industrial metal containers, each of which is represented on the board of directors. This organization, being aware of the need for material handling engineers, was the guiding force behind the formation of the American Material Handling Society.

In order to make industry and Government aware of the benefits to be derived from material handling, MHI maintains a traveling clinic for panel type forum sessions. It has to date published four articles in a series called the "Material Handling Library of Know-How." These, plus films and other educational aids are available without charge to students and teachers. It supports a college industry committee on material handling education.

Its objectives are:

1. To promote the use of material handling equipment and standards.
2. To compile, distribute, and exchange helpful information and simplify material handling information.
3. To improve safety methods.
4. To provide special services to members.
5. To emphasize advantages gained through integrated material handling.

R. C. Sollenberger, executive vice president, Conveyor Equipment Manufacturers Association, has written: "The correspondence to and from Congressman Robinson is most interesting and we hope it will result in the declaration of a National Material Handling Week. Heretofore, material handling equipment has always been thrown into a basket called 'general industrial equipment,' to the effect that we are eternally telling people that such equipment is basic to industry and that you can't have

anything without such equipment coming first."

The CEMA is an organization of manufacturers of conveyor equipment which has presented many programs for the education of materials handling engineers. Mr. Sollenberger is a nationally known figure in material handling and his articles on the conveyor industry are nationally recognized and quoted.

Glenn Mather, secretary, Fibre Drum Manufacturers Association, writes, "You may count this organization among your sponsors—I believe the proposal is excellent and should be a very effective means of educating the general public on modern methods of material handling."

The Fibre Drum Manufacturers Association is an organization of manufacturers which has contributed much to the material handling and packaging field. During the late war, the developments of the member companies of this organization, in the moisture-proof, corrosion-proof packaging drum, and in the packaging of foods, chemicals, and other items necessary to the effort, did much to keep the masses of materials moving overseas and insuring the good condition of the contents on arrival. This organization lists as these objectives:

To collect and disseminate information and to promote the growth of the industry through expansion of markets. To establish and maintain contacts with Federal agencies regarding specification and related problems, and with rail, motor, air, and water transportation authorities. To foster equitable business practices. To promote friendly relationships among its members and to cooperate with other industries and organizations.

If you will note the type of organization which has endorsed this effort, it can be seen that these are the organizations of men first called in national emergencies: The railroad in war, fire, flood, or famine or disaster, this tremendous farflung, nationwide network of supply lines; the industrial powered trucks, the hand trucks, the conveyor lines which move the material into receiving, through manufacturing into warehouse area, to be shipped via the over-the-road carriers; the Fibre Drum Manufacturers, with their shipping containers. The Nation thrilled with pride in the know-how when they read of armies being supplied by dumping the cargoes over the side of the supply boats to float to shore. These, then, are the men who did it. These may be the men called on to do it again, though we pray it may never be necessary.

Research, development, know-how, education, training: these are things that we must continue in order to stay ahead in our methods of supply. It is for these things that we ask that recognition be given for past accomplishments, that the future may bring all the benefits to our civilization that these men are capable of providing, the engineers who develop the methods.

May I request that this be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the program—A National Material Handling Week.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary.

Fallout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Fallout," by Leo A. Lerner, which appeared in a recent issue of the Lincoln-Belmont Booster, of Chicago, Ill. The editorial follows:

THE FIRST COLUMN
(By Leo A. Lerner)

FALLOUT

It used to be that the word "fallout" meant that we could break ranks and go home.

But now the term "fallout" means that we should form ranks and get away from home, especially if we get any warning.

I have been reading an article about radioactive fallout in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists. The article is illustrated by a man sitting in an atomic foxhole shelter.

An atomic foxhole, according to the article, is a special hole that every well-equipped family should have. We have had a mistaken notion, up to now, that every family should have an automobile, or a television set, or a combination washer and laundry drier. This is wrong. What every family needs is an atomic foxhole, and the best families will have one for each member of the family.

The foxhole has to be at least 3 feet wide, and 5 feet deep. There should be a chair or a box in it, so that its occupant can remain seated in it for at least 2 days.

If there is a warning when a bomb falls, each member of the family goes to his atomic foxhole, or, to say it another way, he falls out to avoid the fallout.

The top of the open hole should be covered with a loose board and on top of that there should be a thick newspaper or some articles of old clothing, since the wind is more likely to blow fallout into the foxhole if it is open to the sky. Nevertheless, even in an open foxhole the radiation exposure is less than 5 percent compared with standing in the open.

I like the calm and perfectly matter-of-fact way that the scientist who writes the article tells his story. He doesn't turn a hair, as if he were telling us how to go down to the drug store for an ice cream soda.

After we have been in the foxhole for about 2 days after a hydrogen bomb has fallen (it is a good idea to keep a bit of food and clean water in the bottom of the foxhole for emergency), you should get out and put on some uncontaminated clothes.

I fear the scientist made an error at this point in his advice. He doesn't say where to find any uncontaminated clothes. I am guessing that it would also be an idea, therefore to keep an extra set of coveralls and shoes in a tin box in the bottom of the foxhole in order to have some clothes when they are needed. You also should have a battery-powered radio in the hole to get instructions from the authorities.

And now comes the big task. If the all-clear has sounded and the wind has blown most of the contaminated air away, you are to crawl out of the foxhole, find a broom and sweep the roof.

Yes, you heard me right. Your first and most important job is to sweep the roof of your house. And mere sweeping isn't enough. The article speaks of "a good stiff sweepdown." I suppose with an uncontaminated broom.

After that, you are to sweep down the walks, the street, and stairways around your house. This is a more normal procedure, until we think about the sweepings. The sweepings are full of fallout. You can't therefore, sweep like most clumsy men sweep when their wives are in the country, by raising clouds of dust.

Radioactive dust is worse for the lungs than that cancerous cigarette smoke. You sweep so as not to raise the dust, and you keep all the particles together. Also, you wear a mask, if you have one left over from last Halloween.

The next big job is to dispose of this practically invisible dustpile.

The scientist says to bury it in the lawn, or sweep it into the sewer.

As for the lawn, it should be immediately turned over with a spade.

At this point, I must admit, I rebelled.

What, I asked myself, is the matter with those guys?

Don't they know I spent 17 years trying to raise a good lawn? I should spade it up, just like that?

I was reading some of this aloud to the family, and I became quite belligerent when I came to that part about spading up the lawn. My son calmed me down.

"Listen, Dad," he said. "You mustn't forget that would be after a superbomb had fallen. Don't think about your lawn as it is now, but how you would feel about it then. What's a lawn compared to all our lives?"

He had me there. It is very hard to think about how it will be after. Ordinary things certainly won't matter.

But to get back to the foxhole, if you can't dig them in the open, you may dig them in a corner of the basement. The main thing is to have underground shelter of a type that reduces the intensity of radiation.

The article stresses that all this preparation and all these activities are temporary. It has been discovered that extensive dispersal from a big city is unwise (and also impossible), so the best thing to do at the beginning is to get out of the atomic rays and wait a while. After that, you decontaminate as much as possible.

And then, within a few days, and before you have taken in too many roentgens (pronounced rent-jens), you clear out, preferably to a decontaminated area, being careful on the way not to go through any districts that are sprinkled with particles.

If you think I am dreaming all this, or imagining it, I assure you that I am not. Most of the technical material in this column comes from an article in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists for February 1955. You can get a copy of the magazine for 50 cents and find there a picture of the foxhole, with dimensions. This is the age of "do-it-yourself," a part of the thermonuclear era, and it is appropriate to look over the blueprint with an eye to building one.

As to my purpose in telling you all this, it is the same old purpose. It is to talk with you about the kind of age we are now living in, and to ask, without having an answer, whether we can grow up in time to deal with it and save the things we think are worth-while.

To Amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

SPEECH
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize my strong support for the provisions of H. R. 1573, which would repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Sometime ago I introduced a bill identical in purpose to H. R. 1573.

Section 348 under existing law is to take effect this year and will deprive farmers of agricultural-conservation program payments if they knowingly exceed acreage allotments for any of the crops under control by the ASC.

For example: In my own State of South Dakota, during 1954, 60 percent of the farmers in the commercial-corn area overplanted their allotment. These same farmers, if they continue their present operation in 1955, will lose their AC payments under the provisions of section 348.

Many South Dakota farmers have contacted me about this matter, and I share their belief that the agricultural-conservation program should not be tied in with the acreage-allotment law. No one would suggest that the original ACP program was inaugurated in order to exercise an unfair control over the farmers of this Nation. It was to the contrary a program aimed at inducing farmers to enrich the fertility of the soil by building up soil resources through engaging in good farming practices.

I do not have to outline for you the significant accomplishments of the ACP program, as we are all familiar with the great value of soil-conservation practices. It is enough to say that the AC program has given our farmers increased incentives to practice soil-conservation methods, and the program has thereby played an important role in maintaining our Nation's economic strength.

It is grossly unfair to deny our American farmers partial reimbursement for cost of their conservation programs because they have not complied with acreage allotments.

The agricultural conservation program should not be used to compel compliance with the programs for price support. If a farmer does not choose to comply with acreage allotments and thereby lose his right to participate in the price-support program, it is not necessary to impose an additional penalty in the form of depriving the farm operator of soil conservation payments.

I know there are many Members of the House who agree with my contention that the provisions of section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 would prove to be very detrimental to the American farmer and thereby of great harm to the entire Nation.

I hope that the Congress will recognize the great benefit to be derived from repealing section 348 and making it possible for the farmers of this country to receive Federal cost-sharing payments under the agricultural conservation program even though the operator plants in excess of acreage allotments.

Stop the Smuggling of Narcotics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II there has been a sharp increase in the crime rate throughout the country, due in large measure to the social upheavals during and after the war, the lack of discipline, and the

breakup of many family units. Most deplorable is the growth of juvenile delinquency, particularly the large number of youthful drug addicts.

In recent years narcotic addiction among teen-agers has reached alarming proportions in many of our major cities. These young addicts are often driven to commit serious crimes in order to obtain the necessary funds to purchase drugs. Unfortunately, the American public is not sufficiently aware of the problem and the menace it constitutes to our youth. Our laws are too lax in meting out punishment to those who peddle drugs among teen-agers, and the hand of our Federal Government must be strengthened if we desire to gain control of the situation.

Above all, it is absolutely necessary that we locate the origin and roots of the narcotics trade and expose the evil men who bring this poison into our country for illicit purposes and force it into the hands of inexperienced and thrill-seeking youth. Most narcotics are imported from the Far East, the Middle East, and Africa. They are smuggled into this country by ship and plane as well as across our borders, and then distributed to the dope traffic to continue its deadly work, whose only harvest consists of broken and agonized lives.

If we can succeed in plugging up this evil trade and corrosion of human lives, we will have solved much of the problem. About 2 or 3 years ago, Harry M. Durning, the collector of customs for the port of New York, stated that only 1 of every 5 ships entering the port of New York can be searched for smuggled narcotics because of the lack of sufficient personnel in the customs service. I do not know to what extent this situation has been remedied since then, but the problem is still very much with us.

Congress must take effective action to suppress this vile trade by giving the Bureau of Customs the means and the men with which to operate in the proper enforcement of our antismuggling laws.

For this reason, I have introduced today a bill in Congress which provides for the establishment of a United States customs port patrol and a United States customs border patrol in the Treasury Department's Bureau of Customs in order to increase the effectiveness of this agency in dealing with the smuggling of narcotics into this country. These are to be law-enforcement bodies with adequate personnel and equipment for use in patrol work in our harbors, airports, along the coasts and borders. Officers of these patrol services shall be empowered to enforce the antismuggling laws of the United States, to make searches of all vessels, as well as seizures and arrests in accordance with our laws.

Mr. Speaker, the customs patrol officer is our best and most effective obstacle to the constant flow of illegal narcotics from our docks, airports, and borders. He is the only law-enforcement officer regularly assigned on a 24-hour basis to apprehend and arrest the dope smugglers. By increasing the ranks of these men and giving them the necessary authority to pursue their antismuggling

assignments, we shall be able to root out this evil.

Parents, teachers, welfare agencies, civic organizations, church groups, and most of all, our young people themselves, whose health, morale, and careers are at stake, will heartily endorse this action by Congress. I urge all of my colleagues to support my bill and I call for its speedy enactment. Remember that each day's delay means the additional sacrifice of young American lives.

Eisenhower Security Program Pays Dividends—Routine Check Caught Petersen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, at page 170 of this RECORD, our colleague from New York, Mr. KEATING, revealed that a man named Joseph Petersen, Jr., a former code expert in the National Security Agency, had just confessed and been sentenced to 7 years in prison for espionage. The point of Mr. KEATING's remarks was that Petersen was caught by means of a routine check under the new security program instituted by President Eisenhower. He pointed out that but for this program, Petersen would still be on the Government payroll today, undetected and unapprehended, and continuing to turn over the Nation's secrets to our enemies.

Now it has been revealed by Columnist David Lawrence that Petersen himself was one of those who attacked as un-American even the loose 1950 security measures that failed to turn him up.

There are bound to be mistakes in administering any security program. We should seek constantly to improve our program and avoid any injury to the innocent. President Eisenhower commendably suggested recently that procedures be established to permit persons labeled as security risks to establish, if they can, the error of such classification. But let us not forget the Petersen case when evaluating the efficacy of our present program.

The David Lawrence article referred to above is as follows:

ATTACKS ON SECURITY SETUP—PETERSEN, NOW IN JAIL FOR STEALING NSA SECRETS, IN 1950 DENOUNCED UNITED STATES SPY-DETECTION SYSTEM

(By David Lawrence)

Who is attacking the security system of the Government today and attempting to discredit it? Many well-meaning persons, thoroughly patriotic, are doing some of it, but it so happens coincidentally that this form of attack has for some time been engineered also by persons who themselves turn out later to be involved in violations of the security system.

Thus this correspondent has just received a clipping from the August 29, 1950, issue of the Washington Post, which, in its "letters to the editor" column, innocently printed a communication from Joseph S. Petersen,

Jr., who now is in jail. He pleaded guilty in December 1954, to the theft of secrets from the National Security Agency but in 1950 appeared to be just an indignant letter-writer. Yet from March 1948, through December 1952, according to the evidence at his trial, Petersen was giving to a representative of a European government messages and documents which he was not authorized to transmit and the foreign government was not authorized to receive.

So vital was the secret material that the Department of Justice, for security reasons, did not disclose at the trial all the coded documents that were stolen by Petersen.

How did Petersen escape detection for nearly 5 years? Evidently the security system was not strong enough. But Petersen himself boldly wrote to a Washington newspaper vigorously condemning the very system he was violating. Here is the full text of his letter:

"Under the guise of security, numerous sins are being committed. The welfare of the Nation is of supreme importance, but the right of an individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, is one of supreme importance, too. The Constitution does not allow one to be condemned without trial; it does not permit one to be judged guilty of charges of which he has no knowledge. But that is happening in our Government at this time.

"Today our Government agencies are accused of everything short of treason by irresponsible persons. The faith of the American people in the Government is being undermined by villifiers seeking self-aggrandizement. In order to restore this waning faith of the people, agencies are forced to sacrifice all upon whom the breath of suspicion falls.

"How this must give aid and comfort to our enemies. Those enemies in our midst are united on a definite plan of action and are slowly but inevitably putting it into force. The ghosts of Marx and Lenin must be chuckling over the distrust and disunity that decadent capitalists are causing among themselves—preparing the way for communism.

"Now is the time to cease seeing enemies on all sides, to stop this persecution of innocent people under the label of security of the Nation. The American way is to let a man know what charges have been brought against him and give him a chance to defend himself. Otherwise, what we condemn in others we shall find being used by ourselves.

"JOSEPH S. PETERSEN, Jr.

"WASHINGTON."

It would be a mistake for anyone to generalize about all those who write letters to newspapers just because the Petersen letter reveals insincerity and duplicity. But some of the people who are attacking the security system are exultantly talking about Harvey Matusow's lies as proving that all ex-Communists are liars. Such generalizations are ill-founded, and the case of the Petersen letter underlines how important it is to take every incident separately and weigh the factors in the light of the circumstances in each case.

There are some letter writers who are guilty of writing lies to newspapers, even including their own names and addresses. Again and again, as some of these persons are addressed, the post office returns the letters with a notation that the individuals are unknown at the address given. It is a Communist trick to use phony names, and some day it may prove advisable to print names and addresses so that the neighbors can check as to whether anyone of that name lives at the address given. Many letters come from Communists, but there is no way for a newspaper to know who they are, though sometimes the argument or the language parallels exactly the articles in Communist newspapers.

The art of propaganda is well known to the Communists in this country, and the device of letters to the editor has in the last few years become a powerful means of creating confusion and of attacking the security measures being taken by the national Government.

Heart and Spirit Have Been Reorganized Out of FPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article by Tom Stokes which appeared in the San Francisco News of February 8, 1955, entitled "Heart and Spirit Have Been Reorganized Out of FPC." The article follows:

HEART AND SPIRIT HAVE BEEN REORGANIZED OUT OF FPC

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON, February 8.—Something has been said here recently about the way Federal regulatory commissions have come under the dominant influence of business and financial interests—which the commissions are supposed to regulate—and how their function, ordained by Congress, to protect the public interest has been submerged.

A revealing case study is offered in the Federal Power Commission, which was created as an independent Commission by Congress in 1930 during the Herbert Hoover administration to have jurisdiction over hydroelectric power development and to which subsequently was assigned authority over natural gas in the 1938 Natural Gas Act.

The FPC emerged finally from a reorganization instituted by the Eisenhower administration. The result is that the guts, heart, and spirit once possessed by this agency in behalf of protecting public and consumer interest have been nearly reorganized out of it.

OLD STORY

It's the old story. Things were made uncomfortable for key members of the expert staff whose conception of regulation does not coincide with that of the now prevailing business-minded element on the FPC. Some have been demoted and shunted aside to make way for more amenable personnel. Some have quit, including a number of lawyers on the staff as well as technical experts.

Morale is low. Apathy has supplanted a once-high esprit de corps.

The expert staff now finds itself frequently without support from the Commission, its recommendations and findings disregarded in vital issues with utilities, gas and electric.

TWO STEPS

Instead, there is developing a situation where the top officers of powerful utilities deal directly with the front offices of the FPC to negotiate for what they want.

Two steps achieved the transformation of the Commission, both familiar to anyone who has watched the same thing happen before.

First was a change in the commission itself, which consists of five members. That began even before this administration. The offensive opened during the Truman administration, when the Senate under pressure from powerful oil and gas interests that were influential with leaders of both the Demo-

cratic and Republican Parties in Congress, defeated confirmation for another term of Leland Olds, for 10 years a stalwart defender of the public interest.

INDUSTRY VIEWPOINT

That started a shift in the very delicate balance on the FPC until, with three appointments during the Eisenhower administration, it now is weighted definitely toward what might be called the industry viewpoint.

But something more is required. That is the second step. That is to carry the treatment down below the Commissioners themselves and intimidate or weed out in one way or another those on the permanent civil service expert staff whom the utilities, electric and gas, consider troublemakers because they seek to carry out the law in their recommendations without fear or favor.

Several months ago, as reported here at the time, the new Chairman, Jerome K. Kuykendall, ordered a reorganization of the Commission, which he announced at a staff meeting. Called in to make a survey was a New York management-engineering firm employed by the Budget Bureau, Cresap, McCormick & Paget, which had no previous experience with regulatory agencies.

TOP EXECUTIVES

It called in the top executives of natural gas and electric utilities at the suggestion of Chairman Kuykendall, but seemed to pay much less attention to the consumer so directly affected by everything the Commission does.

Though not adopting all of the firm's recommendations, the FPC has followed them fairly closely. It has abolished some bureaus, consolidated others, created some new ones—a technical process which it is not the intention to explore here except for the effect.

The heart of the FPC was its Bureau of Accounts, Finances, and Rates, which passed on matters so vital to the public. Its head since 1936 has been Charles W. Smith, who has won a national reputation among men in his field for his knowledge of ratemaking. He was relied upon heavily by the Commission because of his experience and his fairness of judgment. His judgments were often counter to those of powerful utility interests naturally.

DIVISION ABOLISHED

In the reorganization his division has been abolished and replaced with a new Bureau of Rates and Gas Certificates and a new Office of Chief Accountant. Mr. Smith was fully aware of the purpose of the reorganization, opposed that aim, but knew he could not stop it. He has now been relegated to the newly created post of Chief Accountant, a position which his friends say he has taken until eligible for retirement a few months hence.

Thus a valuable public servant has been sidetracked. Everyone who has worked with him and under his direction is fully conscious of the meaning of his shelving, and knows that it puts an end to the kind of regulation in the public interest for which Charlie Smith always stood.

There's another clue to what is happening in the case of another veteran who has been with the FPC since 1933. This is Edgar S. Coffman, Chief since 1945 of the Division of Rates which was under Mr. Smith.

NEW BUREAU

This, too, was abolished. Its functions are being taken over by the new Bureau of Rates and Gas Certificates, of which not Mr. Coffman, but another man, Carl T. Kallina, formerly head of the Gas Certificates Division, was made Chief.

The purpose of this was clear enough to Mr. Coffman. He asked for another assignment and chose to leave here and become regional engineer of the Fort Worth, Tex., regional office.

That tells more of the story. Another clue, too, may be found in the single dissent to the whole shakeup in these various key divisions. It came from the one member of the FPC today who has been on it since its creation in 1930, Claude T. Draper, a Republican, who from his long experience can see just what is going on today. It does not fool him.

But his was a voice in the wilderness.

Congressional Resolution to Abolish War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD of February 17, 1955, I inserted an exchange of letters which I have recently had with Gen. Douglas MacArthur regarding the latter's proposal for the abolition of war.

The St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times has published a most interesting and thought-provoking editorial, in its issue of February 28, dealing with General MacArthur's views in the matter and my offer to him to introduce a congressional resolution declaring that it is the will of the American people to abolish war as a means of settling international differences.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert this editorial in the RECORD and call it to the attention of all my colleagues:

A TOKEN OF FAITH WHEN HOPE SPRINGS ETERNAL

The Lenten season brings a lull in the world's turmoil and hope enough to some men to at least discuss the possibilities of permanent peace.

The awesome reports on atomic and hydrogen tests commands men of good will to reconsider and reappraise possible means of abolishing war.

After other wars men have dared to hope for permanent peace. In 1929 the Kellogg-Briand antiwar treaty was signed by 62 nations pledged to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. President Hoover and the free world proclaimed this pact.

And now another disarmament conference meets in London. President Eisenhower acknowledges that history does not reassure us in our eternal hope that mankind will not continue to crucify itself on the cross of war.

But a Congressman writes to another protagonist of three world wars in the last half century—Gen. Douglas MacArthur—and wants to know whether a simple congressional resolution—speaking for all the American people—might make it clear to the world that we abhor war and devoutly hope to abolish it as an instrument of national policy—if other leading peoples will join us. In a remarkable letter, the general replied, and said:

"It has always been my opinion that war's abolition can only come about through the emergence of a leadership in world affairs with the strength and vision and moral courage to proclaim a readiness in concert with other major powers, to enforce it as a matter of constitutional doctrine by specific constitutional prescription. There is no doubt in my mind but that the great masses of every nation in the world, whether on this side of the Iron Curtain or on the other, would, as

a matter of self-interest and protection, fully support such a constitutional limitation upon political power and zealously guard it against any despot's violation or abuse."

We need, the general says, "aggressive action to implement the basic concept" as well as great world leadership. And with that we would all agree. Do we have the concept? Do we have the leader? MacArthur, like the rest of us, hopes and says:

"To trigger a worldwide movement for the abolition of war . . . it would take a ringing affirmation of a dedicated leader commanding universal respect, capable of arousing the conscience of mankind into a crusade against lagging leaders who in the mad lust for ever-increased political power willfully ignore the realism that war as an instrument of political power has been outmoded by the advance of science. I do not know when this Nation will be blessed by such a leadership but I pray that it will be before it has been drawn through the tragedy of another and infinitely worse cataclysmic conflict."

The general's efforts to arouse the United States and the world to the basic concept of outlawing war, can be doubly effective, because he has fought in all the modern wars. But the general's thinking and planning are hampered because he can conceive of action only in terms of the leadership of one man.

MacArthur was replying to Congressman Victor Anfuso, of New York, who is groping for the answer on just how America can convince and reassure the world that we are devoted to the idea that war can be abolished—despite the record of history. Somehow we have lost the initiative and even our friends fear that we are trigger-happy and irresponsible—that the Nation which made the first atomic bomb cannot comprehend the madness of a hydrogen war.

A congressional resolution, backed by numerous other State resolutions throughout the land, can prove that our leaders will be supported in any truly practical disarmament plan. President Eisenhower rightly says:

"We must have ways and means of determining that each principal nation . . . is acting in good faith."

But a congressional resolution subscribed to by the whole country and by the President's own party leaders, such as Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, can be the token of faith America offers at this time of year when hope springs eternal in the breast of all mankind.

It Must Be Conclusive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MYRON V. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial by F. W. Brinkerhoff, editor of the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight of January 26, entitled "It Must Be Conclusive":

IT MUST BE CONCLUSIVE

The Asiatic situation now is undoubtedly far more serious than the country realizes. The defense of Formosa with arms by this country may quickly require war. What else than war can such a defense by force be?

The President made it perfectly clear in his message to Congress that aggressive mil-

itary operations may come when he asked congressional approval to "engage in whatever operations may be required," to keep Formosa out of the hands of the Reds. It was indicated that the defense may mean aggressive action as a proper military measure when the President made it clear that the defense of Formosa may require attacking the Red Chinese before they leave their own ports. If it is deemed necessary that such an attack be made, and the highest military judgment undoubtedly would approve, the attack must be a major one. Certainly it should be designed not merely to warn the Reds or to discourage them but to destroy their military effectiveness before they can use it. If this move must be made, and certainly now it must, it should mean business. The quicker and more powerful the American move, the better it will be.

America's experience in Asia in these recent years gives support to the idea that this movement must be conclusive.

It was Gen. Douglas MacArthur who said, it will be recalled, that "in war there is no substitute for victory."

President Eisenhower moved with wisdom as well as in obedience to his promise to the American people in submitting to Congress for its approval his proposal for the defense of Formosa. His proposal was clearly and fully stated. He has pursued the constitutional course. The decision of Congress on the President's recommendations, whatever results, will produce a policy that will be a national one, not an administration one.

The Poor Man's Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article written by Bernard Simon which appeared in the February 1955 edition of the National Jewish Monthly.

Mr. Simon is on the public relations staff of the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith. The director of the bank is my very dear friend Abraham Gribetz.

THE POOR MAN'S BANK

(By Bernard Simon)

Abraham Gribetz fingered the morning mail that lay unopened on his desk. We sat in his small private office at the far end of the shabby, weather-worn building on New York's Second Avenue. In the large front room that faced the street entrance were the customary wickets behind which tellers did their work. It looked like a run-down bank.

Gribetz nodded at the calendar on the wall. "This is the day," he said. He is a white-haired, quiet-spoken man who has worked 30 years behind the same desk. He chose one envelope from the pile, tore it open. Without examining the contents he handed it to me.

I unfolded a check for \$500. There was also a small note that said simply: "Lucky money."

"They haven't missed this day in 12 years," said Gribetz. He told me the story—without names.

It began on this anniversary morning, 19 years before. A middle-aged man and his wife entered the offices of the Hebrew Free

Loan Society and asked for the director. The man had the mark of a business executive, the woman wore an expensive fur coat that was now somewhat threadbare. Not an uncommon sight in those depression days.

The man told his story frankly. His once thriving business had succumbed to hard times. Rather than seek escape by bankruptcy, he and his wife had sold almost everything they owned, their furnishings and personal belongings, to pay off creditors.

But the man was cheerful. He wanted a fresh start, he said, another business. He needed capital. Would the Hebrew Free Loan Society give him a free loan of \$500?

"I handed them the check myself," Gribetz remembers. "Under our rules they were supposed to repay the loan in 6 months. They tried, but couldn't meet their payments promptly. We gave them extensions, and finally, after 15 months, they both arrived one day with the final installment and many words of gratitude."

"I learned later that after several years of struggle the new business prospered."

And every year, on that same day, there's another \$500 check and the same note: "Lucky money!"

Philanthropy, along with steel, oil, and automobiles, is one of the 10 biggest industries in the United States. It is a three-billion-dollar-a-year business. By these standards the work of the little-known social service group called the Hebrew Free Loan Society might be dismissed as inconsequential. In fact, its annual overhead, less than \$50,000 a year, marks it as a small-time operation.

What makes the society unexampled in the ranks of philanthropy is that it doesn't give anything away. Whatever it gives—it wants back. It started in business 62 years ago with \$95. It still has the same \$95, and some six hundred thousand more.

The purpose of the society is exceedingly simple. It will lend you from \$5 to \$500, for as long as 6 months. You pay no interest or other charges. Your credit rating doesn't matter. And although this is a Jewish-sponsored institution, your race or religion doesn't matter, either. No one asks why you need the money or how you intend spending it. It calls itself "the poor man's bank."

To research this article I walked into their bank and approached a teller's window. "I want to borrow \$100," I said.

The young lady in the cage answered matter-of-factly. "Of course." She motioned me to a large, glass-enclosed conference room.

I had brought with me some canceled checks to identify two business acquaintances who had agreed to act as endorsers to my loan. This is the society's only safeguard for its funds.

"Only one endorser is needed on loans of \$100 or less," the girl explained. Then she got down to my personal history. She asked exactly three questions: My name, my address, my occupation. I said I was an unemployed poet.

With that, the interview was over.

I couldn't resist interrogating the clerk.

"You people don't seem to care what happens to your money," I said.

"Oh, but we do!" She was dead serious.

"You are obligated to repay it promptly, you know."

"But you don't know anything about me," I protested. "How can you possibly check on me without any information?"

"We don't," she said. "We have never investigated a borrower. We lend him money on his good faith. It's always paid back."

I discovered later that this is true. The society's yearly losses on free loans are between one-tenth and one-half of 1 percent, a record better than that of most commercial banks.

Next day, when I returned, she handed me a check drawn for \$100 which had no identification on it except a number. This, I learned, was to help preserve the anonymity of my loan. When I cashed the check no one could tell where I had gotten it. This, I thought, is strictly business—I'm no charity case. Which is precisely the way the society wanted me to feel.

The poor man's bank has been operating in this fashion for six decades. Some 800,000 persons have entered its doors to borrow, without interest, a collective total of \$40,000,000. During periods of economic stress, as in pre-World War I days, when waves of immigrants landed in New York, most of them impoverished, and in the depression of the 1930's, when native and immigrant both hit bottom, as many as 20,000 persons hunted up the society each year and the annual volume of loans exceeded \$1,250,000. There were times when the society's perpetual loan fund was completely exhausted. When that happened the directors went to commercial banks and borrowed at normal interest rates in order to keep making free loans. In that way they preserved the society's most unique boast: It has never turned away a single legitimate borrower.

On the morning that I returned my loan and revealed my identity and purpose to Abe Gribetz, he invited me into his office to examine some of the society's files and learn the character of its borrowers. Few of them, I quickly learned, are the kind of credit risk welcomed at ordinary banks. Many are in desperate straits—an operation to be paid for, a new baby in the family, an empty pay envelope because of a seasonal lay-off. But these are people who scrupulously reject charity, and it is to sustain their spirit of independence and self-reliance that the Hebrew Free Loan Society provides its unusual services—in a manner that, as its founders decreed, violates the dignity of no man. To many, it has meant freedom from the pawnshop and the loan shark.

The society's attitude is that if a financially responsible person has enough faith in the borrower to endorse his loan, why should they have less? The need for endorsers keeps out the chiselers and petty swindlers. The sincerity of the borrowers is evident in the fact that in less than 2 percent of its cases is the society forced to apply to endorsers to make good.

Free loans have started many young people in their own business. They helped to establish a doctor in his new office; bought tools for a refugee carpenter; financed the car that embarked another eager lad on a salesman's career. They have paid for births, for weddings, and funerals; for a poor youngster's graduation dress and a GI's down payment on a home. One free loan bought a new suit—and a chance for rehabilitation—for an ex-convict.

How good is an ex-con's credit? This one had just finished a stretch for—embezzlement. When the society loaned him \$100, with no questions asked, he called it holy money. He was as prompt with his weekly installments as was the Brooklyn minister who borrowed for a new set of dentures.

Their secret is safe. The society will not, for any reason, reveal the identity of a borrower.

In Gribetz' office hangs a little tablet on which is inscribed in Hebrew, gemilath chasodim (acts of loving kindness). It is one of the great Jewish precepts and it was imbedded in the hearts of the 11 men who met in an East Side synagogue one evening in 1892 and there organized the Hebrew Free Loan Society.

It was strange, indeed, that these 11 worshippers should have become organized philanthropists. They were hard-working tenement dwellers, none of whom could boast even modest resources. Yet, they reasoned, there were others in greater need than them-

selves. How best to help them was found in the Biblical quotation of Exodus XXII, 24: "If thou lend money to any of My people, even to the poor with Thee, thou shalt not . . . lay upon him interest."

The 11 founders contributed a total of \$95 to start a perpetual loan fund. By making free loans of \$5 and \$10—\$10 in those days could buy stock and a pushcart for an immigrant, or tools to ply his trade—they assisted 227 borrowers in that first year.

The fund has since grown to more than \$600,000—although the society has never made any public appeal for funds. Instead, many of its grateful clients have become its financial supporters, and philanthropists like Jacob H. Schiff and Adolph Lewisohn also came to its support. It was Schiff who coined the name "poor man's bank."

As the fund increased, the maximum loan was proportionately increased until, by 1929, the present \$500 figure was set. The fund is used for no purpose but capital for free loans. The society's operating expenses are borne by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies.

Last year the society inaugurated another fund provided by a donor who prefers anonymity. It serves refugees who have escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. "Most of them," said Gribetz, "are Russian intellectuals, capable, freedom-loving people whose abilities find them jobs in this country quickly. But they arrive here penniless and need a little help to get started."

The Hebrew Free Loan Society takes pardonable pride in its "acts of kindness" and its philosophy of accepting without question any man's good faith. "But we're proudest of the integrity of the clients who come to the poor man's bank," says Director Gribetz. "You don't find a really bad risk among them."

National Material Handling Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a communication which I have received from J. Wellington Hall, national secretary, American Material Handling Society, Inc.:

AMERICAN MATERIAL
HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, March 1, 1955.

Hon. P. M. RODINO, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: Since writing to you advising of the spontaneous response to your speech by various organizations engaged in or interested in material handling, I have received some letters from other organizations endorsing your effort to establish a National Material Handling Week.

Mr. Roy H. Stewart, operations engineer, American Trucking Association, Inc., has written stating, "I personally feel that the effort to secure designation by President Eisenhower of a National Material Handling Week is a worthy one. We at American Trucking Association stand ready to lend assistance wherever possible in publicizing the efforts of the various participating organizations."

The American Trucking Association, Inc., is an organization composed of almost 400 member organizations of trucking associations. It's worth is attested to by its phenomenal growth from 202 member organiza-

tions to its present size in the 12 months of 1954. They maintain training programs for the membership, educational program, scholarships are given, reprints of articles of interest are mailed to their members and educational institutions. A monthly newsletter keeps their members advised of conditions within their industry.

Chester C. Thompson, president, the American Waterways Operators, Inc., has written, stating, "I wish to acknowledge—reprint of speech by the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr., urging the adoption of a resolution proclaiming a National Material Handling Week, and you are assured that this National Association of the Barge and Towing Vessel Industry will do everything it can to further the adoption of Mr. RODINO's resolution."

The American Waterways Operators, Inc., is an organization of domestic water carriers engaged in the transportation of freight cargo, chiefly in the Mississippi River and Gulf coast areas.

Mr. Kenneth E. Knowles, vice president, Clapp & Pollak, Inc., producers of industrial shows, writes, stating, "We believe the idea has very fine possibilities and will add impetus to a better understanding of the tremendous importance of material handling as a technique which vitally concerns not only industry, but, in the end, our personal life. I hope that you will keep in touch with us so that we may best see how we may participate."

This organization will produce the Materials Handling Exposition in Chicago's amphitheater in May of 1955.

John Bright, chairman, the Institute of Material Handling, London, England, writes, and in his letter he states, "This organization seeks to join in an all-out drive during an International Material Handling Week. He further states, and I quote, 'This institute would act as the responsible coordinating body this side of the globe.'"

The Institute of Material Handling is an organization of men engaged in the material-handling field who have joined together to preach the gospel of material handling on the other side of the ocean. Though separated by many miles of water its aims and purposes are essentially the same as those of ASME, SAM, SIPMHE, AMHS. Truly, the science of materials handling knows no boundaries.

Donald W. Pennock, vice president, Material Handling Division, Society for the Advancement of Management, writes, stating, "On February 12, 1955, the SAM executive committee and society officers approved of a National Material Handling Week."

This is an organization of more than 50 chapters in the United States and Canada. It has 95 student chapters in leading universities. An organization of some 60,000 members, drawn from the top levels of management, they have contributed much to community and industrial development by undertaking specific projects for labor-management cooperation, worker incentives, and advanced management techniques for government.

SAM was formed in 1936 by merging the Taylor Society, organized since 1912, and the Society of Industrial Engineers, formed in 1917. In 1946, the Industrial Methods Society merged with SAM.

They participate yearly in hundreds of clinics, seminars, and round-table discussions on all phases of industry and community management. Their annual time study and methods conference is one of the most outstanding each year, averaging an astounding 2,000 registration per session in the last two sessions.

The organizations listed here, the trucking industry with its 10,000 trucks on the road, the barge and towing-vessel industry, the management organizations, the engineers, these are the people who have solved this Nation's problems of supply and distribution. It is material handling that stocks

the floor of the automobile showroom, the shelves of the supermarket, the vegetable store, the department store, the coal bin or oil tank in the cellar. Yes, even the water, electricity, or gas flowing into the home must be moved in some fashion and in any movement of material there must be a means provided for the movement, be it a piece of wire or a piece of pipe, a ship, a truck, or an airplane or conveyer.

The general public, however, accepting all these things as part of our civilization without ever asking how, is not fully aware of the tremendous scope of these functions. It is for this reason I would ask you, as part of the effort to establish a National Material Handling Week, that this letter be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
AMHS National Secretary, Westinghouse Electric Corp., Meter Division, Newark, N. J.

Pity the Poor Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Stewart Alsop:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

PITY THE POOR DEMOCRATS

The hassle over taxes neatly illustrates the hideous dilemma confronting the Democrats. The dilemma is so seemingly insoluble that it has the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate, who are about the shrewdest politicians in the United States, baffled, irritated, and divided.

The dilemma can be defined in a couple of questions: How are the Democrats to win back the White House when it is seemingly political poison even to criticize the well-liked President? And what issues are Democratic congressional candidates to run on when the administration keeps snatching all the best issues out from under their noses?

There are two theoretical solutions to these conundrums. One is to use every means to present the Eisenhower administration as the friend of the rich, casting the Democratic Party in the role of the defender of the little guy. Meanwhile, the Democrats should be ready to stand up and slug it out with the President when the need arises. Chief proponents of this strategy are Paul Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and his assistants. With modifications, the Butler view is shared by House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and the other House leaders.

Solution No. 2 is to avoid direct conflict with the President, concentrating instead on building up the Democratic Party as unified and responsible and the Republican Party as irresponsible and divided. As for defeating Eisenhower (everybody assumes he will run again) that is a nasty little problem for the Democratic candidate, whoever he may be.

Chief proponents of this view are Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON and most of the senior Democratic Senators. This is not to say that there is any row brewing between JOHNSON (whose illness has complicated matters) and his fellow-Texan RAYBURN. But there is a distinct and important

difference of approach. There are good reasons for this difference.

For one thing, only a comparative handful of Democratic Senators need to worry seriously about the next election. Moreover, the Senate leaders are by no means starry-eyed about Adlai Stevenson, most probable Democratic presidential candidate. This gives them a rather relaxed attitude toward 1956.

By contrast, Butler and the national committee officials are Stevenson men, and they are quite aware that Stevenson can hardly hope to win if Eisenhower is considered above criticism. The House Democrats, what is more, feel the breath of 1956 already hot on their necks.

In fact, many House Democrats are worried sick at the prospect of running in 1956, with the popular Eisenhower heading the Republican ticket and with no "gut issue"—no issue that really excites the voters—to use against the Republicans. State delegations have repeatedly passed the word to RAYBURN: "We've got to have an issue."

This is one reason why RAYBURN and Butler are natural allies in the Democratic war council. It is also one reason why RAYBURN and company decided to spring the \$20-for-everybody tax surprise.

The surprise was most unwelcome to the Senate leaders. As they saw it, instead of giving the Democrats the needed issue, the move unified the Republicans and hung the irresponsible label on the Democrats, all at one stroke. As this is written an effort is being made to patch up some sort of compromise which will save face for the House leaders without giving the administration a political bonanza.

This will be a neat trick if it can be done, but it will not begin to solve the Democratic problem. The Democrats thought they might have the essential "gut issue" in aid for education. But Senators Ives, of New York, and SMITH of New Jersey needed the administration to jump in with an education bill of its own. Democrats angrily denounced the administration bill as a phony. But the bill has, nevertheless, robbed them of the clear-cut issue to use against the administration which they are seeking. And the same thing is true all the way down the line.

Perhaps events may solve the Democrats' problem. An ugly little war in Asia, for example, might change the political climate. Former President Harry Truman has reportedly written Senator WAYNE MORSE, congratulating him for his antiadministration stand in the Formosa crisis, and accusing the President of abdicating his responsibilities. The time might come when some such line would be politically effective.

Or a worsening economic situation might do the trick for the Democrats. But House Minority Leader JOE MARTIN often remarks to friends: "Give us peace and prosperity in 1956, with Ike heading the ticket, and nothing can beat us." And many Democrats privately agree—at least as regards the White House.

Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1955, representatives of the Smaller Business Association of New

England, Inc., presented their views in Washington on the problems and plight of small-business men to the Members of the Massachusetts delegation. Each and every one of those who addressed the meeting of the delegation—A. L. Lawrence, president; Ralph A. Fletcher; Howard D. Williams; A. Dudley Bach; and S. Abbot Smith—made concise and constructive recommendations. What they had to say, as well as their recommendations, is a matter of interest to all small and independent businessmen throughout the United States. I am pleased to include in my extension of remarks the statements made by the above gentlemen on the occasion of the meeting of the Massachusetts delegation on February 24, 1955, in the Capitol in Washington:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF A. L. LAWRENCE, PRESIDENT, SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.

Honorable chairman and Members of the Senate and Congress from New England, it is nice to be with so many friends. My name is A. L. Lawrence. I am treasurer of the H. B. Smith Co., Inc., of Westfield, Mass., manufacturing boilers for 102 years. I have the honor this year to be president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc.

We very much appreciate the time and interest you are giving to us today on the problems of smaller business. These problems are many but they are still basic. They have, however, been multiplied over the years.

The small-business man is a truly optimistic and independent American, who has faith in his country, in its future, and in himself. If he didn't, he would never have had the courage to start his own business. What he really wants are the rights he should have inherited, has fought for, and is still fighting for under our free-enterprise system, primarily his rights to live as a free man, to worship as he pleases, to work in his chosen field, to grow and prosper thereby to better his standard of living, and to obtain thereby some measure of earned security for himself, his family, and his fellow employees. These rights certainly are in the American tradition and must be preserved. That is why we are here today.

It is a fact that this is the only country in the world where these basic rights are still even recognized and we are thankful, but let us be fully aware that these rights are being constantly impaired, so that the objectives are getting harder and harder to attain.

The American rights to live as freemen, to worship and to work have been virtually preserved.

Our chief concern today is for our right to grow and prosper as a result of our good hard work. This right has become an obstacle course, full of legislation, taxes, red tape, and not always helpful administration.

The tax situation we believe is the greatest deterrent to the growth of small business, as what is left after today's multiple taxes does not leave enough to the small-business man to reinvest in the business for reasonable growth and progress. Couple this with a lock of equity capital, rampant business mergers, Government competition in business, some poor administration, and red tape, with the prospect of lower or no tariff, and the obvious advantages of big business to mention only a few reasons, and we have some very real causes for concern.

The Smaller Business Association of New England has fought for many years for relief from this eventually ruinous situation. We fight in the American way with a program of education and understanding, for corrective legislation and better administration of the

laws. We are this year reorganizing our association on a regional basis with membership committees in every New England State and are at this time planning an extensive radio program. Our bulletin entitled the Voice of New England has this year been streamlined and is now widely circulated and read.

It is obvious that there is not time to cover today all of the things which bother small business, so we have picked out some of the most important. The gentlemen who you will hear on specific matters of great concern to us are all directors of our association and have made this trip at their own expense.

Again may I thank you all for our association for your kind interest and we hope for your continued cooperation on behalf of smaller business, the backbone of our economy.

STATEMENT OF RALPH A. FLETCHER, BEFORE NEW ENGLAND SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 24, 1955

Honorable chairman and members of the New England congressional delegation, I appreciate your extending to me the privilege of appearing again before this group on behalf of the Smaller Business Association of New England.

We have always been accorded an attentive and understanding reception not only by our representatives from New England but as well by the Senate and House committees before whom I and my associates have from time to time appeared.

I shall first explain the reasons for my interest in the problems of small business. I am a small-business man. As an engineer by education and training and a quarryman and manufacturer by experience, I have long been concerned with the difficulties which confront every small-business man. These have resulted in part from an expanding economy, our Federal tax structure and the disproportionate advantages that accrue to the large business corporations under our current system.

For these reasons, some 10 years ago I became associated with the Smaller Business Association of New England as a director, and had the honor to serve as its president during this past year.

Among the many problems which have beset the small-business man under our present tax system is that of depreciation including obsolescence, and that is the problem to which I wish to direct my remarks. We do not need to expand on the fact that this problem of a more flexible depreciation is accepted by you and our other representatives in Washington.

The Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate in a considered report issued in June 1953, recorded themselves in favor of more liberal depreciation policies: "We do not wish to recommend a reproduction cost basis for calculating depreciation, but we do believe that management should have a greater latitude for judgment and should tie depreciation charges to its own policies as they relate to machinery replacement and the recognition of obsolescence." (83d Cong., S. Rept. No. 442).

Not only in 1953, but in 1954, when the new code was under legislative consideration, the Senate Finance Committee in its report recognized the impact of depreciation policies on the small-business man: "Small business and farmers particularly have a vital stake in a more liberal and constructive depreciation policy. They are especially dependent on their current earnings or short-term loans to obtain funds for expansion. The faster recovery of capital investment provided by this bill will permit them to secure short-term loans which would otherwise not be available."

In these reports the problem is recognized. I could continue at length in an attempt to

convince this group of a need which is conceded to exist. I do not intend to waste your time. I expressed these same views on April 6, 1950, at a similar meeting of this delegation. These comments were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am having copies of these remarks distributed.

The question is what do I suggest should be done to solve this problem.

In the first place, I know that we all appreciate the time and study the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Committees have devoted to the depreciation problem. And I think that the requirements as expressed in section 167 of the new code present a liberalization of the old rules which could have resulted only from serious study of the problem. However, the declining balance method and the sum of the digits formula do not as a practical matter solve the depreciation problems of the small-business man.

Frankly, the problem is as simple as this. A Government agent or agency sets a period of time which is presumed to represent the useful life of a depreciable asset. This may be an arbitrary standard, as for example Bulletin F, and which in many instances fails to give due consideration to the factor of obsolescence. This under present retooling and replacement demands greatly shortens the period which would reasonably be considered the useful life of a piece of machinery or other property subject to depreciation.

Therefore I believe and, with the support of my codirectors, recommend to the serious consideration of our New England Representatives, and to the congressional committees charged generally with the interests of small business, that two changes in section 167 should be made.

The first one has to do with the burden of proof. This is important. I am not a lawyer, but it has been my experience in ordinary business transactions that the person claiming money is due him must prove his case (by competent evidence). He has the burden, the responsibility, of establishing his claim.

In the case of depreciation allowances, however, the burden is on the taxpayer to prove that the Government in establishing the depreciation rate (based on useful life) is wrong.

Our association believes that the independent small-business man who knows his own business and has his own capital at stake and who is faced with rapidity of change in technique and style is better qualified to fix the depreciation period.

Our second recommendation is that the individual or concern who proposes to take depreciation be free to a limited extent to set his own life estimate, especially since obsolescence may quickly destroy the useful life of a property. In our tax structure, we have many specific exemptions granted, for instance for each dependent, \$600; from estate taxes, \$60,000; from gift taxes, \$30,000. We think that a reasonable amount should be established, in the nature of a specific exemption, as an annual depreciation allowance. This should not be subject to question but, of course, could not be taken in excess of the available undepreciated asset values. This should eliminate most of the controversy with Federal tax authorities and also quiet most of the complaints from small business relating to depreciation and obsolescence allowances.

In order to accomplish both of the purposes which we have in mind, we recommend that section 167 of the 1954 code read as follows:

The law as proposed:

"Sec. 167. Depreciation.

"(a) General rule: There shall be allowed as a depreciation deduction a reasonable allowance, as determined by the taxpayer, for the exhaustion, wear and tear (including

a reasonable allowance for obsolescence) (1) of property used in the trade or business, or (2) of property held for the production of income. The Secretary or his delegate shall have the burden of proving that the allowance as determined by the taxpayer is not reasonable and in determining such question of reasonableness annual depreciation deductions in an amount not exceeding \$50,000 may be taken by the taxpayer which amount shall not be subject to attack by the Secretary or his delegate: *Provided, however, That adequate depreciable assets exist.*"

And again I thank you for the opportunity of appearing before this group among whom I recognize so many friends of long years standing.

STATEMENT BY HOWARD D. WILLIAMS, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE FOR THE ADEQUATE FINANCING OF SMALL BUSINESS; PRESIDENT, WASHINGTON MILLS ABRASIVE CO., NORTH GRAFTON, MASS.

To the Honorable Delegates to Congress from New England, at Washington, D. C., February 24, 1955:

The level of high taxation, both corporate and personal, continues severely to discourage the financing of small-business enterprises. Individual savings continue to be channelled largely into savings banks and insurance companies whose funds are not generally available to small-business enterprises; and taxation does not leave enough working capital in small businesses to enable their reasonable growth, nor indeed to build up those resources desired to safeguard workers' security in adverse business cycles.

The short-term cash requirements of small businesses are in general being well met by commercial banks in our area, however commercial banks do not generally undertake the long-term needs, by which I mean loan terms of 1 year and upwards.

It is for the long term capital needs of small business that a vacuum exists. Smaller business of New England does not prefer direct financing by Government agencies, but until some adequate source for these long term capital needs is established we firmly recommend the continuance of loaning authority in the Small Business Administration.

To enable Small Business Administration effectively to function we recommend its continuance as an independent Government agency, reporting directly to the President and to Congress, and another of our speakers makes a recommendation to you as to its life span. We recommend to you that SBA be authorized to make individual advances up to \$150,000, but that this amount be increased to \$300,000 in the case of advances for the fulfillment of Government contracts, prime or sub. We point out that the fulfillment of Government contracts in many cases imposes a very heavy drain on the contractor's finances, and believe that an increase in SBA's loaning limit for this purpose is necessary and realistic. We point out that without this increase an obstacle is being created which would prevent many smaller businesses from obtaining Government contracts and this would not be to the advantage of the Government. In this general connection we could stress the desirability of authorizing progress payments to the contractors and subcontractors. This does not eliminate the need for financing on Government contracts, but does reduce it.

We would like to mention to you that in each New England State there is now in operation some form either of credit or business development corporation, working under State charters. These bear some close resemblances to the capital bank for the long-term credit needs of small business which our association has been urging for some years. It is evident that a State credit corporation will not be able to obtain the

broad averaging of risks which would be possible to a federally chartered and operating capital bank, but our association will watch and if you will allow us will report to you as to the ability of these State development and credit corporations to raise the working funds they need, and as to the extent to which they may be able to meet the long-term financing needs of small business.

We are of the opinion that a federally chartered capital bank for the purposes of making secured or unsecured advances to small businesses is needed and will prove to be one of the most effective and satisfactory ways of meeting this unmet need. Quite recently three Senate bills introduced by Senator SPARKMAN have been brought to our notice, S. 381, S. 382, S. 383, all of which have been referred to Committee on Banking and Currency.

At this time we ask your interest particularly in S. 382. Section 2 (a) would regulate the interest chargeable by Small Business Administration in participation loans, and we recommend this to you. Section 2 (b) would increase SBA's loaning authority to \$500,000 and we have made a different recommendation to you. Section 3 would extend the life of SBA to 1957; we have recommended SBA as a permanent agency.

S. 381 would authorize the formation of national investment companies; S. 383 would provide for the insurance of credit risks, on advances to small business, by the Federal Reserve System. With regard to S. 381, we approve the principle of this bill but are giving it further study. With regard to S. 383, it is our belief that such powers if given to the Federal Reserve System would not be used more extensively than were the powers given to the Federal Reserve System to make direct loans to small businesses.

STATEMENT BY A. DUDLEY BACH, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW ENGLAND METALLURGICAL CORP., BOSTON, MASS.; PAST PRESIDENT, SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND; MEMBER, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CONSULTANTS OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

To the Honorable Delegates to Congress from New England, at Washington, D. C., February 24, 1955:

The New England Smaller Business Association has asked me to appear before you today on their behalf and express their views on what we believe should be incorporated in any legislation sponsoring the continuance of the Small Business Administration.

Our association does not at this time wish to go on record as being in favor of any one of the many bills that have been presented, but wish to point to the important items that should be incorporated in such a bill.

We firmly believe the Small Business Administration should be extended as a permanent, independent agency; whose Director shall be responsible only to the President and Congress. We wish to emphasize the words "independent agency" because there is a tendency by some to recommend that the Small Business Administration be absorbed by the Department of Commerce. This has been tried on two different occasions with no success. We feel that while the Department of Commerce furnishes data to all business, it is particularly geared to the problems of big industries and, therefore, we believe that small business with its problems should have the benefit of a completely independent agency such as the Small Business Administration.

One of the important functions of the Small Business Administration is the loaning of money to those small businesses who cannot obtain it from other sources, and we believe that the limit of \$150,000 is normally adequate. That amount, however, is not sufficient in our opinion to finance Government prime or subcontracts because of the

great amount of money involved, and we suggest, therefore, that the bill be amended so that the maximum be increased when the borrowed money is to be used to finance Government contracts or subcontracts to be \$300,000. This limit might be adequate providing progress payments against Government contracts would still be available to the small contractor against any Government prime or subcontract.

We do not believe that municipalities should be eligible for loans under the Small Business Administration, and we also feel that the Small Business Administration should not be privileged to make loans for recreation or amusement facilities of any kind.

The bills that have been presented thus far in most cases stress the loan features of the Small Business Administration. But we would like to point to the many other functions of the Small Business Administration that we think are equally important and should be given consideration.

The Small Business Administration, for example, has been cooperating in establishing the many State development corporations which are being set up to furnish equity capital to small business. These are operating very successfully in some cases, but we still feel that a Federal capital bank of some type is necessary, and our Mr. Howard Williams will comment on that.

Any new bill should strengthen the hand of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration by giving him more authority in the matter of procurement. The greatest part of dollar volume of all Government contracts is still going to big business, and the inability of the small contractor to get a portion of these contracts is working a severe hardship on all small industries throughout the country. Our Mr. S. Abbot Smith, who is with us today, has some very definite recommendations upon that problem.

There are other features of the Small Business Administration such as technical aids and marketing aids that have been more than helpful to small business and should be continued. Again, the college-management courses which are being sponsored at 51 universities throughout the country, for which the individual attending has to pay as much as \$50 tuition, are meeting with tremendous success, and in many cases repeat courses are already underway.

Because of the success of these many programs, it is important that adequate funds will be appropriated so that the Small Business Administration can broaden its service to small businesses of America.

In closing we again wish to stress the most important point made in my opening remarks to the effect that the Administrator be responsible only to the President and Congress, and further that the bill setting up the Small Business Administration as a permanent, independent agency give the Administrator of the Small Business Administration sufficient authority so he can make it a strong, constructive agency and help small business to become once again the strong, vital force that it at one time was in our American economy.

Respectfully submitted,

A. DUDLEY BACH.

STATEMENT OF S. ABBOT SMITH, SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF NEW ENGLAND, INC., BEFORE NEW ENGLAND SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 24, 1955

Chairmen and honorable Members of the Congress, may I add my thanks to those of our President to you all for taking the time out of your busy day to meet with us here this morning. It is especially pleasing to me because so many of you are old friends

of years' standing. We have fought the battles of small business and New England together since those days in 1942 when I first came to Washington as a Director of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

As I believe you all know, ever since its inception the officers and directors of the Smaller Business Association of New England have always tried to present only well-considered programs. We try at all times to be sound and constructive.

In line with that objective, I should like to present for your consideration a recommendation which we made to Mr. Wilson, Secretary of the Department of Defense.

We have been disturbed because the SBA has apparently not been able to obtain for the small businesses of the country as large a proportion of Government contracts—both prime and sub—as we believe they should, and as we believe the Congress intended when it created SBA.

A while ago we were told an Executive order was under consideration to try to improve this situation by transferring the small-business specialists of the services to the SBA. While this might help, it did not seem to us this went to the root of the matter.

The basic problem, we believe, is that many of those specialists and the procurement officers do not thoroughly know the already existing directives of their respective services with regard to small business and many pay little or no attention to them. Furthermore, there seems to be a very considerable difference in the extent and efficacy of these programs as between the services as well as between contracting officers.

Quite obviously no program will work unless it is given wholehearted backing at the top and unless it is followed through at each level of command right down to the individual contracting officer.

So after considerable study we wrote Mr. Wilson a letter, a copy of which is attached to my statement which you have. In brief, our suggestion is that he should appoint as an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Small Business a high caliber, competent man sympathetic to small business who would report directly to him and whose sole job would be directing the coordination and implementation of the small-business programs throughout the armed services—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; who would study the programs now in effect with a view to improving them and who would utilize in all the best features of each.

Then in each of the services, starting in the Secretary's office and right down through the chain of command there would be one individual charged with this same responsibility for his part of the small-business program and who would devote his entire time to this job.

By focusing responsibility in this way on one individual at each level, we believe better coordination, integration, and implementation could be obtained. Every contracting officer and every small-business specialist would know exactly what he has to do under the program.

If you, for instance, wanted to know just what the program is you would contact one man who would have the whole thing in his hands.

When the Administrator of SBA felt changes were desirable, he would go directly to this Assistant Secretary of Defense, i. e., the top, to discuss them. In short, this Assistant Secretary would be charged with seeing that the intent of Congress when it created SBA is carried out as regards the Armed Services and procurement.

It seemed to us this might eliminate to a large extent what so many people, especially small-business men, complain about when dealing with the armed services, the run-around.

In our opinion, this would be a more efficient plan than the recent arrangement SBA has just made whereby one of their men has a desk in the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Supply and Logistics. In this way it is hoped to have closer liaison between the two offices. Also, the men in charge of the small-business programs in each of the services are being upgraded. This surely is better than it has been but still the liaison man is an SBA man on the outside looking in while under our plan he would be on the inside. Furthermore, it is our understanding that most of the men in the services who now are supposed to take care of the small-business programs have other duties as well. Under our plan, their whole time and attention would be devoted solely to the small-business programs.

Although we are somewhat skeptical, nevertheless it is undoubtedly best to try out the new arrangement for awhile anyway. We hope it will produce the desired results.

However, the trial period must not be too long for already small businesses are in trouble and failing all over the country due to the cutting off of subcontracts by large primes. So if good results are not forthcoming soon, then it might be worthwhile to take out our suggestion and dust it off again for further consideration. The titles suggested may not be correct but we believe the basic idea of pinpointing responsibility is good.

Furthermore, we fully realize that the suggestion we make is one which requires executive not legislative action. On the other hand, the Congress expressed its intent to help small business when it created the Small Business Administration. We do not feel that intent is being realized to the greatest extent possible and so are calling this suggestion to your attention.

We hope you will keep close watch of how things go because whether or not they get a suitable proportion of prime and subcontracts will make a tremendous difference to our small businesses and the whole economy of New England.

JANUARY 7, 1955.

HON. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We smaller businessmen of New England were very much disturbed at the reports published some months ago that you favored the services placing most contracts with a few large suppliers, and then were much pleased to read in the Wall Street Journal early in December that actually you favored spreading contracts widely and wished to encourage multiple sources of supply, which would obviously mean keeping many competent small concerns with their great geographical dispersion in the picture.

This is of vital interest to many of our members who built up organizations to produce essential, frequently highly classified items, during World War II. If they cannot continue to obtain contracts now, much of this skill and know-how accumulated by years of effort will be dissipated. That kind of organization and know-how takes even longer to build up again than the big long-lead-time machines and so should be held together as part of our defense mobilization policy.

The officers and directors of the Smaller Business Association of New England have watched with the keenest interest the efforts of the Congress and the armed services to utilize to the greatest extent possible the facilities and know-how of the small businesses of the country, both during the war and since. Sometimes the results have seemed to be pretty good and sometimes

rather poor, depending usually upon the attitudes of individual procurement officers, their superiors and their departments or bureaus. Directives which looked good in writing at the higher levels seem to lose efficacy as they go down through channels until when they finally reach the man in the field they have become so weak and diluted the procurement officer usually seems to think he had better follow the old easiest, and safest procedure of giving the contract to the big well-known company whenever he can, pretty much without regard to other considerations.

The Congress has for many years and in various acts expressed its intent that small business should get a fair share of defense business. We know that you, as Secretary of Defense, would like to see that mandate satisfactorily carried out. The \$64 question is how can it be done and yet not weaken the responsibility of the procurement officers for obtaining the right items, at the right time, at the right place, and at the right price.

The officers and directors of the Smaller Business Association of New England after long study and consideration recommend that you appoint a top-grade, high-caliber man, sympathetic to the cause of small business, as an Assistant Secretary of Defense who shall report directly to the Secretary of Defense and who shall be directly responsible for the coordination and implementation of the small-business programs throughout the armed services—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. He shall study the programs now in operation in each of the services with a view to constantly improving them in every way possible by adopting and adapting to each, to the greatest extent feasible, the best features of the others as they now operate. Working down through the chain of command in each service, there shall be a specific individual assigned to see that the directives of the small-business program are fully carried out both as to letter and spirit so that the intentions of the Executive and the Congress may be realized that the facilities, manpower and know-how of the small businesses of the country shall be utilized to the greatest extent possible to broaden our mobilization base and keep multiple sources available in case of emergency.

We realize this setup will mean the addition of some personnel but the added cost will be small compared to the tremendous increase in the efficiency of the program and will probably actually save the services money by bringing into the procurement program highly competent smaller companies who will in many cases furnish as good or better items for less money.

We believe it will be a relief for you to have an Under Secretary who will be in charge of and responsible for the whole small-business program and to whom all inquiries on the subject would be directed, including congressional committees. He in turn would have an under secretary in each service who would be responsible for the program in that service and so there will be one man in each echelon conversant with what is being done and seeing that directives are being carried out satisfactorily.

Thus the whole would be thoroughly integrated and coordinated to the advantage of all concerned. The intent of the Congress will be carried out, the services will get what they need, more small businesses will get more contracts and to that extent life will be easier for you.

Sincerely yours,

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
S. ABBOTT SMITH,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

More on the Northwest Airlines Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, for those who are in doubt as to what happened at the White House that caused President Eisenhower to reverse a unanimous decision by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the West Coast-Hawaii case, docket No. 5589, I recommend the reading of the following article which appeared in the February 28 issue of *American Aviation*:

"SINNY" WEEKS' BOBBLE

Put aside for the moment the particular airlines and the particular route involved, but focus attention on the procedural steps in the controversial transpacific route case just recently resolved, and you come up with a shocker of the first order.

We refer to President Eisenhower's reversal of the CAB decision and his subsequent public admission of error and supplementary instructions to the CAB in the transpacific case and specifically his partial reversal of his original reversal of the Board on the Seattle-Portland-Honolulu segment. Here was an extraordinary case of mishandling involving the mysterious role of Secretary of Commerce Sinclair "Sinny" Weeks.

When Congress created the CAB it gave this independent agency full and final authority over the air transport system of the United States. But for all routes outside the continental United States, i. e., to foreign countries or to Territories and possessions, the CAB decisions "shall be subject to the approval of the President." Through the years since 1938 the White House has taken an increasing interest in and responsibility for all such international cases until now, it seems, just about everybody can get into the act.

The shocker in the transpacific case comes in two parts. One is the knowledge that the President of the United States didn't even know (and wasn't told) what the CAB decision was. The second is why "Sinny" Weeks accompanied Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams to the President's office to obtain his signature on a letter of instructions to the CAB which only vaguely resembled the Board's own recommendations. There can even be a third question asked, and that is why Mr. Adams didn't take Acting CAB Chairman Chan Gurney with him to the President for the deciding action.

It seems fair to ask whether "Sinny" Weeks, a Boston blueblood possessing only a remote idea of how the rest of the world lives, did not subvert the intent, the language, the purport, and the spirit of the Civil Aeronautics Act by injecting himself actively and directly into procedural steps in which he has no part by statute, morals, ethics, or direct concern.

In short, "Sinny" threw a curve to the President which resulted in considerable embarrassment to the White House. To the full credit of Mr. Eisenhower, the President had the good grace to admit he hadn't been informed of the Board's decision. As for Mr. Adams, if he is fulfilling the job of chief of staff for the President, he couldn't have fumbled worse.

Congress has shown signs of dissatisfaction over the way CAB matters are handled in the White House. Well it might. We hope it digs deeply into the interventions

and pressures of the Department of Commerce in the affairs of an agency which Congress intended to be independent. It might well inquire also why Under Secretary of Commerce Robert Blaine Murray, Jr., who resigned effective January 21, accompanied "Sinny" Weeks to the White House February 5 and took a leading part in the hastily called conference on the transpacific case. The whole situation has a mighty foul odor.

A Sound Warning to the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, because of its keen analysis of the present world situation and the sound message which it contains for this country and for the entire world, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, excerpts from an address delivered in Detroit, Mich., on January 30, 1955, by Gen. Kazimierz Sosnkowski, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Polish insurrection against Russia in 1863.

Gen. Kazimierz Sosnkowski is generally conceded to be the elderly statesman, reflecting the consensus of opinion of Poles in exile. He has a distinguished career as a military leader, having been the inspector general of the Polish Army at the outbreak of World War II. He served as Minister of War in 12 Polish prewar cabinets. During the war, he served in the cabinet of General Sikorski's government-in-exile, as minister in charge of organization of the Polish underground forces. After General Sikorski's death, he was commander in chief of the Polish forces.

The remarks of the general follow:

Polish soldiers fought in the last two wars for Poland and for the freedom of other nations. These Polish soldiers fully realized that in the 20th century and in the present conditions freedom as such had become indivisible and that the times when it could be cut and fashioned according to specific tastes were gone forever. A clear understanding of this obvious truth which, I am sorry to say, is so often forgotten by the West, is a consolation for our hearts in the difficult times in which we live. Most difficult times, I should say, because once more the Polish nation is obliged to drink the bitter cup of disappointment prepared by Allied statesmen, erring so tragically at the crossways of Teheran and Yalta.

With the development of the present world crisis, the democracies of the West, and among them the great American democracy, will have to realize that they will have to fight for their own survival. They will have to think again and this time in all earnestness about the fate of Poland and the other nations behind the Iron Curtain. They will have to prove this positive way of thinking not by words but by deeds. I use the term "have to" because otherwise either the successful outcome of the coming unavoidable world struggle will be endangered, or the final victory will be achieved only under the most difficult conditions at the cost of

additional but unnecessary sacrifices. Therefore, you, Americans of Polish descent, must demand justice for Poland, that is, freedom within her rightful frontiers. By doing this, you are supporting the truest interests of your new homeland, America, sparing your country unnecessary holocaust, if and when it comes to the worst.

After the fateful Yalta agreements and even after the end of World War II, unceasing convulsions have harassed humanity because Soviet Russia keeps the world in turmoil by modern methods of Red strategy. She uses infiltration, penetration, and the stirring up of social friction and internal unrest; she provokes the armaments race and economic difficulties; she organizes civil wars under the pretext of fighting colonialism or supporting liberalism everywhere—except in her own territories and those of captive countries. At the same time, Soviet Russia supports local wars. For these local wars which have been and are taking place near the frontiers of the huge Red empire, the world of the west has invented a whole collection of shy and modest labels which make it easier to avoid facing the dangerous truth. Terms such as cold war, police action, war by proxy, peripheral war, pocket war, and so on, have been coined. However, if we choose to remind ourselves of the classical definition of Clausewitz, that war is a continuation of policies by other means, then we arrive at the inevitable conclusion that Soviet Russia, after the defeat of Hitler's Germany, strengthened by gaining all the key territories of central eastern Europe, has turned against the western democracies, waging a peculiar war which, although not openly declared and hidden behind the smokescreen of peace offensives, is creating an extremely dangerous world situation.

After all, in every struggle, and especially in great historic struggles, it is the final result that counts and not the means used—the strength of the forces employed, the types and amount of weapons, or the type of combat used. The battle at Yorktown finally decided the fate of American independence; in other words, it has changed the course of history and has had a strong, even if indirect, influence on our present epoch, for the United States of America has now assumed the main burden of responsibility for the future of the world and of the civilization known to us.

And yet the battle of Yorktown was fought on a rather limited space within the sight of commanders. Only a few thousand soldiers and only a few hundred bronze guns of limited range and fire power were involved in this epic battle. How then can we describe the continuing military-political struggle which has been going on for 10 years extending the frontiers of militant communism over Czechoslovakia, the whole Chinese continent, half of Korea and Indochina, increasing the Red empire's reservoir of fighting forces to 800 million people? This question constitutes the crux of the whole problem: the free world has to realize that the war is already being waged, at least in its initial preparatory phases; only on the recognition of this fact will the West become immune to the insidious peace declarations coming from Moscow. The West may then abandon its defensive attitude and the initiative in the struggle pass from the Reds to the defenders of Christian civilization.

In the realm of strategy one should not separate political from military problems; they permeate each other and must be considered as one. Soviet strategy has always adhered firmly to this principle which in a large measure explains her successes. On the Western side, the separation of military from political problems has occurred many times and that is why the Soviet Union has reaped such a political harvest from World War II. The Western cession of Central Eastern Europe to Russia has protected her

on the west, allowing her ample opportunity to begin the big gamble for the Asiatic continent which up to now has been very successful.

To understand clearly what is happening in our world today we must first realize that the principal traits of Soviet strategy are consistent planning and immutable aims. It is only the tactics of the Red satraps which are flexible and subject to frequent changes depending on the necessity of a given moment or situation. It is well known that strategy has to answer the questions of where, when, and why to fight, whereas tactics—how to conduct the struggle.

The answer to the question of what are the aims of Soviet strategy has been given long ago in such reliable sources as the words of Lenin himself and I quote:

"The existence of the Soviet republics and the imperialistic states side by side is, in the long run, inconceivable. One side or the other has to triumph in the end. However, before this occurs, it will be impossible to avoid terrible collisions between the Soviet republics and the bourgeois states. . . .

" . . . We will first conquer central eastern Europe, then we will take the Asian masses. Later on, we will complete the encircling of the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism . . . and then it will fall into our hands like an over-ripe fruit."

My final quotation from Lenin is the most concise and timely statement of Soviet strategy: "The road to Paris leads through Peking."

Before our own eyes the second act of the great drama is already being played on the world stage—the mastering of the Asiatic Continent. The tentacles which are to encircle the United States are already being stretched toward Africa with her airbases and her western shores. The Soviet effort to penetrate the South American Republics, though so far not very successful, is certainly continuing.

As we see, facts are confirming Lenin's statements with an iron logic. In this context it becomes clear that the recurring peace offensives of the Soviets are only a very cunning trap ventured against a background of the postwar weariness and the known, sincere love of peace of the Western democracies. The secondary objectives of these smokescreens are to confound and mislead public opinion as to the real Soviet aims and, if possible, create disagreements among the Western nations. The main objective, strategic in nature, is to gain time for the reorganization and rearming of Red China's Army and for consolidating and extending the Communist empire in Asia.

Thus, the deeper insight into the true meaning of Soviet maneuvers is truly revealing. We note, on the one side, the siren voices offering peaceful coexistence with the West and, on the other, the activities the ultimate aim of which is the conquest of the Far East. The conquest of all of Indochina with Laos and Cambodia will encompass Thailand and Burma and will eventually constitute a menace to India. The real objective of the loudly heralded attack on Formosa, supported by dubious arguments based on international law and on claims of unifying all Chinese territory, is to outflank Japan and the Philippines as well as drive a huge wedge pointed at the American bases in the Pacific. Finally, the aim of the so-called psychological warfare being waged by the Communists in the Far East is to cause the United States to lose face. All these elements together fit exactly into the strategic pattern outlined in Lenin's thesis of conquering the masses of Asia and encircling the United States.

That is why no Poles, and especially those who have had the opportunity of getting well acquainted with Russia and the ways of thinking of the Kremlin masters, can dis-

cern even a shred of political realism in the fashionable ideas of peaceful coexistence with her. Sooner or later these theories will share the fate of similar dreams which, under the pressure of hard facts, have turned to ashes. Here I have in mind the well known attempts at coming to terms with the red world by means of the so-called policy of containment. All efforts to appease the red moloch were, are, and will remain vain; he understands only the language of strength. Stalin did not hesitate to ask with irony, "How many divisions does the Pope command?" You can only vanquish the plague, you cannot coexist with it.

To the Poles and I presume to all other enslaved nations, the terms "appeasement," "policy of containment," or finally "peaceful coexistence" have one and only one meaning: a tighter closing of the Iron Curtain and leaving their countries, surrendered against their will to the rule of the despots, under the Soviet heel. The Poles simply cannot realize that the United States have actually abandoned their traditional ideals on which their greatness has developed—human right, self-determination of nations, freedom and justice for all.

When I spoke here in Detroit a few years ago, I stressed that in the gigantic struggle which sooner or later threatens the world, the West will need not only material but, above all, moral and spiritual values. I think this truth still remains incontestable. How then today, and I repeat, today, when the material strength of the West has been so eminently increased, thanks to the efforts of the United States, how then today could the free world renounce its conscience? The last three words are an expression used 2 years ago in one of the speeches of the President of your great country. In another speech that same year he said, "The conscience of America cannot find its peace until the enslaved nations again become the masters of their own fate."

I consider it simply my duty to state publicly that the Polish people in Poland and the free Poles scattered all over the world are deeply concerned and saddened by the lack of even a mention of the enslaved nations in the last state of the Union message. What a difference between it and the one in 1953 in which we were told of the need for revoking the secret agreements concluded in the past which allowed the enslavement of free nations.

The Poles are by no means a nation of war mongers as hostile propaganda tries to represent them to the West. The Polish nation suffered too much in the last war and sustained too many losses to welcome a new universal catastrophe. Still war came usually against the will of the people. I remember too well how in the critical summer months of 1939 most of the information from Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy stressed that in all probability war would not occur because of the people's great resistance to war and their desire for peace. But the longings of a nation mean nothing when we have to deal with the uncontrolled will of one madman or of a few madmen who will not hesitate to set fire to the whole world and sacrifice millions of human lives, if they are convinced that for this price they will be able to gain mastery of the world and realize their insane dreams.

For this reason the free world must take into account that, in spite of all the efforts of people of goodwill and in spite of the West's great love for peace, a universal catastrophe is possible. In case this happens, the hearts and souls of the enslaved nations will become most valuable, they might even play a decisive role in the balance of strengths. It would be most painful if, in the general conflict between Red imperialism and the West, the enslaved nations' confidence and trust in the West were diminished

or lost because of indifference or neglect on the part of the free world.

In European affairs, the problem of re-arming Germany has reached a critical and maybe final stage. In several public speeches which have been published in London 3 years ago, I voiced my opinions on the German problem; I also called attention to the dangers for the Polish cause in the rearmament of Germany. I do not have time today to repeat all my considerations but will summarize them briefly.

In the present situation with the ratification of the Paris agreements possibly taking place within the next few months, the free Poles, deprived of course of the possibility of taking any active part in these momentous decisions, can only express their regret that as usual their warnings have been made in vain. Today the climax has been reached of what I called years ago, "the haggling for the German soul and the bones of the German grenadiers." Both sides, the East and the West, are eagerly promising the Germans: the end of the state of war, the end of occupation, the regaining of full sovereignty, and the unification of their country. At least there are the promises made publicly; we do not know, of course, whether there are also secret clauses whose meaning is tantamount to yielding some territory to the Germans at the expense of Poland and some other enslaved nations.

The Polish Nation is the natural ally of the free world in its fight against Red imperialism, even though today Poland can reveal only a small fraction of her true conviction. Therefore, it is the moral obligations of Free Poles and Americans of Polish descent to warn persistently whomever it may concern that such a rearming of Germany cannot include the promoting of German revisionism. Promoting German revisionism would be a fatal step threatening the security of Europe. It would be a great asset for Red propaganda and would further the aims of Moscow. Remembering the bitter experience of the past, we are obliged to cry out incessantly that our country cannot bear again a bargain at the expense of our national territories, and that no honest Pole in the whole world can ever abandon the defense of the Polish Oder-Neisse frontiers.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Minnesota Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Frazee (Minn.) Times of February 21, 1955:

FFA CHAPTER SETS OBSERVANCE

Future Farmers of America members throughout the State are scheduling special activities to focus public attention on the work of their organization during FFA Week, February 19-26. This year, 1955, marks the 25th anniversary of the Minnesota Future Farmers of America. The silver anniversary State FFA convention will be held at University Farm, St. Paul, May 9-11.

Locally, members of the Frazee FFA chapter plan a main hallway display at the high school.

Membership in the FFA is made up of farm boys who are students of vocational agriculture in high school. The organization's activities are designed primarily to help develop rural leadership and good citizenship, and to stimulate the boys to better achievement in their study and work toward successful establishment in farming.

The Frazee FFA chapter has 101 members. It is the seventh largest chapter in the State. Lambert Schilling, vocational agriculture instructor in Frazee High School, serves as adviser of the FFA chapter.

The national Future Farmer organization has more than 370,000 members in the 48 States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Membership in Minnesota totals 10,500. There are 240 Future Farmer chapters in Minnesota.

A story of Minnesota FFA in commemoration of its 25th anniversary year is being prepared and will be released on April 1. Highlights of 25 years of activity, personal anecdotes, and items of local interest will be included in the 200-page publication. The local chapter at Frazee will be in charge of sale and distribution of the publication. A film depicting FFA activities during the silver anniversary year is also being planned. The film will be financed jointly by the Minnesota FFA association and the newly organized State FFA foundation. The film will be available for showing after July 1.

Twenty-Dollar-a-Head Gimmick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial entitled "Twenty-Dollar-a-Head Gimmick," which appeared in the Detroit Times for Monday, February 28, 1955:

TWENTY-DOLLAR-A-HEAD GIMMICK

Democrats have a lulu of a gimmick riding on the tax bill.

We hasten to add that the Democrats referred to are the Democratic politicians in Congress, of whom there are many, as opposed to the Democratic statesmen, of whom thank heaven, there also are many.

The gimmick is to tack a \$20-a-person (or dependent) income-tax reduction as a rider onto the administration tax bill.

President Eisenhower describes it as reaching the heights in fiscal irresponsibility.

This being a period when we are fighting for the very life of our Nation, we agree.

We hate high taxes. We hate them only less than we hate the kind of money-destroying inflation that is brought about by deficit financing, and the reduction in all fixed values—pensions, savings, defense bonds, insurance—which follows.

We can't escape a suspicion that there is an element of vote buying in this unfortunate device.

Once upon a time the big city machines bought votes for drinks at the corner saloon. Then, for a time, \$5 was the going price of voting right.

But that was before inflation.

If vote cadging is in the minds of the politicians, we don't think \$20 a head will do the trick. Certainly not when the price would include weakening all the Nation's defenses.

The U. N. and American Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a most interesting and significant editorial by Mr. Raymond Moley which speaks for itself both as to content and the background of Gunnar Myrdal:

THE U. N. AND AMERICAN OIL INDUSTRY

(By Raymond Moley)

Through a fine example of newspaper enterprise the Wall Street Journal has published the details of what was intended to be a secret report by the Secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. It proposes that governmental machinery, which probably would be implemented by an international agreement, to fix right prices for crude oil produced in the Middle East. This would affect 5 American and 3 European companies. European newspapers are full of the subject at the moment and are interpreting the U. N. proposal as an attack upon monopoly. It is in fact an effort to substitute a socialistic government system of control of which American companies would feel the brunt.

I shall give some attention to the economic aspects of this proposal at a future time but at the moment confine my attention to the interesting person who seems to be masterminding this scheme.

That person is one Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist. He is the head of the Secretariat which has gotten up this scheme. Myrdal is not unknown in the United States. He was brought over here by the Carnegie Foundation to make a study of the status of the Negro in the United States. The appropriation by the foundation for that purpose was \$250,000 and the results published under the title "An American Dilemma," in 1944. Why there should be no person or persons in the United States fit to make such a study is not clear. Perhaps the Carnegie people felt geographic detachment would be a virtue even though that detachment had been so absolute as to deny the student of this problem an opportunity to have lived with the vexing problems of race in the South.

At any rate the Carnegie Corp. got exactly what it might have anticipated which was a severe indictment of the United States. The Myrdal rancor toward the American Constitution can be illustrated by some of his comments. He designates the American respect for the fundamental law as "a nearly fantastic cult." He says that our Constitution "is in many respects impractical and ill-suited for modern conditions," that its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people," and that "until recently, the Constitution has been used to block the popular will." His contempt for our culture is equal to his contempt for our Constitution. One of our cultural traits is, he says, "a relatively low degree of respect for law and order."

Our legal culture is anarchistic but we have a tendency to regulate human behavior tyrannically.

Myrdal's qualifications were apparently highly satisfactory to some Americans for 5 years after these animadversions the Rockefeller Foundation gave a grant of \$12,000 to the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe. Gunnar Myrdal was

then as now the Executive Secretary of that outfit. The grant was to provide social-science scholarships for selected European students. The cream of the jest is that according to tradition the Rockefeller money was made in the oil business. Now the UNECE is cracking down on American oil companies including the Standard of New Jersey, the Socony-Vacuum, and the Standard of California.

Still earlier than his Carnegie grant was a turn as a Rockefeller fellow at the School of International Studies at Geneva.

At the commencement of Columbia University in 1954 there was a great celebration of the bicentennial of that institution. Among those honored with the degree of doctor of humane letters was Gunnar Myrdal who was hailed as the "distinguished son of a distinguished kingdom . . . a man of gifted energies . . . at home on two continents . . . making the world his classroom."

At the moment he seems to be making the Rockefeller oil companies his footstools.

Grain Storage at Cathlamet Basin, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a resolution favoring storage of grain at Cathlamet Basin, in the area known as Tongue Point near Astoria, Oreg. Also, I include a telegram received by me on this date from the mayor of Portland, Oreg., and representative of the extreme concern held by the people in my State over consideration by the Board of the Commercial Credit Corporation in this matter. At present there are approximately 80 empty Liberty ships of the reserve fleet berthed at the Cathlamet Basin to be used for surplus-wheat storage. It has been proposed that 75 of these ships be removed from their present moorage and towed up the coast to the Puget Sound area near Olympia, Wash. This proposal is most regrettable because there exists most conclusive evidence that maintaining the ships at their present moorage is overwhelmingly preferable to the proposed transfer.

RESOLUTION FAVORING STORAGE OF GRAIN AT CATHLAMET BASIN

Whereas the Department of Agriculture's latest plan to use 75 Liberty vessels from the Astoria reserve fleet for surplus wheat loading and storage in the Columbia River area is in danger of being diverted to Olympia, Wash., because of outside opposition; and

Whereas the State of Washington's congressional delegation in Washington, D. C., has been successful in holding up definite action because of their contention that the storing of wheat at Astoria would require expensive dredging operations at Cathlamet Basin, while there is already sufficient room for mooring the ships at Olympia, Wash.; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture, although favoring a strictly Columbia River operation, has agreed to hold up further ac-

tion pending receipt of additional information which would clarify the dispute; and

Whereas the Portland Branch of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots, Local No. 90, is vitally concerned in keeping this operation in the Columbia River because of the critical unemployment and economic conditions existing in the maritime industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Portland Branch of the Masters, Mates, and Pilots, Local No. 90, advise the Commodity Credit Corporation in Washington, D. C., that they feel that the loading and storing operation should be a strictly Columbia River project because—

1. The freight differentials on grain shipments to the Northwest makes it cheaper to load the vessels in the Columbia River, and that the cost of towing a loaded vessel to Olympia, Wash., would be more expensive than a strictly Columbia River towing operation;

2. It is also in the national interest to maintain shipyards, loading facilities, and labor forces at a reasonable and continuous level in all communities in the Northwest instead of concentrating them in one area such as Puget Sound;

3. The dredging operation at Cathlamet Basin, which is considered expensive by opponents of the Columbia River plan, will also be of great strategic value as well as a mooring from the grain vessels because another potential naval base and anchorage will be made available for the west coast, and which could be rapidly expanded in case of an emergency and all-out war; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the Members of Congress from Oregon, the Oregonian, the Oregon Journal, chamber of commerce, and other interested parties for their information of our efforts to keep this operation in the Columbia River area.

WILLIAM M. CALDWELL,
International Organization of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, West Coast, Local No. 90.

PORTLAND, OREG., February 28, 1955.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

I today sent the following telegram to Hon. Ezra Benson, Secretary of Agriculture: Regarding March 1 meeting of Commodity Credit Corporation on program for ship storage of surplus wheat.

I have organized committee of interested Columbia River people as listed below. This committee through me emphatically protests any consideration for diversion of vessels from Tongue Point lay-up fleet to Puget Sound for loading and subsequent moorage. Our experience satisfies us comparative costs plus consideration of normal flow of greatest volume of grain via Columbia River will demonstrate that such diversion greatly increases overall cost of the program.

We believe any proposal to tow empty vessels in open sea without crews consists unwarranted risk of public property. We insist no decision be made until all costs are determined and compared and most important made public.

Harry Lundberg Sailors' Union of the Pacific states "His union insists vessels be manned with nine sailors including boat-swain for open-sea towing and that he has so advised Maritime Administration."

Costs in addition to normal factors of towing, dredging, cleaning, and preparation should include special preparation of vessels for open-sea towing, including securing of all tackle and equipment thereof. Volume of annual grain flow via Columbia River is 3 to 1 compared to Puget Sound.

Loading facilities in river are 9 marine terminal elevators compared to 3 in Puget Sound. Therefore greatest demand for relief of storage exists in river area. Labor

representatives on committee emphatically point out river area is in critical zone for unemployment classification.

Committee which concurs in the foregoing consists of: John J. Winn, Jr., Port of Portland; Kit C. Conyers, West Coast Transoceanic Steamship Co.; H. Davies, Albina Engine & Machine Works; Al Bird, Portland Metal Trades; H. H. Harrison, Electrical Workers Local, No. 48; John Gillard, Steamfitters Local, No. 235; A. G. Merriess, Coastwise Line; Norman Hicks, Boilermakers Local, No. 72; Geo. Palmon, Machinist Local, No. 63; Larry Rafferty, Boilermakers; William R. Gray, Laborers, No. 296; William Berry, Sailors' Union of the Pacific; J. Moorhead, colonel, Corps of Engineers, district engineer, Portland District; Matt Meehan, ILWU; J. C. Hayes, Willamette Iron; A. E. Farr, Northwest Marine Iron; F. E. Battaglia, Albina Engine & Machine Works; Capt. A. J. Carlton, M. M. and P. Local, No. 17; Capt. H. T. Shaver, Shaver Transportation Co. and Tidewater Shaver Barge Lines; Thomas P. Guerin, commissioner of public docks; Hudson Lothian Pope & Talbot; L. M. Thompson, Western Transportation Co.; William Garry Bend, Portland Truck Service; William F. Martin, the Quaker Oats Co.; H. E. Sanford, Continental Grain Co.; R. L. Clark, president of Portland Chamber of Commerce.

FRED L. PETERSON,
Mayor of Portland, Oreg.

The Principle at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include and have printed in the RECORD an editorial in the February 1955 edition of the American Issue, a monthly publication devoted to abstinence and civic righteousness, which editorial has some very constructive thoughts pertaining to the necessity of having appropriate restrictions upon the alcoholic persuasions of the whiskey, wine, and beer visitors that may come into the American home through modern advertising media.

One of the world's great writers once referred to "booze" as something that could steal away the human brain and I have seen it happen on many occasions with very tragic results. I have never been able to see any man-of-distinction personality in this robber and arch criminal called "booze." The wisest of books tells us in Proverbs 20-1: "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging, and he that is deceived thereby is not wise." So, I hope my colleagues will be very wise and seriously consider this editorial and then help enact pending legislation for banning "booze" advertising from the American home.

The editorial follows:

THE PRINCIPLE AT STAKE

Broadcasting magazine, in an editorial Drink on the House opposes dry efforts to ban beer and wine-casting by claiming that a vital principle is involved. "The principle at stake," says Broadcasting, "is whether Federal censorship will be applied to radio and TV. It is on that principle that broadcasters ought to stand."

"By Constitutional amendment, the Federal Government has left it up to the State to decide whether the sale of alcoholic beverages is legal or illegal. It is not the prerogative of the Federal Government to reserve for itself the power to prohibit advertising of such beverages. Such a prohibition would constitute unadorned censorship of a particularly objectionable kind since it would be directed exclusively against radio and television and would not affect any other advertising medium.

"Let the Government get away with banning beer-wine advertising from the air and there would be no consistent argument against its banning any other kind of advertising.

"Whether the percentage of total broadcast time occupied by beer-wine advertising is zero or 100, it is not a matter for adjustment by the Congress of the United States."

And that's exactly where the temperance forces of America feel this problem of the invasion of the home by beer and wine advertising must be settled—by the Congress of the United States—and there are certainly several principles at stake.

WHY RESTRICTIONS ARE NEEDED

First, there is the alcoholic beverage industry. Because of the harmful character of alcohol, whether in beer, wine, whisky, or vodka, the manufacture and sale of these beverages is a privilege—not a right. In every one of the 48 States there are dry areas where the citizens by local option or regulation have banned the sale of alcoholic beverages. In every one of the 48 States there are hours of the day and week when such beverages may not be sold. In every one of the 48 States there are more laws, regulations, restrictions, and prohibitions dealing with alcoholic beverages than with any other marketable commodity. Why these regulations and restrictions? Because alcoholic beverages are injurious to the health, safety, and moral welfare of the individual and society. Alcoholic beverages are not healthful products like bread and milk and oranges. Alcoholic beverages make pedestrians stagger and drivers dangerous, and homes a hell on earth for the families of millions of alcoholics. This is why the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages is so closely guarded and proscribed.

SALES TALK INVADERS HOMES

Second, the advertising of any product is the process of education and persuasion, and the subconscious compulsion to buy and consume that product. And there is no more persuasive or compulsive advertising than the beer and wine advertising on radio and television. Radio is everywhere—home, car, barbershop, filling station, student's room, and children's bedside. Television has moved from the tavern to the living room, but it has brought with it into the home the breath of beer and wine. And into some 35 million American homes today, this marvelous instrument which could so bless our Nation, is using human voice and human personality to consummate skill and limitless wealth, to talk and sing the harmless glories of beer and wine, persuading all listeners, young and old, that no matter what else belongs in the home, beer and wine belong. Never a word of warning. No mention of the presence of dangerous alcohol. In fact, the ABC of Beer Advertising published by the U. S. Brewers' Foundation in 1953 warns brewers never to mention the presence of alcohol in their advertising.

AIR WAVES BELONG TO THE PEOPLE

Third, the air waves and television channels belong to the people of the United States. They are not the property of the stations or of the networks. Through the Federal Communications Commission the People of the Nation grant to radio and TV

stations a franchise for the use of a certain wave length or channel to be used in the public interest. The radio or television franchise is a privilege to operate, not a bill of sale. The radio and television business is a privileged business, like the liquor traffic. And because of its power to influence the thinking, the habits, the desires, the ideals, the lives of people, the radio-TV industry needs to be as carefully and closely guarded as the liquor traffic itself. In fact, the radio-TV industry is a vital part of the liquor traffic when it uses the air waves and TV channels to create the desire and appetite for alcoholic beverages. And as long as it engages in this practice of beer-casting it should come under the same strict regulation as the liquor traffic whose willing servant it is.

FEDERAL CONTROL NEEDED

Fourth, the 21st amendment gives full power to the several States to deal with alcoholic beverages as they may see fit within their respective borders. But it does not give to the States any power to deal with advertising of alcoholic beverages which crosses State lines from without. The licensing of radio and TV stations is not a State matter; it is in the hands of the Federal Communications Commission, because all broadcasting is interstate. It is obvious therefore, that some legislation is essential to correct this division of responsibility. There must be Federal laws giving protection to dry areas against beer- and wine-casting, and to protect homes from invasion by brewers and vintners via the ether waves.

This is not a matter of censorship. It is a matter of keeping out of the home the appeal to buy and drink harmful beverages. Temperance people are as anxious as other citizens that radio and television shall be used as a blessing and not as a curse to America. They are willing and glad when these important media can be used for wholesome and constructive purposes, in the public interest. But selling beverage alcohol in the homes of the Nation is dangerous business. A Federal law banning such advertising should be enacted without delay. Certainly if less than 3 percent of television time and 2 percent of radio time is used for beer and wine, the broadcasting industry will suffer no financial loss while it replaces alcoholic with nonalcoholic programs.

Congress should speedily enact a law to protect the homes of America from the invasion of the liquor traffic over air waves and TV channels which belong to the people themselves.

Resolution Approved by the Egyptian District, Department of Illinois, Disabled American Veterans, at Centralia, Ill., on February 20, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution approved by the Egyptian District, Department of Illinois, Disabled American Veterans, at a regular meeting held at Centralia, Ill., on February 20, 1955:

Whereas the Supply Department of the Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., has issued an order that in all general medi-

cal and surgical hospitals of the Veterans' Administration with under 300-bed capacity, the 35-millimeter commercial movie program will be discontinued on April 1, 1955; and

Whereas the 35-millimeter commercial movie program in these hospitals under 300-bed capacity is one of the major sources of entertainment for patients in these smaller hospitals; and

Whereas the geographical location of most of these hospitals is such that entertainment for the patients is hard to obtain, and these movie programs in these smaller hospitals enhance the morale and contentment of patients; the discontinuance of this movie program would not only leave much idle time, which would have a tendency to lead to moroseness of patients with chronic conditions, who are forced to stay in the hospitals over long periods; and

Whereas these movie programs have been in force over a period of years at most of these hospitals, and would be very hard to replace with other forms of entertainment: Be it

Resolved, That we urge our State department and national organization to serve notice on the Veterans' Administration to the effect that our organization cannot see the justification for the discontinuance of the 35-millimeter movie program of the smaller hospitals; and be it further

Resolved, That our State department and national organization take necessary action to inform all subordinate units of our organization on the aforesaid contemplated action, and that the membership at large may act to cause the rescinding of such action.

Dated March 1, 1955.

EGYPTIAN DISTRICT, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,

JOE P. BOYLE, Commander,
FLOYD J. GROOTHINS, Adjutant.

Price Increases in Shotgun Shells

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district whose inhabitants burn up more powder than those of almost any other district in the Nation. In recent months, I have received many protests from hunters and trap shooters at the sweeping price increases imposed by the manufacturers of shotgun shells in the last 10 years. In the case of 12 gauge trap loads alone, the increase in this period has been 147.6 percent. I am further informed that price changes are generally announced by all manufacturers on the same, or practically the same, date. Typical of the many protests I have received is the following letter of February 25, 1955, from Mr. J. W. Whitehill, president of the Milwaukee Gun Club:

DEAR Mr. REUSS: I am writing to you this morning in the interest of the many shooters from Wisconsin who participate in shooting trap and skeet at the Milwaukee Gun Club, Lake Park, Milwaukee, Wis.

The greatest number of shooters are from the Milwaukee area, however, at times shooters from all over the State shoot on our grounds. A considerable number of teams

from the large industrial plants also shoot with us and we all are very much disturbed over the raising of the price of shotgun shells during the past year.

Earlier in the year of 1954, these prices were raised and at this time both the shooters and the manufacturers felt that by the elimination of some of the variety of shells being loaded we could agree upon simplifying our requirements by adopting a lighter load in a few specific types. It was our feeling that this would in some degree assist the manufacturers in stabilizing the price. Shortly after this, however, the manufacturers again raised the price 6 percent.

These continuing raises in price are most discouraging to the average citizen who derives pleasure and recreation in shooting of shotguns and in a very sincere effort to help ourselves we are experimenting at this time in the reloading of shells already shot and in this way we are reducing the cost to the shooters who are turning to this reloaded shell in desperation. The Milwaukee Journal has already written a story about this situation and we are finding more and more clubs around the country very much interested in doing something to cut down shooting costs, even importing foreign shells which can be delivered here for 10 percent less than the cost of American shells. We believe this is a most unfortunate situation, Mr. Reuss, and something should be done to stop it.

Shortly after these complaints came to my attention, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to obtain for me the price history of shotgun shells in the last 10 years. On February 11, 1955, the Legislative Reference Service wrote the Shotgun Shells Manufacturers Trade Association, the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute at 250 East 43d Street, New York, requesting a list of price changes in shotgun shells for the postwar period. When no reply was received, the Legislative Reference Service sent a followup telegram on February 25, 1955, saying, "Information urgently needed for Member of Congress."

Finally, a letter dated March 1, 1955, has been received by the Legislative Reference Service from the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter requesting a list or table showing price changes in sporting ammunition.

We regret that we are unable to comply with your request, but the Institute does not collect or publish information of any kind in regard to prices and has no such list or table. It is a definite policy of the Institute not to engage in any activity in respect to prices. Thus, the Institute has nothing whatsoever to do with prices charged by any of its member companies. Each member company determines its own pricing policy on whatever basis it sees fit and does not report its prices to the Institute. Therefore, we do not have and are not able to furnish any information as regards price changes for sporting ammunition over any period.

The activities of the Institute are concentrated in the fields of research, promotion, safety, and conservation. With the thought that they might be of some interest in connection with your survey of the industry, we are enclosing copies of various Institute publications, which will give you an idea of the important types of activity engaged in by the Institute.

RICHARD F. WEBSTER,
Secretary.

I have communicated to an official of one of the sportsmen's clubs in my district the position of the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Institute that "We do not have and are not able to furnish any information as regards price changes over any period," and asked him for his comment. His comment was "apple-sauce."

I have today directed to Mr. Edward F. Howrey, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the following letter:

MARCH 3, 1955.

MR. EDWARD F. HOWREY,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wish to bring to your attention a situation existing in the shotgun shell industry which is working great hardship on the millions of Americans who enjoy the sport of hunting and of trap and skeet shooting.

For some time, I have been receiving complaints from both within and without my district complaining of the steady price increases in shotgun shells and noting that these price increases have quite generally come at precisely the same time and in precisely the same amount. The following appears to be the price history of the larger shotgun shell manufacturers for 12-gauge trap load shotgun shells during the past 10 years:

Year:	Price per thousand shells
1942-46.....	\$32.41
March 1946.....	37.21
July 1946.....	40.00
January 1947.....	48.00
March 1947.....	50.80
July 1947.....	53.45
January 1948.....	53.52
April 1948.....	58.82
July 1948.....	64.50
November 1948.....	67.70
May 1949.....	64.50
January 1950.....	65.10
August 1950.....	71.10
December 1950.....	78.60
January 1953.....	75.60
December 1954.....	80.25

Although trap loads are only some 20 percent of the total shotgun shells sold, the same percentage raises have been made over the years for all varieties of field loads.

You will note that the increase in price is 147.6 percent in under 10 years. I am further informed that these increases by the various manufacturers have been practically simultaneous.

You are, of course, familiar with the numerous cases establishing that horizontal price-fixing practiced in concert by manufacturers is violative of the Federal antitrust laws:

Federal Trade Commission v. Pacific Paper Association ((1927) 273 U. S. 52, 62); *United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Company* ((1940) 310 U. S. 150); *American Tobacco Company v. United States* ((1944) 147 F. 2d 93); *United States v. Paramount Pictures* ((1946) 66 F. Supp. 323, 337).

On the question whether concerted action can be inferred from a long-standing uniformity of prices charged for a given product by the various manufacturers, coupled with almost simultaneous announcements periodically of identical price increases, the Federal court in the *United States v. Paramount Pictures* case had the following to say:

"Such uniformity of action spells a deliberately unlawful system, the existence of which is not dispelled by the testimony of interested witnesses that one distributor does not know what another distributor is doing; and there can, in our opinion, be no reasonable inference that the defendants are

not all planning to fix minimum prices" (*United States v. Paramount Pictures*, op. cit., p. 337).

On the facts, it seems to me that a thorough investigation of whether the Sherman and Clayton Acts have been or are being violated is in order. In this connection, the question of mergers in the shotgun-shell industry, and of possible relationships between domestic producers and foreign manufacturers of shotgun shells in restraint of trade should also be investigated.

I shall appreciate being informed of such public action as the Federal Trade Commission undertakes.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

Address by Louis S. Rothschild, Chairman
of the Federal Maritime Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on maritime problems, delivered in Boston, on February 24, by Louis S. Rothschild, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY LOUIS S. ROTHSCHILD, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD AND ADMINISTRATOR, MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, BEFORE A LUNCHEON OF THE GREATER BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, HOTEL STATLER, BOSTON, MASS., ON FEBRUARY 24, 1955

I am, indeed, honored to have been asked to speak in the Port of Boston. There are a number of reasons why I feel deeply gratified on this occasion. First of all, as a schoolboy at home and later as a student in a nearby New England university, I developed a sort of reverence for the Port of Boston as the birthplace of our seafaring heritage.

Of more recent date and more immediate interest, however, is the fact that my immediate boss, the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, hails from this historic port. His selection by President Eisenhower for the Cabinet post under which comes the responsibility for maritime affairs is most fitting. The President, keenly aware of the importance of our maritime potential to the strength of the Nation, could not have made a more appropriate choice.

Secretary Weeks has set a wonderful example as an American businessman of the highest caliber serving his country unselfishly and with rare efficiency. Boston, which has given more of its sons to national service than perhaps any American community, may well be proud of his contributions to the present administration. Certainly I count him as a warm and understanding friend and mentor, my superior officer in whom I have the utmost confidence and trust.

So when I was asked to make this talk I thought the least I could do was to look up some statement made by the Secretary that would prove appropriate to the occasion. I found it.

Sinclair Weeks once said: "The sea is the old, tried friend of Boston business. Don't overlook its value."

With true New England brevity and aptness, I think he has given us a valuable message in these few phrases. It has a special meaning to those of us primarily concerned with ocean transportation.

As Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board and Maritime Administrator, our principal interest in the American merchant marine has been the merchant fleet itself, its construction, maintenance, and operation. But we do not forget that there is another equally important factor in our maritime potential—the continued efficient functioning of our port cities.

These communities are more than mere terminals for ships traversing the seas. They must face the sea and inland as well. They must provide for the all-important function of transshipment of cargoes to and from the rails and highways into and out of the holds of oceangoing vessels; their complex organization calls for a standard of efficiency and orderly procedure unappreciated until ill fortune stops it. Almost immediate economic paralysis is the inevitable result, a malady that quickly affects interior communities for hundreds of miles, disturbs deeply the daily livelihood and habits of millions of Americans.

The task of administering the multiplicity of functions of a great port such as Boston is of great importance and requires skill and experience. It is a task that calls for constant improvement, constant attention to the daily details, and a readiness to meet competition of all kinds. It calls for an attitude of responsibility not only to the port itself but to vast productive areas of our Nation—the fields and forests, the factories and workshops, and the market places for goods transported in ships from far-off lands across the seas.

All that I have read and heard about the Port of Boston's progress in recent years points to the fact that it is quite conscious of its vital role as a doorway leading in and out of a vast producing and consuming region of this Nation. Boston has, perhaps, led the East in the provision of new and modern facilities, such as the Mystic, Hoosac, and the East Boston piers. It was a forward-looking spirit that envisaged the need and found the means to accomplish this. As a matter of fact, I think it fair to say that Boston started the postwar cycle of port improvement that will add nearly a quarter of a billion dollars worth of new facilities to the ports of the Nation. Furthermore, one cannot help but be impressed at the high caliber of the individuals in authority and the democratic manner in which they are selected to direct the port activities of the State of Massachusetts.

It is heartening, too, to contemplate the demonstration that takes place day after day, month after month, of the cooperation of management and labor in keeping the goods flowing in and out of Boston in an uninterrupted stream. Such stability begets sound confidence on the part of users of this great national port. This year of unbroken labor peace on the water front is an augury of what can be done throughout all port areas of the Nation.

I believe, in other words, that the Port of Boston well understands that trade goes where it is invited, and stays where it is welcome.

Other ports have heeded this axiom, particularly in the postwar period. For example, Savannah and Wilmington, on the Atlantic coast, have added greatly to their facilities and stepped up their promotion throughout the inland areas they serve. Baltimore is planning additional modernization, and the matter of a new port authority is currently before the State.

On the west coast new and very modern terminal facilities have been put into service in San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Long Beach. New Orleans, the Texas ports, and

Gulfport, Miss., on the gulf coast, have all stepped up their postwar developments, reaching for their business far into the heart of the Nation through the transportation network of the Mississippi Valley.

Development and improvement in this competitive world is all important, not only to the management of a port but to the seagoing phase of our maritime life as well—to the designing, building, and operating of the ships of our merchant fleet.

Today, the policy of the United States is clear. Federal Government aid and encouragement must be available to the extent that our American merchant marine can be relied upon as an instrument of national security. The principal measure of the amount of that aid is the differential in costs that must be borne by our shipping firms in meeting low-cost foreign competition. It is a credit to the present administration that it has reaffirmed that policy, not in any offhand manner, but as a result of a study both deep and wide in its implications and scope.

With true New England conservatism and prudence, the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration, under the direction of Mr. Weeks, engaged first in a down-to-earth audit of its maritime responsibilities, and reached its judgment as to further action only when a sufficient amount of data had been accumulated and analyzed.

The value of such a process is obvious. It removes us from an area of doubt and uncertainty in the field of Government-industry relations, into a position of clarity and understanding. It encourages the mutual trust and confidence which must be present in the partnership of industry and Government if we are to meet America's maritime needs. The steps taken in this direction have been among the most valuable achievements of Secretary Weeks' administration of the Commerce Department.

Make no mistake about it—America's maritime needs must be met, for despite the lurid fascination of push-button warfare, of the Buck Rogers type of ultra-technology which blithely conquers the air and stratosphere for trade and defense, ocean transport remains as the solid bulwark of our strength and defensive planning. We must continue to guarantee our ability to use the sea lanes to support our bases overseas in an emergency, and meanwhile to employ them as avenues of peaceful trade with the free nations of the world, over which to export our own goods and products, and to import the long list of cargoes essential to our well-being, to our production schedules and to the stockpiling of strategic materials.

The maintenance of our seagoing fleet at an acceptable competitive level with the merchant ships under other flags, plus meeting our national defense requirements in terms of active ships, in reserve strength and in mobilization readiness—this is one way of describing the major responsibility of the Department of Commerce's Maritime Administration. In addition, the Federal Maritime Board is charged with carrying out the Nation's maritime regulatory laws and the all-important task of determining the extent of the differential subsidy contracts entered into by the Government to aid the maintenance of operation and construction of seagoing ships under the American flag.

Let me sketch out some of the highlights of our present program. In so doing, may I pay tribute to one of your outstanding national leaders—Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, who has continued throughout his years of service to his State and country to understand and work for our maritime welfare. His efforts in the Congress contributed mightily to the achievement of the current shipbuilding and ship repair programs, and he continues to be enthusiastic over the continuing efforts proposed in the President's budget request to Congress for the coming fiscal year.

In 1953, our studies showed clearly the need for maintaining sufficient shipbuilding in this country to continue the employment at all times of a skilled working force in our major shipyards so that they could be a nucleus for expansion to meet mobilization pressures and a high level of shipbuilding if war comes again.

At the start of last year, no orders from the shipping industry had been placed with the shipyards for the construction of new ships. A Government program, commenced at the time of the Korean campaign for the construction of mariner-class freight ships, was coming to a close. And of deeper concern, our projections showed that the eventual replacement of presently active ships in the commercial fleet would not be due, under normal economic processes, until a period of from 8 to 10 years in the future.

We realized, of course, that the prime impulse for the construction and employment of merchant ships must come from private industry, since ships are units in our maritime industrial plant. We were convinced that in the past there had been great wastefulness inherent in the Government's role of principal shipbuilder.

Therefore, our task was to move quickly, for the sake of our shipbuilding and ship repair potential; but at the same time, to use all our efforts to encourage and supplement the investment of private funds in the construction of oceangoing vessels.

Massachusetts can be doubly proud of the part played in bringing this program to reality by those two great congressional leaders, Representatives JOSEPH MARTIN and JOHN MCCORMACK.

I believe that the teamwork exhibited by both the executive and legislative branches of our Government in bringing about our present program was unique and marks the beginning of a new period of coordinated national effort aimed at keeping our maritime progress rolling.

The Congress made possible a shipbuilding and repair program amounting to a \$400 million potential of business for the yards, at an expenditure of less than half that amount in direct Government appropriations. In addition, a wider Federal insurance of privately held mortgages for ship construction was made possible.

Whereas the program could not immediately translate itself into jobs for the shipyards, it has already halted the downward trend, and is beginning the long uphill climb.

Already there are orders for 8 new super-tankers, of which 1 has been placed in the yards at Quincy. There is a potential of 25 more tankers of this new type in the current program.

It should be emphasized that 4 of these 8 ships are being built by private industry. Two are the result of the so-called tanker trade-in-and-build program, and two made possible by our approval of the transfer of older tonnage to foreign registry. Under the present trade-in program authorized by Congress, the Maritime Administration can place as many as 20 serviceable tankers in the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

In addition, the present program calls for the construction of four large new passenger ships. The ability of the New England shipyards to produce ships of this type would lead one to suppose that they will be active bidders on these jobs when invitations to bid are sent out.

Of very great significance has been our ship-repair program, authorized by the last Congress. There are a number of military type ships in our reserve fleet anchorages that need basic repairs before they could be reactivated. Up to now, funds for anything more than preservation of these ships along with the others in the anchorages, have not been available. But our current program has enabled us already to contract

for drydocking and repair of 46 ships, and we expect to complete 70 before the current program is over.

One of the compelling reasons for this program was to provide work for this vital industry along all the coastlines. Bidding was invited on a regional basis, and in this area, Boston yards have worked on four of these vessels, withdrawn and towed here from our Hudson River reserve fleet anchorage.

Already, too, our program has taken us deeply into the field of new ship machinery design and plans for the development of new cargo handling gear, both of which will no doubt greatly influence our merchant fleet in the coming years. Experimental work is going ahead on Liberty ships withdrawn from the ranks of our reserve fleet, where there are 1,400 of these cargo carriers so valuable in the last war, and yet which are completely outmoded today.

While our current ship building and ship repair program continues, it is necessary, of course, to present for budgetary approval scheduled operations for the next fiscal year beginning July 1. Here we have continued along the major lines laid down during this year, but with even more emphasis on the greatest problem overhanging the merchant marine—that of ship replacement to offset the bugaboo of block obsolescence.

In our new program, we hope to encourage the replacement of five older dry cargo ships with new ones in much the same manner as we are now offering tanker operators under the trade-in-and-build program. We look forward to the start of construction of 4 additional new passenger liners, 2 for the round-the-world service, and 2 for service between the west coast and Australia and New Zealand ports. The latter two will be created by extensive conversions of mariner-type ships.

At the same time, we are well aware of the need to maintain our defense posture, a requirement in our maritime planning that has been sharpened with recent developments in Asian waters.

All of the ships I have mentioned so far in our 1956 program are to be constructed under the subsidy laws, with the Government sharing in the costs only to the extent of the difference in the estimated foreign cost of producing such ships and the higher prices necessary from American shipyards. In addition, we hope to continue the tanker trade-in-and-build program, planning for the construction by the tanker industry of 10 new supertankers and the acquisition by the Government of 20 older but usable tank ships for standby service in reserve. Here, too, full materialization of this part of the program will provide some \$194,500,000 worth of work for American shipyards, with the Federal share of the outlay about \$72 million by the taxpayer.

In addition, three ships are contemplated to be built directly by the Government under the 1956 program. These will be prototypes of ships essential to mobilization plans. We must not delay in producing such ships, which can be built in large numbers under emergency conditions, and which would serve in the vital functions of general cargo carriage and as naval auxiliaries.

Two of these new ships are to be freighters, each with the same hull design, but one of higher power and suited for use as a naval auxiliary. The other, with a speed of 18 knots, would be the counterpart of the Liberty ships of World War II. This design has been termed the Freedom ship.

The third prototype contemplated is a 20-knot tanker of the pipeline class, extremely valuable to the Navy as well as to meet the very heavy demand which war would bring for swift, worldwide transport of petroleum products. The jet age has increased this dependence upon the sea transport of fuel, not decreased it.

In the list of new ships to be built as replacement vessels come additional names new to America's maritime terminology. In addition to the freedom replacement for the old Liberty, there are on our drawing boards the following: Clipper, of 18 knots speed, intended for replacement of present C2's, and Seafarer, for the C3's and C4's. These two latter types form the backbone of our merchant freighter fleet today. The new designs are faster, and show the trend toward higher stowage factor. All will embody the very latest in cargo-handling gear.

Three other designs are ready for new construction as shipping companies decide to replace their steadily aging vessels. These are the Island type, a coastal freighter; Bulk, a 16-knot common carrier for all types of dry bulk cargoes such as ores and grains; and perhaps the newest concept of all, the Turnpike class. This is a twin-screw ship of 20 knots speed, essentially a ship to carry trailers and capable of side and end loading. Presumably this type of ship would be used for the most part in intercoastal and coastwise services.

These are preliminary designs produced for the purpose of discussing with the steamship lines the replacement of ships now in operation. We have thus provided a variety of ship designs to help evolve a well-balanced fleet in the next generation of vessel construction. Propulsion machinery and cargo gear no doubt will be greatly influenced by the experimental work we are conducting today. Given the type of cooperation between Government and the industry which I confidently expect, we should be able to look forward to a fully competitive, advanced merchant fleet suitable to meet the needs of our commerce and our defense.

Thus we are working toward the provision of an improved merchant fleet—a fleet of ships faster and better able to handle the transfer of cargo to and from transit by sea to carriage by land vehicles. We must seek the greatest efficiency in this direction, for it is at the terminal where we must work toward achieving the quick turnaround of a ship. It is the ship at sea, not at the pier, that pays for itself.

This means an increasing responsibility on port management. Here, too, the element of direct competition is evident. The opening of new port facilities, such as now looms because of the St. Lawrence seaway program, calls for correspondingly greater endeavor on the part of the older ports. Yet I feel confident that there will be business for all in this expanding economy. Populations are increasing, world-trade volume is steadily climbing, and as we hold off the aggressive threats of communism, the economies of the friendly nations of the world improve by leaps and bounds.

Tomorrow is bringing a tremendous promise to the businessmen of America; and a vital part of that business must flow through the port cities of our coastlines.

Such a realization sharpens the impact of Secretary Weeks' admonition: "The sea is the old, tried friend of Boston business. Don't overlook its value."

The Fourth Object of Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address which I delivered on Tuesday of this

week at the Memphis Rotary Club. As Senators know, I have been concerned by the manner in which our policy has been proceeding in the Far East. I am glad that the President clarified it publicly to some extent this week when, at his press conference, he assured all that this Nation will not help Chiang invade the mainland. I am glad also that the Secretary of State this week did not give Chiang assurances of help in support of the offshore islands. How I feel about this situation is expressed in my address to the Rotary Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor that you have invited me to participate in your golden anniversary of Rotary. I have been rereading the object of Rotary. I want to talk with you briefly today about the fourth object. As all of you know, it is: "The advancement of international understanding, goodwill, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service."

There is no greater need in the world today than just such organizations truly dedicated to just such an object. I am told that there are now 8,431 Rotary clubs, composed of 396,000 Rotarians in 89 different countries. Your Rotary foundation is contributing much toward international understanding by sending students all over the world for a year's study.

The activities of such an international group as yours, really working at the job of effectively carrying out the fourth object can contribute magnificently toward international understanding.

I feel that we Americans today face three major problems. Broadly stated they are these:

1. To preserve the peace.
2. To preserve our constitutional liberties and our free way of life, and
3. To preserve our economic health and prosperity.

All three of these blend together and are really aspects of the same problem—the problem of preserving a free society.

It is the first of these—the problems involved in preserving the peace—which I wish to discuss with you today and which fit in so well with your fourth object.

Anyone would be less than frank to say that we are not today in a very delicate situation in our international relations. Our world is balanced precariously between peace and war.

We want peace—but what has caused me so much concern is the fear that we are forever on the verge of stumbling into war, with the very best of intentions to be sure but with disastrous consequences nevertheless.

I think it is time that we raise our sights. We owe it to ourselves and to posterity to do so. We have been losing the forests in the trees. We haven't been able to see India for Matsui—we haven't been able to see Japan for Quemoy.

If a major war is to be avoided we cannot blink at the fact that the position of the United States in Asia generally is deteriorating steadily and that the Communists are gaining strength through improved tactics. If this trend continues the bulk of free Asia may follow China behind the Iron Curtain within the matter of a decade or so. Long before then, moreover, we may have lost whatever ability we now have to influence events.

An Asian policy broad enough, bold enough, and flexible enough to reverse this dangerous drift must have the support not only of a preponderant majority of the people here at home, but also of our free allies in Europe. Like it or not, there is a situation in the world in which the only alternative to co-

existence may be no existence, which could be the result of an atomic or hydrogen war. And coexistence is a two-way street—there has to be give and take on both sides.

I don't think we have been proceeding in a very sophisticated way. For instance, we have just entered into a mutual defense treaty with Chiang Kai-shek. I was one of a minority who voted against it. In this treaty we mutually agree that if anyone attacks Formosa we will help Chiang and if anyone attacks the United States he in turn will help us.

What's mutual about that? I have no objection to defending Formosa. I think that the United States has both a moral and a legal obligation to do so. Formosa and the Pescadores were liberated from Japan largely by our arms during World War II. Pending their final disposition we are in what amounts to a sort of trustee position. Chiang is there by our forbearance.

We are, therefore, under obligations to defend Formosa, but let's not kid the world or ourselves by keeping up the fiction that Chiang is a great, dynamic force in Asia, and that he will be rushing over to defend the United States should anyone attack us in mutual exchange for our defense of Formosa.

I thought my colleague, from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, put it very well when he said:

Of course, I have no sympathy whatsoever with the Red Chinese claim to Formosa, but I believe that until final disposition of the islands is determined, neither Chiang nor the Reds have sovereign rights to them. In this respect the Formosa treaty falls short of meeting the definition of a treaty, because treaties are agreements between sovereign nations. Chiang's government is not a sovereign nation, but a government in exile.

Furthermore, Formosa, doesn't include Matsu and Quemoy. These offshore islands are within 5 miles of the China coast. To say that their defense is necessary to the defense of Formosa is about like saying that the defense of Staten Island, in front of the harbor of New York, is necessary to the defense of Bermuda. They may be important to the morale of Chiang Kai-shek but one cannot really expect the Chinese Communists to lie down and play dead with his forces that close to their harbors.

I doubt if the administration intends to defend these islands. We are told that they must keep this unclear in order to confuse the Chinese Communists. The trouble is that it confuses us here at home, too, and it certainly confuses our allies. Thus during this past week we have seen Mr. Eden at the SEATO conference trying to clarify the situation as far as these islands are concerned and Mr. Dulles keeping it unclear.

I had hoped that the administration had given up its go-it-alone policy. However, when we had the Formosa resolution before Congress, it was obvious that it took the British, our strongest ally, by surprise. Evidently there had been no consultation.

Unless the administration has a very firm rein on Chiang this is very dangerous business. His goal is to return to the mainland. I would rather see him there than Mao, but to be realistic I must say that he can't get there unless we put him there and that brings into play the Sino-Soviet defense treaty, which really is mutual. And I'm not willing to pay that price, particularly when I believe that if the Chinese people ever successfully throw over the Communist regime they will not be looking to Chiang for leadership, but will be looking to some new force.

One disturbing thing is that immediately after ratification of the Formosa treaty, Chiang announced that this meant the United States would defend Quemoy and Matsu even before Dulles indicated we would. At the very least, I prefer to have our policy

announced by our own State Department, rather than by the Generalissimo.

A Far Eastern policy tied to Chiang is almost certainly doomed to fail, and by the time the failure is recognized it may be too late to disengage ourselves without grave loss of prestige.

The key to the security of Asia lies instead in the development of dynamic centers of indigenous stability and power which will lend their own growing strength to that of their neighbors—with the military and economic power of America and the western alliance discreetly in the background.

The two major potential sources of such stability are Japan and India. The history of our generation in Asia may be written around what happens in these two nations, with one-fifth of the world's population.

If they remain free, there is every reason to believe that the bulk of Asia will remain free. If they go under, the Communists are likely to take over from Tokyo to Cairo. We must continue to defend and support the smaller nations now favorable to us, but we should not assume that they constitute a decisive, effective anti-Communist force.

We must remember also that the real bulwark of our strength in the world is the western alliance. For the past 2 years while the administration has fought the so-called war party within the Republican Party the western alliance has taken a back seat. The doctrine of massive retaliation enunciated for domestic political purposes along with the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek frightened our allies. They would stand exposed to massive annihilation.

Now the administration is again showing awareness of the Atlantic concept, but here, too, we have got to drop outworn theories and plan big things. My own strong conviction is that NATO must be more than just a military alliance. It must have political and economic ties as well in order to operate effectively. We will be effective neither in Europe nor in Asia as long as the free world itself is divided on its approach, for the Communist world is not.

Problems of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I was pleased to deliver on Washington's Birthday at Stephen's College in Columbia, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY at Stephen's College, Columbia, Mo., February 22, 1955)

I am grateful to you for asking me to speak on the problems of American foreign policy instead of on the answers. It is a great deal easier to recognize the problems than it is to find the solutions to them, and I will frankly confess at the outset that I do not know the answers to many of the problems I am going to discuss with you.

Still, it is helpful if one knows the problem to which one is looking for an answer. Indeed, a precise definition of the problem may point to an answer. And in this field defining the problem is not so easy an ex-

ercise as some people apparently think. There is a great temptation to oversimplify, and oversimplified problems lead to oversimplified solutions.

Let us begin, however, by attempting to define our objective. What is it that we are really trying to achieve through our foreign policy?

The answer to this question, I think, is fairly simple. We want a world in which the American people can live securely, peacefully, prosperously, and happily. That is what is at the bottom of our foreign policy—so far to the bottom that sometimes we lose sight of it and talk about the means by which we try to achieve it as if they were ends in themselves.

Some of us may have strong cultural and sentimental ties with Western Europe, but the preservation of democracy in Western Europe is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for these reasons, but because the communization of Western Europe would immeasurably reduce the chances for the American people to live as they want to live.

Some of us may have strong emotional feelings about the righteousness of the cause of Chiang Kai-shek and the iniquity of Chou En-lai, but the defense of Formosa is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for this reason, but because the occupation of Formosa by an unfriendly power would make the defense of the United States more difficult.

Some of us may feel called upon in a spirit of Christian charity to feed the hungry and clothe the naked of Asia, but the success of the Indian 5-year plan is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for this reason primarily, however appealing it may be, but because a prosperous India can contribute to the peace and well-being of the American people while an impoverished India represents a positive threat to that peace and well-being.

Keeping our eye on the end and not on the means will help us to limit our activities and commitments somewhat, but even so our objective is a pretty big one and our national resources are limited.

Despite our great wealth and power, we are not strong enough to arrange the world precisely as we would like it. Neither are we strong enough or secure enough to ignore the rest of the world.

This seeming paradox sets the upper and lower limits of our foreign policy. Regardless of our likes or dislikes, there are many things which we cannot do, and at the other end of the scale there are some things which we must do.

Although we still occasionally hear voices urging upon us the doctrine of isolationism, I think the suicidal implications of that doctrine have by this time been pretty well established.

It is rather a curious thing, however, that some of the people who have been emotionally inclined toward isolationism have now swung to the other extreme. Whereas formerly they wanted to have nothing at all to do with the rest of the world, they are now clamoring for all kinds of impossible intercessions. I am sure you are familiar with the type. They have what we might call ultimatum mentality. They demand that we tell the Soviet Union and Communist China to behave themselves or else. What is even worse, they demand that we have the effrontery to tell one of our sovereign allies to do as we say "or else." Apparently they are not at all concerned that the "else" in one case might be hydrogen warfare and in the other case the loss of a valued ally.

One extreme is as bad as the other. The ostrich, which hides its head in the sand, is not particularly more stupid than the rhinoceros, which charges at every noise it hears.

Both of these extremes fail to take adequately into account four major interna-

tional facts of this mid-20th-century world. These facts are:

1. The existence of aggressive communism with sufficient resources and power to constitute serious threat to all free societies.

2. The development of technology at an ever-increasing tempo.

3. The dynamic urge for political independence and economic development which characterizes most of the non-Communist world.

4. A shrunken world due to man's ingenuity.

Any one of these facts, taken alone, would present a challenge to American foreign policy. But they are interrelated, and the problems presented by each become more acute and more difficult because of the existence of the others.

NATURE OF COMMUNIST THREAT

Let us consider some of the implications of these facts, and let us begin with the nature of the threat posed by aggressive communism.

This threat is only in part military. It is also in part economic and political. It has been most immediate, however, in its military aspects, and this is the form in which it is easiest to meet.

Compared to our other problems, it is a relatively simple matter to draw a line around the Western Hemisphere or around Western Europe and to generate, in concert with our allies, enough military strength to create doubts in the minds of the potential aggressor as to his ability successfully to breach that line.

In his first annual message to Congress in 1790, George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate today, said: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Well-meaning people have sometimes criticized our policy as being too heavily militaristic; but when you are confronted with overwhelming military power, you necessarily have to devote first attention to building some sort of a defense structure. While doing this we have by no means neglected the political and economic aspects of the Soviet threat, but I think the time has now come when we must give these aspects even greater attention.

IMPLICATIONS OF HYDROGEN WEAPONS

One reason for this is found in the second major international fact which I mentioned earlier—the ever-increasing tempo of technological development. This is one of the factors which seems to me to make all-out war a remote possibility, if, indeed, it is any longer possible at all. In the cobalt-coated hydrogen bomb technology has given us something which, if it is not the absolute weapon, is at least so close to it as to raise grave questions as to whether its use would be self-defeating. Both the United States and the Soviet Union may very well at this moment have the mutual power of total destruction. This includes, of course, self-destruction.

In dealing with nuclear weapons, you very quickly reach a point beyond which superiority becomes meaningless. If each side has the power to inflict a mortal blow upon the other, then it doesn't matter if one side has twice as much power as the other.

I once heard this point made in terms of less awesome weapons. For example: If I am pointing a .38-caliber pistol at you, and you are pointing a B-D gun at me, I have a very great superiority. But if we each increase our strength, so that I am pointing a .45-caliber pistol at you and you are pointing a .38-caliber pistol at me, then, although I would still have a superiority of sorts, it wouldn't really do me very much good in and of itself.

GROWTH OF TECHNOLOGY

As the military applications of technology make all-out war more nearly impossible, and as the defensive strength of the free world increases in other respects, aggressive communism tends to shift its tactics from overt military action to other means. These other means cannot be met by military measures. They require a good deal of imaginative, constructive thinking on our part.

The United States has risen—one might almost say it has been thrust—to its present extraordinary position of wealth and prestige with only 6 percent of the world's land area and only 7 percent of the world's population. Other countries have more natural resources. Other countries have more people. But none has approached the United States in either total or per capita production.

There is an old saying that "It's what you do with what you have that counts." Americans have done the most with what they had. The atmosphere of political and economic freedom which has always prevailed in the United States has had a great deal to do with it, but there is more to it than that.

One of the great advantages which the United States has in world competition—perhaps at this moment in history the greatest single advantage—is our superior technology. This superiority is so marked that we are apt to take it for granted. But it is not inherent. There is nothing peculiarly American about genius. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that genius occurs with no more frequency per million Americans than per million non-Americans. The difference lies in the fact that the American system of education and of social organization makes possible a greater development of the talents which are inherent in all people.

Recent studies, however, indicate that the Soviet Union is bending every effort to close the technological gap between itself and the United States. More scientists, engineers, and technicians are being trained in the Soviet Union than in the United States. And the evidence is that they are being well trained. This to me is an alarming fact, and one that we had better do something about.

It seems to me, for example, extremely wasteful of talented manpower to draft bright young scientists into the Armed Forces. These people can make a greater contribution to the security of the United States by working in laboratories than by carrying a gun.

We would also be well-advised to take steps to train more high school and college teachers in mathematics and the physical sciences. Our position in the world dictates such a course, quite apart from considerations of domestic policy and aid to education generally.

I would not want it inferred from this, however, that our schools should emphasize science and technology to the exclusion, or even to the neglect, of the humanities and other fields of learning. As short as we are of technicians, it could still be argued that our technological progress has outstripped our social progress. One need only look at the impressive fact that although scientists have discovered how to blow us up, statesmen haven't discovered how to keep them from it.

It is important, therefore, that we maintain, or if possible widen, the technological and economic gap between ourselves and the Soviet Union. At the same time, it is equally important that we narrow that gap between ourselves and the underdeveloped countries of the free world.

The economic disparity between the United States and these countries is great—and it is growing at an increasing rate. This trend is not in our national interest.

I have frequently said that the world today is one big neighborhood. Now, no matter how well off you may be yourselves, you cannot have a really good neighborhood if most of the families in it are on the verge of starvation. And the United States cannot continue rich and growing richer in this world neighborhood today so long as a majority of the human race, in the words of Fairfield Osborn, is "living in a crisis whose monotone is interrupted only by catastrophe."

People in this condition make poor customers. They also make poor suppliers—and more and more of the materials our industry uses come from abroad.

Thus, it is our national interest to encourage the economic development of underdeveloped countries on economic grounds alone. Given the existence of the Soviet threat, it is also in our national interest on political and military grounds. From the military point of view, highly developed countries are better able to defend themselves, and to join in measures of collective defense against overt aggression. From the political point of view, they are better able to defend themselves against subversion.

The matter takes on particular urgency at this moment in history because of the third of the major international facts which I mentioned at the beginning: the drive for political independence and economic development in these underdeveloped countries. These twin urges pose different problems for American foreign policy.

DRIVE FOR POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE

The United States itself was born in a revolution against colonialism, and it has traditionally been anticolonial. Most Americans can easily understand the desire of other people to govern themselves.

Our history confirms that we sympathize with that desire. We set a target date for the independence of the Philippines and stuck by it. We allowed the people of Puerto Rico to work out their own destiny, and they freely chose to become a self-governing commonwealth in association with the United States. We have turned down many opportunities to acquire overseas colonies and possessions.

We have used our good offices, through the United Nations and in direct contacts, to hasten the withdrawal of colonial powers from other territories, many of which are now sovereign states. At the same time, however, we have found some of our principal allies in the world struggle against aggressive communism among the colonial powers of Europe. Because of our close relations with these powers, we have been tarred throughout much of Africa and Asia with a kind of colonial guilt by association.

For understandable, but also, I fear, ill-founded, reasons, we have too frequently sought to steer a middle course, torn between military logic which dictated that we support our European allies on the one hand, and on the other hand our historic sympathies which dictated that we support the colonial peoples. After much travail of spirit, we have usually aligned ourselves in the end with the colonial peoples.

Speaking now with the benefit of hindsight over the last 10 years, I think we should have been much less equivocal about our position in these matters. I do not say that in any spirit of criticism of those who have been in charge of our policies, because I am not prepared to say that I would have done it differently myself—given the circumstances which existed at the time. I am not one of those who believes in using hindsight to take an unfair advantage of someone in public office. Hindsight is useful only to the extent that it helps us to avoid mistakes in the future. But if we had it to do over,

I would advocate a much stronger policy in favor of freedom and independence for the colonial areas of the world. It is not yet too late to adopt such a policy, and I believe we are moving in that direction. Actually, of course, more people have achieved political independence in the last decade than at any other comparable period of history.

DRIVE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The record of economic development does not, unfortunately, show as much progress. A start—and on the whole, an encouraging start—has been made, but the difficulties are so complex that we do not as yet thoroughly understand the problem. Here, especially, we must guard against the tendency toward oversimplification against which I warned at the outset. There is a proneness in some quarters, and not least in some of the underdeveloped countries themselves, to think that massive doses of capital investment, administered by the United States, will bring about the desired results. The problem is not that simple, nor is the cure that expensive.

This is another field in which what the United States can do is limited, not only by our own resources but also by the attitudes of the people with whom we are dealing. After all, it is their countries we are talking about, and they can do as they please with them. We should—and we do—stand ready to help insofar as we properly can, but the initiative and most of the effort must come from the people who are being helped.

Economic development is an exceedingly intricate process, consisting of many things, but one of its most important aspects is psychological. Economic development—or economic stagnation to look at the other side of the coin—is in part a state of mind. It is the result of a combination of circumstances which can rarely, if ever, be induced from without. The urge for economic development must be self-generated.

At this point, it is important to distinguish between the urge for economic development and the simple desire for automobiles, air conditioners, and steel plants. Economic development is closely related to cultural attitudes and social organization. Before a country can economically have automobile factories, it must have enough people with enough money to buy the automobiles, and it must have highways for the automobiles to run on. It must have an agricultural production efficient enough to feed the persons who will have to give up farming themselves in order to work in the automobile factories. If it wants greater agricultural production, is it willing to change its system of land tenure which, in at least some underdeveloped countries, breeds inefficiency? If it wants greater industrial production, is it willing to step on the toes of the privileged few who have a vested interest in monopoly and restrictions on output—a privileged few who are usually in positions of great political power? Finally, if it wants eventually to have a complex corporate economy, is it willing to revise its social ideas about the position of women, without whom the American economy could not operate a single day?

These are all questions which can be answered only by the country itself. What its answers are will indicate whether it really has the urge to develop or whether it merely wants the material results of economic development without the social and cultural reorganization which such development implies.

Economic development is only in part the result of capital investment. It is also an aggregate of technical skills—the knowledge and capacity to make efficient use of capital and capital goods. This is the field in which, in my judgment the United States can make the most worthwhile contribution to the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

In this context, then, it seems to me that the proper course for the United States to follow is to adopt, on a long-term basis, a policy of furnishing technical assistance to countries which are genuinely interested in making efficient use of it. You can get more results in work of this kind from a billion dollars spent over 10 years than from a billion dollars spent in 1 year. Indeed, if we tried to spend that much in 1 year in the areas I am talking about, it would be largely wasted. Among other things, it would cause a severe inflation and leave the country which was supposedly being helped worse off than before.

I would not rule out entirely funds for capital investment. But such activities should be limited to specific situations in which a clear and compelling case can be made.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that results are required quickly. Throughout Asia, Communist propaganda is telling people that communism offers a short-cut to economic development. The short-cut, of course, is slave labor but sometimes a people may not realize the implications of this until it is too late.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

We may now, thanks again to technology, have found a way to speed up the process within the framework of a free society. As atomic energy provided the weapons which may have made war impossible, so atomic energy may also have provided the materials which will make peace durable. Potentially the most hopeful development of the atomic age is the movement through the United Nations to establish an international pool of atomic energy materials for peaceful uses. Growing out of the President's great speech before the U. N. General Assembly in December 1953, this movement has made slow but nonetheless real progress and there are grounds for encouragement that more progress may be made in the next several months.

This promises, indeed, to be one of the great imaginative triumphs of American diplomacy. The Soviet reaction indicates that the Kremlin is fully aware of the danger which is posed to its own schemes. The first reaction of the Soviet delegate to the U. N. was automatic—he criticized the President's speech. Within 48 hours, his bosses in Moscow had taken a new reading on world opinion and instructed him to make noises of cooperation. In the intervening period, the Soviet Union has tried to block the project without giving the appearance of doing so—and without being wholly successful on either count. All in all, the last 14 months must have been a very trying time for the Communists. They have used it, however, to push feverishly ahead on their own research into the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

It is just as important that we stay ahead of the Soviets in regard to the peaceful use of atomic energy as it is that we stay ahead of them in regard to the military applications. It is perhaps not too much to say that the uncommitted world of Asia will go to the side that first develops a feasible means of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes on a large scale. For that reason, we can welcome the recent decision to supply heavy water to India.

It may very well be that the benefits of atomic energy can be made available in underdeveloped countries before they become practicable in countries such as the United States. In a country with a shortage of electric power and with fuel resources which are either insignificant or underdeveloped, for example, it would be economical to generate electricity from atomic energy at higher costs than in a country with abundant and well-developed supplies of other fuels.

We can only guess at what large quantities of atomic-generated electric power

would mean in the underdeveloped countries of the world. Irrigation projects would become feasible to bring vast new areas of land into cultivation with all that that would mean in terms of an increased food supply, a better diet for the people, and improved distribution of land ownership. Multitudinous new light industries could be established.

There are undoubtedly other uses which we cannot now foresee. The potentialities are so vast that any sort of analogy with known experience is dangerous. But one comparison which suggests itself and which may be indicative, if not precise, is that the atomic powerplant may very well do for Asia what the steam engine did for Europe—and that, of course, is to remake totally the economy and society of the area.

We must not allow ourselves to become so preoccupied with day-to-day crises that we lose sight of these underlying, long-range problems that I have been talking about. But at the same time, of course, we have to deal effectively with today—or else tomorrow may never come. So let us now examine briefly 2 or 3 of our more pressing immediate crises. There are, unfortunately, a large number from which we can choose, but let us take two on opposite sides of the world—one in the Far East and one in Europe.

SITUATION IN FAR EAST

Paradoxically, it seems to me that both the chances of war and the chances of peace have increased in the Far East in the last month. This results primarily from the fact that both military and diplomatic activity in the area of Formosa have been stepped up, and the situation, which had been in something of a stalemate, has become more fluid. It is now off dead center, but we do not yet know which way it will move. This is another instance in which the power and influence of the United States are limited, and we must frankly admit that the decision is to a large degree up to the Communists. If they want war, there will be war. If they want to avoid war, they can do so very easily.

So far as the United States is concerned, our basic position is quite simple. Our national interests do not permit us to tolerate the occupation of Formosa by an unfriendly power. The island is an integral part of the chain which runs north and south in the Western Pacific from the Aleutians through Japan, the Ryukyus, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. World War II provided a vivid demonstration of what even some of these islands in unfriendly hands can mean to the United States. Formosa provides a potential enemy a means to outflank the Philippines, as well as our bases on Okinawa in the Ryukyus. The Philippines and Ryukyus, in turn, provide stepping stones to other islands and so on, until we reach Hawaii and the west coast.

Since the end of World War II, Formosa has been in friendly hands—namely, the Republic of China headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. But its status in international law is not entirely clear. Prior to the 1890's, Formosa was occupied by the Chinese, and it was ceded by China to Japan some 60 years ago. In the Cairo Declaration of World War II, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang agreed that it should be returned to China. In the Japanese Peace Treaty, Japan renounced all claims to the island, but no affirmative disposition of it was made. It should be noted that the Soviet Union was a party neither to the Cairo Declaration nor to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Since 1950 there have in effect been two Chinas—one on the mainland, which is Communist, and one on Formosa and a few other islands, which is not Communist. The United States, the United Nations, and most of the nations of the world have recognized the non-Communist regime on Formosa as the legitimate Republic of China.

As long as these two Chinas spar with each other across the Straits of Formosa there exists an area of international tension which is in constant danger of erupting into full-scale war. The situation has become increasingly acute since last September as the Communists have stepped up their attacks on the Nationalist-held islands and as they have filled the air with loud declarations of their firm resolve to capture Formosa.

Two other new elements have also been added. First, the United States has made it as clear as possible—we hope beyond the possibility of misinterpretation even in Peiping—that we will use American Armed Forces to protect Formosa and the Pescadores. We have already used our Armed Forces to protect the withdrawal of Chinese Nationalists from the Tachen Islands in a redeployment which will not only strengthen the overall Nationalist position but will also remove a potential trouble spot.

Second, the United Nations Security Council has taken cognizance of the situation, and efforts are under way to arrive at a cease-fire which will introduce at least some measure of stability into the situation. I do not know what the outcome of those efforts will be. So far as the U. N. itself is concerned, the prospects do not at this moment look particularly favorable. But at least the question has been opened up, and it is a matter of active concern to the world's statesmen, not only in Washington but also in London and New Delhi, and we may hope in Moscow and Peiping.

The United States should support these efforts to achieve a cease-fire, insisting only that our vital interests be protected. We can protect those interests without becoming involved in a war on the mainland of China. The prevention of such a war should be one of the primary objectives of our policy.

SITUATION IN EUROPE

Let us look now at Europe, where the stakes are, in some ways, even higher than they are in the Far East.

Western Europe contains the world's greatest aggregation of industrial capacity and technical skills outside the United States. With Western Europe a part of the free world, our preponderance of economic strength over the Soviet bloc is overwhelming. With Western Europe behind the Iron Curtain, our economic strength and that of the Soviet bloc would more nearly approach parity.

Through the Marshall plan, we strengthened Europe economically so that it could resist subversion and at the same time support a military effort of its own. Through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the military defenses of Europe have been further built up.

But one more tremendously important step remains to be taken, and that is to make the skills, the energies, and the resources of the people of Western Germany available for the common defense of Western Europe. We thought a way had been found to do that through the European Defense Community, but national jealousies were still too great, and the memories of three German occupations of France were still too vivid.

Now, through wise statesmanship, an alternative has been worked out to admit the Federal Republic of Germany to NATO, to restore German sovereignty, and to provide for the rearmament of Germany.

The London and Paris agreements which make provision for these steps have been approved by the French National Assembly, but we still wait for action by the French Council. We wait, also, for action by the German Bundestag.

Meanwhile, we see a political deterioration in both France and Germany. In France, one government crisis follows another. In Germany, delay brings with it increasing opposition to the agreements.

Actually, what is involved is more than simply adding German strength to our system of collective security in Western Europe. What is really involved is the integration of Europe—a dream of a thousand years that is now so close and yet apparently still so far from realization.

If we fail this time, we may not again soon have another chance. Yet here we have another instance of a situation beyond the control of the United States. We can only watch and wait and pray—and remind our friends in Europe that this is a time for responsibility, for rising—as Lincoln said—with the occasion, and for putting aside petty jealousies in the interests of the whole community.

UNITED NATIONS

No discussion of the problems of American foreign policy would be complete without considerable emphasis on the United Nations. It is perhaps not a very great exaggeration to say that no organization has ever accomplished so much in the face of so many difficulties. By any standard, the list of what the U. N. has done is impressive. It becomes positively astonishing when one remembers that the U. N. was founded on the principle of Big Five unanimity in the Security Council and that that unanimity hardly survived the San Francisco Conference.

To mention only a few of the U. N.'s accomplishments, it got Russian troops out of Azerbaijan, it ended the Israeli-Arab fighting, it preserved the integrity of South Korea, and through its technical assistance program it has made a modest but hopeful beginning toward improving standards of life in underdeveloped countries.

But it has done more than this. It has provided an international forum where nations can talk out their problems and differences, where the whole world can see the obstructionist tactics of the Soviet Union and the constructive efforts of the free nations. It has provided an excellent means of clarifying the issues in the cold war.

That the United Nations has accomplished as much as it has despite the abuse of the Soviet veto is a clear indication of the powerful, underlying desire of the nations and the people of the earth for an international organization to keep the peace.

The United Nations deserves our full support. I do not have very much patience with people who criticize the U. N. because it falls somewhere short of perfection. No human institution will ever be perfect; nor will one ever be improved by carping complaints.

CONCLUSION

Now, in conclusion, let us try to sum up by formulating some principles which can serve as guideposts for the United States to follow in making and carrying out its foreign policy.

First, we must measure up to the position of leadership which we occupy in the world, but we must at the same time remember our own limitations.

Second, the foremost of these limitations is that we cannot live alone. We must have allies. The only real security lies in collective security.

Third, although the Soviet veto in the U. N. has made it necessary for us to develop a series of regional security alliances, we must remember that the best instrumentality for developing a real system of collective security is the United Nations.

Fourth, although we must not neglect the military aspects of our security, we must pay increasing attention to the political and economic aspects.

Fifth, we must continue technical and other assistance to promote the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

Sixth, we must continue and strengthen our overseas information programs, not

merely to counteract Soviet lies about us, but more importantly to present an affirmative story of freedom.

Seventh, and possibly most important of all, we must keep faith with ourselves and our allies. Let the Communists entangle themselves in devious Machiavellian plots. In foreign relations, as in personal relations, honesty and frankness are the best policies.

With our minds so much on the Far East, I cannot help but recall the teaching of Confucius (and this the Chinese Communists would do well to recall) that there are three essentials to a state—a revenue, an army, and good faith. Of these three, he said, "the greatest is good faith. Without a revenue and without an army, a state may still exist, but it cannot exist without good faith."

Senator George, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article entitled "Senator GEORGE Is Most Powerful Single Solon," written by Martin S. Hayden, of the North American Alliance, and published under date of February 27, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR GEORGE IS MOST POWERFUL SINGLE SOLON

(By Martin S. Hayden)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The venerable WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE seems to prove a paradox—that as senatorial togs get older they become more durable.

At 77—and after 33 Senate years—GEORGE, of Georgia, is not just the senior Member of the United States Senate. He is also the most powerful single man in Congress. As the Senate's president pro tempore, he holds titular rank over all his colleagues.

As the Foreign Relations Committee chairman he has three times demonstrated in recent weeks that he is the strongest foreign-affairs voice Capitol Hill has heard since the passing of Michigan's Arthur Vandenberg.

As the senior member and ex-chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, his is the single vote most likely to make or break a tax bill.

And, in almost every other field of legislative business—from reciprocal trade to the slapping down of Joe McCarthy—one question dominates among predebate doers: "Where does WALTER GEORGE stand?"

It wasn't always so with the big, slow-moving, gray-haired man whose ponderous voice echoes a political era when statesmen needed no mechanical microphones to make themselves heard by a crowd.

GEORGE entered the Senate in 1922 as an avowed conservative supported by businessmen, the power interests, and Georgia's dries. As those groups thought, so did WALTER GEORGE vote. It might have been unfair to state (as some did) that GEORGE lacked political courage. But certainly he was troubled by indecision when Georgia, like other Southern States in the 1930's, split between those who went New Deal and those who

stuck with the interests and traditions of the Old Dixie.

During a period of wavering, GEORGE supported the National Reconstruction Act (NRA) and the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) but opposed investigations of private power and the death-sentence act on public utility holding companies. He was for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Wagner Act, and social security, but against the Guffey coal-control bill, civil-rights legislation, and anything else pictured as an invasion of States rights.

The break with Franklin Roosevelt came on the Supreme Court packing plan. When the President suffered there his first major congressional beating, he put WALTER GEORGE at the top of his list of unreconstructed Democrats who had to be purged in retaliation. The President made his decision known on a Georgia campaign platform. After endorsing GEORGE's opponent, Lawrence S. Camp, he turned to the Senator on the other side of the platform and said with a Roosevelt grin:

"God bless you, WALTER. May we always be friends."

GEORGE rose solemnly, shook the President's hand and boomed out: "I regret that you have taken this occasion to question my democracy and to attack my public record. But I want you to know that I accept the challenge."

In a campaign marked by brass-knuckle tactics and undisguised play by the contenders for racial voting, GEORGE swept the field. Under Georgia's archaic county-unit system he got more than a majority of the whole unit count while Gov. Eugene Talmadge ran second and New Dealer Camp a bad third with less than one-quarter of the popular vote.

From then on no one accused GEORGE of being a Roosevelt man. In 1940 his seniority gave him the Foreign Relations chairmanship and a year later he gave it up to take the Finance Committee chairmanship. If they did not actually suggest the change business interests were pleased by the move that put a man they trusted in the tax-writing post that would have otherwise gone to the less-predictable Tom Connally, of Texas.

When the Democrats took over Congress last month, GEORGE returned to the Foreign Relations chairmanship, leaving another sound tax policy man, Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, in charge of finance. In 5 weeks he pushed through lop-sided Senate confirmations of three historic measures sought by the Eisenhower administration: the resolution authorizing the President to fight for Formosa and related regions, passed by an 85-to-3 vote; the southeast Asian (SEATO) defense treaty, approved 82 to 1, and the defense treaty with Nationalist China, which passed 64 to 6.

Urging the controversial authorization for use of American men in the defense of Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa, GEORGE, who lost a son in World War II combat, hit a new high of bipartisanship:

"I believe," he said, "that President Eisenhower is a prudent man. I believe he is dedicated to a peaceful world. I believe what he says and I am willing to act upon it."

By the time GEORGE was finished a retreat had begun by big-name Democratic Senators who, until the old man had his say, were talking of amendments that would have limited the President's freedom of action. GEORGE passed them off as trifling and told his colleagues to stop talking so the world might know of America's bipartisan unity.

When GEORGE's three-rollick job was done, Republican State Department officials hailed it as the hardest blow yet struck at world Communists who would picture America as a divided Nation.

In the Senate today there is speculation about how long GEORGE will be around to run

the show. Some say that, come 1956, he must either retire or be beaten by the established political power of Georgia's ex-governor, Herman Talmadge.

Others take a different view, Talmadge, they agree is the boss of Georgia, but WALTER GEORGE has lived to become a legend and legends are hard to beat in politics.

Nixon Makes a Good Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nixon Makes a Good Ambassador," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON MAKES A GOOD AMBASSADOR

(By Marquis Childs)

While he still stands high on the Democrats' list of ambassadors of ill will, Vice President Nixon is winning friends and influencing people from Central America.

The Vice President stepped into the middle of the bitter feud between President Anastasio Somoza, of Nicaragua, and President Pepe Figueres, of Costa Rica. He undertook not so much the role of a mediator as that of a catalyst seeking to bring a better understanding between two proud Latins.

There are increasing signs of his effectiveness in bringing peace between the two embittered neighbors. President Somoza has opened up the San Juan River to traffic, thereby resolving one of the chief sources of friction.

During his tour Nixon got publicly behind a project that has languished since the withering of the good-neighbor policy. That is completion of the Inter-American Highway, which has strategic as well as goodwill aspects and is dear to the heart of Central America. He also pledged himself publicly to speed up economic aid for Guatemala.

Those who followed the tour he made last year in Asia, and they include critics of the domestic brand of politics he practiced in the election campaign last fall, believe that fully as important as any specific achievement is the psychological effect of the touring NIXONS. Both the Vice President and his wife make every effort to be friendly and cooperative. There is never anything condescending or stuffy in their approach to their hosts.

Several of the countries they visited in Asia are in the neutral or uncommitted category. Nixon was careful to avoid any suggestion that they had better choose sides between East and West in the cold war.

An example was Indonesia where the Vice President made plain in a half-dozen speeches that he understood both the power, real and potential, and the problems of this new nation struggling to achieve statehood and stability. He was cheered by Indonesian audiences again and again in their country of 80 million people, the sixth largest in the world in population and with vast undeveloped natural resources.

On the practical side Nixon familiarized himself with the urgent problem of the Indonesian Government in disposing of its tin and rubber in order to get foreign ex-

change to try to build up industry. On his return to Washington the Vice President provided the extra push necessary to get an agreement signed providing that the United States would buy all Indonesian tin and rubber for at least a year.

All this is particularly important in view of the Asian-African conference to be held late next month in Bandung, Indonesia. The Indonesians are disturbed by statements in the American press to the effect that this is to be a Communist-dominated conference. Yet, as they point out, Pakistan, which is firmly allied with the West, is one of the inviting powers.

Among the 17 powers that have already accepted the invitation is Communist China, but whether the Red Foreign Minister, Chou En-lai will attend is not yet certain. Also among those accepting are the Philippines and Thailand, both members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization which recently met in Bangkok. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is reported to have encouraged both countries to send representatives to help counter the Communist viewpoint put forward by China.

Nixon in his own estimate of the conference puts it down to the desire of newly independent people to show that they can get together to talk about the future just as do the great powers with a long history of diplomatic negotiation.

As Nixon concludes his Central American tour, there is already talk of another such good will expedition, perhaps as early as next fall, to the Middle East. On the assumption that he will be the vice presidential candidate seeking reelection with President Eisenhower, Nixon is planning to do all his traveling in this country in 1956.

Angry Democrats discussed after election in November various ways to punish Nixon for what they charge was a calculated use of the Red smear. One proposal was to force him to listen as a senior and conservative Democrat read the speeches Nixon made in Montana and Oregon. Nothing has come of these proposals. Told of the achievements of Nixon's good will tours, one of these still-embittered Democrats remarked:

"What you say may all be true and, if so, fine. I'm for keeping him out of the country all of the time."

Education: Democracy's Indispensable Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, at St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, February 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: DEMOCRACY'S INDISPENSABLE WEAPON

(Address of Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama, before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, St. Louis, Mo., February 28, 1955)

The public school, conceived in a frontier settlement more than three centuries ago,

is one of the great rocks on which our Nation has been built. In the early days of this Republic, learning, reason, and faith in the people's capacity to govern themselves inspired that adventurous spirit which dared trust the future of an infant nation to the judgment of the many instead of the dictates of the few. The lives and fortunes of individual Americans, the nature of our institutions, the quality of our industry, commerce, and agriculture, the conservation and use of our natural resources, the nature of our law—the destiny of the Nation itself—depend on decisions rendered by all the people. The public school was created to inform the popular wisdom.

The magnitude of the responsibility resting on public education was forcefully described by Jefferson when he declared: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

The frontiers of our forefathers have faded from the American scene. Today we live among busy lanes of commerce, mighty industries, complex networks of communications, productive farms, great hydroelectric plants, and, now, the harnessing of nuclear power.

These are achievements of generations of American men and women educated in our system of free public schools—achievements wrought by a nation grounded in belief in the supreme worth of the individual man, his dignity, his freedom, his capacity to meet the challenge of each new age.

These are the values and traditions that have led people all over the earth to turn longing eyes toward America, to knock on her door for admittance. These are the values and traditions that have made people in the free nations turn to America for leadership in this time of crisis. These are the values and traditions upon which the greatness of America rests. These are the values and traditions that our schools must preserve and perpetuate.

Our schools, as has been so eloquently stated by your splendid president, Mr. Larson, "are the backbone of our national defense, the bulwark of our free enterprise system, and the foundation of a trained and loyal American citizenship."

Yet, anyone who studies our public schools today, as it has been my opportunity and responsibility to do as a citizen and a Member of your Congress, knows that American education is in serious trouble.

The millions of children attending school on a part-time basis, in makeshift quarters, in overcrowded classrooms, evidence the plight of education in America today. Census figures on the increased millions of children already born who will be crowding through our schoolhouse doors in the years immediately ahead pose an even more desperate situation.

Quantitatively and qualitatively we are possessed of an education deficit that threatens the very capacity of the American people—scientifically, politically, and intellectually—to cope with the most complex and most dangerous problems in the history of freemen.

Educationally speaking, we are still breathing the quiet air of the peaceful years before the wars and revolutions of the first half of the 20th century wrought a world filled with malice and fear.

As we analyze what has taken place in the world, we know that the fall of the western democracies from their preeminence was due not as much to the designs of evil men as that those nations lacked the clarity of purpose and resolution of mind and heart to deal successfully with the world disorders which made possible the rise to power of the totalitarian warlords.

The world disorder has forced us to adopt a radically higher and different defense concept, employing the most terrible and costly

weapons that man can devise, yet we have been willing to limp along on an educational system that is wholly inadequate for turning out sufficient numbers of highly trained citizens and for meeting the multiplied demands for moral discipline and wisdom of great affairs.

The hour demands a radically higher and different concept of education.

Our supreme and ultimate aim is to build a world in which all men may live together in peace. But, if we are to build the peace, we must first be able to survive.

We know that our ability to survive in this era of warlords of aggression rests upon our ability to marshal superior brainpower against the brawn of overwhelming numbers. And our edge is slipping away as our educational system fails further and further behind in the quality and quantity of its product while Russia is pushing her educational effort to unprecedented heights.

One field in which this is clearly apparent is that of the training of engineers and scientists.

Our defense authorities tell us that Russian schools this year will graduate some 54,000 engineers, as compared with only 19,000 to be graduated in the entire United States. This is a ratio of 3 to 1. The ratio is as bad or worse with respect to physicists and scientists of every kind. But this is not the worst of the story of how Russia is outstripping us. Russian facilities will turn out approximately a quarter of a million technicians in nonengineering categories this year, while Americans with comparable training will number but 10,000. This is a ratio of 25 to 1.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, of the National Research Council, and Dr. John R. Dunning, atomic expert and dean of Columbia University School of Engineering, have warned that if present trends continue—that is to say, if our education systems fails to effect a sharp increase in the annual output of engineers and other scientific graduates, the Russians will catch up with us in the next 5 years and after that they will pass us in the race.

The same warning has been echoed by Prof. Joel Hildebrand, president of the American Chemical Society. "In producing scientists," Professor Hildebrand declared, "we need to run very much faster if we intend to win the race for survival."

Today we are reaping the harvest of years of neglect of our educational system—of waste of the talent of our youth. Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration, Columbia University, told our committee at our hearings on school-construction legislation that "more than half the children who enter at the first grade fail to finish high school." He added that "even more important in terms of its effects upon our preparedness is the fact that only one-half of our top talent, those who get high marks in high school, who pass intelligence tests, who it is generally agreed could do college work and do it well, actually do so." "We are," Dr. Norton declared, "wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial professional, technical, or vocational training."

We must bring to a halt the 50-percent dropout rate in our elementary and secondary schools. We must make certain that more and more of the top talent among our high-school graduates is fully capitalized through college and university training.

We know that if we are to do these things—if we are to build our professional manpower resources—we must begin in our elementary and secondary schools for it is here that our young people must be trained and prepared to pursue college and university training.

Emphasizing the urgent need for training more scientists, the National Science Foundation in its annual report just submitted

to the President and the Congress declared that the fostering of scientific training involves first the matter of incentives.

"The primary and indispensable incentive," the National Science Foundation report declared, "is a deep, personal, and indefatigable interest in scientific discovery. To find ways to promote that interest is," the report concluded, "of first importance and leads directly to the quality of the teaching in the secondary schools."

We must sharply increase our supply of well-trained teachers. To do so, we must lift the level of teachers' salaries from its present rank among the lowest of all employed groups in America to its rightful place.

Indeed, the hour demands a bill of rights for the teacher. A bill of rights guaranteeing a salary which will enable the teacher to enjoy a good standard of living, to permit recreation and travel, continued study and educational growth, and provide security in old age.

The bill of rights must go further. It must recognize the essential worth and dignity of the teacher and assure full opportunity to take part in the life of the community—outside the classroom. The teacher must be free of the petty restraints and interferences with his personal life that are so often imposed in many communities. The teacher must be protected from the unprincipled demagogic attacks that fetter the mind, breed suspicion and fear, and threaten the very destruction of free public education.

Teaching has long been called a profession. We must make it a profession, in fact—appreciated and honored in the community, adequately paid and acclaimed for devoted public service.

The total accumulated needs of our educational system are so great that we cannot, with any reasonable hope of success, attack them all at one and the same time on any major scale.

Today the States and local communities and the across-the-board needs of education are straitjacketed by our \$12 billion classroom deficit and the 6-year certainty of continued recordbreaking school enrollments. Our best hope of relieving the deficit and of enabling the States and local communities to turn more of their efforts and resources to raising teacher salaries and to meeting the other needs of education lies in the Federal Government putting its shoulder to the wheel and providing substantial Federal aid for school construction.

As soon as the returns of the elections last November were known and it became evident that I would be chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I pledged to our parents, teachers, and school officials that the very first bill that I would introduce in the new Congress and the very first bill that I would take up in the committee would be for Federal aid for school construction.

On the very first legislative day of the Senate, I, along with 29 of my Senate colleagues, introduced Senate bill 5, providing a billion dollars in Federal aid for school construction over a 2-year period.

On the same day the President referred to the school crisis in his state of the Union message and announced he would have more to say in a special message on February 15. This was encouraging but the idea of waiting another 5 or 6 weeks to see what the President might say would—it seemed to me—involve a breaking of faith with our parents, teachers, and school officials to whom I had pledged full speed ahead. So we moved forthwith with hearings and consideration of Senate bill 5 and similar bills that were ready for action.

As we know, the President early this month sent to Congress his education message and the administration bill. Our committee moved promptly to hold hearings and consider the bill.

The administration bill provoked a storm of protests from educators and school officials. Spokesmen for leading educational organizations, experts on school financing problems, State school laws, and State constitutional provisions came before our committee at the hearings and literally took the administration bill apart.

One witness called it Federal aid for investment bankers. Others said they are prohibited by their State constitutions and State laws from complying with the loan provisions of the bill. Still others said their school districts could not afford to go further into debt or pay interest or amortize Federal loans or pay rent on school buildings without seriously reducing the already inadequate funds for salaries to teachers.

Stating that the bill provides "much too little aid and much too much control," Dr. William Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, declared that the NEA refuses to "embrace untested and hastily formulated proposals which do not conform to the existing pattern of State and local school administration."

Dr. Carr declared further that the bill, while hedged about with unnecessary restrictions and controls, provides only token assistance.

He showed that while Secretary Hobby and Commissioner of Education Brownell have spoken of the administration's bill as a proposal to set in motion a \$7 billion school program, analysis of the bill reveals that actually the only Federal expenditure for construction provided is \$67 million a year for 3 years—less than 1 percent a year of the huge \$7 billion figure Secretary Hobby and Commissioner Brownell have been talking about.

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, told the committee that he had "never seen a bill that had more Federal control. Under the bill," Dr. Fuller declared, "there would be General Accounting Office people, tax attorneys, estimators of building values, and a horde of Federal officials in local school districts. The bill," Dr. Fuller declared, "is written with the tone of a mortgage banker who is lending money to a pauper and is going to tie him down just as solidly as he can to make sure he gets back every cent plus a good rate of interest. As this bill is written," Dr. Fuller declared, "the Federal Government will eventually make a profit at the expense of the school districts of the county most in need. The Chief State School Officers," Dr. Fuller declared, "would not favor the bill because it would set up separate State agencies and because it would be too expensive and because it would be an example of Federal discrimination against schools in contrast with generous Federal grants to highways, hospitals, and other physical facilities in the States. It would," he continued, "make education an orphan, deny it broad sources of income that every other service has and throw the schools back on real estate taxes as a permanent policy."

Our committee heard either in person or by telegrams and other communications from 40 out of the 48 State superintendents of education. Not one favored the bill.

Dr. Carr and other educators cited as the proper kind of approach to school construction legislation the bills developed and sponsored by the late Senators Elbert Thomas, of Utah, and Robert Taft, of Ohio, and myself. The bills embodied these fundamental principles:

1. Direct grants to all the States;
2. Allocation of funds on an objective formula;
3. Administration of the funds by the established State and local agencies.

We have twice passed in the Senate by overwhelming vote, bills containing these principles. These are the principles of Senate bill 5.

Every day of delay deepens the crisis in our schools.

The testimony before our committee made clear that with the passage of Senate bill 5 at least 42 States, under authority of State statutes already on the books, can begin at once to put Federal funds to work along with State and local funds to build schoolhouses for our children.

I am urging that Senate bill 5, strengthened and fortified in every possible way be quickly brought to the Senate floor that we may pass it now. With your splendid help, we shall win the battle.

Please let me take this opportunity of telling you how helpful the support of your association has been in the fight for our Oil for Education amendment, which will dedicate to education the income from the oil wealth of the Outer Continental Shelf. With your help we won adoption of the amendment in the Senate in the last Congress. We have reintroduced the amendment and are carrying on the fight for final victory.

From these oil resources \$150 million has already come into the Treasury and the Department of the Interior has predicted that the revenues will ultimately exceed \$3 billion.

The \$150 million that has already been derived and the revenues that will follow should be put to work to help meet the financial crisis in our schools and colleges.

Here is nontax revenue for relieving the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools, for providing more and better schools and better trained teachers, and for scholarships, fellowships, and training and research grants. With your continued help, my friends, these revenues will become education's endowment for the future.

As we provide for the education of our children, we nourish the wisdom of America at its roots, we strengthen the well-springs of our democracy, we build the strength and security of our country and build for the peace of the world.

Judge Harlan Before the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Judge Harlan Before the Senate," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE HARLAN BEFORE THE SENATE

Judge John Marshall Harlan has been testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee which is considering his qualifications for membership in the Supreme Court.

Judge Harlan, in substance, asked the Senate to take him on trust. The nominee did not deny that he had been a member since 1952 of the advisory council of the Atlantic Union Committee. Yet when the objectives of this organization were read to him, he professed astonishment that he had been supporting a movement to drive the United States into a political union with a number of European and other foreign countries, with a common citizenship, common foreign policy and defense establishment, unified currency, economic integration, and unrestricted immigration.

Judge Harlan said if that was a correct statement of the objectives of Atlantic Union, "I disassociate myself." We should say that this awakening comes rather late in the day.

We find it difficult to believe that an experienced lawyer, a sitting judge of the United States Court of Appeals in New York, and a worldly man could be as naive as Judge Harlan seeks to make himself out. He could not have been around for 4 years, with the newspapers available, let alone being a member of Atlantic Union Advisory Council, without knowing at least generally that it is committed to the liquidation of American sovereignty.

A lot of Communists and members of Communist fronts have testified that they were so simple minded that they never knew that they were being used for a revolutionary purpose. It is difficult to credit their testimony as to Communist fronts; it is difficult to credit Judge Harlan's as to one world fronts.

The judge admitted membership in the Citizens' Association for the United Nations, but again said he had no idea of its program or aims and would drop his membership. "I am not," he said despite these connections, "an internationalist, a one worlder, nor a union now."

Again, Judge Harlan said he felt that a Supreme Court judge, when he takes the oath, must resign from all such organizations as those he was questioned about. But the fact is that the candidate already is a judge of a very important Federal court, and not until now has he felt it incumbent on himself to put aside connections with internationalist organizations. If a Supreme Court justice should not be encumbered with such prejudicial baggage, why doesn't the rule hold equally for a judge of the court of appeals?

Judge Harlan was noncommittal when the claims of treaty law as against the supremacy under the Constitution of internal law were brought up in questioning. He would not declare himself, although the seat for which he has been nominated may prove decisive in tilting the Court toward the extinction of American sovereignty and constitutional liberty.

It is no pleasure to take note of these matters. Judge Harlan is a distinguished lawyer and in his brief career on the court of appeals, has shown judicial capacity of a high order. Nevertheless, the testimony before the committee raises the gravest question of his fitness for the Supreme Court. It would be a great mistake to forget that, in the steel seizure case, three Supreme Court judges took the position that obligations assumed under the U. N. treaty authorized the Federal Government to seize property in violation of the Constitution. The margin of safety on the Court is already narrow. Surely among thousands of learned and judicially minded lawyers in this country, at least one can be found who can pass the most rigorous of Senate examinations without raising any doubts of his fitness.

Centenary of St. Mary's College, Near South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement

in commemoration of the centenary observance this year of St. Mary's College, near South Bend, Ind.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**CENTENARY OBSERVANCE OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE,
NEAR SOUTH BEND, IND.**

St. Mary's College for women, the first Catholic women's college in the United States empowered to grant degrees and the first to confer bachelors' degrees continuously, celebrates the centenary of its establishment at its present site just north of South Bend, Ind., during 1955.

The college began as an academy for girls in Bertrand, Mich., in 1844 and held its first commencement 4 years later. Four young French Sisters of the Holy Cross, members of the order established 2 years previously, came to the Indiana frontier in 1843 to assist the priests and brothers who had founded the University of Notre Dame only a year before.

The Sisters began their work in America by assuming housekeeping duties for the new mission school of Notre Dame, but soon established their own girls school at Bertrand, 6 miles north of Notre Dame, and the school was chartered by the State of Michigan in 1851.

As the decade of the 1850's opened, the Sisters came to realize that Chicago was fast replacing Bertrand as the area's population and trading center.

Early in 1855, the Sisters of the Holy Cross moved their young school to its present location north of South Bend, Ind., and west of the University of Notre Dame. The State of Indiana promptly granted an academic charter to the school (February 28) "for the education of young ladies in the various branches of arts and sciences . . . and to confer such degrees upon scholars as are usual." In April 1855 the cornerstone was laid for the first building.

The convent and novitiate later (1863) became the motherhouse of the United States Sisters of the Holy Cross.

Under Mother M. Angela, first directress of studies, who guided the school until 1870, St. Mary's developed a curriculum acclaimed by both Catholic and non-Catholic educators.

While emphasizing the study of the liberal arts—still the foundation of a St. Mary's education—the college curriculum continued to add specialized courses.

The most memorable event for the young science department at St. Mary's came in 1899 when the first long distance wireless transmission in the United States was received at the college.

Prof. Jerome Green, of the University of Notre Dame, unaware of Marconi's achievements in Europe a few months before, amazed a group of newsmen by successfully sending a message from the Notre Dame campus to St. Mary's, more than a mile away, on April 19, 1899.

The physical growth of the campus has kept pace with the academic development of St. Mary's. Magnificent LeMans Hall, a tasteful combination of administrative offices, resident rooms, and classrooms, was built in 1926 at a cost of \$1,250,000 and a home economics practice home was erected in 1939.

The college marked the centenary of the founding of the Sisters of the Holy Cross with the building of a 90,000-volume library in 1941. A new 30-room science hall will be dedicated on April 23, 1955, as one of the major events of the year's centenary program and a modern fine arts building and auditorium will be begun on February 26, 1955, as a centenary project.

Sister M. Madeleva, CSC, current president of St. Mary's succeeded to the presidency of the college in 1934. A world-renowned poet

and educator, Sister Madeleva has had a strong influence on the intellectual and physical growth of St. Mary's.

Under her guidance, St. Mary's in 1944 established the Nation's first graduate school of sacred theology for laywomen and sisters. This pioneering graduate school, under papal approbation, offers the master's degree and doctorate in religion and a number of summer schools of theology have been opened throughout the country as a result of Sister Madeleva's inspiration.

St. Mary's College, in its centenary year, now ranks as the largest resident Catholic women's college in America.

St. Mary's offers courses leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of music, and bachelor of science.

**The Republican Valley Conservation
Association**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me, entitled "The Republican Valley Conservation Association."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE REPUBLICAN VALLEY CONSERVATION
ASSOCIATION**

(Statement by Senator CURTIS)

I should like to take a few minutes today to call the attention of this body to a very important development which is taking place out in Nebraska. I refer to the reorganization of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, which has made great strides during the past 15 years, and has built a reputation for effective promotion of flood control and irrigation in the upper Republican River watershed.

Many Senators will recall the disastrous flood of 1935, when 112 persons were drowned and tens of millions of dollars of property loss sustained in southwestern Nebraska. It is interesting to note that the numerous flood-control conferences which were called through the years, to deal with the perennial flood threat, found Gov. Arthur Weaver, of Nebraska, among the most active advocates of a complete program of flood control from the headwaters down. Congressman PHIL WEAVER, who succeeded me in that great First District of Nebraska, is the son of the illustrious Governor, and has taken up the campaign where his father left off, determined to complete the job that is so nicely underway. The whole decade of the thirties witnessed repeated droughts and floods. Frequently, as in 1935, heavy floods would be suffered in the spring, then the crops would be lost that fall as a result of drought. Clearly, the only possible method of stabilizing agriculture in that area lay in a program involving the storage of floodwaters in the spring, which could subsequently be spread upon the land in the summer months in the form of supplemental irrigation. For instance, during the year just passed (1954), this territory received less than 10 inches of moisture. To meet this challenge, many of the State's outstanding citizens have come forward and put their shoulders to the wheel.

Nebraska has furnished many outstanding workers in the field of reclamation. C. Peterson

Peterson, of Lincoln, is currently serving as president of the National Reclamation Association and one of the greatest authorities nationally on irrigation from ground water sources is Dr. E. C. Condra of the State University, Lincoln. Also, the lower Republican River had had its share of illustrious leaders who have unselfishly devoted their efforts to the furtherance of such a program. Any such list would have to include Oswin Keifer, of Superior, the late Paul Spence, of Red Cloud; Ben Harrington, Leon Sprague, and Halpert Thomas. Also, northwestern Nebraska, and the Platte River territory generally, have brought forward their own group of men who have helped mightily to make our State a better place in which to live.

But no group has ever launched a program of action with as many strikes against them as did the Republican Valley Conservation Association. The organization was formed in McCook in 1940 under the vigorous presidency of Harry D. Strunk, who himself served as director for many years, representing Nebraska on the board of the National Reclamation Association. The Republican Valley group was told by the United States Corps of Engineers that no flood protection was possible in the upper Republican, inasmuch as the valley possessed no satisfactory sites for dams and reservoirs. This would have stopped men of lesser courage. I am rather proud that, responding to a request of that body, I personally urged a review of the reports on the upper Republican by the Engineers Corps. Also, the association sent representatives out into the field, and recorded detailed statements of landowners, setting forth the actual property losses which they had sustained in 1935 and subsequent flood. These sworn statements helped the Engineers Corps reappraise the potential flood damages, and increase its estimate of benefits which could flow from the construction of flood-control reservoirs. And, fortunately, a review of the upper Republican enabled the corps, and the Bureau of Reclamation, to come up with a list of about a dozen reservoir sites. Here, then, was the basis for a sustained drive by which the people of that area could appeal to the Congress to reclaim their lands and usher in an era of irrigation farming.

Many other headaches confronted this little group of citizens. They immediately discovered that, because of State and Federal statutes, it would be necessary to negotiate an interstate compact between Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado, legally apportioning, for consumptive purposes, the flow of the Republican River and its tributaries. And such a compact had to be ratified by the Congress. With the everlasting help and guidance from the late Senator Hugh Butler, together with all other members of the Nebraska congressional delegation, these initial legislative hurdles were cleared.

Then World War II broke loose. It was apparent that the United States would be fighting for its very life, and all critical materials were to be diverted to defense purposes. So it was that a good many of the members, and some of the officers of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, took the view that it would actually be unpatriotic for the organization to carry on its activities during the war period. It was proposed that they suspend their efforts until the war was over, but level heads prevailed and the group decided to carry on for, after all, a stepup in the production of food supplies comprised one of the methods by which such areas could make their maximum contribution to the Nation's welfare during that emergency period.

It was well that they continued active, because they were able to bring about Federal appropriations sufficient to complete investigations by technical agencies of the

Federal Government. Thus it was that they were ready to have included in the Flood-Control Act of 1944 authorization of 10 or 12 upstream projects. Since Congress passed that measure, Enders, Medicine, Bonny, and Culbertson Dams and Reservoirs have been constructed, one by one, together with several diversion dams. This is a tremendous beginning toward a basinwide program, which will ultimately enrich that area immeasurably. Senator Butler used to say that completing the flood-control and irrigation program in the upper Republican Basin would mean more, economically, than striking oil in southwestern Nebraska.

But as the years went by, some of the original band of loyal sponsors of the program, including Dr. M. Campbell, of McCook, treasurer, and P. N. Foster, director, from Imperial, passed away. The organization encountered considerable difficulty in meeting its moderate financial requirements. Some of the leaders have been obliged to invest substantial amounts of their own money in order to keep a vigorous program running. McCook, the headquarters of the organization, has always contributed a good deal more than its proportionate share among the 32 member towns. But with the firm backing of the McCook Chamber of Commerce, under the presidency of Joe Rothmeier, a special committee has now been named, including Ralph G. Stevens, John Van Auken, Elwood C. Ackerman, and Ben Hornel.

Also, a few of the forward-looking business firms in Lincoln, Omaha, Kansas City, and Denver have made modest contributions through the years. Unquestionably, it is to their enlightened self-interest that they do so. After all, more than \$100 million of Federal funds alone have been expended to date in the upper Republican, and \$50 million to \$75 million remain to be spent before the job is finished. This will treble the farm production in that area. Supplemental irrigation brings in sugar beets, potatoes, increased corn crops, and multiplies materially all phases of livestock production. Growth of these crops also brings, in its wake, the processing plants needed to handle such products. Further, completion of the job will step up the population and the buying power materially, and it will provide permanent protection against recurring floods. All of these things are important within the market area of Omaha, Denver, and Lincoln. By the way, irrigation is universally conceded to be the biggest single factor which has caused population in the 17 States to increase nearly 2½ times as fast as population in the 31 Eastern States during the last 50 years. Without irrigation, western Nebraska would undoubtedly have lost population heavily in the decade of the thirties and subsequently.

One of the principal reasons that I wished to speak today was to urge that the Congress give sympathetic consideration of the proposal for appropriations for investigations by the Engineers Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, not only in Nebraska but elsewhere in the Nation. It seems to me that we should have a reservoir of projects built up, from those which are found practical and feasible, so that construction can be inaugurated at the earliest possible date. You are all undoubtedly aware of the fact that President Eisenhower himself has said, "I am recommending increased funds for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation to insure a proper basis for project authorization." We must have investigational moneys from which detailed investigations can be undertaken on the Red Willow, the Pioneer, either Wray or Parks, and along those three Kansas tributaries, the Beaver, Sappa, and Prairie Dog, which enter the Republican below Oxford. It has already been 11 years since these projects were authorized by the Congress, but no detailed investigations have yet been undertaken.

I want to emphasize today that I am especially ambitious for this program because of the great record which the Republican Valley Conservation Association has made in its efforts to develop southwestern Nebraska, northwestern Kansas, and southeastern Colorado. Not only has Harry Strunk continued to serve as president in the intervening 15 years, giving unselfishly of his time and energies, but he has been surrounded by other good citizens who, likewise, have made a great contribution.

Mr. Strunk has stepped aside now, and become chairman of the board of directors of his organization, welcoming to the presidency H. E. Robinson, who just retired as director of the Kansas River District, Bureau of Reclamation. It was he who built these projects that today stand as a monument to them, and to the farsighted Members of this Congress who have appropriated the necessary funds. And it is Harold Sutton, one of McCook's real leaders, who today serves as treasurer of the organization. And there is another man who has served the group extremely well through the years. He is M. O. Ryan, who served as executive secretary of the organization from 1940 until World War II struck, in 1942. Since 1943, while being otherwise employed in Washington, his extensive knowledge of the entire area and of the complex problems involved has made his judgment invaluable to the Federal agencies and to the Nebraska congressional delegation as they sought to push this program forward.

There are some who maintain that Federal appropriations for development of western areas must be reduced. Let me point out that W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, states that for the fiscal year of 1954, all appropriations for reclamation construction through the 17 Western States comprised only one-fourth of 1 percent of the national budget. Geographically that is more than one-third of the land area of this country. Of course, President Eisenhower has already asked Congress for a somewhat larger allocation of funds for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. In addition to funds to step up navigation facilities on the Missouri River, which runs through eastern Nebraska, and for the construction of agricultural levees at numerous points, an appropriation is asked for multiple-purpose power project at Gavins Point, Nebr. And then, in the field of reclamation, the President is asking more than \$10 million in appropriations for the Bostwick, the Frenchman-Cambridge, and the Sargent projects in Nebraska.

Appropriations alone do not meet the total needs, however. Refinements in our Federal statutes must be made from time to time. Already, during the 84th Congress, I have joined hands with 11 other Senators from the Great Plains, including my colleague Senator HAYSKA, in introducing S. 787, which paves the way for the negotiation of a compact to achieve maximum conservation and development of water resources throughout the Missouri Basin. Also, I have joined with seven other Republican Senators from west of the 100th meridian, in introducing S. 863, which strengthens the control of the individual Western States over navigable and unnavigable waters within their boundaries. Such a bill appears necessary in order to clarify the nebulous area between State and Federal jurisdiction over reclamation and flood-control activities.

Also, my esteemed colleague, Congressman A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, who is the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has reintroduced a bill which he proposed in the last session, which is now numbered H. R. 1824, clarifying national policy in regard to the development of certain water resources. These are among the measures which Congress will need to enact if we are to meet our full responsibility in paving the way for

maximum development of arid lands throughout the West.

A watershed like the Republican is honeycombed with many small creeks and streams. In between the major tributaries, upon which larger projects can be built by the Engineers Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, lie innumerable smaller streams, each of which provides a flood threat. The Soil Conservation Service, an integral part of the United States Department of Agriculture, is geared to treat these areas with small retardation dams. My mind goes back to 1950, when Senator Kenneth Wherry, an active member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, personally inspired the first appropriation of \$500,000 for the Soil Conservation Service to undertake surveys to ascertain those watersheds where feasible projects existed. Our late Congressman Karl Stefan, who was simultaneously serving on the House Appropriations Committee, put his shoulder to the wheel, and both bodies of Congress approved that appropriation. From the resulting survey, the first of a number of pilot projects are ready for construction in 1955. The McCook Gazette of January 26 gave a map, in complete detail, of Dry Creek watershed project, the first in that area to be constructed under the Hope-Aiken Watershed Protection Act, which was passed by the 83d Congress. These projects do take time, but once constructed, they last a lifetime.

Commissioner Dexheimer offers concrete evidence of the national value which reclamation projects offer to our United States economy. He reports that Federal-tax revenues from reclamation areas, since 1916, have exceeded \$3 billion. This sum alone exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all Bureau-constructed projects in the past 50 years, or since the Reclamation Bureau was established. Not only do landowners on reclamation projects enjoy enhanced revenues, as a result of irrigation, but the adjoining urban areas share substantially in the increased revenue. As an example, in 1953 reclamation project farmers had an income of \$550 million, whereas the nonfarming urban areas, which had these projects in their immediate vicinity, enjoyed total income of approximately \$786 million.

We have reason to rejoice this year over the fact that hundreds of additional acres of fertile land in the Missouri basin will be brought under supplemental irrigation for the first time. Completion of the last 50 miles of irrigation canals on the Frenchman-Cambridge project, east of Cambridge, and the 13-mile Franklin Canal on the Bostwick project, jointly account for very substantial acreage in southwestern Nebraska which will be irrigated this year for the first time.

To my way of thinking, these groups like the Republican Valley Conservation Association are the only device by which 32 member communities, or whole sections of a State, can pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. I think that the modest support required from chambers of commerce, city councils, and county commissioners, to maintain such organizations, comprise one of the best possible investments in the future welfare of any State.

As I stand here today, I am concerned about the fact that the Department of Agriculture reports more than 26 million acres of farm land in the whole dust bowl area are in condition to blow this spring. In many areas the Great Plains are experiencing the worst drought since the decade of the thirties. Without adequate snow cover, and frequent spring rains, the Dust Bowl could be revived before root fiber from the 1955 crop affords protection against wind erosion. This perennial threat will be with us constantly until we have brought the benefits of supplemental irrigation to the maximum acreage possible, and stepped up the volume of cover crops and legumes which effectively anchor the soil.

Let me confide something to this great body, the United States Senate. The very last day he was alive, our beloved Hugh Butler spent the afternoon in his office conferring with top level officials, seeking ways and means to step up the tempo of this program in the upper Republican watershed in Nebraska. I was there, as were Secretary McKay and other officials of the Department of the Interior. That night he was stricken, and died 24 hours later. To Mr. Strunk and Mr. Robinson, and the directors from the individual cities and towns that comprise the association, I send greetings, confident that they will continue to enjoy the support of all city, county, and State officials. Their efforts will forever remove the threat of repeated floods, and will temper the droughts, and thus stabilize the economy as nothing else in that whole area can do.

I trust that this important program may go forward to completion.

Peace Through Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Peace Through Power," delivered by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Fred A. Seaton, at Kansas State College at Manhattan on February 9.

On this occasion Secretary Seaton was awarded by Kansas State College at Manhattan the honorary doctor of laws degree.

Manhattan is the home town of the Secretary and he is a graduate of Kansas State College.

Secretary Seaton is a successful businessman and newspaper publisher who has had an outstanding career in public life. At the present time he publishes newspapers in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota. Through these mediums he wields great influence for the building of our Nation and the strengthening of our democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH POWER

You are all familiar with the general aspects of our present world situation. You know the story of the spread of Communist influence and power from a numerically insignificant Russian political party prior to the October 1917 revolution to its present dominion, over 800 million people arranged over one-fourth the land area of the world.

In response to the common threat to their security, more than 40 of the nations of the world, including our own have allied themselves in several regional defense agreements.

The two blocs—the Communists and the free world alliance—now face each other across a narrowing world, and compete for the support of those nations which have not as yet committed themselves to the struggle.

The seat of military power of the Communist bloc is the Soviet Union. In terms of ground strength, this amounts to a standing army of 175 divisions, to which must be added the 70 divisions of the European satel-

lites. Communist China, furthermore, has more than 2 million men under arms. The amount of manpower the two principals could eventually mobilize is suggested by the fact that during the latter part of World War II, the Soviet Union had on its western front an active strength of over 400 divisions, and, further, on conservative estimates, that the Chinese military manpower pool amounts to over 20 million men. In contrast, at the peak of its military strength in 1945, the United States had 95 divisions (89 Army and 6 Marines) under arms.

On the sea, the Soviet Union commands virtually all the effective strength of the Communist bloc. Its submarine fleet consists of at least 375 vessels, 75 of which are long-range fleet types. It possesses 125 modern destroyers, and 24 cruisers, 15 of which are known to be modern, combat-worthy types. So far as we know, the Russians possess no aircraft carriers but we cannot dismiss the possibility that some may be under construction. Since World War II, the Soviet Union has built more combat ships—destroyers, cruisers, and submarines—than all of the free world put together.

In the matter of air strength, we estimate the Soviet Union to have an inventory of over 1,000 TU-4 bombardment aircraft, which are copies of our own B-29's. If we credit the Soviet air commands with the capability of in-flight refueling, which seems reasonable, it means that a substantial number of our vital cities and installations come within their range. And, of course, on a one-way mission, they could reach almost any target in the United States, if confronted with no opposition. We know also that the Soviet has an undisclosed but growing number of medium and long-range jet bombers, and that they are producing a better fighter than the MIG 15, which was used in Korea. Their total number of aircraft of all kinds exceeds 20,000, most of them tactical types—fighters, interceptors, and light bombers.

As you know, this brief recital of military means at its disposal in no way describes the true dimension and nature of the threat which comes from the Soviet sphere. Policy decisions in the Kremlin have resulted in a world situation which has influenced us to allocate since June 1950, a staggering portion of our national substance and effort valued at \$220 billion to the economically unproductive purposes of defense. Today, 60 percent of your Federal taxes go for the equipping and maintenance of a 3-million-man armed force.

The Communists know as well as we that the physical basis of all our military power is our economy, and that if this economy can be undermined and sabotaged, the effect may well be as disastrous to us as a major military defeat. We must not permit this to occur.

Moreover, we must also contend with the insidious threat of subversion, sabotage, and espionage within our own country and the countries of our allies, which can sap the strength and vigor of the most enlightened democracy. Externally, there is the continuous pressure of political and psychological warfare, of deceit and bluff and blackmail. All these are also part of the total threat, physical and moral, which militant communism poses to freemen.

Obviously this threat, total as it is in scope, cannot be successfully countered by military means alone. But the provision of adequate military strength, particularly for the years immediately ahead, is an indispensable prerequisite to every other action which we must undertake. We must maintain military forces in being sufficient to deter aggression, either limited or unlimited, or in the event we are attacked, to preserve the minimum territorial and military security essential to successful mobilization and subsequent prosecution of the war. Moreover, we must be organized for smooth and

rapid mobilization of our material and human resources.

This military capability to handle ourselves under any and all possible situations is the essential shield upon which we must rely to provide the protective sanction to the political, economic, and psychological pressures we must continue to exert against the Communist regimes.

To this end we have developed over the past 4 years a very potent military force. It is in fact, the most powerful we have ever maintained in time of peace. We have a Navy second to none, with its own steadily growing atomic striking potential. Our large and growing Air Force now consists of 119 wings which will increase steadily toward an ultimate goal of a minimum of 137 wings by 1957. We have a mobile amphibious striking force of 3 Marine divisions and 3 Marine air wings. With the cessation of fighting in Korea, our Army has gradually been reoriented toward a June 1956 strength objective of approximately 1,027,000 men. This represents a decrease of about one-third from the average strength during the Korean operations, but it remains well over 80 percent above the pre-Korean level.

And here I would like to talk briefly about this matter of ground strength, if I may. One of the foundation stones of our military policy is that our strength shall be integrated with that of our allies in such a way that the maximum power potential is made available to the community of allies. Throughout all these alliances there runs the understanding, written or otherwise, that each partner will contribute to the common cause those elements of strength which it is best able to supply, and to the limit that it is able to supply them.

In this great global system of alliances in which we participate, our Nation is peculiarly well suited to supply two vital elements—sea power and the striking capability of long-range land based air power. Our contribution in these particular categories is by all odds the preponderant one. We also have made a substantial contribution in ground strength, but in the very nature of things we cannot hope to supply more than a small part of the total number of troops required. The basic accounting unit of a land army is the man. Which suggests that within the special situation obtaining in each strategic area, the contribution in ground strength must bear a general relationship to the population of each interested nation. So we greatly understate the total ground strength available for our common defense effort if we do not count the very substantial contributions of our allies.

To our own 19 divisions should be added at least a hundred more which the free world could count on in any major war undertaken by the Soviet bloc. NATO presently has available to it an active ground strength equivalent of 48 divisions. The Republic of Korea has approximately 19 battle-tested divisions within a total force of 400,000 men. Japan has initiated the formation of its national security police force, and the Philippines have reestablished internal order and are rapidly building up their strength. The 12 West German divisions are to come. We feel, militarily, well able to take care of ourselves in the event of actual physical attack, provided we conduct our operations along lines which permit us to oppose our own factors of strength against the Soviet factors of weakness.

And this, I think, is the key to the success of our whole defense effort. There are certain areas in which we are greatly superior to the Soviet—our powerful and versatile economy, the depth and breadth of our technology, the enormous fire power and mobility assured by our intensive development of atomic weapons and our control of the seas. Most important of all, there is the universal appeal of the great system of values we have

moved to defend, as contrasted to the total disregard for human life and liberty which necessarily underlies the Communist philosophy.

It is of great significance to me that in 1952 United States produced half again as much coal as the Soviet, $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as much steel, 4 times as much electric power, 7 times as much oil, and 20 times as many automobiles and trucks. While free American agriculture was bringing in record crops, the Soviet staggered lamely along at about its level of 25 years ago. I am sure you would be interested as I was, in knowing that the USSR, still largely an agricultural nation, consumes more grain than it harvests, that its cattle population is 10 million below what it was in 1928, that its pork production has dropped by 5 million tons since 1940; that by its own admission the supply of meat, potatoes, and vegetables is unsatisfactory.

Our allies, on the other hand, have set remarkable records of food production. England now produces a surprising 56 percent of her food needs whereas she formerly imported about 80 percent. France and Turkey are now producing surpluses of wheat. Wherever free enterprise operates free men always win the battle of production.

I derive a keen sense of satisfaction in the marvelous technology which both supports and depends upon our economic system—the same technology which daily enriches our lives in its thousands of peacetime applications, but which when the chips were down could bring forth such vital weapons of war as radar, the VT fuze, and the atomic bomb.

But, most of all, I sense the great latent strength of a society whose goals represent the highest hopes and greatest expectations of men throughout the world—values which men the world over have repeatedly shown themselves ready to lay down their lives to obtain and defend—a sense of dignity for the individual, the right to worship, to speak, and to think as freemen, to have the love of family and friends, to enjoy the love of the land, and of one's ancestral home, the right to participate freely in a government of their own choosing, and to stand as equals before the eyes of the law. These deep and abiding aspirations we hold in common with all people, and in no way can the barren, atheistic philosophy of communism claim them as basic or even a fundamental part of its ideology.

In contrast, the Soviet has nothing to rely upon except force—force of the most brutal and callous sort. Many of you have read of our President's account of his deep shock when, as General Eisenhower, he learned from a high-ranking Soviet officer the Russian Army technique of clearing minefields. "When we come to a minefield," the Soviet officer told him, "our infantry attacks exactly as if it were not there. The losses we get from personnel mines we consider only equal to the losses we would have gotten from machine guns and artillery if the Germans had chosen to defend that particular area with strong bodies of troops instead of with minefields." This may be logical from a coldly analytical military viewpoint, but it is hardly logical in light of the fact that any regime, even a dictatorship, depends for its existence over the long term upon a certain minimum degree of acceptance by the people over which it exercises its authority. To me it shows weakness, not strength.

Nevertheless, there are certain areas in which we must concede the advantage to the Soviet bloc. Their numbers far exceed the combined strength of ourselves and our allies in sheer military manpower. Moreover, a differential population increase is presently weighing the manpower balance further in their favor, so that it may be expected to become more and more unfavorable to us as time goes by, unless we can associate ourselves with additional allies. In World Wars I and II, our side had a very

substantial numerical superiority, and this advantage had its influence in shaping our strategy and tactics in those two great conflicts. But the reverse will be true of any conflict which may be fought out on the present alignment of world power and this tremendously important fact demands our close and continued study.

The only logical remedy for a situation in which we cannot match the enemy man for man lies in the development of capabilities which nullify this enemy advantage. Fortunately, the controlling element in military operations is not mere manpower, but effective firepower, delivered at the time and place of decision. And in the development of such firepower, and the means of its effective delivery, our technology and our massive economy give us a long lead over our nearest competitors. Our arsenal of atomic weapons ranges from giants in the megaton range, which is to say the equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT, down to small tactical weapons which can be fired from guns for relatively limited effect. We have them in increased supply. The Army, Navy, and Air Force all are busily engaged in perfecting the tactics and techniques of employing these tremendous new additions to our military capability.

In the battlefield employment of atomic weapons the effectiveness of our Army has been enormously increased by the 280-millimeter atomic gun, the Honest John rocket, and the Corporal guided missile. All these powerful innovations are now available to our ground forces in Europe, and the recent North Atlantic Council meeting in Paris gave its approval to the proposal that atomic weapons be fully integrated into the basic strategic concept for the defense of Western Europe. It is our deep and earnest belief that the devastating curtain of fire which we shall be able to call down upon the enemy hordes will enable us to keep any would-be invader out of Western Europe and thus deny him his prize.

Measured in our capability to project destruction in the form of rockets, missiles, and bombs, our firepower in the air increases daily. The last B-29 has been retired from active service, and our long-range bombers now are mainly the jet B-47's and the combination jet and propeller-driven B-36's. The B-52's, a superb long-range jet bomber, is being received in increasing numbers and will eventually replace the B-36.

A point frequently overlooked is the fact that the capability of delivering massive firepower is not confined to the Strategic Air Command alone. Our Tactical Air Command also has a tremendous atomic capability. All the fighters and light bombers of the TAC will be able to carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending on what the target requires. All of its wings are modern, and all of its fighters are jets, in the high subsonic speed ranges. Our new fighter interceptor aircraft now in production, beginning with the F-100, will have supersonic speeds. Moreover, our great mobile airfields, the Navy aircraft carriers, have comparatively unrestricted access to the seven-tenths of the earth's surface which is covered by water, and can bring their sea-borne atomic striking forces to bear upon targets deep in the interior of the enemy's homeland.

We review this vast power which is ours with mixed feelings.

We can derive great satisfaction and confidence from the enormous increase which it represents over the power which was available to us even a scant 10 years ago. Yet we are sobered by the contemplation of where our weapons technology may lead us in the decade which lies ahead. Moreover, our problem is complicated by the fact that we neither can nor will prepare for initiating war as a conscious act of national policy. Adhering to our moral code, as a nation we

can only prepare for the eventuality that war may be forced upon us under unknown conditions at an uncertain future date. Thus, the element of chance in the preparatory phase of war is inherently larger in the case of democracies than it is with dictatorships, for we cannot with certainty predict when war will occur, if at all. We cannot predict, except within the general limits, the method of attack, or the exact direction from which it may come. Nor can we now foresee very far into the future the political arrangements which may result from the use of military pressures exerted by an aggressor prior to the outbreak of hostilities. These things we cannot know. We can know only that in this lawless world we must be prepared to fight at any time, with weapons that are better than those which will be used against us.

As a result, in the area of weapons procurement, we dare not put all, or even most of our eggs, in one basket. We dare not load our Armed Forces down with weapons which may, at best, have begun to be or become obsolescent even before the last lot has been delivered. The best that we can possibly hope for is to keep our weapons stocks at a level which will enable us to fight effectively with what we have, meanwhile pushing out the older versions with newer, more efficient models as they become available from an economy that has never been known to stand still.

There are those who constantly agitate for more of everything now—more planes, more guns, more of this and more of that. Sincere as they may be, they fail to take into account either the economic or the military problems involved. To over-burden our economy is to risk losing the struggle against communism without firing a shot. To overload the services with obsolete equipment is to risk defeat in battle. True war readiness consists in being able not only to fight today's war with today's weapons, but of being ready to fight tomorrow's war with tomorrow's weapons. This requires a sensible balance in weapons programing. And that, we now believe we have achieved.

This, I think, is the thing which we must keep always in mind in all our defense considerations. For our national security is not tied to a date on a calendar, or to a certain specified number of divisions, ships, planes, or men. It is not to be identified with any one type of weapon or any one strategic approach. Rather, it depends upon our continuing and increasing ability to meet successfully a variety of challenges—military, political, and economic—while maintaining the essential soundness and health of our economy and our political system. And this we must be prepared to do perhaps for 50 years to come.

There is nothing transitory about the threat to our Nation and our way of life, and there is nothing cheap or easy or simple about the things which we must do to protect and preserve them. These difficult and costly measures which we must undertake in our defense will demand the very best that is in us, the people of America. Among these responsibilities will be your own part in the great common effort we all must make to maintain our military readiness, our political solidarity, and our industrial and technological superiority over that of any possible enemy.

If we can do these things, we have an excellent chance for peace, and an accommodation between the free world and the Communist bloc which will effectively serve our interests.

From a plateau of great strength we can negotiate for the easing of tensions and the reduction of trouble areas dangerous to world stability. For many years, it may be a peace, not of good will, but of power, in which our national strength will be the validating factor. But it will be a peace in which free men can live and breathe, and pursue those

ends which tend to lessen the misery and increase the sum of human happiness in the world. It can, at the least, be a peace which will stop the flow of the Red tide which has engulfed so much of the world, and the opening of a more hopeful prospect for democracy than the one it has faced these past 20 years.

This is the peace which we must have, and can have, provided we remain patient, united, and strong.

Defense Argument Not All on One Side in Oil Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Defense Argument Not All on One Side in Oil Case," written by John Harriman, and published in the Boston Globe of March 1.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE ARGUMENT NOT ALL ON ONE SIDE IN OIL CASE

(By John Harriman)

In no area have the voices of protectionism been louder and more insistent than in the matter of oil imports.

Leading the fight have been the domestic producers of oil, the coal industry, and John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers. These groups have consistently sought to have a lid clamped on the 1 million or so barrels of oil which we draw daily from foreign sources, mostly the Near East and Venezuela. And it now looks as if their efforts may meet with success.

Over the past weekend the President's so-called blue ribbon Cabinet Committee recommended just what the doctors of coal and domestic oil have been trying to order—a limit of foreign imports to 14 percent of domestic production, the amount which we took last year.

WHY NOT USE NEAR EAST OIL WHILE WE CAN?

Oil imports come from American companies, of course. These are the big internationals: Gulf, Socony Vacuum, Texaco, and the Standards of California and New Jersey.

This oil is, by and large, cheap oil, due to the high productivity of the fields of Venezuela and the Near East. It could undersell most oil in this country in a free market where costs would dictate selling price. It is for this reason that the coal and domestic-oil industries have sought to have it placed under quota. And they have sought to justify their moves by maintaining that restrictions on imports are necessary to a healthy domestic industry and that a healthy domestic industry is a prime requisite for national defense.

But many, including some of the best students of the industry, place the defense shoe on the other foot and say that our defense need will be best served by increasing imports.

Much of our imports come from the Near East, which is close to the Soviet orbit, and hence only available to us in peacetime. As one statistical service recently put it in a study of the industry, "If war came, it would make sense to have consumed their (Near East) oil during prior years, and to have saved ours for the time of dire need."

IMPORTED OIL IMPORTANT TO NEW ENGLAND

But there is another reason why it would seem the part of wisdom to draw on foreign oil as much as possible for our domestic needs today.

In the Near East, oil is about the only source of wealth, and economic progress in that area, as well as in Venezuela, depends on the royalties that American producing companies pay. If these royalties are reduced, by a cutback of production due to our limiting imports, these countries will suffer. Thus, governments at best none too stable would be still further weakened, and the cause of the Communist propagandists by the same token would be enhanced.

Finally, there is the broad question as to why the American people should be asked to subsidize with import restriction a domestic industry already lavishly favored by the tax break given in the so-called depletion allowance.

This is particularly true of us in New England. Oil is the only fuel that is relatively cheap in this area and that is due to our geographically favored position for imports. Every study of the New England economy has emphasized the importance to us of increasing oil shipments from abroad.

But the Cabinet Committee has recommended the opposite course. As a result, Congressmen from the Gulf States are preparing this week to write into the President's reciprocal-trade bill a provision limiting the import of oil.

Bank Consolidations Viewed as Serious Threat to the Future of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release dated February 25, 1955, issued by the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, stated today that the recent announcement of the Federal Reserve Board citing 207 bank consolidations nationwide in 1954, contrasted with 116 in 1953, and 100 in 1952, is viewed by small business as a serious threat to their future in getting needed financial assistance through customary banking channels.

Small business notes with further alarm that the justification given for these increasing mergers in the banking field is credited to United States growth and spread of population in leading metropolitan areas—for example, New York, Philadelphia, and California.

Burger states: "The federation and small business generally cannot agree with the statement which appeared in the press that it has become necessary for large banks to open numerous neighborhood banks. The outlying or suburban communities would offer tremendous opportunity to local small banking facilities to be established and serve adequately both the needs of small business and the public." He concluded that the administration and the Congress must act effectively to arrest the trend in the larger segments of our economy, big business, big labor, big farm groups, or by failing to take the necessary action it will result in a serious

economic situation which has spelled ruin for most nations throughout the world. The spiral of gigantic growth in the hands of few segments of our economy opens up the door for socialistic planners.

Agricultural Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 25, 1955, which I have received from George Stadstad, of Manvel, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANVEL, N. DAK., February 25, 1955.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: It appears as though a vote will be taken again this year to determine if we have changed our minds from the last few years as to whether or not we want the high or low support for our produce.

Why do we have to vote on this issue every year as long as we have a support program? It seems, as in the past potato-support program, that as soon as the Department of Agriculture succeeds in obtaining enough votes in any one year to drop supports on any one commodity we never have an opportunity to vote on such a program again. The Government must think we change our minds from year to year, or they wouldn't require a vote each year to determine if we still prefer a high support. If we are apt to thus change our minds, then why not ask us to vote on 90-percent support on potatoes? We were asked such a question a few years ago and voted to go along without so-called Government interference. We cut our acreages, and potatoes went up. The Government put a ceiling on them. Why?

By lowering the supports on our crops 15 or 20 percent the Government would succeed in bankrupting agriculture, such as Mr. Benson did with the livestock men. Is this doing anyone any good?

I read from time to time where the Government cannot stand the continued expense of farm supports. That statement is too stupid to even be good politics.

I'm no economist, but I'm sure that very nearly 100 percent of the money put out by the Government for supports is returned to them in the form of income taxes, excise taxes, etc., and at the same time creating a healthier economy.

A very successful businessman friend of mine in California (a Republican) told me this winter that he was very much disgusted with the proposed Benson farm program. I asked him why, and also told him I was under the impression that most businessmen felt that as long as agriculture was supported so should other business. Here is his reply: "Let the Government support agriculture, and agriculture will support the rest of the economy."

I hope you see fit to vote for and work toward 90-percent rigid supports for the farmer, and also to bring potatoes back under price supports. Even with acreage controls. You know as well as I do that the sliding scale can't work for the farmer. If he has a good chop the price drops, and with a poor one it goes up when he has nothing to

sell. Sliding scale and lower price supports cannot work for us; for Mr. Benson and Ike, sure; anything to break agriculture.

Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

GEORGE STADTAD.

Current Issues in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address entitled "Current Issues in Education," by Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association. Dr. Carr's address was delivered before the National Association of Secondary-School Principals in Atlantic City, N. J., on February 19, 1955. The address is timely and challenging, and I hope that every Member of the Senate will read the address.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CURRENT ISSUES IN EDUCATION

(Address by William G. Carr, executive secretary, National Education Association.)

My topic is Critical Issues in Education. We can forget the plural. The one issue I shall discuss is this: What is the proper role of the Government of the United States in the education of its citizens?

All agree that the welfare of our country demands good schools fully available to all our young citizens. All agree that our schools are not good enough. All agree that a quarter century of inadequate support has now developed into an educational crisis. The question is no longer whether the Federal Government ought to act in this matter. The question is: How should it act, and how quickly can it act?

The policy of the National Education Association is the result of years of study and experience. It calls for substantial Federal grants distributed according to an objective formula through the regular State educational agencies. It calls for clear written guarantees that educational policy remain in the States and communities.

We have been applying these principles to proposed school legislation for many years. We have stood fast by them when it was not popular to do so. Many of you can remember the stand we took on the National Youth Administration. During the depression, educational service to youth was needed on a scale far beyond the ability of the local communities and States to finance. The Federal Government responded not by helping the schools but by establishing the National Youth Administration. This Federal agency without administrative connection with the local high schools, proceeded to use Federal funds to educate selected segments of the population. Of course, the teaching profession opposed this development. Of course, we identified it as a dangerous infringement on local control of education, and eventually the National Youth Administration was discontinued.

Meanwhile, the Chief Executives, beginning with President Hoover and continuing to the present time, have each created commissions or other agencies to study Federal relations to education. Regularly, as these

commissions completed their work, they recommended Federal grants to the States. Regularly, these reports were transmitted to the Congress. Regularly, each session of Congress held hearings during which the same evidence was taken over and over again. Sometimes these bills got out of committee, sometimes they did not. On two occasions they passed the Senate but failed to come before the other House for consideration.

That process is still going on. Meanwhile, another process has been going on. School buildings are getting older; teachers are not getting any younger; and the supply of new teachers continues to dwindle. Increasing numbers of children and youth are receiving instruction from inadequately prepared teachers in overcrowded and unsafe buildings.

Is it not strange that the rich and powerful United States, which can perform miracles of production and construction, which has more wealth per capita than any other nation at any time in history, which can actually spend more for amusements than it spends for food, and which must have good education to survive, has continued to temporize with this situation?

Nevertheless, that is just what has happened. Meanwhile other functions of Government, notably highways, but not exclusively highways, have continued to demand and to receive more and more Federal money. Typically, these Federal funds are on a matching basis. They tempt the States to allot money to these favored purposes because they can get a Federal dollar for every dollar of their own. This Federal policy may cause the States to reduce their ability to provide adequately for their schools.

Our Government has also inaugurated a splendid, far-flung program of aid to education in other countries. We are sending some of our best teachers and educational leaders to distant lands to lay the educational foundations for national freedom and prosperity. But at home education has been largely ignored by our National Government.

We are told that our Government is in debt. So it is; but we do not forget that taxes were reduced last year while Federal grants for highways were nearly doubled.

Now let us see where we are right now in the process of persuading our National Government to accept its responsibility in education. It is not easy to summarize the entire situation. So many different conferences, committees, inquiries, hearings, bills, proposals, and counterproposals have clustered around a relatively simple proposition that we are in danger of overlooking the essentials. Let me try to review the main points in the record of the immediate past.

One of President Eisenhower's first recommendations after he took office in 1953 was the creation of a commission to study relations between the States and the Federal Government. This body, commonly known as the Intergovernmental Commission, has been operating for about 2 years. Originally, Dr. Clarence Mannon, formerly of Notre Dame Law School, was named chairman. Now this Commission is under the direction of Mr. Meyer Kestbaum, of Chicago. It had a subcommittee on education which is said to have drafted a report. Little has been heard from it in Washington for many months.

Also in 1953, the President recommended, and Congress promptly agreed, that a new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be added to the Cabinet. The National Education Association and other civic and professional groups strongly recommended that in this reorganization the United States Office of Education be given an independent professional status, wherein the Commissioner would be responsible not to a political appointee, but to a national nonpartisan

board of education. This recommendation, however, was not approved. The status of the Office of Education within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare remains no better than it was in the old Federal Security Administration.

Coming down to 1954, early that year, in his state of the Union message, the President called the attention of Congress to the crisis in our schools. He recommended that there be held in 1954 a series of State conferences on education, culminating in a White House conference.

Legislation to make such conferences possible was not considered immediately. By the time the Congress acted, it was clear that the conferences could not possibly be held in 1954 as the President had suggested. The White House Conference is now scheduled for November 1955. The State conferences should be held before that date. However, there has been no clear request to the States for their opinion on the Federal role in financing education. On the contrary, attention has been directed toward local and State matters. It is not easy to see how the State conferences can culminate in a useful consideration of national policy unless more of the States than is now the case formulate their views on what the national policy should be.

During 1954, committees of the 83d Congress held hearings on bills which would have provided Federal grants for school-building construction.

It is a remarkable fact that such bills received unanimous, bipartisan approval from both Senate and House committees. This approval, however, was directly contrary to the advice of Secretary Hobby and Commissioner Brownell, who said that Congress should await the findings of the White House conference. Largely, for this reason, the bills were never on the floor of either House. The legislation carefully considered by the 83d Congress must in the 84th Congress start all over again on the long road from drafting to enactment.

That was the situation a little over a month ago, when the President rode down Pennsylvania Avenue to deliver his annual message on the state of the Union. In that message, he rejected the policy of waiting for the White House Conference before even emergency action could be taken. He affirmed the deep national interest in education. And he announced that on February 15 he would send to the Congress a separate message on education.

These declarations had an electric effect. Bills were introduced in both Houses. Senator HILL, the new chairman of the Senate committee, gave school legislation an unprecedented top priority. Hearings were quickly completed on legislation closely similar to that approved by the committees of the 83d Congress. Most of the present members of the Senate committee were members of the committee last year when it voted unanimously for the legislation. It seemed difficult, therefore, to see how this committee could fail to recommend passage again. Very strong support also was rapidly building up again in the House of Representatives. The President made his own contribution to the sense of urgency by sending his message on education a full week ahead of time.

Naturally, the contents of the message were properly kept in complete secrecy, although rumors about it found their way into the press. It is not so easy to understand why there was no sustained consultation about the legislation with the professional and civic groups concerned.

Now that this legislation is before us at last I believe that disappointment is the most kindly word that anxious parents and hard-pressed school boards, administrators, and teachers are likely to use to describe their reactions.

Before we analyze this legislation, however, let us return for a few moments to the President's message itself. It is a noteworthy state paper for a number of reasons.

First, the state of the schools was recognized by our Chief Executive as an integral part of the State of the Union. The President eloquently affirmed, at the very outset of his message, "the undeniable importance of free education to a free way of life." Such an expression of Presidential concern in a separate education message to the Congress is unique. It will make February 8, 1955, a memorable date in the history of education in our country.

Second, the message states clearly that emergency action is needed to meet a national crisis. "Millions of children," said the President, "still attend schools which are unsafe or which permit learning only part time or under conditions of serious overcrowding." This is not news, of course. But for the President to say this, with all the close public attention and immense prestige which accompany his office, is a cause for gratitude.

Third, the President did not stop with recognition of the national importance of education and of the school-building crisis. He went further. He declared explicitly that the crisis required the Federal Government to act—as he put it, to "step forward to join with the States and communities." On many previous occasions, President Eisenhower has indicated his concern about the inadequacies of education. Those of us who had the privilege of working with him when he was a member of the NEA Educational Policies Commission for 4 years know how deeply he believes that good education is an essential source of national security, freedom, and prosperity. On one occasion, the President stated that an impairment of our schools could be more dangerous than an armed assault. In several important state papers, before and since he became President, he has stressed the necessity for prompt effective help for the schools. On February 8, President Eisenhower made explicit his belief that the Federal Government must carry part of the financial responsibility for education. And the President, believing as do nearly all Americans in local and State control of education, is sure that this Federal financial responsibility can be met without Federal control.

Fourth, the President concluded his message with a tribute to the teaching profession which this often underpaid and almost invariably overworked group of citizens will profoundly appreciate. In a time when professional alarmists are pointing with trumped-up trepidation to the supposed failures of our teachers, it is heartening to have the President of the United States calmly declare that "Today, the professional quality of American teaching is better than ever."

Now let us consider Senate bill 968, the legislation proposed to give effect to this Presidential leadership. Its major provisions are stated in three titles. With some oversimplification they may be summarized as follows:

Title I authorizes Federal purchase of local school bonds where such bonds cannot otherwise be sold at reasonable rates of interest. State educational agencies must certify that the district could not sell its bonds at a reasonable rate, and that the proposed schools met all State standards. Appropriations are \$750 million for the next 3 years. Interest rates would run about 3½ percent.

Title II authorizes Federal credit assistance to State school building agencies. The United States Commissioner of Education and the State would advance to the State school building agency equal amounts to create a fund which would be security for the bonds the State school building agency issues. The State school building agency

uses the money from the sale of its bonds to construct schools which would be rented by local districts. The rent paid by the school districts, collectively, must be high enough to cover interest on the bonds, to pay one-fourth of 1 percent to the State school building agency, and to pay also the cost of maintenance, repair, replacement, insurance, and other expenses. After about 2 years the State school building agency would begin repayment to the Federal Government. These Federal funds are, therefore, advances; as such they are limited to an amount necessary to set up the reserve to assure payment of one-half the principal on the bonds up to \$6 billion over the next 3 years. Estimates indicate that the Federal advances would require about \$50 million a year. The Federal Government gives no money to State school building agencies; it advances part of the money which is to be repaid with interest at a rate fixed at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Title III authorizes \$200 million for the next 3 years to provide grants to enable impoverished school districts to borrow or rent under titles I and II. No district may qualify unless the State educational agency certifies that it is fiscally incompetent and that the schools are needed to relieve "extreme overcrowding, double shifts, or hazardous conditions."

Titles IV and V deal with the cost of administration, research, planning, and legal questions.

The preamble to Senate bill 968 states that free public education is of vital importance; that it is an obligation of the States and communities; that a serious shortage in school buildings exists; that local communities cannot meet the emergency; and that the Federal Government should help them. It is, therefore, proclaimed that the purpose of the act is "to provide assistance of a substantial and effective nature to States and communities which are handicapped by the shortage of public school facilities."

Now let us consider how well the proposed law meets the need for substantial and effective assistance.

First, how substantial is this help? The newspapers, with their imperative demand for simplicity, seized on phrases in Secretary Hobby's release and headlined this bill as "the \$7 billion Federal program." Nothing much has yet been done to correct this monumentally inaccurate impression. Yet it needs to be said that the Federal cash contributions are limited to cases arising under title II and amount at most to about \$70 million a year, or \$210 million in 3 years. All the rest of the widely discussed \$7 billion, or \$6,790,000,000, is provided by States and localities.

The sum of \$70 million would build about 2,400 classrooms. The deficit in classrooms is currently about 300,000, according to the Commissioner of Education. Thus, in each of the next 3 years, the Federal grants would reduce this deficit by eight-tenths of 1 percent.

It is true that title I provides for Federal loans at a rate of about 3½ percent. However, as you know, almost all school districts that can borrow money at all can get it at rates far more favorable than that.

That leaves title II, the backbone of the proposed law. What help can the hard-pressed schools expect from that source? This title requires the establishment of State school-building agencies to construct schools for rental to the local communities. Only two States (Georgia and Pennsylvania) have such agencies in full operation today. Administrators of these agencies have said that title II would be of little help to them. But, it may be said, title II could perhaps help other States after they create school-building agencies of their own. Perhaps; but it will take years to establish such agencies and set them in motion. It will require State

legislation, with all the delays inherent in that process. Even then, if Georgia and Pennsylvania are typical, it will require another 2½ years before the first school is ready to receive children. Even this lethargic timetable assumes that such legislation is constitutional in each of the States, an assumption open to grave doubts which time does not permit us to explore.

With minor exceptions, S. 968 leaves the burden of school construction exactly where it is now, on the back of the local real-estate owner and on such supplementary revenues as can be obtained by the taxing power of the States. Real property, even when fully assessed, lags far behind the rapidly growing wealth and income of the Nation. The schools will be barred from a proper share in national prosperity until they secure grants through use of the Federal tax mechanism. In short, this bill does not provide substantial and effective assistance.

Moreover, this system of loans would be attended by far more Federal controls than are possible under any of the direct grants-in-aid bills which have been recommended by previous committees of the Congress. Thus, in title I, the Commissioner of Education may, at his discretion, include "such other covenants, conditions or provisions as he may deem necessary to assure payment." There are many other examples. In title III, for instance, the Commissioner must tell the States how to determine the eligibility of local school boards. Again, although it is probably an oversight due to hasty drafting, it must be recorded that the bill includes no clause which explicitly restrains the Federal Government from exercising control of the educational process.

But the presence or absence of particular clauses are not the greatest sources of danger with respect to control. By limiting direct aid to those districts that will, in effect, step forward to take a pauper's oath, the bill isolates the weak local school districts from the rest of the Nation and leaves them in a position highly vulnerable to pressure.

Furthermore title II, the backbone of S. 968, requires the States to establish State school building agencies. Whether or not they think this is the best way to meet their school problems, whether or not they can constitutionally assent to it, the States must adopt this particular federally favored procedure or forego even the limited benefits of the bill.

The teaching profession wants no Federal control of education. Our record in resisting it, whenever and by whomsoever it has been threatened, is clear and emphatic.

The National Education Association will, therefore, continue to support bills of the type which were reported favorably and unanimously by committees of both Houses of the 83d Congress. We shall try to get similar unanimous action (and we hope prompt action) by the 84th Congress.

We are not committed to oppose every aspect of the administration bill if it is amended to safeguard more fully local and State control of education, and if the amounts involved are substantially increased. We must oppose the bill if it is intended to prevent or to delay more fundamental, substantial, and better considered legislation. We support legislation of the type that has been championed and developed over years of study by such universally respected lawmakers as Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; John S. Cooper, of Kentucky; Elbert Thomas, of Utah; and Lister Hill, of Alabama. Their programs and policies in this matter call for legislation extending Federal grants to all the States for school purposes. Only in this way can the President's earnest desire to offer our schools prompt, effective help be realized.

Ninety-six years ago next Thursday President Buchanan sternly vetoed the first attempt to provide Federal grants to the State

colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. He asserted flatly that the proposal was unwise and unconstitutional. He said the bill would surely encourage the States to depend on Uncle Sam instead of expending their own resources for education. He predicted a long series of catastrophes if such a law were to be approved.

Two years later another President, and one much better known to history, approved this same proposal. Many of us remembered this act when the Nation celebrated Abraham Lincoln's birthday last week. During all the intervening years the Federal Government has given a modest measure of assistance to the land-grant colleges. They have repaid the Nation a thousandfold. The States did not relax their efforts. The Federal Government has not controlled instruction in a single classroom. Lincoln was a better prophet than Buchanan. Those who today prophesy the doom of the Republic if the Nation spends some small part of its wealth for better schools may well ask themselves whether history has vindicated Lincoln or Buchanan on this issue.

The Matusow Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis by Mr. James Ratliff with respect to the Matusow case.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 27, 1955]

THE MATUSOW CASE

(By James Ratliff)

One of the most remarkable exhibits of irresponsibility ever seen, even at Washington, D. C., was staged this week by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas Democrat, as chairman of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee.

Nothing ever charged to Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, his predecessor, came near the spectacle put on by Mr. MCCLELLAN with Harvey Matusow. Mr. MCCLELLAN took a man who already had publicly confessed that he was a perpetual liar, and gave him a nationwide, congressionally immune Senate forum to promote the book in which he psychopathically describes his own lies. As if this weren't enough, Mr. MCCLELLAN put the mess on television.

Senator MCCLELLAN knew that the publisher of this book could answer under oath whether or not he was a Communist. He knew that Matusow's press conferences were staged by Carl Marzani, notorious jailed Communist, and Nathan Witt, who refused to reply when asked if he was in Alger Hiss' Soviet espionage cell. Yet despite all this, Mr. MCCLELLAN questioned Matusow in front of cameras and newsmen on the ground that he wanted the truth from Matusow "if the truth was in him."

For 1 week Matusow had been babbling, "Read the lies in my book." This was a book by a Communist, openly parroting the Communist lies. But instead of questioning Matusow behind closed doors, Mr. MCCLELLAN chose to give the Communists of America their outstanding propaganda coup of years.

I met Matusow in October 1951. He was brought here by Martha Edmiston, one of the Federal Bureau of Investigation undercover agents who had helped so much 16 months before with the Enquirer's Communist expose before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Matusow was a swarthy but alert young man in a snappy Air Force sergeant's uniform. He kept twisting pipe cleaners into funny little animals while he talked. Maybe it was a warning. Martha, then a public relations official of Wright-Patterson Air Base, told us: "This is the fellow who drove Wright Field brass into shudders when he listed the Communist Party and 46 Red fronts in his back-ground. But he's a former Commie who wants to talk, Jim."

Matusow could type, so we put him at a typewriter to do his life story. It was an interesting tale of Red intrigue, 37 pages of it. But it still lies unused in Enquirer files, because only a little of it could be verified by us. One verification was a copy of the Daily Worker, the Commie paper, of January 29, 1951. In it Matusow was pictured as expelled from the Communist Party for misrepresentations. (How ironic can you get?)

By coincidence, the Communists were helping to form the National Negro Labor Council, a Red front, over on Central Avenue. Matusow said he could identify some of the Communists so he went over there with reporter Joseph Green, who had the news story.

Matusow recognized some Communists all right. But they recognized him as a traitor to the party and threw him out. The Enquirer reported the incident, without using Matusow's name.

In a few weeks Matusow was bounced out of the Air Force. He went to testify before the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. I told Sid Isaacs, commission counsel, that he might be able to use Matusow for a while as Commie spotter and research man. This is a calculated risk, but the best way to investigate a secret conspiracy is a man who has been in or can get into it.

Mr. Isaacs told Matusow he would give him about \$300 a month, but Matusow didn't actually last a full month. He started working on January 21, 1952, identifying Red literature, but had to go off for 10 days in February to testify in Washington, Sid told me.

When Matusow got back from Washington he had forgotten the repeated warnings that he was just a Communist trying to undo the harm he had caused. He became a big-time agent. Without a by-your-leave, he went off to Yellow Springs, Ohio, site of Antioch College, and suddenly, to the horror of Isaacs, issued a press statement.

"Antioch has at least 400 potential Communists on its campus," Matusow blurted. Even if true, Matusow didn't know this and he had no authority to open his mouth anyway. Isaacs, who had given him endless warnings, blew up. Matusow was due to testify before the Senate, so Sid paid him off at the end of February.

We never saw Matusow again, but heard of him. He made occasional headlines, romping from one trial and hearing to another as a witness. Many columnists, including ourselves once, mentioned him briefly. But when he began identifying Owen Lattimore and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam as Reds we became worried. We looked up his forgotten story in the files.

"He didn't tell us he had met Lattimore or Oxnam," I told city editor Jack Cronin. "He may be lying." But we were unable to prove his possible lies any more than his story and we didn't print it.

Now Matusow admits he lied about Lattimore and Oxnam. He says he doesn't know when he ever told any truth. This leads to speculation the Communists may have pub-

lished his expulsion to set a decoy who would discredit all Communist investigations.

Credence to this theory is lent by the fact that Matusow, again a Communist, is linking every Communist exposé he can think of with his lies.

But his tissue of lies is mainly hackneyed Communist Party line stuff. For example, I am supposed to have told him (his book says) "not to overshadow the Ohio Commission, as they need the headlines for votes."

The Communies aren't even clever. This has been the Communist Daily Worker line for years. Imagine me giving a hoot whether the 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats on that commission from all over Ohio got votes for the Ohio Legislature.

Matusow quotes Sid Isaacs as telling him to "break up unions in Dayton, Ohio." The old mouldy Red line. Not only is Sid so liberal that the Republicans wouldn't give him a job in the State Department which asked for him but whenever he goes after Communists like those leading the United Electrical Workers, a decent American union benefits.

I don't think Matusow was planted from the start, however. Too much of his original tale was corroborated by Government committees. The Communies wouldn't dare let him expose so much just for the later harm he could do. They probably black-mailed him back into line when it became obvious to them, too, that he was lying for headlines.

But the harm is done. All over the country people who never say an unkind word about communism are saying it's all a tissue of lies. The fact that endless FBI files send the Communies to jail—not just a Matusow—doesn't bother them. They keep croaking it's all a witch hunt.

As for Senator MCCLELLAN's great book promotion that has aided the Communists? Well, it's your move now, Senator.

The Current Situation in Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, most Members of the Senate know personally May Craig, Washington columnist for some of our Maine newspapers. May is currently on a trip to Europe and the Middle East. The dispatches she is sending back are excellent firsthand observations on current happenings of great interest to us all. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report May Craig has written on the current situation in Berlin together with an editorial on that report from the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of March 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the report and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYOR OF BERLIN WANTS REARMAMENT

(By May Craig)

BERLIN.—In Berlin, "an island in a Red sea," the tall blonde Governing Mayor Otto Suhr told us that Berlin is for the rearmament of Germany. I asked him if he would be for neutrality to get unification of Germany and he said he would not. This is the great bait being dangled before West Germany today the Russians and the Social Democrat Party, to which Dr. Suhr belongs,

and to which half the Berliners belong. Social Democrats are first and foremost for reunification of Germany. Dr. Suhr's party accuses Konrad Adenauer, the Chancellor of West Germany, whose party is the Christian Democrat, of not putting reunification first.

This party claims it has the unions and youth with them against rearmament and the treaties linking West Germany with the West, and Berlin sent Willy Brandt, Social Democrat, to Bonn, while the treaties were being debated in the Bundestag, to oppose ratification. He wanted talks with the Russians before the ratification, saying that ratification would make reunification almost impossible.

Supporters of the treaties argued it would make it easier to talk with the Russians, because West Germany would then be talking from a position of strength. With the small group of editors and publishers I travel with, we went to the city hall and talked with Dr. Suhr and with his deputy, Franz Amrehn. We asked them if they were for rearmament and they said yes. What they said was translated to us, in sentences, after they spoke, and at this point Amrehn interrupted the translator to use the word "defend." Yes, they would defend West Germany. But even as we talked together, busloads of rioters, mostly Communist, were in Bonn, surging around the Bundestag buildings in the falling snow, with placards saying "Mothers' Protect Your Sons," "Free Elections in 1955," etc. We have this picketing in the United States, too; I have seen it at White House and Capitol and elsewhere and it was usually Communist too.

The appeal to the mothers is poignant; rearmament means the draft, and these women have seen their husbands go forth in the world war, and what happened. War-weariness and pacifism is the fruit of dreadful and too-recent experience here, not to lead to reluctance toward a draft.

In a high tower on the city hall is freedom bell, the great bronze bell, gift of the American people to Free Germany, and every day at noon it rings and Berliners stop to listen. At city hall we were asked to pause a moment before 12, so we would be silent and hear the deep bell ring. An official said: "It reminds us of our struggle for freedom."

Berlin is divided into 4 sectors, 1 United States, 1 Russian, 1 French, and 1 British. Russian sector is set apart by the Communists and though people from the West may go into it, the East Germans do not come too much to the West. Berlin does not belong to the Federal Republic, which is West Germany. The Western Allies do not want it to, besides the fact that Berlin is cut off from the rest of Free Germany, and is deep in the Russian Zone. The three Western Allies wish to maintain the contention that Berlin does not belong to the Russian Zone, that it is in fact a quadripartite city, free to all the people of Berlin and to the three Western nations.

The 3 Western nations have practically unified their sectors and zones, the area and population of the 3 sectors about that of the Russians, though the Western zones have many times the population of the Russian, augmented by many refugees from the East. Some go back to the Eastern zones because the West is so crowded they have to live in camps, and they long for the homes they left in East Germany.

Since Berlin is cut off from the West by the 105 miles of air corridor, and other means of transportation is too often blocked by the Russians, industry and business is difficult. Contracts might or might not be fulfilled in Berlin though the Western Allies subsidize it so that the transport back and forth to Berlin to the West does not add to the cost compared to production in the West.

So there is unemployment in Berlin and it is not any longer a white-collar city, the banking and other important business having fled to the Western zones.

Dr. Suhr spoke of the difficulties of administering such a city. To me one of the important things he said is that "the will for freedom is our best treasure." If the Germans deeply believe that, they will stay with us in our struggle against communism.

MAY CRAIG IN GERMANY DURING HISTORIC MOMENTS

Germany has an historic tendency to lead the news. Whether she is making war, disturbing the peace or contributing to the peace she is one of the pivotal nations of the world. Her legislature's decisions have international repercussions.

The past weekend was typical of Germany's prominence and the seriousness with which the rest of the world watches every flutter of a ballot in the Bundestag. It finally came time for West Germany to act on proposals, the West has been working on for years. The Bundestag, had it not followed the stubborn leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, could have virtually nullified the plans of a free world for effective defenses against communism and effective buffer territory on the outskirts of those defenses.

The Bundestag cooperated with the West. It voted for West German rearmament; it voted for the end of occupation, the restoration of sovereignty, authorization for American, British, and French troops to remain in the Bonn republic; it voted to join NATO; it voted to neutralize partially the Saar valley.

The weekend marked a turning point in world history. Whether the turn will be for better or for worse, no prophet can tell us. The Bundestag voted as the West would have had it voted. To do otherwise would have been an immediate tragedy. But it is possible, for instance, that West Germany's decision to maintain its attachment to the Saar will cause trouble in France. West Germany's attitude could prevent ratification in France and another major chasm in western unity.

Press Herald columnist May Craig observes these events. She is visiting West Germany at a truly historic moment. Her first stop on a tour of Europe was Berlin, whence this morning's column was filed. As she travels to other parts of Germany and to other parts of Europe, Mrs. Craig will see at first hand the repercussions of the West German decisions made over the weekend and attempt to interpret what she sees for Press Herald readers. She couldn't have picked a more strategic time for her globe-trotting.

Back to Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Back to Inflation," published in the Arizona Republic of February 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK TO INFLATION

When President Eisenhower was campaigning for the Presidency, he delivered a speech in Troy, N. Y., charging that inflation was no accident under the Truman administration.

Now Speaker RAYBURN and his Democratic associates in Congress have proved the truth of Mr. Eisenhower's charges. They have passed a bill which would provide a \$30 across-the-board cut in personal income taxes, thereby adding another \$2.3 billion to the \$2 billion deficit already planned for next year. In Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey's words, the Democratic measure would "just about wipe out" the progress President Eisenhower has made toward balancing the budget. It would also hit every consumer in the Nation right square in the pocketbook, despite the illusion of tax savings.

In January 1953, when President Eisenhower took office, the wholesale price index of the bureau of labor statistics stood at 109.9. In January 1955, it stood at 110.2. Two years ago the consumer price index stood at 113.9. The latest figure is 114.3. In other words, so well has President Eisenhower's administration held inflation in check that wholesale prices have risen only .3 percent, while retail prices have risen only .4 percent. As a result, rising wage scales have given every worker increased purchasing power in stable dollars.

If the Rayburn faction has its way, this trend is now to be reversed and the country is to go back on the inflationary merry-go-round. But there is still a chance that the Democrats will come to their senses, and a coalition of Republicans and Democrats can hold the line against inflation in the Senate.

States Can Do Own School Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "States Can Do Own School Building," published in the State, of Columbia, S. C., of February 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES CAN DO OWN SCHOOL BUILDING

A Washington dispatch carried in our newspaper Friday morning said that a recommendation reportedly approved by the United States Commissioner of Education, and now under study by a Presidential Commission, says flatly that Federal money for school construction is not necessary.

Not only have we here in South Carolina undertaken to modernize our facilities, but we have completely revamped and implemented our transportation system.

No State proportionately will have a greater burden to carry, and few face one that is equal to that undertaken by us.

What the report in question says is what on several occasions we have urged in these columns. We have suggested that our Representatives and Senators in the Congress cite South Carolina as an example in the matter of school construction.

The report which the Presidential Commission is now studying says in part:

"We have been unable to find a State which cannot afford to make more available to its schools or which is economically unable to support an adequate school system."

South Carolina, as readers of this newspaper know, assessed a 3-percent general sales tax to finance the multi-million-dollar school-improvement program undertaken in 1951. Some States already have a sales tax, the revenue from which is being used for

other purposes. But the type of tax is not the point. The general sales tax was not being assessed here, so it was chosen as the levy to back the bonds. A State already in this field would have to find another source to tap.

It is a mistake to think that Federal aid is outside money—something free. In most cases it is simply our money that has traveled to Washington only to be sent back after a handling cost. The sooner we realize this, the better for all concerned. We will never get Federal taxes down if we are continually opening up new avenues of expense.

That a Government Commission should recognize State responsibility, and ability, as evidenced in this case, is indeed refreshing, but if its recommendations are ignored, and Congress goes right ahead with its Federal construction plan, the Commission, like so many in the past, will have wasted its time.

We hope our 2 Senators and 6 Representatives will stand up and be counted on the right side as this issue develops in Congress.

Preservation of the American Outdoors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the preservation of the American outdoors has stirred our people for many decades and has brought to the fore such men as John Muir, Gifford Pinchot, and Lyle F. Watts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article written by Ora Niemela about the Three Sisters Wilderness area in the Willamette National Forest of Oregon, which was published in the Oregon State Grange Bulletin of February 25, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE SISTERS WILDERNESS REGION BEING THREATENED

(By Ora Niemela)

Farm people have become more and more conservation-minded in the last decade. Flood, silt, and erosion control are an accepted part of our planning. To effect these controls on our farmlands we must be on the alert to first see to it that similar planning and control is done in the watersheds of our streams, the planned runoff of which is vital to every lowland acre.

Thus it is that Oregon farmers are interested, though as yet amazingly uninformed, in the developments in that part of the Three Sisters Wilderness area which embraces the McKenzie River watershed. Farmers should also be interested in the Three Sisters Wilderness area because of its value to the science departments of our Oregon colleges, and its value as a recreation area for the present 1,500,000, and soon-expected 3 million people of Oregon.

The Three Sisters Wilderness area is threatened immediately by dissection.

HISTORY OF THE AREA

In 1929 the Secretary of Agriculture gave the Chief of the United States Forest Service the authority to set aside areas within the national forests to be designated wild areas (between 5,000 and 100,000 acres) and wilderness areas (over 100,000 acres). At present

there are 78 such wild and wilderness areas in 73 national forests scattered through 12 States. Their total acreage comprises 8 percent of the national forest lands. Much of their acreage is in alpine country above timberline. Although many of our wild and wilderness areas have outstanding scenic value, they were not set aside for that purpose, but rather to preserve intact samples of typical primitive areas of the outdoors before we have none left. With the exception of Linville Gorge Wild Area in North Carolina there are no such areas in the East large enough to be so classified because easterners awoke to the possibilities too late. (By Forest Service regulations, to be classified wild or wilderness areas, sections of land under consideration must be free from roads, private property, and commercial activity of all kinds although a few exceptions have been made in the case of already existing mining activities.)

The Three Sisters Wilderness area (246,728 acres) was set aside in 1938 in the Willamette National Forest. It included the North, South, and Middle Sisters, Broken Top, the Husband and the Wife, and many lesser mountains. Near the western border, it includes Horsepasture Mountain and Olallie Mountain, which are joined by a ridge to which we will refer later.

LUMBER RESOURCES QUESTIONED

Now the Forest Service proposes to eliminate 55,620 acres from the wilderness area starting at Horse Creek, which lies in the canyon bottom, and continuing up the steep western slope and over the Horsepasture Mountain-Olallie Mountain ridge with the intent of opening this area to logging. The chief contention of the Forest Service is that small and medium-sized mills in Lane County must have this extra timber to sustain themselves. Lyle Watts, who was Chief of the United States Forest Service from 1943 until he retired in 1952, has exploded this contention by pointing out:

"The need for additional timber to log is not acute in the Willamette National Forest or in Lane County. The west side of the Horse Creek drainage includes some 12,000 acres. This area, based on available estimates, would appear to support between 380 and 525 million board-feet of timber. The increase in the allowable cut under sustained yield for the McKenzie Working Circle would be between 4 and 6 million board-feet per year.

"At present, about 1,250 million board-feet of lumber is cut each year in Lane County. The volume cut on the Willamette National Forest annually is around four hundred and twenty-five million. To be sure, the sustained yield annual cut for Lane County is only about eight hundred and thirty million. Thus the timber in the county is being cut one and a half times as fast as it grows.

"The point is, that by opening to cutting the west side of Horse Creek you would add just about one-half of 1 percent to the allowable cut for the county, and about 1 percent to the allowable cut on the National Forest. Obviously, in a community where the unbelievable volume of 1,250 million board-feet is being cut each year, the additional 5 million is of minute economic consequence. It may well be desirable to place this timber on ice for future need."

Ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague said in his Oregon Statesman, November 30, 1954:

"The argument for scaling down the size of the area now reserved as wilderness is that the size is excessive and that the timber is needed to help sustain the local economy. However, there are other values than economic, and the wilderness in its primitive condition with access only by trail provides values which cannot be calculated. As the Sierra Club has said: 'It is important to us and to those who follow us that samples of our richest heritage be preserved intact, complete with all the resources that, despite their

possible money value, are even more valuable for their inspirational qualities.'

"The demand of the lovers of the wilderness that the boundary revision stop at the ridge rather than split the basin along the creek seems quite practical and logical. A divided basin, one-half green and the other half logged off, would be neither fish nor fowl. The creek would become a carrier of silt from the eroded hillside, and brush and snags would collect along its course."

COLLEGE SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS OBJECT

The science departments of Oregon State College, University of Oregon, and Willamette University have protested the change for scientific reasons. They point out that the area makes an ideal natural-science laboratory close at home, inasmuch as it contains terrain from low altitude to high altitude—1,900 feet to 5,600 feet on Horsepasture Mountain. Dr. Ruth Hopson, Ph. D., assistant professor of general science, University of Oregon says:

"We are spending vast sums of money in buildings and indoor laboratories for science, but we can never reproduce within a building the things found in this region, nor can we replace them, once they are destroyed. Fieldwork in the out of doors as a method of learning in the natural sciences is gaining in importance both in the public schools and in the colleges. By the time we fully realize these values, will the virgin forest be here to study?"

"Since plans call for the eventual logging of most of the virgin forests and the sustained-yield program does not provide for trees much more than a hundred years old, who can say what the worth may be of such a region left undisturbed, containing as it does the wisdom of the ages by representing the sum total of everything that has happened here in ages past. It is, in fact, a history, a record that may be studied. We cannot afford to lose such a record."

USES OF NATIONAL FOREST

Many of us are unacquainted with the resources of our national forests and make the mistake of assuming that their sole purpose is to produce timber to log. When he was Chief of the United States Forest Service, Lyle Watts said:

"The national forest are forests in the larger sense of the term; that is, they are not exclusively tree-covered areas. A forest in the larger sense is a composite of trees, brush, grass, water, wildlife, scenery. Each one of these elements has its own value. Combined, they give the forest a value much greater than that of a mere producer of wood. For the most part, these various types are so intermingled that no one can be set apart from the others for separate handling.

"It is this composite value which gives the national forest importance to so many different elements in our population."

Now the Forest Service's avowed policy in the supervision of the national forests is to operate them for the greatest good of the most people. Would they be carrying out their promise to us if they turn these acres over to a small group of local logging operators instead of preserving them for the use of millions in the not too distant future? It has been reliably estimated that Oregon's population (now 1,500,000) will reach 3 million in 20 to 25 years and that the Willamette Valley will then house 2 million people. We cannot wait to set aside recreation areas until teeming thousands have arrived to demand them; they must obviously be set aside in advance if we are to have any at all.

RECREATIONAL IMPORTANCE

The CIO Woodworkers Union is one of those organizations opposing the change; A. F. Hartung, CIO-IWA international president, says timber resources of the area don't merit logging. The executive committee of the AFL's Northwest Council of Lumber and Sawmill Workers also oppose the logging of

this area, basing their decision, in part, on the A. F. of L.'s policy of protecting recreation areas. As many laboring people have pointed out, laborers cannot afford to fly their families to plush Miami Beach spots for a vacation; they must have easily accessible, inexpensive places to vacation close at home.

Approximately 21,000 members of 30 outdoor clubs of the Pacific coast, including the Mazamas, Crag Rats, Salem Chemeketans, Astorian Angoras, Eugene Obsidians, and the Salem Chemeketans, banded together in 1931 to form the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs. The 21,000 members of the federation vociferously oppose the logging of this western portion of the Three Sisters wilderness area. They have reluctantly agreed to sacrifice that portion further west of the Horse Pasture-Ollalie Mountain Ridge. These clubs depend almost exclusively on our national parks and forests for their weekly hikes and climbs and for their annual outings in the summers. For a lover of the wilderness to look down from the Skyline Trail or from the summit of any of the Three Sisters on the nearby scarred, logged-off western slope leading down to Horse Creek would ruin much of the pleasure of this country as a recreation area.

THIS IS JUST THE BEGINNING

An audience of over 300 interested persons listened to a four-man panel discuss this boundary revision question on December 3 in Eugene. They heard Gus Arneson, representative of the lumber companies on the panel, state quite frankly that the logging companies would, of course, quite logically demand the timber on the eastern slope of Horse Creek once they had taken the timber on the west slope. His frankness was admirable; his demand for the timber across the creek would in a few short years be bolstered by the claim that the logging road which they had built up Horse Creek (if they are allowed to build one) must be used if it is to give the most economical returns on the investment.

On that same panel Robert Aufderheide, superintendent of Willamette National Forest, said: "When in doubt we should withhold our decision because true wilderness cannot be restored in less than centuries." If the Forest Service has not had enough doubt cast on their decision by the testimony of ex-Governor Charles A. Sprague; ex-chief of the United States Forest Service, Lyle Watts, the science departments of the three colleges, the protests of 21,000 Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, all augmented by protests from labor unions, Boy Scouts, and other organizations, it's probably time we farmers added our voices in this matter.

A public hearing on this question will be conducted at the Veterans' Memorial Building, 1626 Willamette Street, Eugene, Oreg., February 16 beginning at 9 a. m. If you are interested in the Three Sisters western boundary you may appear at the hearing and you may voice your protests to J. Herbert Stone, Region Forester, United States Forest Service, post office box 4137, Portland 8, Oreg., with a copy to Richard McArdle, Chief Forester, United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C.

The Problems of Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the proposal now before the Senate Armed Services Committee to establish a spe-

cial commission to study the increasingly complex nature of civil defense has focused new attention on our preparation for atomic warfare here at home. One matter which merits immediate consideration is the possibility of industrial dispersal. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun of February 28, 1955, discussing civil defense and industrial dispersal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSURANCE AGAINST DISASTER

One of the wisest moves this administration has made, in connection with defense of the United States against overseas air attack, is to propose a special commission to study the increasingly complex nature of civil defense.

Defense Mobilizer Flemming has laid the plan before a Senate Armed Services Subcommittee, suggesting that the commission it sets up be required to report by May 15.

Now, civil defense means protection of humans against bombing raids, for one thing, and that function has thus far occupied most of the attention of the appropriate agencies. But civil defense also means protection of the Nation's war-making potential, and that is an equally difficult problem.

Assuming a set of fortunate circumstances, such as enough warning time and an evacuation plan that works, we may be able to protect most of the civilians now occupying our largest cities. War industries, however, are a different proposition. You cannot pick up a plant employing 10,000 or 20,000 or more persons and lift it out of the way of a hydrogen bomb. You cannot even shield it from gamma-ray activity if a bomb drops 100 miles away.

So it is highly important that Mobilizer Flemming says the commission's primary job is to work out a method of dispersing the country's prime atomic targets. Nearly everyone knows what they are. The atomic facilities themselves at Oak Ridge, Paducah, Hanford, and elsewhere cannot be dispersed, though it will be possible to give better protection to their top personnel. But there are the huge electronic plants, the complex of industries around Detroit, the steel mills in the Chicago-Gary area, the big plane manufacturers and shipyards, and even the highly critical scientific research laboratories concentrated in Boston and Cambridge. It would be a great tragedy to lose the brains assembled there.

When the commission comes to study industry dispersion, it will discover at least one sensible method of saving our vital war-making facilities from complete destruction. The Federal Government will have to rule that no more expansions of existing critical industry, or new industry, shall be made within at least 150 miles of existing major manufacturing centers. And it will have to force or induce the most important plants to detach an integrated or vertical nucleus and establish it in some well-removed small city so that it can serve as a well advanced starting point of reconstruction in the event the parent industry is fully wiped out.

There may be other methods that will occur to the commission. But the above is indispensable to the national security. Surely it would be folly to perfect a plan of saving from death scores of millions of citizens in urban areas, and neglect to draw a plan that will secure the United States against a knockout blow. In fact, if the Communists saw they could not destroy our ability to fight back, they might not attempt it. Industry dispersal regardless of what it costs is good insurance against the kind of assault we must expect if war comes.

Strengthening of the Clayton Antitrust Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very timely, able, and thought-provoking statement of the personal views of our former colleague from New York, James M. Mead, who is a member of the Federal Trade Commission. The statement is entitled "Strengthening of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRENGTHENING OF THE CLAYTON ANTITRUST ACT

The basic purpose for which Congress established the Federal Trade Commission was to maintain a competitive economy and to prevent the growth of monopoly. The first antitrust statute, the Sherman Act, was passed in 1890. Notwithstanding that very valuable statute, monopolies continued to grow after the turn of the century. In 1911 the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case limited the effectiveness of the Sherman Act by adopting the so-called rule of reason in interpreting that act.

In 1912 there was a demand by both political parties for Congress to take a New Look at the problem of monopoly and unfair competitive practices and to adopt such legislation as would be necessary in the public interest. Congress in 1914 adopted the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act. Notwithstanding the enactment of these two statutes, we still have with us the problem of monopoly and unfair competitive practices.

The great American dream is twofold: (1) Political liberty and (2) economic opportunity. Without economic opportunity there cannot really be effective political liberty. Economic opportunity in its simplest and basic terms means that the ordinary American—John Smith—has the opportunity to go into the legitimate business of his choice, and by hard work and commonsense, grow and prosper and be able to enjoy for himself and his family the necessities and some of the luxuries of life. When that dream dims, the virility of our economy is impaired.

The prevention of monopolistic and other unfair trade practices depends on three factors: (1) Effective legislation; (2) selection of competent administrators of the statutes; and (3) adequate appropriations.

This memorandum is addressed to the factor of effective legislation and more particularly to the Clayton Act. The basic principles of the Clayton Act are as sound today as they were in 1914. There are, however, certain points involving congressional intent and questions of procedure which merit consideration. They are as follows:

1. The good faith or equality of opportunity bill.

2. Prior submittal to the Federal Trade Commission of proposed mergers of larger corporations.

3. The finality of orders to cease and desist issued by the Commission under the Clayton Act.

THE GOOD FAITH OR EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY BILL

The Supreme Court in the recent *Standard Oil* case (340 U. S. 231) held in effect that the good faith meeting of a competitive lawful price is an absolute defense to a charge of price discrimination under section 2 (a) of the Clayton Act as amended

by the Robinson-Patman Act although the result of the discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. The Robinson-Patman Act is properly regarded by small and independent businessmen as their Magna Carta against the encroachments of monopolies and predatory business practices. In my opinion the discrimination section of the Robinson-Patman Act as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case is now of limited effectiveness and is not in accord with the purpose for which it was enacted. In my opinion the Robinson-Patman Act should be amended so as to make it crystal clear that good faith is not a complete defense when the discrimination is of such severity and importance that the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

In the enforcement of the antitrust laws we must constantly remember that their ultimate objective is to preserve and promote competition. The intent with which business practices are used is certainly a factor to be considered, but the final test of whether or not those practices should be prohibited must be the result of their use and not the intent with which they are used. Our antitrust laws would be futile instruments of national policy indeed if they are to be construed to countenance the destruction of competition solely because such destruction is accomplished by good men acting in good faith.

The right to discriminate in price and meet in good faith a competitive price is a private right subject to regulation by the State. The right to be free from monopolistic and other unfair trade practices is a public right also regulated by the State. When the private right to discriminate in price conflicts with the public right to be free from monopolistic practices, the public right should prevail. That is the basic political and economic justification for enacting the Kefauver-Patman equality of opportunity bill.

PRIOR SUBMITTAL TO THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION OF PROPOSED MERGERS OF LARGER CORPORATIONS

The Federal Trade Commission now has some experience with the amended section 7 of the Clayton Act which prohibits mergers when they have certain adverse competitive effects. In my opinion this record of experience indicates the need of an advance submittal amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act.

Under the present law the Commission must inform itself as to proposed mergers. This necessitates a staff engaged in inspecting a variety of news and trade publications for information which the principals in these mergers could readily supply to the Commission. A large number of these news items suggest the possibility of illegality of proposed mergers and the Commission then has the burden of collecting certain elementary facts about the companies involved in order to determine whether a full investigation should be made. The necessary information includes, for illustration, the assets of the companies, their principal products, their approximate sales, their competitive relationships, whether there has been a customer-supplier relationship between the merged companies and whether competing companies are likely to be cut off from essential supplies, whether important patents are involved, and other types of information. As a practical matter the Commission must depend upon the companies involved to supply this information. When a great number of companies are merging and in view of the limited staff of the Commission, there must of necessity be numerous delays before the necessary information is obtained. This problem of unnecessary expense and delay would be largely corrected by an advance

submittal requirement since such a requirement would give to firms wishing to merge the incentive of supplying the Commission with the necessary factual information as expeditiously and as completely as possible.

While the Commission has not yet had the occasion under the revised section 7 to order a divestiture of assets of illegally merged corporations, there is a real problem in attempting to "unscramble the eggs" after the assets of two corporations have been merged. Fiscal and other business properties are frequently such that they may be used in any one or several lines of commerce and there will be occasions where the Commission's order for divestiture will not assure that an effective competitor, once destroyed, will be recreated.

I do not believe that it would be either necessary or feasible to require all proposed mergers be cleared in advance with the Federal Trade Commission. It may be that any such advance submittal provision should be limited, for illustration, to situations where the combined assets would exceed \$10 million. I am advised that there are approximately 1,000 corporations in the manufacturing industries which have total assets valued at more than \$10 million.

It is probable that there are no more than 1,000 additional such corporations in other fields which are under the jurisdiction of the Commission, these being largely the distributive and mining fields. Thus by this criterion, about three-tenths of 1 percent of approximately 650,000 corporations in the United States would be subject to the advance approval requirement.

One of two different procedures relative to this advance submittal might be adopted. They are as follows:

1. Require the proposed merging corporations to file with the Commission a notice of their intention of merging and also require the corporations to submit to the Commission any facts, data, etc., which the Commission would require. Within certain time limits the Commission would make a finding whether or not the proposed merger is in the public interest. This procedure might be limited to corporations above a certain size. The difficulty with this procedure is that it might place a very large administrative burden on the Commission and adequate staff would not be available to the Commission for such purpose. The difficulty is that the Commission would be required to give a definite yes or no answer within a limited period of time. If the Commission did not find against the merger, it is not likely that the law would permit the Commission to attack the merger at a later date;

2. Require the proposed merging corporations to submit to the Commission a notice of their intention to merge and also require such corporations to submit the facts and data requested by the Commission. Within a certain time limit the Commission could issue a regular complaint attacking the proposed merger. In the event that the Commission issued such complaint the law would provide that the proposed merger would be suspended pending the final disposition of the complaint. The issuance of the complaint would be in effect a "stop order" which some utility commissions are authorized to issue relative to proposed rate increases. The case could then be tried as a regular case but in the meantime the merger would not be consummated and the Commission would not have the very difficult task of trying to unscramble the eggs. The law could also provide as a safeguard that if the Commission did not issue the complaint within the time specified prior to the proposed merger that the Commission would also have the authority to issue a complaint after the merger as is provided in the present section 7. This procedure would not place on the

staff of the Commission the great burden of deciding definitely (and finally) within a prescribed time limit whether or not the merger is in the public interest. The issuance of the complaint which would hold up the merger would not be a final decision. It would only constitute a "reason to believe" by the Commission.

THE FINALITY OF ORDERS TO CEASE AND DESIST ISSUED BY THE COMMISSION UNDER THE CLAYTON ACT

Orders to cease and desist issued by the Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act become final and enforceable within 60 days after their issuance unless the respondent appeals to a United States Court of Appeals. After orders issued under the trade act become final the Commission may request the Department of Justice to have the appropriate United States district attorney sue for a violation of the order in a civil penalty proceeding. Violators are liable to a monetary penalty up to \$5,000 for each day of violation. This provision makes trade act orders to cease and desist effective because they are readily enforceable.

It is suggested that section 11 of the Clayton Act be amended so as to provide for cease and desist orders under the Clayton Act to have the same degree of finality and the same penalty provisions as provided for orders issued under the Federal Trade Commission Act. This amendment is needed to insure effective enforcement of the statutory prohibition against monopolistic mergers, competition-stifling exclusive-dealing contracts, unjust discriminations in price, services, or facilities and certain types of interlocking directorates. It is needed to eliminate the laborious, time-consuming, and expensive procedures now required before an order under the Clayton Act is fully effective.

Under the present Clayton Act the orders of the Commission have no force or effect without subsequent court enforcement. In addition the statute limits the right of the Commission to seek enforcement. In order for the Commission to secure enforcement by the court the Commission must prove that the respondent has failed to obey the order to cease and desist.

The long road which the Commission must travel in order to force compliance with Clayton Act orders to cease and desist is as follows:

- (1) The Commission must prove that the respondent has violated the Clayton Act.
- (2) If such proof is made, then the Commission issues its order to cease and desist.
- (3) If the respondent does not appeal to the court from the Commission's order and if the respondent continues to violate the order, the Commission must prove to the satisfaction of the court that the respondent has violated the order of the Commission.
- (4) If such proof is made to the satisfaction of the court, then the court may issue a decree making the order of the Commission the order of the court.
- (5) If thereafter the respondent violates the decree of the court and the Commission is successful in proving such a violation to the court, then the court may punish the respondent for contempt of court.

Under the procedure now provided, the investigations and hearings may drag on for years before effective enforcement with Clayton Act orders to cease and desist is obtained. The resources and energies of the Commission are thus needlessly dissipated and the antimonopoly purpose of the Clayton Act is thwarted.

CONCLUSION

The above constitutes a modest but a very necessary program of proposed legislation designed toward making the Federal Trade Commission a more effective instrument of national antitrust policy.

Postal Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 26, 1955, which I have received from Thomas Nolin, legislative representative of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, together with an article entitled "Postal Pay Raise," published in the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of February 24, 1955.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
POST OFFICE CLERKS,
St. Paul, Minn., February 26, 1955.

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The morning after the Senate Committee brought out our bill, I phoned to thank you for your fine support. Unfortunately, you were not available, so please accept my sincere thanks for your successful efforts in our behalf. As always, you are in our corner.

In the House, it seems that we may be in for trouble but we have many friends there too, so, although I am not unduly optimistic, I have hopes that the House Committee will bring out a good bill.

Reports indicate that soon an investigation of the overall operation of the Post Office will get underway. If you will be on this committee, I would like to bring to your attention, the manpower-control system. It was initiated about 6 months ago and seems to be as secret as the atomic research program. We would like to learn what it is supposed to accomplish and how much it is costing the taxpayer.

Meanwhile, I certainly hope that the Department does not have sufficient support in the House to gain many of the things advocated. The Postmaster General is using his high office to disseminate to the public, over radio and television, some rather strange information. He has implied that if any postal-salary bill passed by the Congress does not meet with his approval, he will cause it to be vetoed.

High in the Government he may be but isn't this a great deal of authority for one man to hold?

Thanks again, and best wishes.
Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS NOLIN,
Legislative Representative.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of
February 24, 1955]

POSTAL PAY RAISE
(By Val Bjornson)

A fundamental point in Post Office Department reforms launched 2 years ago remains that of whether stress should continue on making the service fully self-sustaining. The issue arises in connection with pay-raise proposals, vetoed by President Eisenhower in the form given them by Congress in August of last year.

Postal employees said widely at the time that they shouldn't be made to bear the burden of the postal deficit. Administration spokesmen objected, in the main, to another indiscriminate across-the-board pay increase, identical in approach to five such increases made the past 10 years. Maurice Stans, the certified public accountant from Chicago who has headed the task force making fiscal

studies of the Post Office Department, expressed such objections in a speech he delivered in the Twin Cities last December.

Speaking of the vetoed measure, Stans said: "It provided for more of the same old treatment, a 5-percent increase across the board. It provided no new revenue with which to meet the \$100 million cost. It did call for a study of reclassification, but this would probably have merely delayed indefinitely the correction of basic existing inequities in the post office salary structure. The President without hesitancy vetoed it."

Postmark, monthly publication of St. Paul Local 65 of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, reports the running fire of argument on now about two varying pay raise bills. The publication also reveals the active interest of postal employees in the goal of improved service, emphasized by current reorganization efforts. Union representatives of postal employees favor a flat 10-percent pay raise now, regardless of classifications, and their bill would make the increase retroactive to last August, the time of the President's veto.

The Department's own pay-raise bill continues its major stress on reclassification, with increases varying according to bracket, anywhere from 5 to 40 percent.

The St. Paul publication, Postmark, shows the concern of postal employees here and elsewhere as to improvements in service and operating efficiency. The view often found as to efficiency experts is evident. Comments, whether as to public or private endeavors in the field, frequently raise the point that it may cost more to study and find supposedly inefficient practices than their continuance involves.

Postal employees, maintaining their interest in long delayed modernization techniques, are wondering about the manpower control structure instituted some 6 months ago among departmental reforms. The monthly Postmark made these "clipboard experts" a target recently. The argument was that stress on production records may be outweighing some phases of service to the public. Tallying closely the mail volume handled in 6-minute intervals makes for remarkably complete production records, the union publication admits, but that bit of efficiency expert technique can be carried so far as to delay mail deliveries.

Interest in postal reforms is obviously widespread, and logically so. The service reaches everyone in the country, and it handles 175 million pieces of mail a day.

The Supreme Court of the United States
a Usurper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of my newspaper employment, I came to know a man whom I now list in my book of fondest memories. He is David Rankin Barbee.

Much water has passed under the bridge since Dave Barbee was one of the brilliant editorial writers and I was the assistant sports editor of the New Orleans States.

Since those days during the late twenties Dave Barbee too has come to Washington and has gone, but in the interim he has left his mark.

Born in Tennessee he has newspapered for some 60 years, 25 of which were spent in Washington.

He has long been interested in the history of the Old South and has written many articles for historical magazines about that section and its people. In the last year of his life, Dave Barbee helped the late Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, on his biography of Lincoln. After the Senator's death, their correspondence was published, with editorial notes, under the title of "An Excursion on Southern History," which was highly commended by leading historians and is now regarded as a classic.

Dave Barbee wrote a popular history of the Nation's Capital, entitled "Washington: City of Mighty Events." This book is much consulted by serious historians and is the most widely read book about Washington in the District of Columbia Public Library.

He has just completed, after 25 years' labor, a definitive study of the assassination of President Lincoln, which scholars call the most original contribution to Lincoln literature in this century.

He wrote several speeches for the late President Roosevelt, notably the Lafayette speech delivered before the Congress, the Gettysburg speech, and the speech before the Gridiron Club on its 50th anniversary.

Mr. Barbee has recently written a scholarly essay on the subject of the United States Supreme Court which is well worth reading and studying. His concern is not individual or personal, but is also the concern of many of us who are strong believers in constitutional government.

Mr. Barbee's article is most timely in view of present conditions and current problems before the Supreme Court which under our Constitution was created to interpret, not write, the laws of the Nation and also to render decisions based on the law of the land and not on sociology books.

Here is Mr. Barbee's treatise:
THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES A
USURPER

(By David Rankin Barbee)

For 170 years the Supreme Court of the United States has assumed and exercised an authority which the Constitutional Convention of 1787 unanimously denied it. This is the power to void an act of the Congress or of any of the States in the Republic. Strange as it may seem, this usurpation of power has gone unchallenged, except in one instance. During the turbulent administration of President Jackson, the Court declared unconstitutional a law in which the President was much interested. Angered by the decision, Old Hickory defied the Court and refused to obey its mandate. "John Marshall has made his law; now let him enforce it," he defiantly exclaimed. And the decision was never put into effect.

Marshall was not a member of the Constitutional Convention, and, therefore, was ignorant of its proceedings. Twelve years before he was appointed the Chief Justice, in the Virginia Ratifying Convention, he announced the doctrine of judicial review of the acts of the Congress, in these words:

"If they (the Congress) were to make a law not warranted by any of the powers enumerated, it would be considered by the National Judges as an infringement of the Constitution which they are to guard. They

would consider such a law void. To what quarter will you look for protection from an infringement of the Constitution, if you will not give the power to the judiciary?"

Seated at his elbow was the man popularly called "the Father of the Constitution," James Madison, whose notes on the daily proceedings of the constitutional convention are almost our sole authority on the debates and the actions of that great legislative assembly. He could have told Marshall that the convention had, after long and serious discussion, participated in by its ablest members, unanimously denied any such grant of power to the Federal judiciary. But he kept silent. He was more interested in defeating Patrick Henry and the cohort of eminent statesmen opposing ratification than he was in the truth. His silence then, and in another conspicuous case, brought everlasting woe on Virginia, on the South, and on the Nation, even to our own time; for, following Marshall's momentous decision of 1815, in the Georgia Indian case, the Court has rewritten the laws of the country and changed the destiny of its historic course.

The Madison papers were locked up in James Madison's possession until 1842, when the Congress, having purchased them from his widow, ordered them published. The Congress, in 1928, ordered a new edition of these papers published. A careful reading of the history of our country, and particularly of the writings of the foremost authorities on the Constitution, from Associate Justice Joseph Story, whose Commentaries on the Constitution was published in 1833, on down to the present, shows that no Member of the Congress, no member of the Federal judiciary, no historian, and no law writer has attentively read those momentous documents which alone reveal the minds of the Founding Fathers. Even so eminent a historian as the late Charles A. Beard, in his *Basic History of the United States*, refers only casually to Madison's notes, and that in his criticism of Calhoun and South Carolina and the Democratic Party in the nullification controversy. He does say that neither did "the public pay much attention to the revelations contained in Madison's papers."

In line with Story and other Federalist interpreters of the Constitution, Dr. Beard says: "The unity of the country was also symbolized by the Constitution in the creation of the Supreme Court. . . . Its Justices might be divided in cases before it, but its decisions made by a majority of them were to be binding at law throughout the land."

It is remarkable, and not at all understandable, that a famous scholar in history, who was venerated by the members of his profession, should have made such a statement, in view of the fact that the Constitution does not make any such grant of power and the Madison papers definitely show that the Founding Fathers shrank with horror from bestowing any such power on the Court. What is still more significant is that the Congress, in the Judiciary Act of 1789, setting up the Supreme Court and the Federal judiciary under the Constitution, carefully refrained from giving the courts the right to void acts of the Congress or of the States.

If Dr. Beard—and he is representative of the profession he adorned—paid little heed to the Madison papers, he fairly worshipped the Federalist, to which he paid this glowing tribute: "From that day (1788) to this the Federalist has been widely regarded as the most profound single treatise on the Constitution ever written and as among the few masterly works on political science produced in all the centuries of history."

After such high-flown praise one naturally would conclude that Dr. Beard had not only read but had studied closely what Alexander Hamilton had written with regard to the

power granted the Supreme Court to void acts of Congress. Hamilton is justly regarded as the ablest member of the Convention of 1787. He had participated in the discussion on the powers to be granted the Federal courts, and had played a principal role in fixing these powers. In the 91st number of the *Federalist*, combatting the widespread notion that the Constitution gave the courts the power of life and death over the acts of the Congress and of the States, he said:

"There is not a syllable in the plan under consideration (the Constitution) which directly empowers the national courts to construe the laws according to the spirit of the Constitution, or which gives them any greater latitude in this respect than may be claimed for the courts of every State." Of course, no State court had the right to void an act of the Congress.

Hamilton did not deceive his readers and the people of New York as to where the Constitutional Convention placed the authority to void an act of the Federal Legislature. He was very definite about that when he says in the same number of the *Federalist*:

"There never can be danger that the Judges (of the Supreme Court), by a series of deliberate usurpations on the authority of the Legislature (the Congress) would hazard the united resentment of the body intrusted with it (the authority to void an act of the Congress), while this body was possessed of the means of punishing their presumption by degrading them from their station."

The Congress has never shown its "united resentment" of any of "the series of deliberate usurpations on its authority." Even now, with a timidity that is amazing, its chief Members shrink from even examining the question.

Turning now to the Madison papers for light, we find that on June 4, 1787, Mr. Gerry, of Massachusetts, raised the question of the right of the Supreme Court to participate in voiding acts of the Congress. "It is quite foreign (said he) from the nature of the office to make them judges of the policy of public measures." He, therefore, moved "that the National Executive shall have the right to negative any legislative act which shall not be afterward passed by (blank) parts of each branch of the National Legislature."

Rufus King, of the same State, seconded the motion, "observing that the Judges ought to be able to expound the law as it should come before them, free from the bias of having participated in its formation."

One of the ablest members of the Convention, James Wilson, of Pennsylvania, opposed the resolution. He said "the Executive ought to have an absolute negative. Without such a self-defense (he went on), the Legislature can at any moment sink it (the Executive) into nonexistence." He proposed giving the Executive and the judiciary jointly an absolute negative.

Joining him in this suggestion, Alexander Hamilton said: "There was no danger . . . of such a power being too much exercised." How little prophetic vision those two great statesmen had.

The Nestor of the Convention, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, sternly differed from Wilson and Hamilton. He was afraid, he said, "that more power would be demanded (by the Executive), till at last enough would be gotten (by him) to influence and bribe the Legislature into a complete subjection to the will of the Executive." The Madison Papers clearly reveal the intent of the Founding Fathers to confer on the policy-making department of the new government, the Congress, the ultimate power in it.

Joining Dr. Franklin, Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, also dissented from the views of Wilson and Hamilton. He was, he said, against "enabling any one man to stop the will of the whole. No one man could be

found so far above all the rest in wisdom. He thought we ought to avail ourselves of his (the Executive's) wisdom in revising the laws, but not permit him to overrule the decided and cool opinions of the Legislature."

"If a proper proportion of each branch (of the Legislature) should be required to overrule the objections of the Executive," James Madison argued, "it would answer the same purpose as an absolute negative. It would rarely if ever happen (said he) that the Executive . . . would have firmness enough to resist the Legislature, unless backed by a certain part of the body itself."

On and on the debate, one of the ablest and most spirited of the Convention, raged, with no determination being reached, but with the chief thought in the minds of the great men participating in it, that the Congress should make the laws and determine their constitutionality.

Action on Mr. Gerry's motion was postponed, and on August 16, 1787, the convention resumed consideration of the question. Mr. Madison reopened the debate by moving "that all acts (of the National Legislature), before they become laws, should be submitted both to the executive and the supreme judiciary departments; that if either of them should object, two-thirds of each House, if both should object, three-fourths of each House (of the Congress) should be necessary to override the objections and give the acts the force of law."

Mr. Wilson seconded this motion.

Mr. Pinkney (sic), of South Carolina (probably Gen. Charles Pinckney), opposed it on the ground that it would lead to "the interference of the judges in the legislative business." If agreed to, it would, said he, "involve them in parties (i. e., politics), and give a previous tincture to their opinions."

From the days of Chief Justice Marshall to the present time, the Supreme Court has been a political and a lawmaking body. Dr. Beard calls attention to this in his *Basic History*, when he says: "A fervent advocate of a strong National Union, Marshall welcomed the opportunity to make his views of the Constitution prevail in law." A leader of the Federalist Party, he gave the laws that came before him the tincture of his political opinions, even during the administrations of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe. That is one reason why his kinsman, the Sage of Monticello, hated him so. In our own day we saw how an ultraconservative Court took almost fiendish delight in knocking down the liberal legislation of the 1930's.

While endorsing Mr. Madison's motion, John Francis Mercer, of Maryland, one of the ablest lawyers and legislators in the convention, "disapproved the doctrine that the judges, as expositors of the Constitution, should have the authority to declare a law void. He thought laws ought to be well and cautiously made, and then be uncontrollable."

When put to a vote, Mr. Madison's motion was defeated, 9 States to 3, only Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia voting for it.

This left Mr. Gerry's original motion before the convention, and debate on that was at once resumed, with John Dickinson, of Delaware, agreeing with Mr. Mercer "as to the power of the judges to set aside the law. He thought no such power ought to exist."

Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, described as "one of those geniuses in whom every species of talents combine to render him conspicuous and flourishing in debate"—the man who took the acts of the Convention and whipped them into the shape in which we now have the Constitution—"suggested the idea of requiring three-fourths of each House to repeal laws where the President should not concur. . . . He could not agree (he said) that the Judiciary . . . should be bound to say that a direct violation of the Constitution was law. . . ."

Encroachments on the popular branch of the Government (the Congress) ought to be guarded against."

Roger Sherman, expressing what undoubtedly was the mind of a large majority of the Convention, said that "he disapproved of judges meddling in politics and parties. We have gone far enough in forming the negative as it is," he concluded.

Finally, tiring of the long-running debate, the Convention voted down a motion to postpone further action on Mr. Gerry's motion, and having made up its mind not to give the Supreme Court or any of the national courts the right to void acts of the Congress or of a State, adopted, by a unanimous vote, the motion, giving the Executive the right to veto an act of the Congress and the Congress, by a three-fourths vote of each House, the right to overturn the veto.

There the matter stands in the long silent records of the Constitutional Convention. Who, then, will deny that the Supreme Court has not usurped the power it has exercised for the past 170 years?

The President's School-Construction Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Honorable Pearl A. Wanamaker, superintendent of public instruction in the State of Washington. In this statement, Mrs. Wanamaker very ably analyzes the ineffectiveness of the administration's school-construction program as applied to the situation in my State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON S. 968, SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1955, TO THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES CONGRESS, BY PEARL A. WANAMAKER, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, STATE OF WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 16, 1955

INTRODUCTION

During the past 13 years a cooperatively financed school-building program has been in operation in the State of Washington. While our effort to provide the necessary funds has been considerable, we now find ourselves in a more serious school-housing situation than we were in 1942, the beginning of this school-building program, although since 1951 local, State, and Federal sources have provided some \$214 million for school-building construction.

School districts have received maximum amounts of Federal funds in federally impacted areas. Local school districts have bonded and rebonded themselves to their legal limit as assessed valuation has increased; in addition, they have raised all the money through special levies that their patrons reasonably can be expected to vote—several cases representing more than 200 mills' effort to provide needed school buildings. This has been accomplished as together we have set ourselves to the task of providing adequately for the education of our children.

In this local, State, and Federal endeavor over the past years, we have learned that

there are certain principles which must be observed carefully in a school-building program which has as its objective adequate teaching space to provide a desirable educational program for our children.

These principles are:

1. Responsibility for school building planning must reside with local boards of school directors.
2. The method of distribution of funds must be understood readily and therefore simple in design.
3. State and Federal funds must supplement local school district funds to provide a minimum program permitting the district to go beyond the minimum in the development of its schools to meet individual school and community needs.
4. Interest rates and debt services must be kept to a minimum cost.
5. Assured revenue must be provided at the local level for the retirement of all legal obligations without impairing current operations.
6. The proper framework for an intelligent expenditure of public funds must grow out of comprehensive planning which involves all the forces within a community and State that affect the growth of that community and State, including economic, sociological, and geographic conditions.

ANALYSIS OF S. 968 AS IT WOULD APPLY TO THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Title I: This section will give no relief to hard-pressed local school districts faced with expanding building needs. Legal bonding capacity of school districts is fixed by constitutional provision at 10 percent of assessed valuation.

School district bonds in the State of Washington command very favorable rates of interest on the open market, ranging from 1.5 to 3 percent with a median of 2.6 percent; lowest rate currently being received on 10- to 15-year bond issues.

Title II: In a growing State, unlimited pyramiding of school district obligations is neither desirable nor supportable. Proposed machinery for administration of this section appears to be excessively complicated and will add to the very substantial bonding debt already carried by needy school districts. This section appears to violate the principle of the prerogative of the local school district to determine the type of educational program necessary to meet the particular needs of its community.

This section does not carry out the principle that all Federal funds for educational purposes shall be channeled through the State educational agency, a basic principle with relation to Federal aid to education.

It appears that the plan proposed in title II would require school districts in the State of Washington to assume a substantial debt with no assured revenue to retire that obligation. In other words, local school districts could be forced to pay debt services out of current maintenance and operation which can be reflected only in lowering teacher salaries.

Title III: This section is not designed to provide relief for needy school districts in our State, inasmuch as it applies only to those districts which cannot qualify under titles I or II. Although school districts in the State of Washington could qualify under title II, they have no assured sources of revenue to repay that obligation. Consequently, it cannot be a solution to our school building program.

Ninety-three school districts, educating 184,460 students, are bonded to capacity and are attempting to vote yearly special levies for operation and maintenance. Seventy-seven of these districts face critical school housing shortages which must be satisfied during 1955-60. In the past, the State has financed up to 75 percent of the cost of building schools in these districts. If districts are to provide needed school housing,

funds from other sources as well must be provided to take care of construction costs, architects' fees, and sales tax. The careful study of this section indicates that Federal funds cannot be made available to the needy districts of our State.

Title IV: Provisions of title IV can be useful for carrying on long-range planning looking toward modifying school-district organization and modification of unduly restrictive tax or debt limits. This section would help to assure the retention of basic responsibility for school planning in the local board of school directors and assure proper framework for intelligent expenditure of public funds.

SUMMARY

Title I will provide no aid to school districts in the State of Washington. Guaranteed debt services apparently would be higher than current rates in this State.

Title II cannot function in Washington because of its failure to protect the prerogative of the local school districts to determine their educational programs. It appears to set up an excessively complicated framework of administration and tends to restrict the right of local boards of directors in planning to meet the educational needs of their respective communities. This section fails to carry out the principle of channeling through the State educational agencies. This section does not provide assured revenue for the retirement of school districts' capital outlay obligation.

Title III could assist needy school districts except for the provision of nonqualification under title I or title II which eliminates title III as a source of help for school districts in the State of Washington.

Title IV can be of assistance to the State of Washington in the further study and analysis of proper school-district reorganization patterns and methods of revising unduly restrictive tax or debt limits currently in effect in this State.

Views of CAB Members Lee and Adams in Respect to Transocean Air Lines, of Oakland, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 8 of this year, I addressed the House with respect to the reported failure of the Civil Aeronautics Board to recommend to the President the adoption of the recommendation of the Board's Assistant Chief Examiner that Transocean Air Lines, of Oakland, Calif., be awarded a limited certificate for a period of 7 years to conduct irregular nonscheduled nonsubsidized air-transport operations between Oakland and various points throughout the critical transpacific area. I was bitterly disappointed in the Board's failure to concur in the findings of one of its ablest and most experienced examiners. His recommendation was based upon a record of extensive and comprehensive public hearings.

On February 16, the Board's opinions and the President's actions in the transpacific case were made public; and I was most interested to read that two mem-

bers of the Board, former Senator Josh Lee and Col. Joseph P. Adams, urged that the examiner's recommendation that Transocean be certified should be approved forthwith. It is difficult to believe that the President was made aware of the views of Members Lee and Adams; because I believe that if the President had read their forceful and cogent dissenting opinion he would have adopted it and thus affirmed the recommendation of the examiner that Transocean be granted a limited temporary certificate.

Because I believe that the Members of the House will be very much interested in the views of CAB members Lee and Adams with respect to Transocean, I am making their views a part of my remarks today:

We must also dissent from the majority's refusal to give Transocean a certificate to engage in air transportation on an irregular basis between California, Hawaii, and points in the Orient as recommended by the examiner. The majority's action in deferring decision on the examiner's recommendation for further consideration with the large irregular carrier investigation, docket No. 5132, ignores the evidence of record in this case which shows that Transocean has performed a needed public service in the transpacific area, transporting more than 26,000 passengers between January 1951 and March 1953. The majority's decision also ignores the fact that the intolerable hardships on Transocean of further delay may force it to disband its efficient organization and deactivate the facilities it now operates in the transpacific area.

We are fearful that the majority's action with respect to Transocean will lend support to the charge that the Board is following a policy of death by delay against the irregular carriers. It was only little more than a year ago, in March 1953, that a former board chairman appeared before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business and assured the committee that the board is not conducting a war of attrition against the irregular carriers but, on the contrary, has a policy of encouraging these carriers to prosecute their applications in proceedings such as this before the Board. The chairman stated:

"The large irregular carrier investigation is not the only avenue, of course, by which the irregular air carriers and others may seek permanent authority from the Board for operations exceeding those which may be conducted on an irregular and infrequent basis under part 291 of the Board's regulations. The Board has always urged that applications for permanent authority for regular operation should be filed and processed by irregular carriers in preference to expansion of operation in violation of the limited operating privileges granted them by the blanket exemption regulation."

Transocean has followed that course here only to be told that this is not the time or place for a decision on its proposal, even though the evidence demonstrates the need for continuance of its service. Instead of having a decision on a clean-cut record as established in this case, Transocean is told that it must wait for a decision in another case—a decision which appears to be at least 2 years in the future.

But now Bureau counsel on brief to the examiner in the large irregular carrier investigation takes the position that the record in that case "will not support any economic finding as to the quantity and class of route-type service required for particular segments or areas." He therefore recommends that the need for such service as proposed by Transocean "should be determined in a regular area certificate proceed-

ing, where requirements for specific route segments are ascertained after a thorough analysis of all related factors." We submit that there must be an end to these procedural maneuvers which are continually pushing the irregular carriers from pillar to post. First, they are told to participate in the large irregular carrier investigation. Then they are encouraged to try their applications in individual-area proceedings. Having done this they are again referred back to the large irregular carrier case (as the majority has done in the instant proceeding). And now Bureau counsel, who is the agent for the Bureau of Air Operations (that arm of the Board responsible for policymaking), takes the position that the record in the large irregular carrier investigation will not permit the granting of the applications of the irregular carriers and suggests that they again seek relief in the individual-area cases.

This is not the first time the majority has placed the irregular carriers in a difficult procedural position. Nearly a year ago on January 20, 1954 (Order Serial No. E-8052), we dissented from the majority's decision in the large irregular carrier investigation to separate the general public interest question from the issues regarding qualification and selection of carriers. In that dissent we pointed out that such action by the majority will delay the final decision in the large irregular carrier case and only if the majority finds that the public interest does not require the services of the irregular carriers could the procedure adopted by the majority result in expediting the proceeding, a finding we were not prepared to make then and are not prepared to make now.

JOSH LEE.

JOSEPH P. ADAMS.

Dispersal of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith Senate Resolution 19 of the 69th Illinois General Assembly submitted to me by Secretary of State Charles F. Carpenter. The resolution, adopted by the Illinois State Senate on March 1, 1955, urges the encouragement of industry to take steps to effectuate the dispersal of its facilities in the State of Illinois.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Springfield, March 2, 1955.

HON. MELVIN PRICE,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have the honor to attach herewith, as directed, copy of Senate Resolution 19 of the 69th general assembly.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES F. CARPENTIER,
Secretary of State.

Senate Resolution 19

Whereas the development of thermonuclear weapons has made all former concepts of warfare obsolete and has made modern war so extremely destructive that the largest cities may be effectively and permanently destroyed by one explosion; and

Whereas the industrial areas now existing in Illinois are so concentrated that virtually

every principal industry in this State could well be destroyed or seriously crippled by bombs dropped by a comparatively few enemy aircraft on the first day of a war; and

Whereas little or no effective action has been taken by industry to disperse the industrial facilities in Illinois so as to preserve an undamaged and repairable industrial capacity in the State in the event of an atomic attack; and

Whereas the degree of dispersal required by the threat of eventual hydrogen bomb attack makes any halfhearted attempt at dispersal futile; and

Whereas the lives of millions of our people may be saved by a suitable plan of dispersal of industry which would minimize the destructive results of any attack by nuclear or radiological weapons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That industry be encouraged to take immediate steps to effectuate the dispersal of its facilities in this State; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Illinois be respectfully urged to call a conference of industrial leaders, city planners, officials of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and other interested State officials and citizens to make plans for dispersal of industry and to discover how the State of Illinois can help, financially or otherwise, in such dispersal efforts; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Illinois to inform them of our deep concern with respect to such matters and to urge them respectfully to initiate similar steps at the national level.

Adopted by the Senate, March 1, 1955.

JOHN WM. CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Smog Can Kill, Claim Experts After Survey and Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Congress may soon have to give serious consideration to legislation concerning the responsibility of the Federal Government to help eliminate smog in highly industrialized and thickly populated areas throughout the Nation.

Smog and all forms of air pollution which are dangerous to the health and welfare of our people have been increasing steadily in the United States during the past decade, and I am sure that this is a matter in which all Members of Congress are concerned.

The Atomic Energy Commission informed the Nation recently of the horrifying effects and possible death and certainly the detriment to the health of millions of people within the area of an atomic bomb fallout which would contaminate and pollute the atmosphere within a 7,000-square-mile area, if the zero point was located in New York City.

This clearly indicates the urgent need of an immediate study of the effects of

the fallout from atomic bombs tested in Nevada over the past several years.

Even if we knew nothing of the atomic bomb and did not have to consider the effects of the atomic fallout on millions of people, we would still have the serious problem of exhaust fumes from millions of motor vehicles which are increasing daily as they are not equipped with efficient carburetors to consume all of the gas delivered to the engine nor are they equipped with filters on the exhaust to neutralize or reduce the unburned gasoline vapors or the noxious products of combustion which is thrown into the atmosphere of thickly populated and highly industrialized areas in various parts of the Nation every day and thus contaminating the atmosphere with poisonous and irritating pollutants.

It is only fair to say at this point that the automobile manufacturers of the Nation are at present studying and experimenting with more efficient carburetors for motor vehicles which will reduce the poisonous gas now released from these machines. However, it is estimated that it will be a considerable time in the future before such a carburetor can be manufactured and applied to the millions of motor vehicles in operation in the United States.

Since motor vehicles are freely permitted in interstate commerce is further evidence that the problem of the elimination of smog and other air pollutants is one which the Federal Government should assume some responsibility for its solution.

Some preliminary studies have been made of the problem of smog and other atmospheric contaminants including a report by the Stanford Research Institute on the nature and causes of smog. This report, published in 1954, considered the growing smog problem of Los Angeles County since 1947, and pointed out that it is a serious problem which cannot be oversimplified. It is a problem which must be thoroughly understood, all contributing causes classified and identified, before effective control can be achieved.

I have introduced H. R. 3680 which would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects on human health of smog and all forms of air pollution, and to investigate the most effective means of eliminating smog.

Many parts of the Nation have been severely affected by the deadly and irritating menace of air pollution, and Los Angeles County and other areas in southern California have had this problem for some time.

As further evidence of the dangerous effect of smog, a survey and study by medical experts was conducted recently which I submit herewith together with a letter to me from Francis M. Pottenger, Jr., M. D., chairman of the smog committee of the Los Angeles County Medical Association:

MONROVIA, CALIF., February 9, 1955.

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McDONOUGH: I am sending a copy of the Los Angeles Times of

January 21, 1955, which contains the full report of our committee which was passed by the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association. In reply to your letter, my remarks are in clarification of these resolutions.

First, we feel that air pollution can cause death. It has done so elsewhere, including within the confines of the United States.

Air pollution is a continuing problem. It changes from day to day and locality to locality, depending upon meteorology as well as technological problems that apply in a given area at that particular time. For this reason, in the past, the committee has felt that the study of smog must be to a large degree be based on the study of local factors. It is for that reason that we have felt that the acceptance of standards of toxicity that might be developed in Buffalo, N. Y., although they might deal fundamentally with the same toxicological studies, that the standard permissible in New York City would not necessarily apply to Los Angeles because there may be other pollutants in the Los Angeles atmosphere that might not be present in Buffalo, and the effect of the Los Angeles pollutants might be additive, so that a far lesser concentration of a given component might be lethal or a serious health hazard, while in Buffalo it could be breathed with more or less impunity.

Likewise, we have realized that the pollutants are continually changing. They are changing as technical advances change, both as elimination is carried on and also as new techniques develop. On the other hand, we are convinced that it is essential that the relative toxicity of each major contaminant in the atmosphere be determined at once. That problem would be the same in any city of the United States, and, therefore, could be a problem of Federal Government.

Definite establishment of toxicological standards would provide the enforcement officer with two primary tools of great leverage. First, it would provide him with a knowledge of what material must first be eliminated from the atmosphere, and, secondly, it would provide him with information that would enable him to act in a legal manner should the accumulation of toxic elements reach a level that could be assumed to be approaching a critical health hazard. It is also essential from our point of view that some biological means of determining the general critical level of toxicity of air pollution must be discovered to supplement purely chemical determinations. A homely example of this was the early observation that the poisonous fumes in mines would cause the canary bird to be overcome long before the effect on man was noted. This warned the miners that they must take measures to protect themselves.

As to the effect of your bill on the smog problem, it appears to me that any legislation that will encourage industry to install devices for the elimination of atmospheric pollution, such as a means for tax relief should be encouraged. Likewise, although not included in your bill for the potential sources of atmospheric pollution, especially those that are associated with the wider use of atomic energy, should make it mandatory that industry determine the public health aspects of its pollutants that are new to the arts.

I certainly wish to thank you for your interest in this problem, and the committee will be very happy to receive further information. I will see that your bill is brought to the attention of our committee at its next meeting.

Sincerely,
FRANCIS M. POTTENGER, JR., M. D.,
Chairman, Smog Committee, Los
Angeles County Medical Association.

[From the Los Angeles Times of January 21, 1955]

AIR POLLUTION CAN KILL, MEDIC GROUP CLAIMS

"Air pollution can cause death."

This was the first of a group of 9 motions submitted to the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association by its smog committee and approved by the council, according to the association bulletin.

The smog committee, headed by Dr. Francis M. Pottenger, Jr., of Monrovia, also noted:

2. That air pollution is a continuing dynamic problem in the Los Angeles area.

SAFETY OF HUMANS

3. That the smog committee proposes that biological as well as chemical indices must be determined for the safety of human beings.

4. That the smog committee approves in principle the establishment of chemical standards of air pollution as proposed and begun by the County Board of Supervisors.

5. That the smog committee feels that present chemical standards do not alone safeguard the health of the public.

6. That the tolerance levels of toxicity for human beings of each important contaminant in the atmosphere must be determined both for acute and chronic exposure, both singly and in combination.

REPORT WANTED

7. That the deans of the three medical schools in the area and the California Institute of Technology be requested to prepare a report to the Los Angeles County Medical Association indicating what program each school would propose to determine standards of toxicity of air pollutants, both acute and chronic, and to prepare an estimate of the cost of such a program.

8. That the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association request each section of the association to send its chairman or representative to meet with the smog committee to make plans for a survey of the membership of the section as to the effect of air pollution on human beings.

9. That the council of the Los Angeles County Medical Association request the county board of supervisors to obtain the cooperation of private, city, State and Federal agencies in financing the necessary facilities and salaries for biological research to determine critical standards of air pollution toxicity, utilizing the facilities of all local institutions capable of carrying on such research.

Federal School-Construction Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Federal School-Construction Aid," published in the Lewiston (Maine) Daily Sun of February 23, 1955.

The editorial refers to one of our distinguished colleagues, the junior Senator from Maine (Mr. PAYNE), who was formerly Governor of that State.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION AID

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has opened hearings at Washington

on the administration's Federal school-construction aid bill, and the measure has quickly run into a storm of criticism.

In one way, this is a good thing. It proves what we have long suspected—that most of the proponents of Federal aid to education want an indiscriminate giveaway program of huge size, taking little or no account of the ability-to-pay principle.

There is no question but that the bill now before the committee can be improved. Its sponsors never anticipated it would pass unchallenged. But the principle is sound, it is flexible in its application, it contains no unjustified rewards for rich States perfectly capable of building their needed schools from current revenue or bonds, and it places the initiative for new school construction in the hands of local and State authorities where it belongs.

All these points were made by Senator **FREDERICK G. PAYNE**, of Maine, when he appeared before the committee late last week and courageously supported the White House bill. This fact in itself is significant. The Senator represents one of the poorer States, and he might have been expected to be among those attacking the bill. But Senator **PAYNE** was Governor when the Maine School Building Authority was established, and he knows something about schools. He could point with pride to the fact that Maine was an early pioneer in setting up a school-construction authority, by which municipalities unable to afford schools through lump-sum purchase or bonding may contract with the authority to build a school, lease it over a long-term period, and then acquire ownership.

Now, the authority idea is basic in the President's plan, and although it has worked well in Maine the educationalists and the New Deal Democrats violently oppose it. They ignore the weakest point in a generous giveaway plan of grants—that on a matching basis the poorer States will find themselves unable to benefit. They say nothing about one of the best features of school-building authorities—as it has worked in Maine, at least—that the careful series of steps undertaken cuts out frills and luxuries and keeps costs at a minimum in terms of functional needs.

We do think the loan section of the White House program can be improved by directing the Federal Government to subscribe to school bonds at much lower rates than prescribed in the bill, and this newspaper would not object to a larger fund for direct grants, which the States would have to allocate among those communities unable even to afford the services of the school-building authority.

But we repeat, the bill is sound, and it rests on the admirably firm foundation of the school authority idea. If Maine can make it work, so can others—unfortunately too many educators, too many Members of Congress, and too many States are simply looking for handouts. It is ridiculous to see big cities like New York and Chicago opposing the bill on the ground that since they build schools from current yearly revenues, they won't be eligible. If they are that well off, they don't deserve it.

Extinction of the United States a Matter of Time Says Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, if you have any doubt that Red China does

not mean business, read the following statement from the official Chinese Communist Handbook published for Communist study groups.

After reading it I am confident that all good loyal Americans will agree that we should not appease, compromise, or yield 1 inch to Red China, that we should not be duped into the fallacy and deception of coexistence, and that we should use all of our influence as a great world power to keep Red China out of the United Nations, or withdraw from the United Nations if Red China is admitted over our veto.

EXTINCTION OF UNITED STATES "A MATTER OF TIME"

Official Chinese Communist handbook titled "Fundamental Knowledge on Internationalism," published for Communist study groups:

"Among the nations today obviously exist two antagonistic camps: one is the anti-imperialist camp, that is, the camp of democracy and socialism, with Soviet Russia as its leader; the other is the imperialist camp, that is, the camp of war, anti-democracy and capitalism, with the United States as the leader.

"The reactionary camp led by the United States is day by day showing its inferior position of passivity and isolation. Its extinction—which means the extinction of the entire world capitalism—is only a matter of time. All mankind is on the eve of the total extinction of world capitalism and the total victory of socialism. The animosity and struggle between these two camps are so acute that all races, all nations, and classes cannot avoid being swept into the struggle.

"If people do not stand on this side, then they stand on the other; if they do not join the anti-imperialist camp and help in the struggle for liberation of all the enslaved people and laboring masses in the world or struggle for their own liberation, then they join the imperialist camp and help American imperialism and its running dogs to enslave the peoples of their world or their own people. There is no third path. If somebody thinks a nation can achieve revolutionary victory alone without unity and assistance from the forces of world revolution, [or] after its victorious revolution stay aloof from the animosity between world revolution and counterrevolutionaries, then he is against proletarian internationalism and has fallen into the mire of nationalism."

Watchdog on a Leash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article from *Ammunition*, official magazine for the United Auto Workers, CIO:

WATCHDOG ON A LEASH

Last November the conservative Los Angeles Daily News published a shocking series of articles revealing the widespread contamination of grain and grain products—bread, soda crackers, rice, flour, cornmeal, cereals, and other common household commodities.

This is what the newspaper said:

"There is no guaranty that the bread on your table isn't made from contaminated flour. There may be weevils, rat droppings, or other infestations in it—and maybe you can't see them."

Despite these disclosures, made in a detailed series, conditions have not been improved.

The paper stamped the blame for these shocking facts on Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; on Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson; on Kansas City and Omaha grain dealers, and on "economy-minded" Republican Congressmen who at the last session voted to slash the Food and Drug Administration's budget by \$648,000. That action forced a 25-percent cut in the FDA inspection staff.

It showed up in invisible dirt in your food.

One of the most important and least-known agencies of the Federal Government, the Food and Drug Administration's main job is to enforce the Federal Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

It has the responsibility to protect the consuming public by making certain that foods, drugs, therapeutic devices and cosmetics are pure and wholesome, safe to be used, manufactured under sanitary conditions, and honestly labeled.

The story of the fight to secure enactment of the original Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906 marks a significant victory for consumers over the powerful drug and food manufacturers' lobbies which fought pure food and drug legislation for years with the now familiar slogans of socialism, regimentation, and dangerous regulation of private enterprise.

Despite these widely advertised well-financed attacks, the law was passed. Through the years, it was enforced vigorously. Even in the wildly political administration of Warren G. Harding, the Pure Food and Drug Law was given needed support to make sure its objectives were carried out.

For while the efforts to weaken the law went on, the measure generally was considered as apart from politics. And the attacks were turned aside.

But that apparently no longer is true.

By 1900, food processing was moving away from the family kitchen and into large factories. There, the housewife no longer could control the sanitary conditions under which food was processed and canned.

Shocking exposures of filth, contamination and vermin-infested food were common. Adulteration of food products by dangerous chemical preservatives, use of poisonous dyes, the wholesale production of "cure-all" patent medicines created a public demand for congressional action to protect the health and safety of American consumers.

The 1906 law was revised and modernized in 1938. Since then, it has been strengthened even more through amendments and court decisions. In 1940, administration of the law was transferred from the Agricultural Department to the Federal Security Agency which in 1953 became the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education.

An important 1953 amendment to the law gave FDA inspectors authority to inspect factories and warehouses without first getting permission from the owners. Passage had followed a sideswiping court decision which invited Congress to strengthen this section of the act.

It did. But later, it did an about-face and slashed the FDA budget so heavily that enforcing the section was weakened drastically.

Despite such administrative and legislative ups and downs, the fight against the unscrupulous, the fraudulent and the greedy food processors and manufacturers who exploit and endanger public health is a never-ending struggle.

Occasional newspaper stories—and regular FDA bulletins—report frequent cases in-

involving food found containing rodent droppings, rat hairs, worms, weevils, pieces of bugs, maggots, and other adulterations. Other cases are based on decomposed food, fraudulent mislabeling, and other danger signs for families.

Most of these never are reported in the press. Often they are considered too small or routine for news. More often, however, the threat by processors or manufacturers to keep their advertising out of a newspaper has been reported completely effective in killing such items.

Some authorities recently observed that American consumers are fighting a losing battle against those who endanger our health for the sake of bigger profits. Charles W. Crawford, former FDA Commissioner, for example, estimated the agency would need \$15 million a year to protect the public adequately.

The new Eisenhower budget calls for only \$5,484,000 to finance FDA's vast watchdog program.

FDA's inspection job is vast. This "consumers' FBI" directs the inspection of domestic plants and examinations of interstate shipments of foods and drugs which involve about 96,000 separate manufacturers, shippers, and warehouses. These handle food, drug, and cosmetic products having a retail sale value of about \$60 billion a year.

In 1953's fiscal year, more than 15,400,000 pounds of unfit or contaminated foods were removed from the market. That was more than 148 tons a week.

In one recent month, the agency brought about seizure of 1,422,833 pounds of unfit food in 81 Federal court actions. FDA court actions average about 2,000 a year. Most of these involve seizure to take filthy, spoiled, or harmful products out of the market before they can be consumed in quantity. Less than 2 percent of the cases brought by FDA actually are contested in court.

Weakening this work by slashing FDA's budget, therefore, can only mean filthy foods and adulterated drugs will be bought unknowingly by families in startling quantities.

The apparent increase in contaminated foods in the past year, for example, can be more readily understood by examination of the FDA budget, the size of its inspection staff, and the behind-the-scenes work of the grain lobby during the past 2 years.

The number of FDA field inspectors has dropped, since the Republicans took over, by more than 20 percent—from 249 to a low of 195.

The FDA budget has been chopped down 10 percent during the same period. Result has been in the last year less than 10 percent of the 96,000 establishments actually were inspected.

That means it would take more than 10 years for FDA inspectors to average just one visit to each plant or warehouse.

Cost of the FDA's watchdog enforcement of the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act averages only 3½ cents a year for each person in the United States. That compares unfavorably with the 7-to-8 cents per person appropriated in Canada for similar inspection work.

Each year 12 times as much of the taxpayers' money is spent by the Department of Agriculture just for the inspection of meat and meat products.

The grain lobby's role in weakening the law has been completely obvious. In May 1953, for instance, FDA and the Agriculture Department jointly agreed to set aside temporarily certain enforcement aspects of the inspection of grain shipped by freight.

That prevented inspection of grain shipments for rodent infestation, a program which had been put into effect just a few months before.

Next, an insect infestation inspection program, scheduled to go into effect in July 1953, also, was blocked. Pressure by the Senate Agriculture Committee and the De-

partment of Agriculture was compounded by protests by grain interests against the new inspection program. The protests did not draw any resistance from Secretary Hobby, whose Department, which includes FDA, had just been raised to Cabinet status, the month before.

Reporting all this, the Wall Street Journal said the action shunting aside the inspection program was apparently taken on the demands of the grain industry.

In an obviously political move aimed at placating those angered by their action, Secretaries Hobby and Benson then appointed a special committee to study the grain inspection-enforcement program. Their report, completed early this year, failed to recommend that the inspection program be brought back.

Thus, for more than a year and a half now, the people have been denied the protection (to which they are entitled under the law) against filthy, rodent-infested, contaminated grain going into the food products they eat every day.

Despite the committee's weak report, FDA has acted to resume the random sampling of carloads of grain. But there again is fresh evidence that the grain lobby is hard at work in Washington once more to cripple strict enforcement of the law.

Senator MILTON YOUNG, Republican, North Dakota, has introduced a bill which would strip FDA of its grain inspection authority and transfer it to the Agriculture Department.

The alarming increase in contamination recently prompted the Eisenhower administration to request an additional \$284,000 for strengthening the field inspection program. But that—which only partly remedies the original crippling slash—is just a small fraction of the amount actually needed.

And instead of requesting sufficient funds, based on obvious needs, Secretary Hobby has appointed another study group to look into the adequacy of enforcement of the Federal pure food and drug law. Should this study take as long as others made by administration agencies, its report will not be made until after the next election.

Consumers, therefore, must look to Congress for their only possible protection. Yet chances for action to improve and strengthen FDA in this session are uncertain.

Legislation tightening up FDA's enforcement power in such areas as chemical additives in food and cosmetics, mislabeling and misbranding of food products, adulteration, and the dangers from residues of pesticide chemicals no doubt will be reintroduced this year.

But unless the Senate and House appropriations committees act favorably to increase the FDA budget well beyond the inadequate Eisenhower recommendations of \$5,484,000, the watchdog enforcement program of the pure food and drug laws will be on a dangerously short leash.

And that would endanger everyone's health and safety.

Special Postage Stamp in Honor of the Late Charles Russell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the late Charles Marion Russell, of Montana, was one of America's outstanding artists.

In recognition of this distinguished Montanan, our legislative assembly asks in the following joint memorial that a postage stamp be issued in his honor:

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Orvin Fjare and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Representatives from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable Postmaster General; relating to issuance of a stamp commemorating Charles M. Russell

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas the western frontier has developed a large portion of the American heritage, a heritage that will live ever in the spirit of our National and State endeavor; and

Whereas the rugged conditions of the West produced a scene in the passage of history that will never be duplicated; and

Whereas Charles M. Russell has preserved for posterity in works of art unsurpassed in character and insight and has, as the passage of time will more fully indicate, designed a monumental guide to which the American people may always refer, to ever keep the thoughts drawn upon the ideals our frontiersmen and cowboys sought to carve out of a wilderness; and

Whereas these principles are now more than ever needed before the public eye, and it is the desire of the people of Montana and those that appreciate his significance, that a stamp dedicated to Charles M. Russell be issued by the Postmaster General of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 34th Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully urge that the Senators and Representatives from Montana to the Congress of the United States, and the Honorable Postmaster General take appropriate action to issue a stamp commemorating the genius Charles M. Russell; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the chief clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable Orvin Fjare and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Representatives from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable Postmaster General of the United States.

LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House,
GEO. M. GROSMAN,
President of the Senate.

Prior to receipt of the above memorial, the senior Senator from Montana—Senator MURRAY—the junior Senator from Montana—Senator MANSFIELD—and I had introduced companion bills (S. 862 and H. R. 4373) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the late Charles Russell.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Transfer of Soil Conservation Technical Assistance From the Federal Government to the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in its issue of November 14, 1954, the Washington Post carried a story in which Mr. Aubrey Graves reported that a committee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations had recommended the transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance from the Federal Government to the various States.

Mr. Graves' story follows:

SOIL PROGRAM SHIFT TO STATES IS PROPOSED—
STUDY COMMITTEE URGES ABOLISHING FEDERAL CONTROL

(By Aubrey Graves)

The transfer of the function of soil conservation technical assistance from the Federal Government to the various States has been recommended by the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture.

The recommendations, concurred in by 9 of the 10 committeemen, are contained in a report filed with Meyer Kestnbaum, chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, last September 30.

The latter group, which will report eventually to President Eisenhower, has not yet accepted or rejected the committee's proposals.

The committee was established to examine the interrelationships among different levels of Government in the conduct of governmentally aided, sponsored or directed programs in the field of agriculture.

It was directed to formulate recommended legislation "to bring about a proper allocation of functions as between the Federal Government on the one hand and the States and their political subdivisions on the other."

The Committee has also recommended that the agricultural-conservation program service, which gives financial help to farmers cooperating in soil-conservation practices, be likewise shifted to State administration and control.

The recommended transfers of authority away from the Federal Government are certain to ring vigorous protests from conservation leaders who futilely fought Agriculture Secretary Benson's reorganization of the Federal Soil Conservation Service.

In that shakeup the seven Federal regional offices were abolished and their duties and most of their personnel transferred to State offices.

Hugh H. Bennett, founder and former chief of the Soil Conservation Service, declared at that time that the shift "cuts the heart out of soil conservation . . . It means watering down a carefully built organization of skilled technical men and dispersing them to . . . State offices or the winds."

Benson replied that in the State offices most of the highly trained scientists and technicians would continue to do exactly what they did before, and that the move would serve farmers better and more economically.

The moves now recommended by the committee would be vastly more far reaching and will be even more bitterly fought.

If they are carried out, soil conservation will be retained at the national level only to furnish national leadership, to coordinate grants-in-aid programs, to carry out the responsibilities of the Department of Agriculture with respect to a few authorized watershed projects, and to work with other Federal agencies on river-basin development and flood-prevention activities.

The individual farmer who wants help in building a farm pond or a field terrace would deal with his local government.

Soil conservation is currently federally operated, federally manned and practically 100 percent federally financed. In fiscal 1954 the Federal appropriation for assistance to conservation districts totals \$56,600,000, most of which is being used to pay Federal technicians.

STATE APPROPRIATIONS SMALL

As of October 1953 State appropriations specifically available for soil-conservation programs during 1 year were about \$2,100,000.

This means the Federal Government is now putting up about \$14 for every State dollar spent in conserving the soil. This compares to 5 State dollars currently being put up for every Federal dollar contributed to agricultural research activities.

Approximately 12,000 permanent Federal employees are now carrying out soil-and-water conservation work: 385 in the national office; 500 in State offices; 700 in area offices; and more than 10,000 in 3,000 local work unit offices located for the most part in county seats. Employees at the local work unit level are the ones who render on-site assistance to individual farm or ranch operators.

The committee, in making its report, conceded that strong Federal action was needed at first (beginning in 1937) to focus national attention upon the necessity of arresting further depletion of an all-important natural resource—the soil.

"Quite likely this could not have been done without national direction, a well-planned national campaign and highly skilled technicians," it says. "However, these arguments are no longer valid, primarily because the importance of soil conservation is now recognized everywhere."

OPPOSITION ANTICIPATED

The committee report anticipates that opponents of its plan will argue that if Federal funds now being used for soil conservation are parceled out to the States, the result will be 48 different programs, some good, some bad, and the majority probably indifferent.

It expects objectors to point out that the States turned in a very poor showing on soil conservation efforts prior to the entry of the Federal Government in this field, and that State administration of the program might become susceptible to undesirable State political influences.

It also anticipates the argument that many Federal civil servants whom the Federal Government has trained at a cost of

millions of dollars may be unwilling to work for State governments, both because of the lower prestige attached to such employment and the lower salaries that might result.

There will be fear expressed, the committee concedes, that the corps of technicians built up over the years will be dispersed.

In answer to these arguments, the committee "emphasizes the blunt fact that the Federal Government is presently engaged in a direct educational program in soil conservation and there is no basis for viewing the function of agricultural extension and that of agricultural research as primarily State functions and, on the other hand, treating soil conservation technical assistance as a wholly national function."

The committee recommended spreading the transition of the technicians to State control over a 5-year period. During the first year it proposes that States receive 100 percent Federal grants.

In the second year, it suggests "an adjusted matching arrangement" between Federal Government and the States, and during the third and fourth years a shift over to an equalizing grant basis. Federal funds would be allocated on a formula giving weight to such factors as area and type of farmland farm population and per capita income.

The States during this period might put up from one-third to two-thirds of the cost, "depending upon States' fiscal capacity as measured by State per capita income."

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Members of the Committee are: R. I. Nowell, of New York, chairman, vice president in charge of farm mortgage department, Equitable Life Associations Society; Edward J. Condon, vice president, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago; Dr. Frederick Lawson Hovde, Lafayette, Ind., president of Purdue University and president of the Association of Land Grant Colleges; Phillip F. Aylesworth, United States Department of Agriculture; Judge Fred B. Glass, president, National Association of County Officials; W. C. Jacobsen, Director of Agriculture, State of California; John A. Logan, Washington, D. C., president, National Association of Food Chains; Herschel D. Newsom, master of the National Grange; Robert A. Rowan, chairman, R. A. Rowan & Co., Los Angeles, and Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel, Republican of Kansas, a member of the President's Committee on Intergovernmental Relations.

Newsom is the member who dissented from the committee's recommendations concerning the Soil Conservation Service.

The Wildlife Management Institute took note of this recommendation. The following appeared in the November 26, 1954, issue of the institute's biweekly Outdoor News Bulletin:

SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM TOO SUCCESSFUL
FOR ITS OWN GOOD

Despite the denials of agricultural leaders, evidence keeps mounting that vigorous efforts are being made to scuttle the highly successful soil conservation program of the United States Soil Conservation Service, according to the Wildlife Management Institute. James G. Patton, national president of the Farmers' Union, was quoted recently in the New York Times as saying that "the Eisenhower administration was preparing to dismantle the Federal soil conservation pro-

gram and shift responsibility for soil conservation to State governments."

Mr. Patton was referring to a report of the committee on Federal aid to agriculture to its parent Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. This report, which is awaiting action by the Commission, proposes that with the exception of a small administrative staff, the SCS be dismantled and its soil scientists and technicians be assigned to State land-grant colleges.

"If this reorganization is permitted to go into effect," Patton said, "it will set our soil conservation work back by 20 years." The Commission is scheduled to make its full report to the President by March 1, 1955.

According to Wayne Darrow's Washington Farm Letter of October 30, 1954, the shift would be done over a 5-year period, with SCS personnel transferred at once and 100-percent Federal grants-in-aid available the first year. It is planned that the States ultimately would share some of the expenses, but even after the Federal program is discontinued, the United States participation still would be anywhere up to two-thirds of the cost of the programs.

The committee that made these recommendations consists of R. I. Nowell, Equitable Life of New York, chairman; E. J. Condon, Sears, Roebuck Co.; President F. L. Hovde, Purdue University; Phil Aylesworth, United States Department of Agriculture; Fred Glass, National Association of County Officials; John Logan, National Association of Food Chains; Herschel Newsom, the National Grange; Robert A. Rowan, Los Angeles; and Senator Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas. Mr. Newsom is reported to have dissented to the plan for shifting the soil conservation work to the land-grant colleges.

At its annual business meeting in Butte on November 30 and December 1, 1954, the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the soil conservation research program being conducted cooperatively by the Agricultural Research Service and the land-grant colleges is of vital importance in developing best possible soil conservation measures and sound land-use practices; and

Whereas funds are inadequate to carry out the research program urgently needed to answer current soil and water conservation problems; and

Whereas new investigations are needed to study means of increasing the efficiency of moisture use and reducing erosion in dry land and range farming areas and to solve drainage, irrigation, and soil-management problems in river-valley areas so as to maintain agricultural production and preserve our soil resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts assembled in Butte this first day of December 1954, go on record as supporting research on problems pertaining to soil and water conservation. These problems are being worked on cooperatively by the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station at Bozeman, Havre, Huntley, Moccasin, and Sidney. To meet the need, Montana could use effectively \$80,000 more annually; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of our Montana delegation in Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D. C., and the Chief of the Soil and Water Conservation Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Beltsville, Md., the Director of the Montana Agricul-

tural Experiment Station, Bozeman, Mont., and appropriate committees in the State legislative bodies.

On January 24, our colleague from Texas, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT, called our attention to the proposal in these words:

One of the finest activities of our entire Government, Mr. Speaker, and one which I am convinced is absolutely essential to our ultimate survival as a nation, is in jeopardy of being destroyed.

A subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has officially recommended that the field activities of our Federal soil-conservation program be discontinued.

The panel proposes that the responsibility for sending these trained field technicians out to the grassroots, at the forks of the creek, where they can actually help the American farmer save our soil, be simply turned over to the various States to accept or ignore as they may individually see fit. I find it difficult to conceive of a more costly or a more disastrous move.

Montana's House of Representatives also urged that Congress "reject the proposal of the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to dismantle the Soil Conservation Service and turn its functions over to the States." Here is House Memorial No. 2:

Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, urging that the Congress reject the proposal of the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to dismantle the Soil Conservation Service and turn its functions over to the States

Whereas the Federal Soil Conservation Service, working with soil-conservation districts, has been outstandingly successful in serving the soil-conservation districts of America; and

Whereas the subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has recommended that this program be relegated to the various States with a progressively decreasing grant-in-aid status; and

Whereas the present corps of SCS technicians would be gradually shifted to the status of State employees; and

Whereas the idea is financially impracticable because a number of the States, including Montana, have, in the past, been unable to make sufficient appropriations to meet their obligations on other similar grant-in-aid programs such as Federal highways and other worthwhile projects; and

Whereas a good program must be based and dependent on well-trained and educated personnel who can be assured of the security and permanence that only the civil-service status could provide; and

Whereas a high standard of achievement is unlikely of achievement in all 48 States under separate programs; and

Whereas under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, this undesirable shift in soil conservation service responsibility will automatically go into effect after its approval by the Federal Commission unless rejected by the Congress within 60 days; and

Whereas the benefits of a nationally administered program of soil conservation accrue to all the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, now in session, hereby most urgently request the Congress of the United States to reject the aforesaid reorganization plan, and retain the soil conservation as a Federal service in substantially its present form, with responsibility for carrying forward the programs developed by the locally administered soil conservation districts; and, be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Montana be hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this memorial to the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from the State of Montana, and to the Honorable LEE METCALF and ORVIN FJARE, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana.

LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

With this file before me, I called the office of the Commission, seeking information. I was told that while there was a leak by a member, the Commission has issued no report, has not made a recommendation to the President, and is not expected to do so until May at the earliest.

I understand that the Commission is meeting this weekend on the recommendation. Knowing the personnel of the committee, I venture the prediction that when the report is published it will show the fears expressed above to be well grounded. We might as well get ready to fight this out on the floor of the House.

The Need for the Bricker Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, that great patriotic organization, the American Legion Auxiliary, has been alerted to the dangerous loophole that exists in the Constitution relating to treaties and executive agreements.

In a forceful article appearing in the American Legion Auxiliary National News, Mrs. Luther D. Johnson, of Valley, Nebr., chairman of the national legislative committee, points out that treaty law can override the Constitution. Her authority is no less a distinguished person than the present Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting Mrs. Johnson's article:

THE NEED FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT (By Lucile Johnson)

Our Constitution has a dangerous loophole. The loophole has been described as follows:

"The treaty-making power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse. Treaties . . . are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, . . . can cut across the rights given the people by their constitutional Bill of Rights." (Address by

Hon. John Foster Dulles before a regional meeting of the American Bar Association, Louisville, Ky., April 11, 1952.)

The framers of the Constitution intended to close every avenue to tyranny. They never dreamed that constitutional rights could be undermined by treaties and executive agreements. Thomas Jefferson pointed out that if the treaty power is unlimited, "then we have no Constitution."

Beginning in 1920, however, a line of Supreme Court decisions removed treaties and executive agreements from effective constitutional control. The loophole opened up by these decisions has assumed alarming proportions.

Scores of United Nations treaties in various stages of preparation would, if ratified by the United States, permit freedom of speech, press, religion, and other fundamental rights to be denied by executive decree. One treaty proposed by the U. N. would permit Americans to be tried abroad by an international court without a jury and perhaps in secret. Already, under the terms of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, American servicemen are being tried by foreign courts under alien law. They are denied the constitutional protections which govern trials in our own military service courts.

Many advocates of world government and Atlantic Union would use the treaty power to achieve those ends.

The American Legion, along with the American Bar Association and many other national organizations, favors a constitutional amendment to protect personal rights and national sovereignty against abuse of the treaty power. The Bricker amendment, re-introduced in the 84th Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 1, would prevent such abuse. It would:

1. Prevent any treaty or executive agreement in conflict with the Constitution from having any force or effect; and
2. Prevent any treaty or executive agreement from becoming domestic law except through valid legislation.

All members of the American Legion Auxiliary should study the vital issues raised by the Bricker amendment. You should then express your views to your Senators and Congressmen.

For additional information on the Bricker amendment, write to Mr. Beurt SerVaas, director of national foreign relations commission, the American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

Industrial Advantages of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I insert in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. George Bell Timmerman, Jr., Governor of South Carolina, before a group of business and industrial leaders in New York City. The address follows:

In South Carolina there is an atmosphere filled with optimism for the future. In the belief and with the sincere hope that many of you will share in that future, I want to emphasize some of the advantages of South Carolina.

PEOPLE

Our people are our greatest asset. Ninety-nine and six-tenths percent of them are native-born Americans. That is a higher per-

centage than in any other State. They think alike and act alike. They are predictable.

South Carolinians are fundamentally conservative—in their family life, their religion, and their government.

They are staunch individuals. Their concept of freedom is basic. It rejects controlled-group ideologies. It abhors outside intermeddlers. It questions the sincerity of those who come professing to see meats in the eyes of others, while evidencing ignorance of the beam so apparent in their own.

To fully appreciate the competence of the South Carolina industrial worker of today, one needs to understand his background.

(a) Attitude

Prior to 1860, South Carolina was the third richest State in the Nation. At the end of the war of that time it was the poorest. The only material values that remained were its natural resources, a favorable climate, and the unconquerable courage of its people. They were determined to hold on to their State and to rebuild it in the face of almost insurmountable difficulties. This required a spirit that can sustain a man in toil from sunup to sundown without regard for time. Hard work engaged all of our people.

Our farmers often had to improvise. When needed equipment was not available, they made their own tools. When modern machinery was available, they learned to operate that machinery and learned to repair it.

Rebuilding required planning and material development without the aid of a Marshall plan. It required the stamina and ingenuity of men and women who could take the ashes of destruction and rebuild their State with their own hands and their own resources. They accomplished this while laboring under the yoke of punitive regulations imposed upon them by unrepresentative government.

Their efforts have made South Carolina today a land of rich opportunity. Its present foretells even greater development for the future. That achievement, no amount of misreport can destroy.

This experience, passing as it did from a ravished economy to the present day of unfolding opportunity, has enriched the character of our people. It has developed, as no other experience could, their basic respect for property and for the rights of others. That respect is engrained in them. They know the value of production. They had to produce in order to rebuild. The variety of their heritage provides a tolerance that lends itself to harmony and unity. They know the value of the rights of others.

It was this same spirit that enabled their forebears to fashion a wilderness into the third richest State in the Nation. It was this same spirit that enabled you and others like you to assume the heavy responsibilities of conduction successfully your large enterprises.

(b) Quantity

In many respects our modern South Carolina farmer is an industrialist. Basically, his problems are like your own. He must plan for the operation of his farm as you must plan for the operation of your industry. He must determine what crops to plant and when and where to plant them, as you must determine your products and when and where to produce them. He must make plans to market what he produces as you must market what you produce. He has problems of financing as you have problems of financing. The successful management of his farm involves the doing of all those things that make for the operation of any successful business. The stability of government is essential to his intelligent planning as it is essential to enable you to plan intelligently.

I am not trying to tell you that the farmer of South Carolina is capable of operating your industrial plant. I do tell you that, with his knowledge and experience, and with his basic characteristics, you need him because he can do a better job for you than many that you may find in other localities.

Industrialists who have come to South Carolina will tell you that our people quickly learn industrial occupations and that their productivity is 20 to 50 percent above that of workers doing similar jobs in other sections of the Nation.

In South Carolina there is no shortage of those with this background and this competence. For every 100 farmers who die or retire in South Carolina there are 214 young men to take their places. This increase is among the highest in the Nation.

Moreover, thousands of skilled employees with the same basic characteristics are being made available for industrial employment in our State through modernization of existing plants.

It was the productive capacity and attitude of the South Carolina worker that played a large part, I am sure, in enabling many of you here tonight to build a profitable textile empire in our State, free of the interruptions and upheavals which have beset your counterparts in other sections.

(c) Dependability

The dependability of South Carolina employees is shown by our low unemployment compensation rates. The experience rates range from twenty-five one hundredths of a percent to 2.35 percent with the largest portion of taxable payrolls in a recent year having an average of less than 1 percent. The unemployment compensation fund has been so administered that there is now on deposit with the Federal Government enough funds to pay the majority of our covered employees maximum benefits for the maximum length of time eligible.

GOVERNMENT

Basic South Carolina conservatism finds its best expression in sound, efficient government, which has been firmly established for many years.

(a) Constitution and taxes

Our constitution prohibits me as Governor from signing a budget bill that is out of balance.

We have a sound tax structure, founded on a broad base, well distributed among various sources of revenue. Corporate taxes account for approximately 10 percent of the total. Our fiscal affairs have been so managed that some taxes have been eliminated. We have no tax on intangibles. We have no State tax on real property. We have reduced the franchise tax from 3 mills to 1 mill, and have equalized this tax with respect to foreign corporations doing business in South Carolina. Our sales tax exempts purchases of raw materials, machinery, machine repair parts and any item used to make or produce a finished product. Our tax system is universally acceptable.

Assessments on industrial plants are made by our State Tax Commission. This insures uniform assessment regardless of plant location.

Plant assessments do not exceed 16.8 percent of the actual cost of the plant. The value of grading, landscaping, air conditioning, or other expenditures which add to the comfort of employees are not assessed.

(b) Appropriations

In our 1953-54 budget, highways and schools account for more than 60 percent of expenditures, all paid for by consumer taxes.

Construction and maintenance of our highway system, one of the Nation's best, is paid for by our gasoline tax, which can be used for no other purpose. Our school-

building program is paid for by our retail sales tax, which can be used for no other purpose.

Other sources of revenue contribute to our general fund and are allocated to specific needs.

(c) Turnover

Turnover in all departments of our Government is small. When I became Governor, there was scarcely a ripple among departments whose officers and personnel continued to function as before.

The only new appointments made to the Tax Commission within the past 40 years have been to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation.

(d) Cooperation

All of our agencies are available to industry upon call. This spirit of cooperation exists in every department. It exists also in the general assembly. Its leaders are in the forefront in our effort to develop the State industrially.

(e) Development board

To assist industry, South Carolina has a development board with a technically trained staff ready to work in confidence. Factual information acceptable by leading engineering firms throughout the country has been assembled and is available on request.

(f) Survey

Our State employment service has made surveys of labor available in any section. This service is also prepared to give dexterity tests and test batteries in order that plants may obtain the best available labor for their respective operations.

(g) Schools

The courage and realism of South Carolinians in public affairs is revealed in the manner in which we are meeting our school problems. For years every State has known that it must modernize its public schools. Four years ago we determined that we could afford such a program. We are building a school system equal to any in the Nation.

Our schools for Negroes are superior to any in the Nation.

Our school planning is projected into the future. As we modernize, we build for future needs.

By sound planning and sound financing South Carolina has already accomplished an educational revolution, while other States continue to face a crisis. The critical school situation in other States has been recognized by the President of the United States. He has advocated a \$7 billion program in an effort to correct the lack of school facilities. We are 4 years ahead of that program despite the fact our State ranks only 45th in the Nation in per capita income. Our financial condition is so sound that we could not qualify for Federal aid under the school program proposed by the President. This educational accomplishment was attained without levying a single corporate tax and without endangering our State's double-A credit rating.

Expansion of facilities in higher education is proceeding in a comparable way, especially in technical fields. South Carolina has the highest percentage of white college graduates of any State in the Nation. This means a continuing supply of educated personnel for management. Our States supported colleges have graduated more than 3,600 engineering students. Our engineering courses are attracting more students each year. We now have more than 750 students enrolled in electrical engineering and more than 500 in mechanical engineering.

Sixteen colleges in South Carolina are undertaking long-range intercampus programs designed to improve their curricula to fit our young people for responsible jobs in industry.

Some 5,000 of our Negro youth are currently enrolled in institutions of higher education in South Carolina, and this number is increasing each year.

NATURAL RESOURCES

(a) Water

South Carolina has an abundance of water for industrial purposes. There are four large drainage basins embracing our State, a 3d of North Carolina, and a 10th of Georgia. The Pee Dee River drainage area is the second largest on the Atlantic coast. The Santee River drainage basin is the third largest. The Savannah and Edisto Basins have high rankings. Together these rivers drain an area of more than 45,000 square miles. The result is adequate water for industry in South Carolina.

(b) Bushy Park

Near Charleston there is a development known as Bushy Park. This development alone will provide a minimum of 1½ billion gallons of fresh water each day for industrial purposes, with a potential of 10 billion gallons every 24 hours. By comparison, your great city of New York consumes only a billion gallons a day.

In addition to its water supply, Bushy Park has 4,400 acres available as industrial sites, served by highways, railroads, and ocean-going ships. When that is utilized, there is a 10-square mile area which can be made available immediately for industry.

(c) Ground water

In ground water South Carolina is fortunate in amounts and in purity. In many areas the ground water is of such excellent quality that no treatment is required for industrial purposes.

Through a scientifically managed water pollution program, industry can be assured that its plans may be confidently laid without fear that future regulations may upset them.

Continuing studies assure a source of data readily available on any water site in the State.

(d) Electric power

Three major electric power companies and two major public power projects serve South Carolina. Their generating facilities provide adequate service and guarantee ample capacity for future growth. These facilities have a history of expansion. All have been geared to our industrial future.

Commercial and industrial power rates in our State are considerably below the national average. The actual figures are 1.795 cents a kilowatt hour for the United States and only 1.280 cents for South Carolina.

(e) Fuel

Our fuel situation is excellent. Coal is readily available from the bituminous fields of District 8. Fuel oil is brought in through pipeline outlets and by tanker at the Port of Charleston. The Transcontinental Natural Gas pipeline crosses the State and the Southern Natural Gas Co. lines also supply us.

(f) Communications

Our telephone and communications systems have matched the pace of industry since World War II so adequately that we have led the Nation's telephone rate of growth by a substantial margin.

(g) Forests and transportation

Our forests—covering 62 percent of the land area—offer numerous opportunities to industry.

Our paved highways reach every hamlet with roads second to none in the Nation.

Charleston, the fastest growing port in the Southeast, offers favorable rates to industrial centers and the great markets of the world. Ports at Georgetown and Beaufort have excellent harbors available for tremendous development.

More than 400 truck lines serve South Carolina.

Sixteen railroad companies serve to give the State one of the highest rail densities

in the South. There are airports near at hand, all served by major airlines.

(h) Markets

South Carolina is centrally located with respect to the world's fastest growing markets. Our State is nearer to 87 percent of the Nation than is the city of New York. Many of our new plants have been built to take advantage of these markets. Many others will come.

In less than a year an acquaintance of mine has purchased 18 bottles to feed one baby. These bottles cost him 40 cents apiece.

Last year about 210,000 babies were born in South Carolina. Some of those babies will not get 18 bottles apiece. But each year, as per capita income rises, more families will buy more milk bottles for more babies. If each baby averages only 6 bottles, that would amount to 1,260,000 milk bottles. At 40 cents each, it would mean gross retail sales in excess of a half million dollars. From South Carolina, in the heart of the Southeast, markets several times as large could be served easily by any manufacturer.

The bottles my friend purchased were manufactured more than 700 miles from South Carolina.

One day, someone will take advantage of this growing opportunity where he can anticipate a multimillion dollar market.

Our markets are not limited to milk bottles for babies. They exist for practically all consumer goods.

INDUSTRY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The record shows what is happening to industry that comes to South Carolina.

A manufacturer of world-famous women's hosiery established a plant in South Carolina. Within 3 years he had 5 plants in the State—one quarter of his total world-wide investment. Today he is further expanding in South Carolina.

A cement plant was designed for an 800,000 barrel capacity. Within a few years it was increased to 2 million barrels.

A giant fiberglass plant went into production only 8 months after ground was broken. Extensions are now being added.

A tufted-carpeting manufacturer is planning to double and possibly triple his operations. The first carpet came off the line only 6 months ago.

A famous maker of women's clothing established his first South Carolina plant in 1944. He now has a chain of six.

The great Deering-Milliken and J. P. Stevens Cos. each have more than 20 plants in the State. The vast majority of their postwar expansions have been in South Carolina.

We are also proud that our own Springs Mills, Greenwood, McKissick, Abney, Textron, Woodside and many other great names in industry have done all of their expansion in our State.

WHAT SOUTH CAROLINA WANTS

South Carolina needs and wants new industry. We believe that the surest way to expand our ability to finance the things that are beneficial is to provide new revenue without additional taxation by raising the income of our people.

We believe that new industry and new payrolls are the best means of increasing our per capita income. Each new payroll not only provides more revenue for services rendered by the State, but enables our people to raise their standard of living. It raises the standard of the necessities—housing, food, clothing, and medical care. It enables our people to purchase more items which add to the pleasure and comfort of living in this modern age.

Our people and our Government reject the philosophy of tax and tax, spend and spend. We want a sound prosperity. We want to increase that prosperity on a broad base.

I have told you of our people and our Government. In the final analysis it is the character of a people which makes their Government and its leaders what they are. It is this character which makes us reject the static thinking of the right and the erratic thinking of the left. It is this character that guides us as we study and plan for the future.

South Carolina has no interest in unsound industry. We do not want industry which seeks to exploit our labor or our natural resources.

South Carolina wants industry that will join us in planning for the future—industry that is sound in its thinking as our people are sound in their thinking. South Carolina wants industry which will grow and develop with us.

Our people and our government are pledged to fair treatment and sound planning. From our future industrial citizens we ask as much.

Review of Civil Air Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill containing a number of amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. In its examination of this bill, along with other amendments of the act which may be proposed by others, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will conduct a review of the civil air policy of the United States.

Through the years this committee has been responsible for developing and presenting in legislative form the present civil air policy, both as it relates to purely domestic operations and as it affects the operations of our aircraft abroad and foreign aircraft to this country. This committee wrote and recommended to the House the legislation which became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the basic statute under which civil aviation operates today. The committee is proud of that statute. Under it, civil aviation has made the magnificent progress with which all of us are familiar—progress which permits us to say that we maintain, under the American flag, the finest air transport system in the world, both at home and abroad.

During the years since 1938 there have been few changes in the Civil Aeronautics Act. The problems of civil aviation have been adequately dealt with, notwithstanding the vast changes which have come about in those 17 years. However, the time has come when it is necessary to review that statute to determine whether some changes need to be made in order to make it a more effective instrument for the continued development and regulation of this great industry.

The bill which I have just introduced will serve as the basis on which this inquiry will be made. In it I have sought to present the major legislative issues which are under discussion at this time.

However, if there are other issues which the Members of this body feel should be reviewed as they affect civil aviation, I hope they will be promptly presented to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in order that they may be resolved.

My bill provides for the regulation of contract carriers by air. At the present time these carriers are not subject to economic regulation under the Civil Aeronautics Act. The bill would impose limited economic regulation upon them along the lines presently prescribed for contract motor carriers and contract water carriers. Since contract carriers compete with both scheduled and non-scheduled carriers by air for the best traffic available, the regulation of contract carriers is designed, among other things, to prevent discrimination in regulation. Your committee will expect to call upon its knowledge of civil aviation, as well as its experience in regulating other forms of transportation, in determining whether contract carrier regulation is necessary, and if so, the manner in which this regulation should be carried out.

My bill also includes provisions which more clearly define the relationship between the State and Federal Governments in the regulation of civil aviation, both safety and economic. Unfortunately, in the past few years there has been quite a bit of litigation in which it has been sought to draw the line under the existing law between the jurisdiction of State and Federal Governments in aviation regulation. Here again the committee will call upon its experience in dealing with other forms of transportation, as well as on its knowledge of the special characteristics of aviation, in working out this particular problem.

My bill also deals with the problem of the proper regulation of nonscheduled air carriers. Some years ago the Civil Aeronautics Board issued certain exemptions from regulation for the benefit of carriers conducting nonscheduled or, as we call them in the motor-carrier field, irregular route operations. Ever since that time the Board has expended great efforts in seeking to enforce its regulation which restricts these carriers to nonscheduled operations. While most of the carriers who are beneficiaries of the Board's exemption successfully conduct operations within the regulation, a few have sought to conduct elaborate scheduled operations between major cities in the country. The Board's efforts to enforce its regulation have resulted in violent controversy, some indications of it having appeared in statements on the floor of the House. Members have been concerned by reason of the charges made by some of the nonscheduled lines that a monopoly exists in air transportation, to the detriment of the sound development of air transportation. Similarly, members have been concerned by reason of the countercharges that the Civil Aeronautics Act is being subjected to wholesale violations. These fears, of which Members of this body have spoken, must be inquired into by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. The facts must be ascer-

tained, and if legislative remedies are necessary, they must be recommended to the House by your committee. This will be done.

My bill provides for the extension to international operations of the Board's present powers to regulate cargo and passenger rates. At the present time the Board's powers to regulate international rates are very limited. A number of times the Board has recommended that its ratemaking powers be extended in the way provided for in my bill. This is a controversial subject. Your committee studied this same question very carefully prior to recommending legislation which became the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. At that time the committee rejected the proposal for complete rate regulation in the international field, because it was fearful that this would cause retaliation and place the carriers in such an inflexible position that they would not be able to compete effectively with their foreign competitors. Times have changed greatly since that decision was made. The committee should explore the controversy and settle this question as to the scope of the Board's rate regulation.

In reviewing this proposed legislation I have touched upon only the major issues with which the bill deals. Many significant, though less important, changes appear in the bill and will be subjected to review. My reason for making this lengthy statement upon the introduction of this bill is to inform the Members of the House that this review of civil aviation policy is to be conducted by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Thus the members will be afforded an opportunity to inform the committee of any problems affecting civil aviation which are giving them concern. Based upon its knowledge not only of civil aviation, but related fields of transportation, the committee will then consider these problems and make a report to the House, accompanied by such legislation as seems required to meet the problems presented.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, Governor of the State of Maryland, to the congregation of Temple Oheb Shalom, Baltimore, Md., during the annual observance of Brotherhood Week.

The address follows:

ADDRESS OF GOV. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, TEMPLE OHEB SHALOM BROTHERHOOD MEETING, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1955

Brotherhood is a theme on which men can write and have written variations in endless numbers, ranging from the highest realms of thought to the lowest levels of expediency.

Consider them in descending order: brotherhood is part of the law of God; brotherhood is the highest of human ideals; brotherhood is the mortar with which we build civilization; brotherhood is the best security of man in a hostile world—brotherhood is a paying proposition.

I propose today to offer you still another variation, without saying whether it is high in the scale of values, or the lowest of all. That depends upon the point of view. But, high or low, it is as profoundly true as any; and I put it in a phrase borrowed from a former President of the United States. It is this: brotherhood is a condition and not a theory.

To illustrate my point I do not need to quote the Bible, nor any other ancient book that men have regarded as Holy Writ. I call your attention instead to the newspapers of this very month in which we are living, the month of February 1955.

You have all read in your newspapers the accounts of what follows the detonation of such a hydrogen bomb as we set off on a remote Pacific island. It was, the scientists tell us, by no means the most powerful bomb that can be made; we know the formulas for the construction of others much more destructive than this one, and there is no apparent reason why we cannot produce them whenever we choose to do so.

Yet after this bomb of relatively moderate size exploded, for 10 miles up the wind and for 190 miles down the wind, that is, for a total distance of 200 miles, invisible death rained from the skies for the next 2 days. It was a visitation more merciless than the fire and brimstone that the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah, for that at least was swift; the cities of the plain were wiped out almost instantaneously. But this man-created horror does not strike like a thunderbolt; it sets up within the victim's body an invisible and unquenchable fire that consumes him by slow degrees through weeks and months of increasing agony.

Under that soft and gentle sifting down of pain and death, do you think it matters in the least what is the color of a man's skin, or how blue is his blood, or which of our countless creeds he holds to be true religion? Whether they cry to Jehovah, or to Allah, or to Christ the King, it is all one. Whatever they may have been before, they are brothers in their agony, brothers when merciful death has brought their only possible release.

This, I repeat for emphasis, is a condition and not a theory. We cannot alter it in any way. We can deny it, but our denial will be "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." We all stand in the same peril, all under the same condemnation, and the way of escape is escape for all or for none. War is the last, most insolent denial of human brotherhood, and continued war plainly threatens the existence of the race.

If, then, we are brothers in the last extremity, who will have the hardihood to assert that the relation begins only in the shadow of death? And if the relation exists from the beginning, how can we escape the conclusion that the organized slaughter of human beings, whatever name we give it, is in the final analysis fratricide?

It is our custom to brush this somber fact aside with the argument that war has existed since before the dawn of history, that war is a condition of human life in this world, and that it is a distortion of logic to equate it with the individual crime of murder.

It is true that war has always existed, has always been a condition of human life. But war guilt is entirely different. Even the stumbling approach to perfect justice that is man-made law recognizes that the degree of guilt increases with the mental and moral responsibility of the guilty. An imbecile is not held legally responsible for any of his acts, and even the crime of murder cannot

send a man to the gallows unless the jury is convinced that he knew the difference between right and wrong.

Only in the higher civilizations have the masses of men begun to suspect the essential criminality of war, and only in the highest have they realized that aggressive war is not distinguishable from mass murder. We have yet to develop a civilization high enough for men to realize that truth, emotionally as well as intellectually, which is to say that we have not yet developed any civilization high enough to abolish war. Not until we feel, as well as think, that war is a crime will we be capable of getting rid of it.

Development of that kind of civilization is the world's one hope, and the chief responsibility for it rests upon the nations that are the leaders of our present civilization. Americans cannot evade that responsibility unless we are willing to concede that ours is a backward nation morally, however far in advance it may be in technology. It is a concession that I, for one, am unwilling to make; I prefer to accept the heavy responsibility for leading the world in the ways of peace.

But in accepting the responsibility we must face the fact that the hour is late, I fear much later than we think. It is an ironical fact that the time left us has been shortened by our own act. Like the fisherman in the Arabian tale who removed the seal of Solomon from the bottle and let the evil geni escape, we have employed our energy, our wealth, and our scientific genius to remove the seal of ignorance that barred release of the infernal powers that now loom over us as the monster towered over the fisherman.

We excuse ourselves by saying that if our hand had not done it, another would within a short time. It may be true; but that does not alter the fact that we did it, and by doing it incurred chief responsibility for seeing to it that the unleashed evil does not overwhelm our brother men.

How may we hope to discharge that responsibility? Only by facing the facts, all the facts. One that must be faced is the somber fact that the nations are not yet morally developed to the point at which they will all voluntarily renounce war as an instrument of national policy. Some must be restrained by knowledge that aggression cannot bring profit but only ruin to the aggressor; and it is our business so to organize the world that the knowledge will be too plain for any man to escape it; this involves labor, expense and eternal vigilance. We must be strong ourselves and we must be surrounded by strong friends, a condition that will last probably for many years.

But we must face all the facts, and there is another that is equally grim, equally distressing. It is the fact that our own moral level is far too low to justify us in assuming a holler-than-thou attitude toward any other country. The fact of human brotherhood is frantically denied every day and every hour in the streets of our own city and in every other city across the continent. It is not done in words as often as in deeds more eloquent than words. If we are honest with ourselves we will admit that it is denied in our own heart. "Am I my brother's keeper?" snarled Cain, and the mark of the murderer was laid upon him; but where is the man who can stand before the bar of judgment and swear that never has that scream of the beast been echoed, even in his inmost thought?

None of us is guiltless, none of us has never yielded to the impulse to reject the condition of brotherhood; and it is that guilt that blinds our eyes so effectively that we cannot see our way through the labyrinth of the modern world. I believe that the growth of a realization of our brotherhood, not with Chinese and Hindus, but with the man next door and the man down the street, with the

man who worships with a rite different from our own, the man whose skin is of a color different from our own, there will come a sharpening of the vision of statesmanship, a lifting of the mists that obscure our way. With the growth of brotherhood here at home, problems abroad that now seem beyond solution will become increasingly simple and plain.

Cynics sneer at this as impractical idealism, but it is the cynics themselves who are superstitious fools, still believing in witchcraft, still proposing to cast out devils in the name of Beelzebub, Prince of Devils. The realist knows that human brotherhood is not a pious aspiration, but a biological fact, and that fratricidal strife among brothers is a defiance of the laws of nature as disastrous as swallowing poison or deliberately walking off the edge of a precipice.

I think it is realism, too, to acknowledge the fact that all existing programs for the abolition of war are probably inadequate. Pacifism will not do it, although loyalty to the ideal of peace is certainly an essential. I am skeptical of world government as a solution because it seems to me that world government should follow as a result rather than come first as the cause of the abolition of war. Most emphatically reliance on military power can produce nothing but the opposite result, as all history proves.

The fact is that the blind alley in which the modern world finds itself has no way out through any sort of formulas and systems. Formulas and systems may have their uses after the way out has been discovered, but the first necessity is a change in the human heart.

If you feel inclined to throw up your hands at that and cry that human nature never changes, my answer is to ask you, in that case what has civilization accomplished? Is the human nature of an American of the twentieth century exactly the same as the human nature of a caveman of prehistoric times? Basically it may be unchanged, but you know very well that it manifests itself in ways so different that the two creatures seem hardly to belong to the same species. Of course human nature changes; if it were not so, education would be a waste of time and religion nothing more than an empty dream.

The attainment of a sense of human brotherhood is not an impossible ideal, but I sometimes think that we may have laid too much stress on it as an ethical duty. It is a duty, certainly, but it is also a rational process, very much like attaining a realization that the world is round. For many ages that idea, too, was rejected by the mass of mankind as a denial of common sense. Any man, merely by looking around him, could see that the world is flat.

For an even longer time men have been taught by that same common sense that they are not brothers, but mortal enemies. Any man can see it, merely by looking around him. Nevertheless, as evidence kept piling up that the world is round until the fact had to be accepted, so the evidence that men are and must remain brothers keeps piling up. The evidence of the hydrogen bomb is merely the latest item. The lives of countless millions of human beings are in our hands, and our lives are in their hands. We are our brothers' keepers and we can no more alter the fact than we can alter the course of the planet around the sun.

Our choice is limited to accepting or rejecting the duty that the fact implies. It is within our power to be murderous brothers of the breed of Cain, but brothers we shall remain, and if the voice of blood cries out from the ground, it will be our brothers' blood.

Which is my reason for saying that brotherhood is a condition and not a theory and

its acceptance is only secondarily a moral triumph. It is first of all a triumph of reason over ignorance and superstition; and as every triumph of reason results in intellectual enlightenment, so I have faith to believe that the progressive acceptance of the fact of human brotherhood will be a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path that will guide us through the darkness that threatens to overwhelm us and lead us into the perfect day.

Address by Seaborn P. Collins, National Commander of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address of Seaborn P. Collins, national commander of the American Legion, before the 32d annual national rehabilitation conference of the American Legion in the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, March 3, 1955:

Chairman McCurdy, distinguished guests, and my fellow Legionnaires, I am very happy and proud to be with you tonight.

It's always a privilege for me to recognize publicly Legionnaires who have worked tirelessly to put across the programs of our organization, programs which contribute so much to the welfare of the Nation. Tonight I especially welcome the opportunity to pay tribute to you post, department, and national rehabilitation officers of the American Legion. No group within the Legion has contributed more to the welfare of veterans and all citizens than you have. No group is more deserving of the gratitude of every member of our organization.

However, you did not come here to be praised. The way you have worked these past few days proves that you came to this 32d annual national rehabilitation conference of the American Legion for one purpose only—to seek, through discussion and the exchange of ideas and experiences, means of serving our Nation's veterans more effectively.

I have seen the various panels and committees in action, so I don't hesitate to predict that you will leave here with new solutions and new approaches to the many difficult problems which you face. You will leave here with new determination to carry out the burdensome tasks assigned you.

It is essential that you do so, because the burden of preserving existing benefits for America's veterans, their dependents, and their survivors is daily becoming heavier and more difficult to carry.

Tonight those benefits and services which we believe in so dearly are in serious jeopardy.

Before considering the nature and extent of the threats to the entire structure of veteran benefits, let's determine the source of these threats.

The increasingly bold challenge to the very concept of veteran benefits stems primarily from the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Government Organization. Of course, the threat comes from other quarters as well—from responsible citizens—yes; even from high officials of our Government.

For my part, I want to make one thing very clear:

The American Legion will fight with every resource at its command to preserve and

protect essential veteran benefits. Our defense of these benefits will be based on principles, not on personalities; on facts, not on the opinion of hurried investigations.

We would prefer to devote our efforts to the things that unify rather than those which divide Americans; to the task of strengthening the military security of our Nation; to the job of destroying the insidious disease of communism that has found openings in the bloodstream of America; to the problem of improving the health and welfare of our children; to the countless other tasks that challenge the wealth and will of our Nation.

If our efforts in these directions must be relaxed so that we might throw our forces into the battle for the preservation of veteran benefits, it will not be because we wished it so.

Let me assure any who might doubt our purpose, however, that the American Legion will not hesitate to commit whatever strength is required to win this fight.

The American Legion seeks no cause to prove that it has the physical courage to stand up against powerful opponents. At the same time we will never fail to meet any challenge demanding the moral courage—the guts, if you want to call it that—to stand up and fight for what is right.

Veterans have earned the help and care to which a grateful Nation—through the Congress—has provided. We believe that the principle of adequate medical care for disabled and sick and indigent veterans, compensation for service-connected disabilities, job opportunities, and modest pensions to enable aged and totally disabled veterans to live out their lives as dignified, decent human beings, is right and just and necessary.

This principle is as sound as the sense of justice and morality which gave it birth. It is above compromise.

The American Legion has always been willing to sit down and discuss every practical, honorable means of discharging the Nation's obligations to its veterans within the limits of sound economy. But such discussions cannot be based on the assumption that the Nation has no obligation to veterans simply because there are a large number of veterans involved.

We are not willing to sit down and bargain with those budget-conscious, nearsighted individuals who can see only one place to trim Federal expenditures—the appropriation for veteran benefits.

By the same token, we respect the other fellow's right to disagree. We welcome every opportunity to discuss the critical question of veteran benefits with men of good will and good faith, with men seeking the truth about veteran benefits, and with men seeking earnestly to reevaluate these benefits in terms of future needs and the means to meet them.

The American Legion, however, will never be party to appeasement. We will never sell down the river the interest of the disabled veteran.

Now that we have made clear how and why the Legion must act to protect veteran benefits, let's see where we must act to preserve these benefits.

The first and most serious challenge confronting us is to combat the unrealistic assumptions, unwarranted conclusions, and unjust recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to veteran hospital and medical benefits, disability compensation, and veteran preference in Federal employment.

Known officially as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Hoover Commission has submitted only 3 out of 20 reports to be made to the Congress. Two out of the three reports submitted to date deal primarily with veteran benefits.

The action taken today by the national rehabilitation commission in adopting a resolution expressing very clearly and in the strongest possible words the American Legion's vigorous opposition to the Hoover Commission's recommendations affecting veterans demonstrates your recognition of the fact that these reports are slightly less than objective and accurate.

I don't know how much consideration and study went into the Hoover Commission's reports. Some of the Commission members perhaps had little time to personally analyze them; otherwise I would find it hard to understand how objective, fairminded men could lend their names to findings which are so misleading, inaccurate, and incomplete.

Let's forget for a moment, however, that these reports may have been the product of a creed—a philosophy, if you will—which substitutes dollars and cents for justice and gratitude. Let's consider these reports in the cold light of facts.

The Hoover Commission, having stubbed its toe in previous attempts to discredit a whole system of benefits through citation of a few sore thumb cases, now comes up with a sore toe case.

The American Legion agrees that the Commission's sore toe doesn't rate disability compensation, but we deny emphatically the Commission's allegation that service-incurred disabilities rated 30 percent or less "are not being realistically related to loss of earning power."

The American Legion is shocked at the Hoover Commission's heartless denial of the historical principle that veterans who have suffered service-connected, disabling injuries are entitled to compensation from their Government. We find it difficult to believe that worship of the dollar has so corrupted the conscience of any American that he would seriously suggest substitution of greed for creed. Surely the Commission does not expect that this Nation will abandon principle for the sake of a few dollars and accept its recommendation that ability to earn be made the single criterion for determining a veteran's entitlement to disability compensation.

No less heartless is the Hoover Commission's recommendation that 20 Veterans' Administration hospitals be closed, despite the fact that the existing number of VA hospital beds is short of the total needed, and short of the total authorized by Congress.

As far as I'm concerned, this recommendation is so short-sighted and unrealistic that it doesn't even merit consideration. It reflects only one of two things: either a complete lack of understanding of the medical needs of veterans, their entitlement to medical care, and their use of this entitlement, or a deep-seated, bitter hostility toward veterans.

The Commission's charges of excessive hospitalization and medical care for veterans with non-service-connected illnesses and disabilities are completely inaccurate. They are completely, if not deliberately, misleading. You know this from your own experience. You have never hesitated to do everything within your power to obtain needed hospitalization for veterans who were entitled to it. At the same time, you have never tried to obtain VA hospitalization for veterans who could afford private care for non-service-connected illnesses and disabilities. I urge you, in all sincerity, never deviate from this policy; never forget this dual responsibility.

You know, it's easy to prove, by juggling figures, that 60 percent or more of VA patients discharged from VA hospitals are non-service-connected.

For example, in a 100-bed hospital, 90 beds are occupied by the service-connected, and the tuberculous, the neuropsychiatric, chronic neurologic and chronic cases. Only 10 beds are occupied by non-service-connected general medical and surgical cases. This is

an accurate percentage of patients in VA hospitals.

During the year, there are 75 discharges from the 10 G. M. and S. beds, 10 from the long-term category of non-service-connected cases, and 15 from service-connected cases. Propaganda artists add the 75 and 10 and broadcast as a fact that 85 percent—not just 60 percent, mind you, but 85 percent—of the discharges were nonservice connected. Even as they make this charge, they know full well that every day of the year 90 out of the 100 beds were occupied by patients in classes which the Hoover Commission itself recognizes should be given VA hospital and medical care in accordance with the sentiment of the American people.

It's also easy to prove that veterans, with incomes of \$50,000 a year, receive VA hospital care for non-service-connected disabilities. It's easy to prove, that is, if you search long enough and hard enough, and finally come up with the case where an individual, earning \$50,000 a year, collapsed on the street from a heart attack. He was moved to the nearest hospital, a VA hospital, and kept there for 3 or 4 days until he was well enough and strong enough to be transferred to another hospital.

Time doesn't permit the full-dress discussion which this particular report of the Hoover Commission warrants. I've covered enough of it, however, to demonstrate how little credence the American people should place in the Commission's findings concerning veterans.

There are other Hoover Commission recommendations which we should keep in mind. These would emasculate, if not destroy, veteran preference in Federal Government.

The first report issued by the Commission dealt with personnel and civil service. The Commission's recommendations are just as hostile and just as destructive in this report as are its recommendations on medical care and compensation.

Among other things, veterans would lose employment preference and job retention rights which they now enjoy under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. And they would be denied the right of appeal to the Civil Service Commission 5 years after they entered Federal employment, if the Commission's recommendations are adopted.

There are many other signs which indicate clearly that veteran benefits are under the gun. It's impossible to examine them all tonight. But before closing I would like to call to your attention two other developments which bear watching.

By Executive order last January 14, President Eisenhower established a commission to make a comprehensive survey and appraisal of the structure, scope, and administration of laws providing pension, compensation, and related nonmedical benefits to veterans and their dependents. Taken by itself, this action might not be considered detrimental to the existing program of veteran benefits. But when it is related, as it must be, to the President's statement of last fall that steps would be taken "to examine the entire structure, scope, and philosophy of our veterans benefit laws in relation to each other and to other Government programs," this action must be recognized as a very serious and very real, potential threat to veteran benefits.

The House of Representatives has appointed a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of benefits provided to survivors of deceased members and former members of the Armed Forces. Again, viewed independently, this action doesn't seem to warrant special concern on our part. Yet, it must be remembered that this special House committee is a successor to the so-called Bates committee. You're familiar with the report of that committee so you can appreciate that the

new select committee might very well consider a major alteration of survivor benefits.

You can be certain that your national rehabilitation commission and staff will keep you immediately and completely informed of important developments in these areas. My only purpose in mentioning these studies tonight is to alert you to the fact that they may develop into critical areas of activity for you in the next few months.

One of the most effective ways I know to destroy whatever good might result from the strong stand which the American Legion has taken during this conference for the protection and preservation of veteran benefits is to begin to qualify that stand. I have no intention of doing so.

In closing, however, I do want to make these points clear.

The American Legion recognizes that existing benefits for veterans who have earned them through wartime service can be jeopardized by their continuation for all future veterans without regard to the length or circumstances of their service. Therefore, we offer our 36 years' experience in rehabilitation and service matters to the President, the Congress, and other concerned agencies or groups appointed to study this critical question.

The American Legion will not hesitate to confer with any individual or organization seeking sincerely to learn the facts about veteran benefits. We will not hesitate to inform and counsel any individual or group uninformed or misinformed about veteran benefits.

In doing so, however, we will never compromise with the principle that the essential veteran benefits which veterans have earned, and for which we fight are just, and right, and necessary.

We cannot compromise this principle if we hope to convince all of our citizens that this principle is right. And we must convince our fellow Americans, if veteran benefits are to be preserved.

Length of Congressional Terms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter of March 3, 1955:

LENGTH OF CONGRESSIONAL TERMS

A chance and probably extemporaneous remark by President Eisenhower at his Wednesday press conference, brings up an interesting concept of the workings of our Government.

Mr. Eisenhower was talking about the pay raise from \$15,000 to \$22,500 which Members of Congress have just voted themselves. He intimated that he favored and would sign the measure.

Then he remarked that he thought Members of the House of Representatives should be elected for 4-year terms instead of the present 2-year terms.

The length of congressional terms is set by the Constitution. Therefore, it would take a Constitutional amendment to change them. Members of the Senate generally serve for 6 years; Members of the House for only 2 years, with the possibility of a complete changeover every 2 years. One-third of the Senators stand for election each 2

years, so, barring death or other emergency, two-thirds of that body carry over.

One of the objections to serving in the House of Representatives has always been that the aspirants or incumbents are in an almost perpetual state of campaigning, with the straining labors and the expense involved. The possibility of a complete changeover in the House is actually not very great because of the general practice of multiple terms, long tenures, and the fact that an incumbent, if he be doing a relatively popular job, has a distinct advantage in both nomination and election over a new-coming aspirant.

But the remark of the President raises the question as to what was the purpose and intent of the Founding Fathers in establishing the two legislative bodies and in the variance in the length of terms.

It is another example of the old idea of checks and balances. The House is supposed to be quickly and highly responsive to the will of the electorate. The Senate is supposed to be more stable and deliberative and to be removed a few degrees from the flash and flare of political pressures. One body offsets the other in a measure. That is the primary reason for the difference in the length of the terms. It should be remembered that for many years Members of the Senate were not selected in direct elections but were chosen by the State legislatures, presumably from a selected list of wise and seasoned men. Still continuing this idea in part is the practice, as in Indiana, of selecting the party's senatorial candidates in convention rather than by direct primary, while the Representative candidates are picked in primaries.

Therefore, no matter how much more convenient it would be to have longer terms for Members of the House, such a change could not be made except to the detriment of the possibility of quick response to the will of the people.

That is important. And in a time when big government is more and more inclined to ignore the public will; in a time when an increasing preponderance of appointive rather than elective public servants are deciding and executing matters vital to the public welfare; it is no time to loosen the public halter, or control, any more than it has been eased.

The Flemming Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Wichita Daily Times of Tuesday, March 1, 1955, entitled "The Flemming Report":

THE FLEMMING REPORT

Congressman FRANK IKARD's bill to divorce the Federal Government from control of natural gas at the wellhead received unqualified support in the Flemming report that was made public in Washington Saturday.

"In the production of natural gas it is important that sound conservation practices be continued," the report recommended. "This area of conservation management is under the jurisdiction of State conservation commissions. In the interest of a sound fuels policy and the protection of the na-

tional defense and consumer interest by assuring such continued exploration for and development of adequate reserves as to provide an adequate supply of natural gas, we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line."

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the seven Cabinet members heading the Departments of State, Treasury, Defense, Justice, Interior, Commerce, and Labor had been directed by the White House last July to evaluate factors pertaining to the continued development of energy supplies and resources fuels.

That the study group should come up with findings to the exact point of the bill introduced by Representative IKARD, and of other measures on the same subject, is gratifying and offering hope that Congress will now act favorably on legislation to contravene the ruling of the United States Supreme Court in the celebrated Phillips case.

The Flemming report clearly outlined the scope of Government control of natural gas production, transmission, and utilization. It recommended that production and conservation of natural gas be regulated by State conservation commissions; that interstate transmission be regulated by the Federal Power Commission; and that distribution be regulated by the local public utility commissions.

Texas ought to be thoroughly familiar with this separation of authority. It is the theory under which the natural gas industry has operated all along until the Phillips case interfered last year.

Thomas Masaryk: The First Czechoslovak President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to pay tribute to an outstanding leader of our time.

Great nations have produced great men who have shaped the destiny of their peoples. America has men like Washington and Lincoln; Czechoslovakia has Thomas G. Masaryk. He was born on March 7, 1850, in Moravia, under humble conditions, and died as the first president of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Throughout his life Masaryk was a seeker and protector of the truth. He abhorred violence and terror in social life and politics. His intense feeling for democracy is evident from his statement: "The ideal of democracy is so high, so valuable, so dignified, that it is worth believing in, living for, fighting for." A champion of the oppressed, he constantly fought for the rights of minority groups.

Believing the Hapsburg monarchy to be incompatible with democratic self-government he worked for a free and independent Czechoslovakia. He continued the struggle after the outbreak

of World War I, by travelling abroad to gain support for the Czechoslovak cause and with the aid of Edward Benes formed the Czechoslovak National Council, which was recognized, during the war, as the de facto government of Czechoslovakia. On November 14, 1918, when the Austro-Hungarian monarchy collapsed, he was elected president of the newly formed Czechoslovak Republic, and being on American soil at that time he visited President Wilson to express his gratitude for America's aid in the creation of the infant nation.

The Czechoslovak state which he founded was based on democratic freedom and recognized the rights and duties of the individual. Under Masaryk's firm leadership Czechoslovakia became one of the foremost democracies in Europe. He was reelected to the presidency in 1920, 1927 and 1934 and resigned, due to ill health, in 1935.

His spirit lives on in Czechoslovakia, despite the tragic experiences of the Czechoslovak people under the present Communist regime. This was appropriately expressed by President Benes at Masaryk's funeral in 1937 when he said:

Though he passes on Masaryk is still with us. . . . President-Liberator, we will remain faithful to the heritage which you have laid in our hands.

Although this heritage has, at least for the present, been betrayed by the Communists, we know that the Czechoslovak people remain faithful to it in their hearts.

Thomas G. Masaryk: The Spirit of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first President of the Czechoslovak Republic, ought to remind us all of the great American heritage of democracy.

Thomas Masaryk was the embodiment of those same concepts that have made our Nation a great Nation. And it is not without significance that it was in America that Thomas Masaryk found much of the spiritual inspiration for creating the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. Thus, Thomas Masaryk represents a link between America and his own native Czechoslovakia.

On this anniversary of the great Czech statesman let us, therefore rededicate ourselves to those higher ideals of democracy which are exemplified so well by the spirit of Thomas Masaryk. We are living in an epoch of trial; and the firmness of our convictions, the steadfastness in the righteousness of our cause, and the determination to preserve Western democracy—all are the elements which will insure ultimate victory.

A Target Area's Request for a Chance To Survive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid statement sent to me by Evelyn Smart, of Roxbury, Mass., entitled "A Target Area's Request for a Chance To Survive."

It is inspirational to know that there are persons like this lady, who are so deeply interested in such an important matter, which should be of the utmost concern to each and every one of us. The thoughts and views of Mrs. Smart are worthy of deep consideration.

The statement follows:

A TARGET AREA'S REQUEST FOR CHANCE TO SURVIVE

Since the detonation of the first hydrogen device in 1954 I have been compiling information from official sources as to the merits of a personal defense kit for the public in target areas, in the event of enemy attack by nuclear or bacteriological warfare.

My first letter, in the spring of 1954, was to President Eisenhower, asking if a program for protective devices was considered. This letter was forwarded finally to the Atomic Energy Commission. The reply was that "the protection of the public against the effects of nuclear detonation was clearly the concern of the Federal Civil Defense Administration."

My first questions were asked at a time when any layman could estimate that a hydrogen blast would generate a dangerously increased fallout of radioactive particles from which the population would need protection by filtered respirators and special clothing.

I have since found information which proves a kit should be prepared with Government specifications, which could be sold at cost, manufactured under Government subsidies.

Statements from the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission Director in San Francisco, the Institute of Pathology in Washington, D. C., Brigadier General Calloway of the Army Quartermaster Research Center in Natick, Mass., all prove that garments can be made to protect evacuating people from blast, flash burns, glass penetration, inhalation of radioactive dusts, and bacteriological warfare.

The present certainty of delayed rescue calls for each person to carry his own first-aid supplies and emergency rations.

Various booklets prepared by the Atomic Energy Commission inform us that workers in atomic-energy installations wear plastic suits against the dangers of internal radiation, so, our garments' outer surface should be of plastic; for the lining, I have learned that 3 or 4 layers of wad cotton insulate well against thermal radiation and would not be bulky enough to impede freedom of movement. The garment should be either a hooded cape or hooded coverall for quickly putting on.

The vital areas of head, neck, and lungs should have the protection of the nylon material already used in the Armed Forces as body armor, to guard against glass penetration and falling sharp or heavy debris.

Outer pockets should carry plastic overshoes and gloves or mitts, as well as goggles. Inner pockets should contain first-aid sup-

piles and emergency Army-type rations. An ultra filter type respirator should be worn about the neck, ready, at a cost of \$4.50.

If civil defense were to issue a design for patterns, many women could make for their families the capes or coveralls. The garments could be made in high schools, settlement houses, prisons, by Red Cross groups, Girl Scouts, and civil-defense groups.

Then for Congress to enact legislation to provide a Government-subsidized manufactured garment, they could still sell at cost. The cost probably would not exceed \$12 or \$15. Not too far out of reach for the general public. Radio, TV, and newspapers could educate the public as to their use and protective qualities.

Boston parents, last year, signed permission for school authorities to evacuate school children. Can the picture of thousands of bareheaded, bare-armed, first graders setting off on the fearful gamble of evacuation to face the most awful perils man has known be the verdict of Congress?

Just as life preservers are stored in ships these kits should occupy one wall in every schoolroom in every school, hospital, office, mill, factory, etc.

The blind and lame and aged will have to be led to shelters; a hooded cape would allow crippled people to use their crutches and increase their chances of survival.

A mother carrying an infant in her arms might have to flee a burning or collapsing shelter. She would be spared a great deal of fallout radioactive particles if a plastic garment covered her and her baby.

We won't all get rides to safe areas. We won't all survive, but it should become the aim of this Congress that no expense be spared to give greater chances of survival to the public.

The life which is spared might be your own.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk: Scholar and Educator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk it is fitting that we pay tribute to the man, to his life, and to his work.

At this critical juncture of civilization, the name of Thomas Masaryk has a special meaning; for next to Woodrow Wilson, perhaps no statesman of World War I had a greater appreciation of the importance of knowledge and education in relations to a democracy and to the continued growth of Western culture than Thomas Masaryk. Like Wilson, Masaryk was a scholar, statesman, and philosopher well grounded in the ideals of our Christian civilization. Christian democracy was to Thomas Masaryk the highest ideal to be achieved in the building of a state: A state inspired by, and based upon, the ideals of both Christianity and democracy.

A statesman convinced of the necessity for a sound educational system in a democracy, Thomas Masaryk infused into the newly constructed Czechoslovak Republic his own spirit of democracy

and humanism. As a cure for political evils, Masaryk wrote:

Democracy demands the political education of citizens and electors.

Education, he pointed out, was not to be solely erudition or one-sided and exclusive school education because they alone cannot bestow understanding, talent, or political sense. A nation needs a "strong and healthy brain," he said, and thus the objective of education in a democracy is "to teach the young to think."

Education did flourish in the Czechoslovakia of Thomas G. Masaryk, and it aided in molding the new Republic in the spirit of true democracy and humanism.

Since the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia in February 1948, the Communists have made a concerted effort to destroy the structure of the educational system of once free and independent Czechoslovakia. They have endeavored to build a structure based entirely upon the philosophy of communism. Knowing that education can mold the generations to come, the Communists have tried to mold the entire Czechoslovak system in the image of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, and to produce a new type of man, the so-called Soviet man.

This communistic system of education, presently operating behind the Iron Curtain, is atheistic; it is materialistic; it is antidemocratic and anti-humanistic.

Fundamentally, the Communist educational system is the very antithesis of everything Thomas Masaryk stood for.

Today Czechoslovakia is a participant in the universal struggle against totalitarian, atheistic communism. Unfortunately, Czechoslovakia is now within the Soviet orbit of power, and thus it is a nation in slavery.

On this 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, let us, therefore, call the attention of all the world to the dedication and to the principles of this great statesman. Let us also reassert and reemphasize our Christian and democratic principles, for it is in the strength and the vitality of these principles that the salvation of mankind may well rest in this global struggle with materialistic and totalitarian communism.

Peanut Industry Nets Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Violet Faulkner:

PEANUT INDUSTRY NETS MILLIONS

(By Violet Faulkner)

Did you know that American farmers reap \$175 million from their peanut crop each year? That's \$25 million more than is spent

on the diamonds imported into the United States in a comparable length of time.

The National Peanut Council states that although America produces only about 10 percent of the world's peanuts, we have more uses for them than any country on earth. We eat quantities of them as is; hundreds of pounds go into candy and peanut butter. We use them in sauces and soups (Hotel Roanoke is famous for peanut soup); in desserts and fancy toppings for cakes and ice cream.

Peanuts rate well in thiamin and niacin and contain large amounts of riboflavin. The fat content is high, almost 50 percent, but there are those who contend their energy value offsets their calories. For the record, the energy value of 1 pound of peanuts is equal to 4 pounds of beefsteak, 21 pounds of cheese or 33 eggs.

Kids, peanuts and carousels seem to go together. So, why not pay tribute to the popular goober and have a party for the pigtail set during National Peanut Week, March 6-12.

CAROUSEL CAKE

It's a tossup who'll have the most fun *** mom, while she's dreaming up variations on this carousel cake *** or the squealing pigtail gang when they see old goober goober doing a wing-ding on the merry-go-round roof.

Let's start: The roof of the carousel is a party hat, minus its elastic. Posts for the prancing animal crackers are jumbo-size soda sippers pushed snugly through holes in the roof. Dots of household cement secure the cookie steeds. The goober goober is held together by bits of pipe cleaner inserted for joints. A big darning needle is just right for punching holes in the shells.

Set your carousel aside while you bake a big 9-inch, 4-layer cake. Two packages of cake mix will save you time. Spread each cooled layer with chocolate frosting. Sprinkle with chopped peanut confection *** candy bars or peanut brittle. Stack. Ice sides with white, top with chocolate. While icings are fresh, press on animal crackers, wagon wheels cut from a one-fourth pound peanut candy bar, and redskin peanuts to hitch the procession together. Use a pastry tube for the chocolate frosting cages. Now a circus ring of salted peanut halves around the edge, those merry-go-round posts erected firmly *** and the show is on the road.

PEANUT CONE SUNDAES

If you've a teener on the premises, expect a platter party any day. Chances are there'll be jitter-bugging in the rumpus room, mamboing in the living room, and hot jazz emanating from the attic.

And where there are teen-agers, there'd better be plenty of food. For a real cool idea that will start the blue jeans crowd stomping. We recommend make 'em yourself cone sundaes for that next disk-spinning party. Stock up on supplies and let the youngsters take over. Have these on hand:

Peanut-chocolate candy bars—figure one nickel-size bar for each cone to be topped. Melt bars over boiling water; soften with a few drops of water.

Whipping cream—half a pint will top up to a dozen cones. Whip and sweeten.

Maraschino cherries—those with stems handle best.

Salted peanuts—have plenty; chopped for topping, whole for munching.

Ice cream—two cones apiece won't be any too many. Neatest to serve are the 2-inch ice-cream cubes, in a choice of flavors. Keep in freezer until needed. Or buy ice cream by the gallon and scoop with the biggest dipper you can find.

Cones—buy 'em by the box.

Peanut cookies—buy or use the new prepared peanut-cookie mix.

H. R. 1, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Malden (Mass.) Evening News of February 28, 1955:

IT COULD HIT HOME HARD

If some superhuman power were suddenly to transfer Malden industry thousands of miles away, the effect on the community would be catastrophic.

Jobs would be lost, millions of dollars in payroll would be gone, the money to buy food and goods and to pay for household appliances would disappear, and the eddies of disaster would move in concentric rings throughout the community affecting the pace of its life in a hundred different unhappy ways. Once recovered from the shock of such an outlandish development every voice in the community would rise in anger and protest.

Such an event, on such a scale, in such a manner, is not likely to happen. But in a less conspicuous way, but very real way, employment of more than a thousand people in Malden and a payroll of more than \$3 million a year (which has a very real effect on the community), and the survival of very substantial local industry, may well be in jeopardy as a result of certain things presently going on down in Washington.

These things include a bill, H. R. 1, which is designed to extend the President's power for 3 more years so that he may adjust the tariff structure of the United States to encourage the development of industry in seemingly less fortunate parts of the world.

Generally speaking, the American people are an enlightened people and they very genuinely subscribe in principle to the theory behind this bill. Why not, they ask themselves, develop trade instead of spending endless sums on aid? Why not, they ask again, help raise the standards of living of people in foreign countries by offering them opportunities to sell goods in our own markets?

Because: Granted that American industry, at least for the present, has a know-how unequalled anywhere else in the world; and further granted that the American workman, for the present, has the skills to out-produce his counterpart anywhere else in the world, nevertheless, the authority inherent in the extension of the reciprocal trade act would make it possible for the President to wipe out differentials existing in tariffs so that the influx of foreign goods could seriously injure those firms in America which produce the same product.

The rubber footwear industry is a case in point and the Converse Rubber Co. in Malden and its employees, which make up our largest industry, face a real threat as contained in the language of the reciprocal trade act.

Let it be understood, incidentally, that nowhere in this act which has already gone through the House in Congress and awaits action in the United States Senate, is the rubber footwear industry specifically threatened with a tariff situation which can put them out of business. But the power and the authority is there given to the President at his own discretion to use.

Not too long ago the threat to use that power to reduce the tariff on importing

rubber footwear was quite real. Except for the tremendous efforts of the workers in that industry and the sympathetic hearing they received in Congress and at the White House, the tariff cuts would have gone into effect and the position of the rubber footwear industry put, in the minds of most observers, in serious jeopardy.

What makes the rubber footwear industry especially sensitive to tariff fluctuation is the fact that labor represents a high percentage of the production costs in its operations. Thus, the American rubber footwear industry finds itself in a particularly vulnerable position as long as it has no guaranties in the face of foreign, cheap labor competition. For example, in Hongkong where 65 percent of the canvass footwear imported into Canada last year was made, the average hourly wage being paid to males in their rubber footwear factories was 14 cents an hour. Workers there have a 9-hour day, every day of the week, including Sundays and holidays except for certain Chinese festivals. The Chinese workman does not enjoy the long list of fringe benefits paid for in American factories. On this score alone it is perfectly obvious that the application of the authority of reduced tariffs to encourage the importation of foreign-made rubber footwear could be nothing short of disastrous for the American workman in this field.

This becomes all the more apparent when it is realized that there is available to the foreign producer of rubber footwear the very same machinery that is used by the American manufacturer. In many cases the American Government is sponsoring tours of factories in the United States so that foreign producers may observe and study American working methods to take back home—but not the wage scales. All these elements contribute to the stark realization that, in truth, there are no special advantages enjoyed by the American producer of rubber footwear which would permit him to overcome the existing wide wage differential.

Passage by Congress of the Reciprocal Trade Act is expected to be followed by consideration of three other bills, all of substantially the same nature and which aim at providing relief for Americans dislocated by any tariff policy that the President may desire to pursue. In recognition of the danger of dislocation to American industry and workers by the Reciprocal Trade Act, these bills intend to provide special unemployment compensation and accelerated retirement policies for displaced employees, some assistance in helping people pick up and leave their localities to get new jobs elsewhere, and a measure of assistance to industries which find adjustments necessary.

As far as the rubber footwear industry is concerned, all these cushions add up to nothing more than a rather dreary alternative to be paid by an industry which has enough problems even now competing with foreign production without the disadvantage of further tariff cuts.

The interesting part of this whole tariff picture and this proposed extension of authority for the President is that even the most zealous supporters of the principle of lowered tariff barriers to encourage so-called economic rebirth abroad, hedge in their convictions with an exception in behalf of special cases, such as our rubber footwear industry. And yet it seems they have set in motion on a broad basis forces to create authority to do certain things which overlook this elemental respect and understanding of a specific problem.

Thus, on a realistic basis no one can ask a complete reversal of national policy to the end that the Reciprocal Trade Act not be extended. The large picture should not be lost sight of, and we do not oppose the principle of assisting our free world allies to build their economies. Nevertheless, the

people of Malden know very well that it does not make sense to try to achieve that goal at the expense of our local prosperity and our local economy. Nor is there any justice in requiring that the major burden of such a national policy be borne by those workers who happen to find themselves employed in industries where wages and salaries form a significant percentage of the cost of production.

Efforts by our Massachusetts Congressmen to halt the speedy passage of H. R. 1 several days ago, because they realized these facts, were not successful. But the matter is now before the United States Senate, which can do something, we think, about amendments to protect such an industry as the rubber footwear industry, which is currently entitled to that protection. The people of this community who are concerned with what can happen to one of our principal industries should make their feelings known in this regard by writing to either Senator KENNEDY or Senator SALTONSTALL. For whether a citizen of Malden feels one way or the other about the Reciprocal Trade Act, he is in no way compromising his principles by asking for a provision to protect an important nationwide industry with an important impact on our own immediate area.

Message of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star newspaper of March 6, 1955. It is a speech delivered by the venerable world diplomat and fearless leader of our Korean allies, President Syngman Rhee.

In preface to his excellent message of encouragement to our great people, I should like to reiterate his timely warning in defining our true enemy—for it speaks in the reminiscent voice of a passed great American leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. Rhee identifies the enemy as fear and self-doubt born of insufficient faith in our own institutions. The greatest antidote for combating this lack of self-assurance is significantly contained in the word "faith." Faith in turn is directly dependent upon our relationship to God, who is the final depository of man's dependent and transient destiny. Therefore let us, as the final hope of all the world's free peoples, be ever mindful of this dependence through the exercise of a greater faith in ourselves and, ultimately, God.

Mr. Rhee's message follows:

RHEE TO AMERICA: HAVE FAITH IN YOURSELF

Last Tuesday President Syngman Rhee spoke in Seoul on the occasion of the 36th anniversary of Korea's Mansel independence day. It commemorates the occasion in 1919 when Korean patriots dared to speak out for liberty and justice against their Japanese oppressors. Much of what President Rhee had to say should be of interest to Americans. Here are excerpts from his address:

"There is no more ridiculous charge ever made than the repeated propaganda of the Communists that the United States is building up military bases in Asia for purposes of colonialism and imperialism. Exactly the opposite is the case, as has repeatedly been proved; but they recite their lie in order to deceive the uneducated masses of peoples and line them up against America.

"The United States entered South Korea with its armies when we had no government and no military strength of our own. It helped us to conduct elections, and build our own democracy; and it has armed and trained for us an army for our own self-defense. Similarly, the United States has intervened in Chinese affairs solely to help defend the last outpost of Chinese independence, for the everlasting benefit of both the entire free world and the great masses of the Chinese people themselves. One of the greatest proofs of American generosity is the great helping hand it has extended to its defeated enemy, Japan.

"I wish the people and the Government of the United States were not so quick to criticize and doubt themselves. When they hear the Communist propaganda charging that the people of Asia do not like their interference, they are fearful that there might be some truth in such charges, and they have a tendency to withdraw.

"If I could deliver just one single message to the heart of all America, it would be this: Trust yourselves a little more. Have faith in your own ideals. For truly the American principles and the American ideal are the last great hope of the world.

"The people of Asia know America, perhaps better in some ways than the Americans know themselves. It is too bad that American newspapers have so much to say about the supposed dislike and distrust of the peoples of Asia toward the United States. It is too bad there is so much discussion in America of the fact the only atomic bombs ever used in warfare were those dropped by American aviators upon an Asian people.

"This kind of self-castigation has partially at least closed the eyes of the American people to the tremendous position of strength they hold in our hearts. Stories such as these are created by the Reds to win over the voting population of every land as part of their Communist revolution campaign. In this way the Soviets have succeeded in making many nations their satellites. All intelligent Americans should realize this and make it known to their fellow citizens.

"No Asian will ever forget that at the time of the Boxer Rebellion the United States used its indemnity from China to educate Chinese students. No Asian will or can forget that the entry of the United States into the Philippines was for the purpose of educating and assisting the Philippine people to attain their independence. No Asian can overlook what the United States is doing for Korea and China.

"The truth is that the United States is a giant only partly aware of its own strength. When that giant is awakened by some awful catastrophe, as it was at Pearl Harbor, its strength is shown to all the world—as is its generosity and forbearance after the fighting is ended.

"Perhaps it is inherent in any democracy that its real power is concealed except in emergencies. In this period of half-war, half-peace—when every responsible statesman is doing his best to prevent a world disaster—the democracies reveal to everyone their own self-criticisms and their own tendencies to retreat as far as possible rather than to fight.

"Under such circumstances, it is the totalitarian dictatorships that look powerful. . . . But while the dictatorships look, talk, and act fierce, the facts show that they are nothing but paper dragons. Red China has

a large army, but the masses of Chinese hate their masters; and there is nowhere on the continent of China any industrial power to support a major war. Russia conducts a tremendous game of global bluff, but is weak in oil, coal, and steel—and has behind its Iron Curtain an uneasy collection of captive peoples who long for the opportunity to reassert their historical independence. . . .

"What I do deeply believe is that our greatest enemy is not the armed masses of Communist soldiers who confront us with one gun held at their own backs. The greatest enemy of the free world is its own fearfulness and self-doubt. If this can be overcome in time, the Communist dictatorships can be stopped and the rot that lies behind the Iron Curtain can be exploited to cause its own collapse."

Upper Colorado River Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, Dinosaur National Monument is an important part of our national-park system. It straddles the Utah-Colorado border up near Wyoming, and contains in it some of the most livable and beautiful river scenery in the entire Colorado system.

Right now, Dinosaur is under a serious threat. There is a multi-billion-dollar reclamation project before Congress to build a series of huge dams in the upper Colorado River system, so that Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico can make use of their half of the Colorado River's water. Conservationists would like to see a good Colorado River development plan. But they do not want to destroy our enviable, priceless reserves of parks and scenic wilderness unless there should be a compelling national need for such destruction. There is not.

The proposed Echo Park Dam, which is part of the proposed upper Colorado River project, would destroy the best of Dinosaur. All over the country conservation organizations have vigorously protested this plan because national parks and monuments were set aside to be left unimpaired for the enjoyment and use of present and future generations. In the course of compiling their protests, they have discovered from the Bureau of Reclamation's own figures that alternate dam sites can do the job that needs to be done.

The conservationists oppose it for one reason: It violates both Dinosaur and the whole national-park idea. If a place is set aside for use as a dam site, the building of a dam will change it for all time. It is only fair, then, that if a place is set aside as a park or monument, it should be left as it is for just as long a time—forever unavailable for conflicting types of use.

I am a life member of the Sierra Club, which is an organization dedicated to the purpose of preserving our national parks and monuments. Last summer I spent 6 days in a rubber boat traveling 80 miles of the Yampa River Gorge

through Dinosaur National Monument and past the proposed site of Echo Park Dam. The Yampa River Gorge is truly one of the most spectacular and unusual river canyons in the United States. It would be changed materially and adversely by the proposed Echo Park Dam. The destruction of the beauty of Dinosaur National Monument for the construction of such a dam would violate every principle upon which our great system of national parks and national monuments was built.

I am strongly opposed to the Echo Park Dam and therefore must be and am opposed to the upper Colorado River project, unless this project is modified to eliminate the Echo Park Dam and to use some alternate site which will not destroy Dinosaur National Monument.

The Sierra Club, in its bulletin for February 1955, has published the following analysis of the weaknesses of the upper Colorado River project as now proposed:

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE COLORADO PROJECT? A BRIEF STATEMENT OF DISPUTED QUESTIONS CONCERNING PROPOSED ECHO PARK DAM

1. Advocates insist, even after demonstration that their figures were wrong, that this dam would save loss by evaporation that would supply water for "a city the size of Denver." This is incorrect. Alternate plans would result in less loss by evaporation.

2. Advocates imply that land nearby in Utah and Colorado would derive irrigation benefits. This is misleading. No water will be available for irrigation or domestic use from this dam.

3. Secretary McKay has stated that the dam would alter but not destroy the scenic beauty of Dinosaur National Monument. This is an error in judgment. The National Park Service was correct when it said the effect would be deplorable. The reservoir would periodically retreat nearly 40 miles, exposing 30,000 acres of silted landscape.

4. Some advocates claim that a reclamation withdrawal in the 1938 proclamation enlarging Dinosaur justifies constructing Echo Park Dam. It does not. This withdrawal is specific to Brown's Park, where a dam would flood a mile of canyon. The Dinosaur dams would flood 100 miles.

5. Advocates promise recreation for millions. Such choice is unnecessary and would be tragic. We need not flood an irreplaceable scenic sanctuary to provide reservoir recreation which can be had in abundance outside the national park system.

6. Advocates deny the damaging precedent, but precedent means "that which goes before"; and there now exist plans to build dams in nine national parks and monuments. The future will need more parks, not fewer.

CONCERNING THE ENTIRE DEVELOPMENT

1. The administration's local-State-Federal partnership plan for conserving small watersheds will alter the flow of the Colorado River. The effect on big-dam requirements is not yet known and needs to be considered.

2. The present storage project encompasses only part of a river basin and tends to duplicate rather than to complement existing costly development.

3. Premature authorization of so questionable a project would prejudice the emerging national water policy.

4. The project is likely to require major redesigning to accord with the pending Supreme Court interpretation of the 1922 Seven State Compact.

5. Financing, based on estimating procedures now proved unreliable, places undue faith on assumed hydroelectric-power rev-

enues for repayment decades hence in an atomic-power age.

6. Excessive water is committed to more agricultural production—and at high altitudes—at the cost of upper basin industrial development and national decentralization.

7. Proponents have not given a frank estimate of the ultimate cost—probably to exceed \$13 billion exclusive of interest subsidy.

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in Collier's magazine in the issue of March 18, 1955, endorsing statehood for Alaska and Hawaii:

LET'S MAKE IT 50 IN 1955

Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONRONEY, writing in the March 4 Collier's, opposed statehood for Hawaii and Alaska and proposed commonwealth status, instead. He made an earnest and vigorous argument which brought the issues out into broad daylight where the American people can sort them out and debate them intelligently.

With full respect for Senator MONRONEY, Collier's finds the weight of logic on the opposite side of the balance, and believes the time is long past when a satisfactory solution can be found by tossing Hawaii and Alaska a bone called commonwealth status. The two Territories have served out their apprenticeships—Hawaii for 57 years, Alaska for 88. Hawaiians and Alaskans want statehood, not a watered-down compromise. They want to be full-fledged Americans and wear the honored badge of that status—the right to a voting voice in Federal affairs. Commonwealth status would deny them that right. The issue remains, therefore, statehood or not.

The kernel of Senator MONRONEY's argument is that the addition of these two new States would diminish the physical strength and symbolism in our land mass, and would dilute the common American heritage of ideals and democratic traditions with new voters of differing heritages.

The first of these arguments was blown out of the water by a series of explosions beginning at Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941, and culminating with the first hydrogen blast beyond the Urals. The second mistakes the very nature of the American heritage.

The events of the past 13 years have thoroughly gutted the concept of the 48 States as a snug fortress with oceans for walls. A nation's strength, in this age, is an amalgam of many elements—scientific and military wherewithal, the speed and mobility of its striking power; its economic know-how and stability, its access to far-flung vital raw materials; and perhaps most important of all, the faith it inspires in its people.

Hawaii and Alaska, in the atomic age, are part and parcel of this pattern of American strength. They are military outposts of incalculable value. They are reservoirs of vast and varied natural resources. And they are communities of people—citadels of great potential spiritual strength. What we make of them is up to us. What we have made of them up to now, compared with their potentials, is very little.

We have denied these people a voice in the control of their own destinies, and in our own conduct of their affairs we have been shortsighted, whimsical, discriminatory and indifferent. We have stunted their industrial development with arbitrary restrictions. We have shortchanged them in various forms of Federal development aid. We have imposed restrictions which have stifled the development of their natural resources. And by denying them both the privileges and responsibilities of full citizenship we have inhibited their progress toward political maturity.

It is no satisfactory answer to point out that in spite of these handicaps the Hawaiians and Alaskans have moved steadily forward, building their cities and roads and industries, rendering loyal service in every crisis. They have labored in patient expectation that their country would one day recognize their deserving and take them into full partnership. To grant them such partnership will not only open the way to accelerated development of their resources and strength, it will spread before the world a practical example of the kind of democracy we preach.

Senator MONRONEY fears dilution of the American heritage; these people have been sharing and defending that heritage for generations. Within the narrow limits allowed them, their performance has been superb. Our own performance, as custodians of that heritage, has left a good deal to be desired.

Our 48 States are a renowned melting pot of races and creeds, brought together in respect for a doctrine that says a man shall be judged by his character, not his ancestry; much of the rugged strength of America derives from this very diversity of peoples. Equality and individual justice are the essence of the American heritage, and we have tried to respect that principle in our policy toward Territories and possessions. Rejecting the way of colonialism, we have brought the Territories along to a level of political and economic maturity and then given them either independence or full partnership. That is how it was with the Philippines; that is how it was with Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and Oregon. That's how it should be with Hawaii and Alaska.

Senator MONRONEY fears for the future of a 50-State Union. He fears that conflicts of interest would arise between the new States and some of the older ones. There have been such conflicts ever since an industrial Massachusetts and an agrarian Virginia aired their mutual suspicions and fought out their differences in the original Constitutional Convention, and the Union has grown steadily stronger. He points out that the populations of Hawaii and Alaska would have more per capita representation in the Senate than would some of the more densely populated present States. So do New Mexico, Arizona, Idaho, and Rhode Island; Nevada has almost twice as many Senators per capita as the new territories would if they came into the Union at this moment. After all, one reason we have a Senate is to afford an arena where the sovereign States can meet on equal terms. He fears that the admission of Alaska and Hawaii might bring a parade of other Territories pounding on the door for statehood. Probably so—but the American people can be trusted to bar the undeserving, and admit those whose entry would strengthen the Union.

This is an age when a businessman can fly to Honolulu in the time it took his grandfather to drive a wagon from Chicago to Gary, Ind., and a bomber can fly from Bering Strait to Detroit in the time it took a frigate to sail the length of Long Island Sound. In such an age it is neither sound nor safe to regard Hawaii and Alaska as remote, picturesque possessions, nor their loyal people as

outlanders. Hawaii and Alaska are essential, integral parts of the United States of America.

To make sure that their development proceeds with maximum speed and effectiveness requires that those most directly concerned—the people of Hawaii and Alaska—gain a positive voice in the basic decisions governing that development, and that freedom be given the same meaning for the people of Alaska and Hawaii that it has for the people of the present 48 States.

Hawaiians and Alaskans are ready for full citizenship—ready and anxious to pull their full weight on the American team. In justice and commonsense they ought to have statehood, now.

A Congressman's Pay—The Increase in Salary Should Bear Good Fruit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times of March 2, 1955:

A CONGRESSMAN'S PAY—THE INCREASE IN SALARY SHOULD BEAR GOOD FRUIT

The action of the Congress in raising the pay of its own Members is not likely to find current listing on the legislative hit parade. It is the sort of thing that always is suspect, and of course it lends itself beautifully to political capital if there are those disposed to make that of it.

But we're for it.

We approve of the \$22,500 salary for Congressmen for several reasons.

First of all, it's more democratic. It removes the necessity that a person be well fixed financially in order to afford to be a candidate for Congress.

Adequate pay for our Congressmen will tend to remove the mink-coat deep-freeze threat. Few Congressmen are dishonest enough to accept bribes, but this eliminates also the need to receive gifts from anybody with an ax to grind.

There are many expenses that a Congressman has that he can't charge up to office expense. He has to do some entertaining, and he has to dress pretty well. Who wants a shabby-looking Congressman?

He has to live away from home, paying hotel and restaurant prices, and Washington is not a cheap place. The whims of the electorate being what they are, he probably still keeps the old home place, too; so he maintains 2 homes.

Most important of all, it should help get good men to run for office for when a man runs for Congress he likely must prepare to give up his occupation.

Many of our Congressmen are lawyers, and their familiarity with the law does tend to make them better fitted to be lawmakers. Take the case of a lawyer who has a good practice, a happy home and a hometown he loves. He is pretty well satisfied with life, and any idea that he close his law office, uproot his family, move away from his friends, and as Justice Sherman Minton used to say, "leave the hometown, where business is done on the square, for Washington, where everybody goes in circles," must be accepted in the sense of personal sacrifice for the public good.

The new Congressman's salary is some recompense to such a man for the sacrifice that he must make to become a servant of the people.

There may be those who will see evil portents in the new salary increase, but we believe that it is money well and properly spent, and that its fruits will be good.

A Common Intellectual Tradition Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is a weakness in our colleges and universities. It lies in the failure to keep intact as a unifying reference point for the students a common intellectual tradition, a sense of an intellectual community leading to a sense of the continuity of human experience. One used to find all this in the old prescribed courses of the humanities before a rampant, free-for-all, excessively individualist elective system ripped everything apart. But now we live with a situation where doctors only know how to make their meaning plain to other doctors; or engineers to other engineers; or lawyers to other lawyers, or businessmen to other businessmen, and so on. Each of these talks, and talks well within the range of a profession. But they do not talk up and down and across their professions. They do not talk up and down and across the whole range of human experience, stimulating and stimulated by that experience, to perfect the spirit of their age in the light of the spirit of all ages. They do not and they cannot do this, because they do not have in common a vocabulary they all understand—a vocabulary that was once drawn from the common fund of knowledge embraced by the humanities.

This point was well and brilliantly made in a recent speech at the National Conference on Higher Education by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, Arkansas. I include this speech here. I do this in connection with a bill I am introducing today which I trust will help to correct a situation which is growing progressively worse.

The speech follows:

After the many taxing hours you've spent in discussion groups, I think I can best thank you for the invitation to speak here in this final hour, by speaking briefly. I shall try to do just that. In fact, the heart of what I have to say is expressed in but one story.

Some time ago, so this story goes, a warden at the Joliet penitentiary played host to a conference of criminologists, called to consider ways and means of reducing the crime rate. One speaker seemed to carry the day with his thesis that the way to do this was by requiring all young people to study mathematics intensively. For the discipline gained in this way, so the speaker claimed, would lead the young to think logically, and so make them virtuous when they came of age.

There was great applause when he reached the end and sat down. The warden alone

seemed unimpressed. He asked an aide to fetch a certain prisoner, introduced him to the meeting, and then at once sent the prisoner back to his cell. "That man you just saw," the warden explained to the criminologists, "is the most brilliant mathematician in the whole prison. So brilliant, in fact, that it took bank examiners 10 years before they found that he was embezzling funds by juggling bank ledgers. That man was not deficient in mathematics. What he lacked was a sense of grammar and rhetoric. He simply didn't know the difference between the words 'mine' and 'yours'."

You will agree, I think, that the criminologist who saw in the science of mathematics the means to create a nation of moral men and good citizens, is not alone in his approach. He is joined by a chorus of voices, each with a special educational emphasis leading to the magic formula. To one person, it is training in physics, or medicine, or plant life. To another, it is training in business, or homemaking, or athletics. Let this or that be the cornerstone for higher education—so they say—and the arrangement of its own force will meet every danger, solve every problem, remove every evil, and gain every good.

As for myself, I am inclined to favor the Warden's theory of education, if I may call it that. I am inclined to favor it, subject to three qualifications.

First, no system of higher education, however arranged, can bear the whole load of cultivating what lies in the human spirit. For that spirit, as the ancients taught us long ago, is a mixed thing. It is formed and ruled not alone by reason. It is also formed, and it is all too often ruled, by the will and by the passions. And if there are those who may deny this ancient fact, the rule of Adolph Hitler in Germany, and Mussolini in Italy, and the careers of a variety of imitators in the United States—each in a land preeminent for its literacy and enlightenment—are case studies of how reason can be set on its head by wilful men who know how to play on passions, and so make the worse cause appear to be the better one.

The second qualification follows from the first. It is that if the education of the individual is viewed in its entirety, then disciplined hearts must dwell in the same body as disciplined minds. And in this light, not the schools alone can carry the burden of the work that needs to be done. Nor can they be charged—as they now often are—with full responsibility for any defective products. Our homes, our churches, our political institutions, our economic enterprises—all our media of communication—are, and must be considered, a part of what educates the individual. None can absolve itself from the end result. All are jointly responsible for what it is like.

The third qualification is addressed to those who would have the schools and colleges emphasize this or that specialized science and art. Let me say here that I have the utmost respect for the specialist. It is plain, for example, that we urgently need scientists and technicians who can lend their expertness to the defense of America and the free world. So, too, as a further example, do we need men, skilled in the art of economic management, who can perfect the way we organize production and distribution. This work is of supreme importance; for though it is true enough that man does not live by bread alone, at least he lives by bread. And we need places specifically set aside for the purpose of cultivating the science and art of making bread, and defending it.

Yet divorced from all else, this specialization in art and science—and here I come to my point—is not an education for a democracy. There is nothing to distinguish it from an educational system in a totalitarian

state. Men like Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin may have boasted of a Nazi, or a Fascist, or a Communist science and technology. Yet these bits of knowledge are not political or moral by nature. The same textbooks dealing with them can be used by students in both democracies and tyrannies. For the subjects themselves are equally useful to freemen and slaves alike; and indeed, in ancient times, they were cultivated chiefly by slaves.

I repeat that this specialization does not form an education for a democracy. It does not create an atmosphere in which the mind can be opened to every intimate impulse and voice, meshed with other minds of a like sort. Specialization, by definition, focuses on only a small part of the human battleline. It orients no one toward a view and a place in the battleline as a whole. It orients no one toward the whole intellectual life and tradition of a country. It orients no one toward an understanding of man as he appears in a particular moment of current history, and in the history of the ages.

And it is precisely at this point—as I shall try to make plain in a moment—that the comment of the warden at Joliet seems to apply on all fours. Here, let me digress to say that from what I have seen of our colleges and universities, their key weakness is not that they breed Communists. It is arant nonsense to say that they do. Not one of our enlisted men who went over to the Communist side during the Korean war and refused repatriation, cited as his reason any Marxist indoctrination while in college. Many of them never went to more than the primary grades, and in fact, were illiterate. As for the officers who were court-martialed for aiding the enemy, not one of these pointed an accusing finger at some university professor under whom they had studied at West Point or elsewhere.

Yet there is weakness in our colleges and universities. And now, in this hour of grace, we ought to turn our thoughts inward, and seek where this weakness lies. In my view, at least, it lies in our failure to teach grammar and rhetoric—to teach the difference between "mine" and "yours." In the largest sense for which this difference in words is but a symbol, it lies in our failure to keep intact as a unifying reference point for the undergraduate body, a common intellectual tradition, a sense of an intellectual community leading to a sense of the continuity of human experience.

One used to find all this in the old prescribed courses of the humanities before a rampant, free-for-all, excessively individualist elective system ripped everything apart. But now we live with a situation where doctors only know how to make their meaning plain to other doctors; or engineers to other engineers; or lawyers to other lawyers; or businessmen to other businessmen, and so on. Each of these talks, and talks well within the range of a profession. But they do not talk up and down and across their professions. They do not talk up and down and across the whole range of human experience, stimulating and stimulated by that experience, to perfect the spirit of their age in the light of the spirit of all ages. They do not and they cannot do this, because they do not have in common a vocabulary they all understand—a vocabulary that was once drawn from the common fund of knowledge embraced by the humanities.

All of this lends an air of paradox to our commitment to democracy. On the one hand, we assert our devotion to a system of government that is based on free and intelligible communication between citizen and citizen, and between the leaders and the led. On the other hand, we weaken the effectiveness of that system by a prevailing educational process that tends to narrow down communication by limiting it to an "Information Please" program and a Read-

ers Digest, or by rendering meaning altogether meaningless. This paradox, let me add, is made to order for exploitation by the demagogues. For I noticed that when our higher institutions of learning came under attack from that quarter, all too many of them were bewildered by what they were called on to defend. They seemed at times to flounder in an inner darkness of their own making, equal in density to the darkness the demagogues meant to impose on them from without. The best that many of them could do was to raise the rallying cry of academic freedom. Yet academic freedom, while of supreme importance in the educational process, is not the end aim of the process. It is but a means to an end. And under conditions where so many of our institutions of higher learning lacked any coherent, general, and organized body of knowledge they meant to impart to their students, they were at a loss how to define the end they meant to preserve through academic freedom.

In saying this, I am not implying that our colleges and universities ought now to sit down in a solemn convention and agree on a body of doctrine which they will then impose as a new orthodoxy on their student bodies. In common with all of you, I see in any such proposal the death of all education; of an education, at least, whose aim ought to be the infusion of the spirit of learning among students, and whose method ought to be not indoctrination, but the constant exercise of the mind in meaningful arguments. In common with all of you, also, I see in any such proposal for orthodoxy, something of the ludicrous outlook of a university trustee who strongly objected to the text of a university president's commencement address. And when the president said to the trustee, "Well, don't you want your students to hear the truth?" the trustee answered, "Of course. But can't you print the truth on the back of the convocation program, and hand it to the graduates as they file out of the chapel?"

The tradition of the humanities, for whose restoration I am pleading as the heart of any educational system that can best serve democracy, is not a tradition of orthodoxy. It is a tradition of continuous disagreement between parties in a great dialogue extending back over the ages. All that these parties agreed upon was the topics they felt were worth talking about. And beyond this, the sense of unity that is present in their great dialogue was hinged to the fact that when they disagreed, they knew what they were disagreeing about. Today, by contrast, we are inclined to rush ahead pell-mell with our solutions, without first asking what the question is we want to solve. Today, also, it happens all too often that people disagree violently without recognizing that they are talking about different things in the first place.

In the long retrospect, I think it is fair to say that the strength of our political institutions, is a strength drawn originally from men who shared the common heritage of education in the humanities. Indeed, in this respect, there probably was no institution of higher learning in history equal to the community of men who formed the Constitutional Convention. All were pre-eminent in practical affairs. Yet they were also men who knew how to speculate, who brought a broad range of human experience to bear first on their thoughts and then on their practical work. This is not to say that they agreed with each other. They disagreed sharply. But when they did, they shared a common vocabulary which made the eventual agreement possible. So, also, in later years, a Thomas Jefferson and an Alexander Hamilton, whose thoughts form the basic fabric of our national life, disagreed sharply. Yet they were children of the same tradition. And because they were,

each in the act of disagreeing, brilliantly served the Nation so that we can now turn to Jefferson for guidance under one set of circumstances, and to Hamilton under a different set. And in this way, we profit from both.

I am saying here that tradition does not mean uniformity. It means diversity within an embracing unity. And it is to this end, I feel, that we must reconceive and reorganize the life that is lived in our schools of higher learning. We must make of those schools the home for a new spirit of learning. We must make them, as Woodrow Wilson pleaded in 1909, "a community of scholars and pupils—a free community but a very real one, in which democracy make its reasonable triumphs of accommodation, its vital process of unity. I am not suggesting," Wilson continued, "that young men be dragged into becoming scholars or tempted to become pedants, or have any artificial compulsion whatever put upon them, but only that they be introduced into the high society of university ideals, be exposed to the hazards of stimulating friendships, be introduced into the easy comradeship of the republic of letters. By this means the classroom itself might some day come to seem a part of life."

A final remark. I have no illusion that even if all this is done, all will be well with us in a present and future hour. For we face the fact that what we are educating, is, after all, the son of old Adam. And like his ancestor who rebelled against a teaching from the highest possible quarter, so can the son of old Adam rebel against what he is taught, and reach for forbidden fruit. Yet this much, at least, can be hoped for: That a familiarity with what the many generations of man have talked about and experienced in their career on earth, can, by pointing up the consequences, reduce the danger of such a rebellion, though it may not eliminate it altogether. Indeed, without this heroic hope that education can inch humanity forward toward the vision of human perfectibility, life itself would have no purpose.

In all that touches existence, free men everywhere look to America for leadership. When we wobble, they feel unsteady. When we creak, they groan. When we slip, they fall. But when we act with the clarity of a great purpose, they feel braced and uplifted. Our schools of higher learning must view themselves as the heart within the heart of what it is that can enable America to give free men the leadership they want. Yet America cannot exercise that leadership if, within the borders of our own land, we are in danger of losing the ability to talk to one another. It is to the restoration of that lost art, in all its admitted difficulties, that I hope our schools of higher learning will bend their chief energies.

Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the *Connersville (Ind.) News-Examiner* of March 3, 1955:

PAY RAISE

Our lawmakers always seem to feel a little embarrassment at voting themselves a raise.

Rarely if ever can they bring the question up in election years.

It is well deserved, and long overdue. Most lawmakers today, whatever the range of their mental talents, are hard-working. They endure heavy strains and are subject to much harassment from constituents, lobbyists, and others.

Furthermore, in the nature of things each is compelled to maintain 2 homes, 1 in his State and another in Washington. Considering today's housing prices, this is in many instances an almost unbearable burden.

If we are ever to improve the caliber of our lawmakers, clearly we must offer recompense that will attract men of ability, and not require them to work as public servants at an undue sacrifice.

Twin Spotlights on Naval Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting editorial which appeared in the February 14 issue of *Aviation Week*.

This editorial very vividly expresses the need for adequate funds so that the Navy can continue its program of research, development, and procurement. Most of us are familiar with the aircraft prototypes developed by the Navy and utilized by both the Navy and the Air Force during the recent Korean conflict. I am greatly impressed with the progress the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics has made since that time in an attempt to maintain our air superiority.

We have underestimated the importance of naval aviation in the development of a well-balanced air arm. It is apparent that we have neglected naval aviation, as we had not anticipated that they would be called upon to play such a vital role in the Straits of Formosa and this Far East area.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this editorial:

TWIN SPOTLIGHTS ON NAVAL AVIATION

(By Robert Hotz)

Twin spotlights of public attention are now focused on naval aviation—off Formosa where the four big attack carriers of the 7th Fleet are holding the line against Chinese communism and on Capitol Hill in Washington where a congressional subcommittee is investigating the reasons for the Navy's lagging procurement of modern combat aircraft.

The fact that development and production of modern transonic jet-powered aircraft for the Navy has been slow is apparent in the equipment of air groups aboard the 7th Fleet carriers. Once again the amount of time it takes to translate congressional appropriations into combat-ready airpower is heavily underscored in an hour of crisis.

The billions appropriated for the production of naval aircraft after the outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 have not yet reached the firing line in the form of enough modern jet aircraft to be of military significance.

NONE IN BATTLELINE

Public prints have been full of the record-breaking capabilities of the latest crop of Navy's transonic fighters—the Douglas F4D Skyray, the Grumman F9F-9 Tiger, and the North American FJ-3 and FJ-4 Fury. All of these aircraft are flying and some of them have been in the air for as long as 2 years. Yet none of them is with the 7th Fleet on the battleline off Formosa. Fighter squadrons aboard the carriers *Kearsarge*, *Essex*, *Wasp*, and the giant *Midway* are equipped with straight-winged Grumman F9F-5 Panthers and McDonnell F2H Banshees, both with speed limitations well below the current standard for modern air-to-air combat. Some fighter squadrons with the 7th Fleet also have Grumman F9F-6 sweptwing Cougars, a more modern fighter edging into the transonic range but still with performance well below the F9F-8 now in production at Grumman's Bethpage, Long Island, plant and the F9F-9, still in experimental flight test stage.

In the bomber category the Navy has two fine Douglas designs, the sweptwing A3D Skywarrior and the A4D lightweight delta, already in production. But again these planes are not on the firing line in Formosa. First A3D carrier squadron has been organized, but the A4D still is in experimental testing. The bombers with the 7th Fleet are the old veterans of the Korean war—the piston-powered Douglas Skyraider. In its atomic bomber units stationed in Japan, but available for operations off 7th Fleet carriers are the North American AJ-2's, powered by a pair of piston engines with a jet for extra boost.

Although equipment is only one part of the air combat equation that includes pilot proficiency, tactics, and leadership, it would take an extreme optimist to be happy about the quality of the aircraft the 7th Fleet has to fight against the sweptwing MIG-15 fighters and the twin-jet IL-28 bombers that are operational in sizable quantities with the Chinese Communist air force.

There is little doubt that in these other items—pilot proficiency, tactics, and combat leadership—the 7th Fleet has quality far superior to its potential foe. Aircraft industry leaders, who remember Vice Adm. Alfred M. "Mel" Pride for his technical pioneering with early carrier aircraft and his tenure as Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, will agree that the Navy could find no better commander for what is now its most important battle force afloat. In addition to his wartime record as an aircraft-carrier commander in the Pacific he knows so well, Admiral Pride made important contributions to the development of carrier arresting gear, and on the autogyros from which developed Navy's present use of helicopters. For years he has fought almost singlehandedly to keep turboprop development alive in this country.

BUREAU'S PERSISTENCE

The fact that the Air Force will be able to build a fleet of turboprop-powered transports to equip its aerial logistics system of the future is due in large measure to the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics' persistence, led by Admiral Pride, in pushing development of this type engine, despite what looked to many as insurmountable obstacles only a few years ago.

We do not think the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee will accomplish much by raking up the details of the technical troubles of the Navy's aircraft development during the past 5 years. The details are well known in the aircraft industry and in the Navy, and investigations will not resurrect the once-promising projects that might have filled the interim gap in the Navy's aerial battle force.

Fundamental to this problem was the starvation diet of naval aircraft research and development funds in the pre-Korean area

that prevented a more vigorous attack on the technical problems of the jet age.

RESEARCH IS KEY

There are many promising new technical avenues along which naval aviation is moving toward its future—the vertical takeoff and landing fighters; the waterborne aircraft, ranging from the giant jet seaplane teamed with submarine tankers to the supersonic delta fighters equipped with hydroskis for landing on water, snow, ice, or tundra, and the lightweight-design philosophy that can pay a double dividend in increased combat strength for less money.

We recommend to the House Armed Services Committee and their colleagues in the Senate that instead of poking around in the ashes of the past they bend their efforts to making certain that naval aviation gets the research, development, and procurement funds necessary to push its promising new developments as hard and fast as possible in a concerted effort to avoid the qualitative inferiority that will threaten its aerial battleline if the new ideas are again allowed to drag and wither for lack of sufficient support.

Paying for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD two editorials from the Democrat and Chronicle of Rochester, N. Y., bearing on the issue of Federal aid to education.

This issue, now coming to focus, is a crossroads issue in the history of our country. Our decision on it will determine irrevocably whether we are going down the road to statism, or shall hold fast to the precepts and tenets of the Founding Fathers. In no area of government is the concept of local responsibility and local control so vital. It is impossible to detach responsibility from control in this matter. The President knows this, and has recommended a program of self-help geared to this principle. The people know it, and have responded to today's unquestionably acute school needs with a high sense of responsibility. Never in our history has there been such a spectacular advance in school construction and support as in the past few years. But it has been well said that responsibility is a sense that deteriorates very quickly. Under the humid promise of massive Federal aid, this noteworthy and vitally important grassroots effort would melt down like butter under a hot sun. We are tampering with the very foundations of our Government when we suggest such a possibility.

The following editorials ably and effectively set forth the grassroots views on this important issue:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of February 26, 1955]

PAYING FOR SCHOOLS

Some of the best news in many a day on the subject of schools has just come from a Presidential commission on the subject.

"We have been unable," says the commission, "to find a State which cannot afford to make more money available for schools."

Rochester area school districts have demonstrated repeatedly their willingness to care for their children's school needs. There has been no tendency locally to look to Washington for the solution to this problem, regarded historically in this country as a purely local one. Delays in approving purchase of school sites or school construction have been nearly all due to disagreement as to details, not disagreement on the principle of paying for schools out of district taxes.

So this area is on its way to solving its own school problems. Programs may be slower than they should be, but a quickening of pace is apparent. School crowding is far from ended in the area as a whole, but there is assurance that it will be. There is an air of solid responsibility about the way school district residents have attended educational meetings on school-construction problems, debated the issues thoroughly, even heatedly, but in the end voted for more schools.

These local taxpayers have a right to call for the same kind of responsible action elsewhere in the State and Nation. No one has a right to ask us to shoulder our own school burdens and theirs, too, if they can afford the money. The Presidential commission, after careful study, says all States can afford to build their own schools. The size of the school shortage makes no difference in the principle. There is a tremendous need for new homes in the Nation, too, but how long would we have to wait for them if Washington was asked to supply the money?

Many politicians are fond of screaming about State's rights when it suits their purpose. There are such things as State's duties, too.

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of March 3, 1955]

LISTEN HERE, PROFESSOR

Some of the folks dignified by higher education took an undignified slide from the heights last weekend. They are unhappy about the Presidential subcommittee's report that Federal school construction aid won't be needed.

Their first tack was to shout "shocking," "astounding," "incredible," and "amazing." The screaming implies the judgment could have come only from a madman or a fool. One gentleman of many attending the convention of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education became downright sarcastic. We thought it was beneath the dignity of one tagged as "head of higher education" in a big university * * * but, from his words, decide for yourself:

"The only conclusion to be reached is that the practice of having babies is an intolerable, expensive hobby which must be abolished. * * * This can be done by persuading people to substitute dolls for babies."

Well, professor, Rochester area people go right on having babies and building schools, the best.

Not the easy way—the grassroots way.

Our school people—from school board members, superintendents, on down to janitors—and parents and taxpayers sell good schools. When a school is needed, they go to work, first selling each other. They talk to the man on the street, in the butcher shop, the drugstore, in factories, in offices, on trucks, on the farms * * * everywhere a school patron or taxpayer can be found. They don't always make it—the first time. We know of one area school now being built that took five school elections.

Scarcely ever do our people oppose schools as such. They often argue on method or detail, and they don't cater to waste or frills. But they don't talk about handouts from Washington. They're solid folks who accept

responsibility. The harder the job, the harder they work.

That's the hard way, professor * * * and it works, too, here in western New York.

Farmers Like Their Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a theory prevailing in some quarters that we have too many farmers in the United States. At times I have the feeling that this theory is held by people responsible for the administration's agricultural policies.

I do not subscribe to this theory. For many reasons—both social and economic—I believe in the preservation and expansion of family-type farmers in the United States.

Family farming—even when the incomes of those who follow this occupation are low—is a way of life. Editor William Ender, of the Durand (Wis.) Courier-Wedge, summarizes reasons why farmers like their life, even when they make less than \$2,000 a year. His editorial follows:

FARMERS LIKE THEIR LIFE

What keeps Wisconsin farmers on the land? What kind of a fellow has the stamina to wrest a living from the land?

Those two questions interested a team of University of Wisconsin economists who began a farm survey in 1950. Their figures suggested these answers:

Strong family ties bind the farmer to the home place. Ninety-five percent of all farm labor is supplied by the family itself. The hired man accounts for only 5 percent of Wisconsin workmanship.

Only one-tenth of the farmers would quit the land for better opportunities elsewhere. And only 2 percent would allow themselves to be driven from their acreage by serious financial troubles.

Many farmers choose agriculture as an occupation because they inherited a farm, because they were brought up on a farm, or because farming is the only type of work they know. Fewer than one-fourth of our farmers even considered any other kind of work.

Yet, life on the farm is not easy. One-tenth of all Wisconsin farmers make less than \$2,000 a year. In northern Wisconsin, 3 percent of all places are in this low-income bracket. Farm wives, in addition to household chores, supply 15 percent of the general labor it takes to keep a farm running. Sons and daughters, too, are kept hustling. That accounts for some departures for the cities, where workdays are shorter and vacations are expected.

Despite the gloomy outlook one might have after reading research figures, those who stay on the farm do so by choice. They are not required to stay there for lack of money. Most farmers find advantages in their mode of living, even though they do not get rich. Only about 5 percent of the rural people of Wisconsin consider farming as a dollars-and-cents proposition.

The University of Wisconsin survey received answers from 1,700 farms. There were 17 sheets of questions. H. W. Halvorson, A. M. Weisblat, D. M. Day, and K. H.

Parsons worked together to compile information.

Their work is a creditable performance. Replies tend to show that farmers, the smallest but most independent industrialists in the world, are willing to face their lot in life with cheerful vigor. When challenges come, they are met and conquered with determination. A lot more of us need dispositions like that.

Are Claims of Defense Essentiality Swamping the President's Tariff Reform Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following statement by the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., published in the New York Times of March 4, 1955:

ARE CLAIMS OF DEFENSE ESSENTIALITY SWAMPING THE PRESIDENT'S TARIFF REFORM PROGRAM?

DEFENSE ESSENTIALITY

That is what the high tariff lobbies are putting their money on.

And because every American wants our country to be prepared to meet any emergency it all sounds like a pretty good argument.

But Secretary of State Dulles and Secretary of Defense Wilson, our two top Government officials responsible for defense, have gone down the line for H. R. 1, the bill to extend and reform our Reciprocal Trade Agreements program. So now, as the Senate begins to consider the President's tariff bill, we should all take a good hard look at this "defense essentiality" line and see how much substance there is to it.

WATCH INDUSTRY STARTED IT ALL

The four domestic producers of jeweled watches began all of this. And again, just recently, one of their major executives took an ad to tell how the industry is being driven into "extinction" by imports from Switzerland. Let us look at a few of the very strange contentions he made.

A. Only 4,000 precision watchmakers are left in America

The fact is that the United States timing industry employs 21,519 precision workers. The four jeweled watch companies are only a small part of the United States horological industry, and yet even they employ 9,754. (From U. S. Tariff Commission's report to President, of May 21, 1954. The figures given are based on 1954 averages of employment in the 4 jeweled lever watch factories and in 14 factories producing pin lever watches and clocks.)

What about that 4,000 figure?

The four jeweled watch companies employ 4,246 workers in making civilian watches, while 5,508, 50 percent of their labor force, are now in military production. All Government authorities agree that about the same "precision" skills are used in both civilian and military production.

Is any part of the United States time industry more "essential for defense" than another?

Not according to Thomas P. Pike, Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of Supply and Logistics, who told the Senate:

"It is * * * from a Defense Department standpoint nearly impossible to arrive at a determination that any one part of the horological industry is more essential for defense than any other part."

Do they make defense materials that no other companies can make?

Not according to the Department of Defense which told the Office of Defense Mobilization the following:

"There is no item or product which is not being made or procured in some quantity outside of the jeweled watch industry."

"There does not seem to be any part of the manufacture or assembly of mechanical time fuzes that is peculiar to the jeweled watch industry."

Another important contention is this—
B. The Swiss already have 85 percent of the United States market

But the fact is that United States watch manufacturers are not confined to 15 percent of the market as they would have you believe, but have 41 percent of the United States watch market, according to the latest official figures. (From U. S. Tariff Commission's report to the President, May, 1954, giving latest official figures on ratio of U. S. production to imports. This shows that United States factories produced 8.3 million jeweled-lever and pin lever watches, in competition with 12.2 million imports in both categories in 1953.)

Here are the facts that disprove basic contentions on the defense-essentiality argument used by the four domestic jeweled-watch companies. This rich industry (the figures for 1953—the last year available—show that three of the four enjoyed the greatest profit margin after taxes in their histories) has certainly started something. Right now, every high-tariff interest has devised some sort of theory by which they are essential. Defense essentiality is the anvil on which President Eisenhower's proposals for expanding trade are to be beaten out of shape.

WHERE WILL IT ALL END?

Riding right in on the second wave of defense essentiality is the chemical industry, particularly those who manufacture synthetic organic chemicals. They are not only against the President's very modest reform of the reciprocal trade agreements program, but, according to one of their spokesmen, also "call for the removal of (past) tariff concessions on items which have resulted in a volume of imports which threaten industrial capacity vital for defense."

What's being threatened? Why only a puny little industry made up of du Ponts, Monsanto, Dows, etc., that has grown 10 percent per year for the last 25 years. Producing \$20 billion of goods annually, they exported \$894 million during the first 9 months of 1954, while imports totaled only \$242 million.

About the vital synthetic organic chemicals for which they ask high tariffs: The domestic industry produces \$4 billion worth each year. The amount imported in 1953 was \$50 million. According to the United States Tariff Commission only \$5.8 million of these imports, or less than one-half of 1 percent, were competitive.

And now, because the getting is good, all the high-tariff lobbies are riding the tide of the defense-essentiality argument. Here are the arguments some industries cited in their demand for more protection:

The lace manufacturers say they make military mosquito nets, and are essential for defense.

The wool glove manufacturers say they make soldiers' gloves, and are essential for defense.

The cutlery manufacturers say they manufacture military machetes, and are essential for defense.

The tuna fish producers contend that their tuna fleet is needed in time of war, and they are essential for defense.

The Lead Pencil Manufacturers Association says that pencil manufacturers are indispensable to national defense only conceding that their product is not directly utilized for combat purposes."

Who's next?

IT SOUNDS SILLY—BUT IT'S DANGEROUS

While it may seem awfully silly, this is a very serious business. No American can, of course, afford to have a closed mind on any matter that pertains to national security. But, in viewing the problem with the objectivity that it deserves, we must be careful not to be just swept along with a "defense" slogan.

Britain did that—and learned the hard way. They decided to "protect" their optical industry so that they would not be dependent on overseas suppliers during time of war. "The result," Fortune magazine reports, is that "Britain has lagged seriously behind the United States and Germany in optical development," so that, walled off by high tariffs from the stimulation of competition, the British optical industry became obsolescent and inadequate for national defense needs.

And in taking an objective look at the defense essentiality argument we should ask ourselves to what we should gear our national preparedness—World War II or a war of the future? Obviously, another world war would be tragically different. This time the war would inevitably come right to our own country. The area of the H-bomb makes an arsenal of defense, 4,000 miles away from the battlefield, an impossible dream.

Just one H-bomb, the AEC tells us, would cause death throughout an area the size of New Jersey. In a third world war tremendous areas of our country and of our defense industry would be devastated. In a third world war the test of our defense industry will be its flexibility; its ability to adapt itself quickly to every circumstance. The idea of copying the British and building a defense industry that becomes complacent and fat behind high tariff walls is not the answer to the Nation's needs.

WORLD TRADE AND A STRONGER AMERICA

Why all the concern about tariffs and trade? The President has stated:

"For our own economic growth we must have continually expanding world markets; for our security we require that our allies become economically strong. Expanding trade is the only adequate solution. If we fall in our trade policy, we may fall in all."

Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., a bipartisan, 100-percent volunteer organization, declared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that the President's trade program is "the touchstone for success in our foreign policy, stimulation of our national economy, and aid to the consumer."

The President's plan for liberalizing and expanding trade, H. R. 1, was passed a short time ago in the House of Representatives. Against the onslaught of the high-tariff bloc the bill only won out by seven votes. Now before the Senate, this attempt to give America a modern trade program faces very rough sledding.

All those who believe in the need for a tariff policy in the national interest—a tariff policy that will build up—not tear down—our anti-Communist foreign policy—should write at once to the Senate Finance Committee or to their own Senator and protest exaggerated "defense essentiality" arguments and endorse the President's program, H. R. 1, as written.

And every Member of Congress should be urged to support all moves that will undo

the harm where we have fallen for "essentiality" sloganeering in the past.

Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., National Headquarters, 270 Park Avenue, New York City: David C. Hamilton; John C. Howatt, Deputy Executive Director; Thomas L. Hughes; W. Byron Kantack; Eric Keble; David C. Lane, Treasurer; Gwelda McPhee, Secretary; Winthrop R. Munyan; B. A. Rittersporn, Jr., Executive Director; Daniel F. Ruge; Board of Directors.

Junior Conservation Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission has sponsored a junior conservation essay contest as part of its program of acquainting boys and girls of Florida with the essentials of wildlife conservation. This very fine program has produced a great deal of interest on the part of young Floridians. I think it worthwhile to reproduce in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the winning essays of the junior conservation essay contest. The first division winner is Paul M. Bruun, age 10, Miami Beach. The first prize winner in the second division is Frank K. Jordan, age 17, Pensacola.

The essay follows:

WHAT CONSERVATION MEANS TO ME

(Winning essay by Paul M. Bruun, North Beach Elementary School, Miami Beach)

I am writing this paper from a sportsman's point of view.

When Columbus came to this country he found Indians who had tried to keep most of the game animals alive. The white men had to build homes and thus had to cut down trees. Food was also needed, therefore lots of game was killed. This was their natural way of providing food and shelter for their families, but like most white men, they were very wasteful.

Likewise the Indians had to kill game, such as bear, fox, deer, panther, and other animals. But they used almost every bit of the animals they killed. They caught fish from the many streams and lakes.

When the Indians hunted buffalo, they killed only what they needed and left enough for future food. They also roamed over large territories and didn't kill off all the game in any section.

On the other hand, the white man used just the choice meat of the game he killed. He used just the middle of the trees he cut down.

The buffalo, the passenger pigeon, whooping cranes, giant panda, trumpeter swan, heat hen, and the Carolina parakeet have become extinct because of man's great greed. The last passenger pigeon on record died in 1914 in the Cincinnati Zoo.

I love to see beautiful woods and beautiful lakes with big-mouth bass jumping and clean rivers and streams. I love wild flowers and growing trees and if the law doesn't protect this beauty, nobody will.

When a farmer plows his hill fields up and down, a heavy rain washes the soil away. But when there is a smart farmer, he will plow crosswise and when the big rains come, the soil isn't destroyed.

Without minerals we would be pretty sad

but with erosion, many precious minerals are lost from the earth. When the forests are destroyed, it leaves the land wide open to big, destructive floods.

I am a fisherman at heart and while I don't really enjoy killing animals, I do go game hunting with my dad. I do enjoy shooting guns for the sport of it, such as target practice.

There is something so attractive in a mountain stream, lake, or in a wilderness that could keep me there for hours on end. But if that lake or stream isn't clean, its beauty is lost, and with it, its attraction for me. A littered body of water isn't going to draw my best attention, as a beautiful lake is a clean lake without chemicals from factories.

A beautiful lake is one where old camping equipment hasn't been thrown in. It does not contain poison for the killing of insects.

A trout will eat anything he can sink his fool mouth into, so it would be a better plan to let the trout and bass kill the insects instead of manmade poisons.

On a visit to Lake George in New York this past summer I learned that New York's forest program has as its slogan, "Don't be a litterbug." This would be a good slogan for Florida.

My main question of the conservation commission is, Why are sailfish allowed to be killed uselessly?

One day I went fishing in the Gulf Stream on a charter boat. I caught a tuna, my father caught a bonita, and a little boy caught a very small sailfish. I have heard there is some sort of a law that says you should not keep a sailfish unless you are going to eat it or mount it. If this isn't a written law it should be. This small sailfish had been injured near the tail.

There was reason to keep the bonita for bait, and the tuna was kept for food. The little boy who caught the sailfish wasn't allowed to take it home. Was it sold illegally. Was it eaten by the captain, or did it just go to waste? Why doesn't somebody put real conservation measures on the big, beautiful fish of the deep?

Ever since I can remember, I have been interested in conservation. To prove my strong feeling on the subject, I am including a little story I wrote when I was 8 years old and in the fourth grade, which was printed in our school paper. It was entitled "The Forest."

"The forests of our country are very, very beautiful. There are beautiful trees and there are many animals and pretty birds that live in the forests. If the forests are burned, the birds and animals wouldn't have any home and our country wouldn't be beautiful any more.

"When you drive out in the country, be careful that you don't throw any lighted matches out of the car windows.

"If you are camping, pour water or sand on your campfire before you leave. The slogan on the 1950-51 license plates is 'Keep Florida Green! Let's do it.'

The population of game is very great in the Everglades. I like to take airboat rides through the swamps but the constant draining of the glades kills a lot of the natural dwellers there and wrecks their homes. Now drilling for oil is permissible but clearing the middle of the swamp for crops is idiotic.

I love the Ocala National Forest where my father and I hunt deer, turkey, bear, and panther. When I think of Florida, I think of good hunting and fishing and if there's hunting, there has to be game.

There is great wealth in wildlife. Conserve it.

THE VALUE OF WILDLIFE IN FLORIDA'S ECONOMY

(Winning essay by Frank K. Jordan, B. T. Washington High, Pensacola)

To consider the true values of wildlife in Florida's economy, I believe that we must

first understand what is meant by wildlife and how we might classify it. Wildlife is, according to noted authorities, all wild animals, trees, and plants collectively and especially as objects of Government conservation. From this definition, I am able to gather three things: First, wildlife has reference to all nondomesticated animals. Second, all plants and trees, within the State, that are not home grown, are classified as wildlife. Third, wildlife, itself is essential to the livelihood of our entire country.

We are especially interested in the effect that these various forms of wildlife have on the economy of our great and wondrous State of Florida. Florida is top-ranked as a resort State and winter wonderland. Its wildlife plays an important, yes, an essential role, in its having so many tourists. More than 4,500,000, of all nationalities, come to Florida annually to enjoy its many natural resources and Florida's wildlife is a principal part of its vast natural resources. Since more than 90 percent of the population of the United States can reach Florida within 48 hours, many people come to Florida solely to enjoy its many varieties of crops, fishes, trees, flowers, herbs, and birds.

Florida's wildlife resources are so plentiful and immense that I shall consider them in sequence. The first is Florida's wild game. Wild game, of all types, are more or less abundant in all sections of this State. In the vast forests and undeveloped sections of Florida may be found deer, bears, coons, wildcats, possums, wild turkeys, squirrels, and foxes. In the vastness of the Everglades, panther and other wild game can still be found. In the more open sections and in the fields, quails and dove offer the hunter ample opportunity to display his sportsmanship. Ducks and geese are found all over Florida's many rivers and lakes.

Fish, too, are wild game and all along the 3,700 miles of the gulf and Atlantic coasts, they provide anglers with unlimited opportunities to display their prowess. For example, the sailfin, and the tarpon are two of the most prized sport fish in the world. They are found abundantly in the waters of Florida. This fact alone, causes literally thousands of sportsmen to visit Florida annually, which when added up in dollars and cents, comes to a considerable amount of money, which is used wisely on improvements on our schools, better highways, and higher living standards in our communities.

Birdlife is another form of Florida's wildlife. Florida is hostess to millions of birds a year. Birdlife, as part of Florida's economy, is so important that the late President Roosevelt established the first bird sanctuary in the United States on Pelican Island, near the lovely city of Sebastian, Fla., on March 14, 1903. The world famous and awe-inspiring sanctuary at Bok Tower, near Lake Wales, Fla., is said to be one of the most beautiful spots in the United States. According to John J. Audubon, world famous for his realistic study of birdlife, our State bird, the mocking bird, is the most beautiful singer in all birddom. It not only imitates but composes, and has been known to change its song 87 times within 7 minutes, and that is a record unequalled. In the extreme southern part of Florida, the rare birds have their home. The crane, who stalks majestically through the shallow Everglade waters; the colorful flamingo, who resembles an immensely beautiful, red and pink rose from a distance; and the white Ibis, who from a distance makes the trees resemble a beautiful snowball; are outstanding examples of why any tourist should visit Florida. The rare beauty, magnificent coloring, and stately grace of these birds gives one a lesson of God-given beauty. Because of the fragile loveliness and rapturous beauty of these birds, they are a natural drawing card, therefore indispensable to Florida's economy.

Another equally valuable part of Florida's wildlife is its plants and flowers. There are more than 3,000 varieties of flowering plants, in this land of many flowers. From the gorgeous royal poinciana, to the hibiscus, to the tiniest wild flower that hides its head on the thick grass of the Everglades, Florida offers a panorama of floral beauty that is unexcelled. To our winter visitors there are many surprises, such as rare air plants, that attach themselves to stately trees and unfold their beautiful blossoms in artistic beauty.

Last, but not least, Florida's forestry plays an excellent role in its economy. Florida has 328 species of native trees. Vast forests of pine, oak, cypress, and other trees, dot the entire State, affording restful contemplation for the visitor. Our forests occupy 22 million acres and yield an annual production of lumber, pulpwood, and naval stores valued at \$175 million. Our tung tree crop annually exceeds \$1 million, and the Spanish moss income amounts to \$1 million a year.

It is, therefore, self-evident that Florida's various forms of wildlife—fish, ducks, birds, plants, flowers, and forests—rank high as being among its most valuable resources, worth more to every true Floridian than his weight in gold. Florida's heart is found in its valuable wildlife resources.

Holy Rosary Academy Nuns' Society Emerges Out of Cholera Plague That Swept Rome 118 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed an article on the Holy Rosary Academy nuns which appeared on March 2, in the Hudson Dispatch, Union City, one of the great dailies in my district. I believe the Nation will delight in reading the heroic account of the noble work of these holy women.

The article follows:

HOLY ROSARY ACADEMY NUNS' SOCIETY
EMERGED OUT OF CHOLERA PLAGUE THAT
SWEEPED ROME 118 YEARS AGO—SISTERS
CARRY OUT EDICT TO "SPREAD CATHOLIC
ACTION" IN WEST HOBOKEN SECTION

Out of a dread cholera plague which swept Rome 118 years ago emerged the religious order which now maintains Holy Rosary Academy in Union City, and contributes to community life in West Hoboken section of the city.

With completion of their new school at 15th Street and Bergenline Avenue only a short time away, Sisters of the Catholic apostolate which run the school are carrying on the edict of their founder, Blessed Vincent Pallotti, to spread Catholic action.

For more than 50 years in West Hoboken, the Sisters have carried on their work, which can be summed up merely as "doing what is best for the life of the community in which they are." Unlike most Catholic orders, the Pallottine Sisters are not bound to any particular field of work, but instead bend their efforts to "what is most needed."

THE NEW WORLD

Half a century ago, when the Sisters first came to Union City, the need was to care for the children of the flood of immigrants who came to this country deluded with dreams of "the New World" only to find it one that

demanded long hours of toil in factories and on construction jobs.

With the schedule of work from sunrise to sunset, many of the immigrants found it impossible to provide properly for their children. To fill this void, Sisters of Catholic Apostolate were established in Newark shortly after the turn of the 20th century, to supervise a boarding school for girls.

In 1903, property was purchased on Spring St., West Hoboken (now Bergenline Av.), which was formerly owned by B. P. O. of Elks, and still stands as Holy Rosary Villa at 15th Street. As it stood, the building was not large enough to accommodate the 60 boarders transferred here from Newark, and work was immediately begun on an adjoining edifice.

FIRST SUPERIOR NAMED

First superior was Mother Catherine, accompanied by two sisters. One of them, Sister Rufina, is still at Holy Rosary Academy although more than 90 years old. The other, Sister Anita, died last year during celebration of Holy Rosary's golden jubilee in Union City.

Through the heroic efforts of the three pioneer sisters, the edifice was completed in 1904, following months of hardship and anguish during which the sisters were forced to solicit alms to pay the workmen. One sister was actually threatened with arrest for illegal solicitation during this period.

As the order became established in West Hoboken, the new edifice became too small to house the students. A new wing was added in 1911.

During World War I, a new problem confronted the community and decided the course of action for the Sisters. With fathers in service and many mothers compelled to take defense jobs, children were being neglected.

SISTERS AID CHILDREN

State and Catholic welfare bureaus called on the Sisters to come to the aid of these children, whose lives had been so violently disrupted. Despite a lack of accommodations, Mother Agnes, then superior, took up the responsibility. An old mansion, opposite the academy, was purchased. Housing was provided for 56 children, many of them of preschool age.

During the postwar period, and through the depression years, the Sisters continued to care for orphans because of public need. Welfare funds were insufficient to provide for needs of the children, and once again the Sisters were compelled to solicit funds from the neighborhood, permitted under rules of the order only in cases of dire necessity.

The foster-home movement of the 1930's deemphasized institutional care, and Holy Rosary reverted to its former status of private school. With parochial schools in the area becoming overcrowded, day students were accepted for the first time.

PLAN FOR HIGH SCHOOL

Within a few years, a new need became apparent. Pupils requested again and again "why do we have to leave after finishing grammar school?" In 1937, plans were initiated for a high school, which was completed under supervision of Mother Faustina, present superior of Holy Rosary.

First principal of the high school was Sister Mary Martha, now Mother General of Sisters of Catholic Apostolate. When she became the first American elected to head the worldwide order in 1948, she was replaced by Sister Cecelia, who has carried on the excellent scholastic rating of the school.

With 1954 designated by Pope Pius XII as The Marian Year, the Sisters chose as their project the building of the new half-million-dollar school which shortly will add to educational facilities of the city. Built despite constant technical difficulties, the school would be in use today except for interruptions.

Under supervision of Sister Xavier, the new school will provide accommodations for approximately 300 students. Cornerstone was laid December 6, 1954, by Most Reverend Thomas A. Boland, archbishop of Newark.

Flexible Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a year ago in March I introduced a stop-gap bill to prevent Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson from lowering dairy support prices from 90 to 75 percent of parity. In numerous speeches I drew my colleagues' attention to the inequitable features of this order by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture had the blessing of the administration and the cut in dairy supports became effective on April 1, 1954. Later, in the general farm bill, we were able to revise the figure up a trifle.

It was with interest, then, that I read an editorial in the Spring Valley (Wis.) Sun which comments on the failure of this program. Before I recommend the editorial to my colleagues' attention, I wish to point out that the editor of the Spring Valley Sun—Mr. Alden Munson—is not a Democrat. As a matter of fact—if my memory serves me correctly—I believe Mr. Munson supported my opponent in the last election.

Editor Munson is a sincere and objective individual, and that is why his editorial—Flexible Failure—is an interesting commentary on the dairy support price program. The editorial reads as follows:

FLEXIBLE FAILURE

As the anniversary of flexible price supports for dairy products draws nearer with no change in the program in sight the editor is placed in the very uncomfortable position of having to admit that he was wrong.

In supporting editorially the flexible price support idea because we thought that it was an answer to the surplus problem that was dangerously threatening the dairy industry, we ignored one significant fact—that lowered flexible supports lose their soundness when applied to only one of many farm products.

If the lowered flexible supports were such a good idea for dairy products, then they should have been applied to all farm products or never put into effect on a small segment of the farming industry, because the result has been a lower return for the dairy farmer while he is paying the old rigid support price for his feed.

In effect this has doubly penalized the dairy farmer without providing a solution to the surplus problem or lowering prices to any marked extent for the consumer.

As a consequence, the flexible price-support program has been a costly and worthless experiment with the dairy farmer paying the bill for the Government's poor management and bad guessing.

Why the dairy farmer has been made the goat for such stupidity we haven't any idea, but it is bad enough to make such a mistake

without adding insult to injury by letting the condition continue.

When narrowed to only one part of the farming industry that is dependent to a large extent on the rest of the industry for feed and other products, the 75-percent flexible program is a form of discrimination that the dairy farmer has every right to question and protest as vigorously as possible, especially when the program has not succeeded in any of its proposed goals.

If the objective of the program was the elimination of the medium and small dairy producer, the reduced return for their efforts the past months has gone a long way toward reaching that objective.

Before the Government takes steps to deliberately lower the income of any segment of our population it would do well to take steps to bring the prices of the thousands of other commodities this segment must buy to live down with their income.

Failing this, the least they can do is to attempt to rectify their mistake and put the dairy farmer back on a level with the rest of the industry and their urban neighbors whose income is going up with the cost of living.

It is certain that Congressmen are going to have a hard time justifying nearly doubling their own income while telling the dairy farmer that he is going to have to continue to take a lower return for his product.

Perhaps the Members of Congress should spend a couple of weeks in a dairy barn milking the cows before voting on their sad plight with only a \$15,000-a-year income and while shoveling out some of the residue a cow leaves they just might realize that members of the dairy industry work as hard as they do while resting their bottoms in the halls of Congress.

Distributive Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Denton Record-Chronicle of Sunday, February 27, 1955, entitled "Distributive Education":

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

The distributive education program at Denton High School is a two-way project: It helps the participating students and also aids the employers in Denton.

This learn-while-you-earn proposition is a sound venture. Right now there are 25 junior and senior students engaged in the program and they not only are paid a salary, they receive academic credit at high school and also learn the techniques of their business while on the job.

There is no better way to learn a job than do it. One can study forever but if he doesn't apply his knowledge he might as well have never been exposed.

After their tenure in the distributive education project, Denton High School graduates are equipped to go right on the job. They have a working know-how as well as academic knowledge.

Credit must go to the businessmen in Denton who cooperate with the program. Without their full cooperation the program could not succeed. But they are wholeheartedly behind it and are continually working to improve their part in the venture.

The distributive education program here is continually growing because it is a good thing. We hope it is around for a long time and that each student who has the opportunity to participate, realizes the full advantages of the program.

Antarctic Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current activities of several nations in connection with the sending of expeditions to the Antarctic the following article, which appeared in the July 1954 issue of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly, would seem to be timely:

ANTARCTIC CLAIMS

(By David Winston Heron)

I

Meteorological observation in the Antarctic is of great importance to long-range weather prediction throughout the Southern Hemisphere. The wild and frigid storms originating over the great glacial plateaus in the interior make themselves felt as far north as the Tropic of Capricorn: It has been estimated that the immense Antarctic icecap results in a difference of 10° Fahrenheit between the mean temperatures of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. For this reason it is not surprising that in spite of the hardship and danger of wintering in the Antarctic, there are some 18 weather stations maintained there throughout the year. The interesting fact is that 15 of these establishments are concentrated within a radius of 500 miles of Hope Bay, at the northeastern tip of Palmer Land, which reaches up from the Antarctic Continent into the southern Atlantic.

This compact arrangement is not primarily in the interest of science, although the Palmer Peninsula and its archipelagoes offer particularly interesting topography, weather, and ocean currents, and are more accessible than any other Antarctic land areas. The primary reason for their concentration is a unique and anachronous contest of increasing intensity devoted, in effect, to the colonization of the last frontier continent. The principal competitors are Britain, Argentina, and Chile, whose efforts have more than quadrupled the Antarctic population since the end of the Second World War. All three have claimed sovereignty over sectors in the American quadrant, with the peninsula and its islands as the main objects of contention.

The competition took a new turn on January 30, 1952, when, with a darkening storm moving in over the icy crags of the Trinity Peninsula, a British ship, the *John Biscoe*, anchored in the comparative shelter of Hope Bay. The *John Biscoe*, commanded by Capt. William Johnson, is one of the ships assigned to the British Falkland Islands Dependencies Survey, and its mission to Hope Bay was to reestablish a meteorological station first built in 1944 and destroyed by fire during the Antarctic summer of 1948-49. The British party discovered, without too much surprise, that there was a new Argentine establishment ashore a few hundred yards from the ruins of their base. After riding out the storm which lasted through the next day, they began to land their supplies and equipment. The naval officer in charge of the Argentine base, according to an account

appearing in the London Times the following Monday, indicated that he would resist any attempt to land; and as the first load of supplies was deposited on the beach, a burst of machine gun fire crackled over the heads of the landing party. The unarmed Englishmen were shortly surrounded by Argentine riflemen who forced them to retire from the beach. The Argentine detachment returned their supplies to the ship.

The next day, Sunday, February 3, after consultations in Buenos Aires between the British Ambassador and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the zealous Argentine lieutenant was apparently instructed to hold his fire. The *John Biscoe* party resumed its landing operations, and eventually the British base was reconstructed. There was a report of a ceremonial visit later by the Governor of the Falkland Islands aboard a small warship.

The shots fired on February 2, 1952, were the first incidence of violence in the course of the competition, and although the affair was not allowed to become a *casus belli*, it clearly reflected the increasing determination of the Latin Americans to challenge the southernmost outpost of the British Empire. The affair has been treated as an unfortunate misunderstanding by both Britain and Argentina, but the use of firearms by the Argentine naval detachment may well mark the end of the era in which national differences were forgotten in the struggle against the violence of nature.

The seven specific claims to Antarctic sectors have all been made since 1908. On July 21 of that year Britain claimed the Falklands sector, the shape of which was altered by letters patent of March 28, 1917. On July 30, 1923, the Ross Dependency was claimed by Britain; France, on March 27, 1924, claimed Adélie Land, sector boundaries of which were more precisely defined in a decree of April 1, 1938. Australia's claim went into effect August 24, 1936; Norway's claim on January 14, 1939. Argentina's claim was made first in a letter to Britain on November 30, 1925. Chile's was in a decree of November 6, 1940. However, because of the inaccessibility of the interior of the continent—four-fifths of which is still unexplored even by air—and because even those strips of coast which have been charted are scarcely habitable, it has been necessary to define and justify these claims by the use of unique and legally questionable devices.

II

The geographical delimitation of claims to Arctic and Antarctic territory has been facilitated by the invention of the Polar Sector, attributed to a Canadian senator named Pascal Poirier. Poirier proposed it in 1907 as a device for proclaiming sovereignty over the Canadian Arctic, and it was adopted by the Canadian Parliament. It has since been used by England, France, Australia, Norway, Chile, and Argentina in the Antarctic, and by the Soviet Union in the Arctic.

The sector is an arbitrary device, reminiscent of Alexander VI's Papal Bull of 1493 dividing the globe between Spain and Portugal. It has been traced to the doctrine of continuity, invoked in past centuries to justify the extension of colonies into the hinterland where effective territorial control was neither possible nor necessary. Because of the need to control islands in or near territorial waters, the continuity principle has been projected into the principle of contiguity, used to justify claims to land separated by water from the territory of the claimant state. In the Antarctic, separated from the nearest inhabited continent by over 700 miles of high seas, even the doctrine of contiguity cannot be applied without reservation.

The substantive justification for the claims themselves can in most cases be documented with legal precedent. This has been done,

in general, by analogy with the European colonization of the Americas and Africa, where national sovereignty over *terra nullius* was established by satisfaction of three general conditions: discovery, publication, and effective occupation.

The requirement of publication is satisfied by the issuance to a foreign government of any pertinent official document with the force of national law. It has little significance in the 20th century, and has not caused any serious differences relating to Antarctic claims.

Satisfaction of the requirements of discovery and effective occupation, however, has been the subject of controversy ever since the British laid claim to the Falkland Islands Dependencies sector in 1908. This claim, made in letters patent July 21, 1908, illustrates the abstract quality of the sector. It blithely included some hundred thousand square miles of Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego, restored in an amending decree 9 years later, which removed the northwest corner of the Falklands sector. Since the Second World War this controversy has been considerably intensified, particularly in the conflicting claims of Britain, Argentina, and Chile in the American quadrant, and their efforts to outdo one another in demonstrating their rights to territorial sovereignty.

One of the most interesting aspects of this contest has been the Latin American challenge not only to the British claims themselves, but to the first principle advanced in their justification: the legal validity of discovery rights. Discovery, particularly in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, was, needless to say, a primary requirement for the claim of a European nation to colonial territory in the Americas, Africa, and the islands of the Pacific. As such it was generally accepted in the 19th century codification of international law.

It has been given consideration in 20th century writing on questions of territorial sovereignty in spite of the fact that only the Arctic and Antarctic coasts have not been accurately charted. When the Island of Miangas was awarded to the Netherlands in 1928, Max Huber, in his opinion as arbiter for the Permanent Court of International Justice, acknowledged that discovery carried inchoate rights to sovereignty, but stated that they must be "completed eventually by actual and durable taking of possession within a reasonable time."¹

Discovery, however, is explicitly advanced as justification for British claims to the Falkland Islands dependencies in the Antarctic, and is at least implicit in the Norwegian, French, and Australian claims to sectors of the continent in which their respective nationals have made significant discoveries. The United States, while not specifically denying the validity of discovery rights in the Antarctic, has maintained the official position first laid down by Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes in 1924, that no nation can claim sovereignty over an area where effective occupation is not possible.²

In an exchange of notes with Britain in the summer of 1951, Argentina denied the validity of British discovery rights in the Antarctic, stating that effective occupation must be the test. Argentine claims to effective occupation, with reference to a weather station operated on Laurie Island since 1904, are in themselves a denial of effective British occupation.

Chile, during the same summer, denied the validity of British discovery rights even more categorically, charging that, "In fact discovery and scientific expeditions carried

out in the Antarctic do not and cannot constitute any title over this region."³ Chile makes no claim to discovery rights, but claims effective occupation since the establishment of a Chilean whaling station on Deception Island in 1908.

Both Argentina and Chile have refused the British offer to submit the dispute to the International Court of Justice. In making this offer, Britain expresses confidence in the validity of her Antarctic claims, and Chile and Argentina seen to exhibit a lack of confidence that they would be rejected. The reasons given for refusing arbitration are various. In addition to their reluctance to weaken their positions by submitting to arbitration, they are aware that an international tribunal might support discovery rights to a certain extent. There is some question as to the effectiveness of the Chilean whaling station on Deception Island as a colonial outpost. The Falkland Islands, included in the Argentine claim, are manifestly an exception to the Argentine assertions of their own continuous and effective occupation of the whole sector. There are, in fact, a number of circumstances which weaken the Argentine and Chilean claims to continuous and effective occupation. Nevertheless Britain has found it necessary to defend her position in the colonization contest.

III

British discovery rights in the Falkland Dependencies sector have been subject for some years to a different type of challenge from still further north. Although the importance of discovery rights in international law seems to have diminished, the heroic stories of exploration still dominate the literature about the Antarctic, and the question as to who first laid eyes on the Antarctic mainland has received a considerable amount of attention. Whoever it was almost certainly gazed at the mountains of the peninsula known variously as Palmer Land, Graham Land or Terra O'Higgins. This peninsula extends to within a day's sailing time of waters frequented by seal hunters as early as the first decade of the 19th century. It was partly the search for sealing grounds which took Captain Edward Bransfield of the British Navy south to the coast which he named Trinity Land in 1820. Captain Nathaniel Brown Palmer, of Stonington, Conn., who was with the American sealing fleet moored at Deception Island later in the same year, sailed south to investigate the line of mountains which he had sighted from Deception.

The British base their discovery claims on Bransfield's expedition. Palmer's expedition is the basis of American claims which have been made officially that "Palmer Land" was adopted by the United States Board of Geographical Names as the official name of the peninsula; a few articles asserting Palmer's discovery have appeared in Government publications. Bransfield sighted Antarctic land almost a year before Palmer; however, Palmer's defenders base their claim on the assumption that what Bransfield saw was actually an island, and that Palmer was first to sight the actual mainland. The records of both expeditions are inconclusive, and for several years before the Second World War there was a heated argument between British and American geographers, led by Prof. R. N. Rudmose-Brown of Sheffield University and the late Arthur R. Hinks, Secretary of the Royal Geographical Society, and by the late Prof. William H. Hobbs, of the University of Michigan. It was carried on in the pages of such publications as *Science*, *The Geographical Review* and *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*. The articles aroused considerable public interest

¹ United Nations. Reports at International Arbitral Awards, vol. 2, 1949, p. 845.

² U. S. Department of State. Foreign Relations of the United States, 1924, vol. 2, pp. 519-520.

³ The British notes and translations of the Chilean and Argentine notes appear in *Polar Record*, vol. 6, No. 43, January 1952, pp. 413-418.

in what had previously been an obscure issue.

Another effect of the Bransfield-Palmer controversy, however, was to call forth new contenders for the honor. No dissenting voice has been raised in England against Bransfield's title, but a New England historian has discovered the log of a Nantucket whaling captain named Christopher Burdick who sighted land from a point close to the controversial peninsula, and identified it as the southern continent, which neither Palmer nor Bransfield had done.⁴ This newly discovered log must certainly be treated as seriously as the secondary accounts upon which the titles of Palmer and Bransfield rest. Another contender has appeared since 1949, when Soviet Russian geographers devoted considerable time and effort to the examination of records of the voyage of Adm. Fabian von Bellingshausen, on which during the Antarctic summer of 1820-21 he discovered 2 large islands off the coast of the continent and sailed very close to the northern coasts of the Palmer Peninsula. As a result of these researches, the All-Soviet Geographical Congress concluded in 1949 that Bellingshausen, sailing in the service of Czar Alexander I, was the discoverer of the Antarctic Continent.

It is unlikely that there can be any satisfactory answer to the question of who first discovered the southern continent. All existing claims have been based on controvertible evidence. Moreover, there is always a chance that an earlier account will be brought to light. The claims to Antarctic discoveries no longer seem able to satisfy the demands based on them. As a result, even those sector claimants whose assertions of sovereignty are associated with discovery are following the leads of Chile and Argentina. France, Australia and Norway (the last in conjunction with Britain and Sweden) have established winter stations within their sector claims during the last 5 years, and plan to continue maintaining them.

Admiral Byrd has announced that he is planning a new American expedition as soon as possible. If he is able to muster an organization comparable to "Operation High-Jump" in 1946-47, there is no doubt that he will cause the governments of Britain, Chile, and Argentina some little concern. There are indications that "High-Jump," with its 13 ships and 4,000 men, served to remind the Chileans and Argentines that unfriendly control of the Palmer Peninsula would be a real threat to their security. Their recent official geographical publications show that they are taking their Antarctic claims quite seriously.

Beginning in 1948, the British have negotiated annual trilateral agreements with Chile and Argentina which have provided that none of the signatories will indulge in a provocative show of naval strength in the Antarctic seas. A bilateral agreement was concluded between Chile and Argentina in 1947, and an exchange of official observers has been conducted between Chilean and Argentine expeditions—indicative of united opposition to British claims. The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947 included the American Quadrant of the Antarctic in its mutual defense area. This treaty, in effect, applied the Monroe Doctrine to the Antarctic for the first time.

Meanwhile, there has been an increasing awareness of the potentialities of the southern polar area as a strategic land mass, as a potential source of mineral wealth and as a possible valuable colony. It lends point to the Hope Bay incident as a reminder that European claims to Antarctic sovereignty which have stood unloved but

unmolested for a good many years are being challenged.

In the eventual solution of the Antarctic question the assertion of discovery rights will clearly play much less of a role than the establishment of effective control. Effective occupation, by a definition which goes back to the 16th century, and is found in such instruments as the General Act of Berlin (1885) and the Treaty of Saint Germain-en-Laye (1679), is exclusively unilateral. No more than one national authority can operate effectively and independently in the same area even though the number of persons and the amount of property involved be negligible.

The importance of effective occupation, the fact that to be effective it must be exclusive, and the fact that the joint tenancy of Hope Bay, for example, cannot be so regarded, combine to stimulate activity in the American Quadrant. It is perhaps significant that the machine gun has been introduced as an instrument of exclusion.

Speech by Mayor Bernard J. Berry, on the Occasion of Welcome to the Deans of Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry, Monday Evening, February 21, 1955, Hotel Plaza, Jersey City

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech delivered on the occasion of welcome to the deans of Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry, on Monday evening, February 21, 1955, at the Hotel Plaza, Jersey City, N. J., by our illustrious and indefatigable mayor, Hon. Bernard J. Berry.

The speech follows:

It's very gratifying to see so many leaders of our city's industries and businesses here tonight.

With your indulgence, I would very much like to consider this attendance tacit approval of a program which the city administration has introduced, developed and—yes, fought for—in the best interests of our community over the past year.

You know, it hardly seems like a year has gone by since the idea of a College of Medicine and Dentistry right here in Jersey City was germinated and encouraged. Yet, in the sands of that time we have seen history written.

From the day our city factfinders returned from Rochester with their report on the feasibility of a private university operating a medical and dental school with the facilities of the Jersey City medical center, we can mark the steps which led to its fruition.

Last March, Seton Hall University showed its first public interest in establishing a college of medicine and dentistry at our city hospital and sent Dean Hirschboeck, of Marquette University School of Medicine, to survey the medical center facilities.

Suffice to say, Dr. Hirschboeck was impressed by what he saw.

In May, the city commission advertised in the Nation's press for interested universities to consider and bid for the facilities of the medical center for a medical school.

On June 22, 1954, Seton Hall University submitted a formal bid and a detailed plan for such a school and the city commission authorized negotiations with that renowned institution.

Negotiations began and on August 11, 1954, the establishment of the Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry was formally observed in televised ceremonies at Murdoch Hall.

In November, my colleagues on the city commission, Commissioners Whipple, Soriero, Spence, and Ringle, and I approved the lease of the clinical building of the medical center to Seton Hall and in that same month the new college received its State charter.

On December 10, 1954, Archbishop Thomas A. Boland signed the lease with the city for the use of the clinical building.

The new year 1955 was still in its dawning when the Right Reverend Monsignor John L. McNulty, president of Seton Hall University, remained true to his promise that only the best educators in the land would be on the staff of the new College of Medicine and Dentistry.

Just a few weeks ago, Monsignor McNulty announced the appointment of the exceptionally qualified man we greet and honor here tonight—Dr. Charles Leonard Brown, the first dean of the Seton Hall College of Medicine, and Dr. Merritte M. J. Maxwell, the first dean of the Seton Hall College of Dentistry.

Those have been some of the stepping-stones, and as I tick them off so briefly, I cannot halt the flood of thankfulness that engulfs me, the gratitude to the many who worked in the spirit of cooperation and untiring devotion to an ideal—from the wisdom and counsel of his excellency, Archbishop Boland, and the inspired zeal of Monsignor McNulty to the unflagging support of my fellow city commissioners.

And what have we all worked for? What has been the ideal, the true goal?

Not merely an edifice, a bronze nameplate to be added to the white bricks on a tall building at Baldwin Avenue.

I don't believe Seton Hall University wanted a medical school just for the sake of adding another college to its already imposing list and, when you come right down to it, even though the unused floors throughout the high medical center buildings offend economic sensibilities, this administration's interest wasn't simply the sheer filling of that space.

No, in the final analysis, the motivating force was service to you, to every man, woman, and child in this city, this county; yes, this State of New Jersey.

The true goal is alleviation of suffering and pain, the curing of ills, giving better health to this generation and succeeding ones.

We have been dedicated, committed—if you will—to the fulfillment of a need New Jersey has long expressed—a medical and dental school to train those who will lead us to better health.

You hear this question raised: "Aren't there enough doctors?"

Well, there are about 220,000 medical doctors in the United States, but three years ago the President's Commission on Health Needs of the Nation estimated there would be a shortage of 22,000 to 45,000 doctors by 1960. And recently, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, chairman of the Health Resources Advisory Committee of the National Security Resources Board, estimated a shortage of 20,000 physicians before 1960.

I can tell you from personal experience, as director of the Department of Public Affairs of Jersey City with jurisdiction over the medical center, that we don't have enough American internes and resident physicians.

⁴Edouard A. Stackpole, "A First Recognition of Antarctica," Boston Public Library Quarterly, vol. 4, No. 1, 1951, pp. 3-19.

The country needs more doctors and the State needs more doctors to meet medical and surgical care, research and medical education programs.

One way to fill this need—and it's not an easy way because of the tremendous costs involved—is to establish more medical schools.

It's heartening to note that 10 new 4-year medical schools are now in various stages of planning or development in the States of California, Mississippi, Missouri, Florida, Kentucky, West Virginia, North Dakota, New York and—thanks to Seton Hall University—New Jersey.

The record of our State to date in attempting to develop medical and dental education has been a sorry one.

As far back as 1776, when the only form of instruction was the doctor-apprentice system, medical men recognized the importance of formal training. A group of 17 doctors met in New Brunswick to form the Medical Society of the Colony of New Jersey and improve standards but it wasn't until 1792 that Queen's College (now Rutgers) started a medical department which was short-lived.

In 1830, Princeton University opened a medical school which lasted only a few years and other attempts followed in various parts of the State but all were of very short duration.

Thus it can be seen that those who worked to help the Seton Hall College of Medicine and Dentistry come into being hold no patent for originality.

The idea for a medical and dental college in New Jersey is not new.

Neither is the idea of attempting to utilize the vast unused areas in the gigantic medical center plant. A score of years ago, the city administration tried desperately to get the Federal Government to help lighten the tremendous financial burdens of the hospital—to no avail.

A few years ago, my predecessor in office, former Mayor Kenny, offered a very constructive plan to the State of New Jersey for use of the medical center facilities for a State-operated school—in vain.

So it remained for Seton Hall University to offer a solution to the problem of meeting the State's medical and dental education needs. I think they have the answer to this problem and I do not foresee a repeat of past State medical education history because the Seton Hall history is one of continued successes.

The very foundation of Seton Hall is its deep faith in humanity and that faith has been repaid in kind.

Every citizen who has any feeling for his community, who wants to see it prosper, should be proud that Seton Hall University selected the medical center as the site for this State's first successful medical and dental college.

This seat of culture and learning, staffed by such leaders in the world of science and education as Dr. Brown and Dr. Maxwell, heralds the dawn of a new era for Jersey City.

Strange View of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "Strange View of Alaska," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for February 26, clearly

suggests that the Defense Department's position in opposition to Alaska statehood is a "puzzler." I take pleasure in presenting the editorial here:

The Defense Department's contention that national security will be best served by keeping Alaska Territory for the present is indeed a puzzler. It is contradictory of the position of the State Department. It runs counter to the views authorities have hitherto expressed. Neither Defense Secretary Wilson nor Air Force Undersecretary Douglas, who stated the position, offered any reason in support of it.

The chairman of the Senate Territories Subcommittee, Senator Jackson of Washington, is therefore quite right in asking the Defense Department what reasoning has led it to so surprising a conclusion. There are many reasons to support the view that admission of Alaska to statehood would strengthen national security.

More people could be expected to cast their lot with a new State than with a neglected Territory—and underpopulation is one of Alaska's greatest weaknesses. Two Senators and voting representation in the House could do far more for Alaska than the present single non-voting Delegate, perhaps striking off the shipping monopoly and extending the inadequate railroad system. A larger population, with better transportation, producing more on farms and in factories, could better feed, transport, and maintain Armed Forces for Alaska's—and the Union's—defense.

What possible considerations of national security could argue stronger against Alaskan statehood than these reasons argue for it?

Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, several foreign nations have been seeking to have our Cargo Preference Act of 1954 undermined. The following article appearing in the New York Journal-American on February 4, 1955, labels their efforts for what they are—propaganda. I trust that Members of Congress will read the article:

PROPAGANDA

Since 1936 this country has paid subsidies to American shipping interests in order to have an American merchant marine to carry a fair portion of our maritime commerce and to serve as an auxiliary to the Armed Forces in time of war.

In World War I we had to spend billions of dollars to build ships. Then the costly process had to be repeated in World War II because of our own negligence. Experience has plainly demonstrated that the ship-subsidy plan is both cheaper and safer.

Now, it appears, Great Britain has a scheme to divert American subsidies to the support of the British merchant marine, which competes with ours.

Under the foreign-aid program, Congress requires that part of the goods we give away be carried overseas in American vessels. Our Government, of course, pays the cargo charges as well as the cost of the goods. And lately the Government has been giving away \$700 million worth of farm products as a means of reducing \$7 billion worth of sur-

pluses accumulated through the agricultural price-subsidy plan.

We read, however, in the London Sunday Despatch, that the British Government is refusing large quantities of these free goods because the United States has laid it down that half the goods must be moved in United States ships.

"The United States Government has been told," the report continues, "that unless the rule is altered, the United States economic aid plan is in danger of breaking down."

Perhaps, in the circumstances indicated, the sensible course would be to let the aid plan break down, and save our money. We certainly cannot afford to let our merchant marine be broken down by subsidized foreign competition—much less, ourselves pay part of the foreign subsidy.

Northwestern Timberlands Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, in House Document No. 88, President Eisenhower asks a supplemental appropriation for control of forest pests.

Last fall I attended a meeting in Missoula devoted to a discussion of the spruce budworm. I came away convinced that unless vigorous control measures were started this year the forests of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and New Mexico would suffer tremendous damage, the economy of the region would be upset, and Montana's thriving Christmas-tree industry destroyed.

An investment of \$2½ million here will save \$38 million worth of timber and thousands of dollars worth of other property and prevent incalculable damage to recreation areas and the watersheds of several of our greatest river systems.

Recently the following appeared in *Outdoors Unlimited*, publication of the Outdoor Writers Association of America:

NORTHWESTERN TIMBERLANDS THREATENED

The great gray shadow that has spread over 1,750,000 acres of Montana forests is cast by a tiny, soft, gray moth, and more than \$2,250,000 will be needed to clip his wings.

The spruce budworm, who is a moth at one phase of his short but destructive life, has been silently and effectively at work almost everywhere Douglas-fir grows in Montana's mountains for nearly 5 years, and that is why his deadly mission has suddenly become so apparent.

Because the budworm nibbles only the new, tender needles, the tree stays green for about 5 years, the time needed for the older, untouched needles to drop to the ground in an evergreen's natural shedding process. When these are gone, there are, thanks to the budworm, none to take their place, and the tree dies.

The more obvious results of such mass death are the graying hillsides so startlingly gaunt where yesterday there was nothing but green, the money loss of sawtimber soaring up to more than \$30 million, and the gradual strangulation of Montana's \$1 million Christmas-tree industry. Not so obvious is the staggering loss of watershed protection,

the rising hazard of fire among the dead and dying, the stripped shade for fishing waters, and the loss of food and cover for wildlife.

Ever since the 1920's the budworm, a native of the forested Northwest, has been nibbling at Montana's forests, first in Yellowstone Park and the Deep Creek Canyon country near Townsend, but not until the forties and fifties did it spread like a crown fire on a hot summer's day, sweeping across the forests of Montana and northern Idaho until it now extends from the Snake to the Musselshell and from Yellowstone to Glacier Park.

As of now, the picture is this: Out of the 2 million infested acres in all this area, Montana has all but a quarter million. Douglas-fir in both Montana and Idaho has taken, and is taking, the brunt of the attack. Last year the blight spread to new forests in the Crazy Mountains, along the Madison Range, in the Beaverhead, and in the Ruby Mountains of southwestern Montana.

Areas sprayed by plane in 1953 around Helena and in the Deer Lodge National Forest are nearly back where they were. Moths moved in practically as soon as the planes left the sky, and foresters are convinced they must act now on a wider scope until there are no moths left to move back.

At a meeting last fall in Missoula there was general agreement that the tiny moth was too huge a problem for private forest owners or even the States to meet. It was a national problem, the meeting decided, and to do the job the way it should be done, in the few summer days when spraying is really effective, it would take more than \$2 million and a fleet of spray planes. This much money to meet a national obligation would have to come from Congress.

Colorado learned the hard way only a few years ago that the bud worm won't wait and that he can wipe out timber. Between Colorado Springs and Denver, a scant few years back, there was a beautiful woods known to Coloradans as the Black Forest. Today there are bare trunks where there was shade, and naked limbs where needles grew green. The big summer homes of Coloradans stand curiously alone in a forest of snags.

Serious as the situation is in Montana right now, there is plenty of time to save a good share of this timber if there is money and if the money is used properly. "Hot-spotting" or treatment of small areas has been shown that spraying will work, properly applied at just the right time, but it has to be done in big blocks to keep the worms from taking over again. This is 1955's problem, and there is no time to lose.

Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the statement on immigration adopted at the annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee, on January 30, 1955, at the Hotel Roosevelt in New York City:

STATEMENT ON IMMIGRATION

In his message on the state of the Union on January 6, 1955, President Eisenhower declared that despite sincere efforts to administer the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952 humanely, certain of its provisions "have the effect of compelling actions in respect to aliens which are inequitable in some

instances and discriminatory in others. These provisions should be corrected in this session of Congress."

This statement applies with equal force to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

While supporting the President's views, the American Jewish Committee nonetheless believes that only fundamental revision will overcome the discriminatory features of the McCarran-Walter Act and the cumbersome, unworkable provisions of the Refugee Relief Act.

We commend those Members of Congress of each political party who, during the last session, joined in sponsoring bills to improve these laws. We approve the reintroduction of these bills and the early adoption of legislation based on American democratic principles.

Adopted January 30, 1955, Hotel Roosevelt, New York, N. Y.

Eighty-three Years on One Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RILEY

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. George Robinson, Washington Post and Times Herald, Sunday, March 6, 1955, giving an account of what is probably the longest continuous industrial employment record in the world.

The subject of this article, Mr. James Wesley Rearden, is a distinguished resident of my district and an employee of the oldest cotton mill in the South operating under its original charter.

The article follows:

GRANITEVILLE, S. C.—This will be quite a year for James Wesley Rearden, a leading citizen of this little mill community nestled in the rolling hills of upper Horse Creek Valley near Aiken. On June 6 he'll celebrate his 94th birthday. On May 10 he'll round out 83 years of work with the Graniteville Co., a group of modern cotton mills.

And that makes Mr. Rearden the holder of the longest continuous industrial work record in the world. In the office of the president of the Graniteville Co. hang five portraits. Four are those of presidents of the firm. The fifth is that of the shipping clerk to whom the firm long has paid tribute for "always doing a little more than is expected of him."

The remarkable Mr. Rearden has a standing offer from the Graniteville Co. to retire any time he wants to or report for work any hour of the day he chooses. But he's regularly among the first on the job, walking the short distance from his white frame home (not far from the plant gates) to his office. He treats himself to a short rest period after lunch every day, but otherwise puts in full time.

A retirement system was adopted by Graniteville in 1949 for employees reaching 65, but Mr. Rearden—then 83—had been told long before that he could work as long as he cared to. So he's doing just that. "As long as they'll let me," he says, "I'm going to show up for work each morning. I like the people I work for and I'd feel lost without something to do."

That "something to do" for the past 35 years has included teaching the Young Men's Bible Class at St. John's Methodist Church in Graniteville, where he has been a member 70 years and has sung in the choir almost that long.

Mr. Rearden won his longest-work-record title fair and square. In 1950 the Thomas De La Rue Co., Ltd., printers and engravers, of London, challenged the United States to produce a man with a longer continuous work record than their Harry Adkins, a 75-year man. The Rearden record, supplied through the National Association of Manufacturers, showed that he topped Adkins by 3 years.

HE STARTED AT 10

He began work for Graniteville on May 10, 1872. He was nearly 11 then, but, as he recalls, "big for his age." That was the only reason he was able to get a job in the plant; every child under 13 was supposed to be in school. Mr. Rearden's first job was "tack boy," his only tools a needle and thread plus a shoe knife for cutting thread to tack cloth.

Mr. Rearden still remembers the company's founder, William Gregg, who started the mill in 1845. It is the oldest cotton mill in the South operating under its original charter. As for Mr. Rearden, he feels the same about his job today as in 1947, when the company honored him on his 75th consecutive work year.

Said he then: "If I had to make the choice again, it would be the same as it was in 1872."

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin appearing in the New Leader of March 1955 entitled "Where the News Ends":

WHERE THE NEWS ENDS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

LET'S NOT YIELD TO RED BLACKMAIL—FORMOSA IS VITAL TO ASIAN DEFENSE

Totalitarian tyrannies are expert in the art of bluster and blackmail, of making crime pay. For years before the outbreak of the Second World War Hitler and Mussolini carried out one land grab after another by exploiting fear of war. But retreats and surrenders did not avert war; they only brought it on under less favorable conditions.

One might have thought that one such lesson would be enough, that the world would have recognized the futility of dealing with totalitarian aggressors without equal or superior force and the willingness to use this force if necessary. Unfortunately this has not been the case. The Soviet Union and Red China have been as successful as Hitler and Mussolini in making crime pay.

One striking example of this technique was the Soviet reaction to the discovery in the Katyn Forest of the bodies of some 15,000 Polish officer POW's. The Soviet Government, in the face of overwhelming circumstantial evidence to the contrary, asserted that the massacre had been committed by the Germans and used the request of the Polish Government-in-exile for an impartial Red Cross investigation as an excuse for breaking off diplomatic relations. This was the first step toward creating a Polish puppet regime.

The Chinese Communists have been apt pupils in this game of terror and blackmail. By intervening in Korea they tried to shoot their way into the United Nations. After winning a still more decisive victory in Indo-

China, they decided that, if they couldn't shoot their way in, perhaps they could kidnap their way in. Hence the outrageous "trial" and sentencing of 11 American fliers who should have been repatriated with other war prisoners in 1953.

As these fliers were fighting a war under the authorization of the United Nations, the challenge to that organization was clear. The U. N. took it lying down. Instead of threatening a complete trade boycott if the prisoners were not released, U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld went to Peking on a pleading mission which has not brought release of the fliers but has considerably increased Chinese Red prestige.

Now the squeeze has started on Formosa, as Peking emits bellicose threats almost daily with responsive echoes from Moscow—the old familiar Hitler-Mussolini smash-and-grab technique. It seems both surprising and unfortunate that public opinion in Great Britain seems to be softened up for new experiments in appeasement and retreat. Britain shares many American ideals and interests, and is our strongest and most dependable ally. But some of the Bevanite outbursts are hard to take, notably the reported suggestion of Harold Wilson that Chiang Kai-shek and his government and the American 7th Fleet should all be banished to St. Helena. (Where would Mr. Wilson expect help to come from when the Chinese Communists fall on Hong Kong and Malaya, as they certainly will if they succeed in driving the United States from the Orient?)

As an antidote to Mr. Wilson, the clear-headed, sensible viewpoint of the Economist is worth quoting:

"Those, like Mr. Attlee, who imply that it is all the United States' fault are simply playing the Communists' game by dividing the public opinion of the western countries. . . . To egg the Communists on, as Mr. Attlee has been doing, is to work for war."

What is at stake in Formosa is something more important than an island of strategic value which is also the last outpost of Chinese freedom. What is at stake is the possibility of making any stand against a complete Communist sweep in East Asia. Mr. Dulles seemed to see this clearly when he said recently:

"It should not be carelessly assumed that peace and security will be promoted merely by the non-Communist nations indefinitely granting one-sided concessions to the Communist nations. A great danger in Asia is the fear of many non-Communist peoples that the United States has no real intention of standing firmly behind them. . . . If the non-Communist Asians ever come to feel that their western allies are disposed to retreat whenever communism threatens peace, then the entire area could quickly become indefensible."

These are brave and sensible words. Does anyone in his right mind suppose that the Communist designs on Formosa would be abandoned if the offshore islands were surrendered, or that Formosa would be anything but a stepping stone to Japan, the Philippines, southeast Asia? Let's hope Mr. Dulles stands firmly behind these words.

Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, marks the anniversary of the

birth of one of the great men of our times, Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first President of Czechoslovakia. Much has happened since the establishment of that country, and much that has happened has been tragic. But history has a way of redeeming its tragedies and of restoring to its great and noble figures the status that is their due.

I was invited recently by the publishers of a Czechoslovakian newspaper in the United States to express my sentiments about Dr. Masaryk; and I was glad to do so in a message as follows:

MR. ANDREW J. VALUCHEK,

New Yorksky Dennik-New Yorkse Listy,
C. S. Publishing Co., Inc., New York,
N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: I am deeply moved to be able to participate in the observance of the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, one of the noble spirits of our times, a great leader of his country, and a distinguished citizen of the world family.

No matter how intensive the efforts of those, to whom his democratic ideals are repugnant, to besmirch his reputation and to seek to eradicate the memory of his great achievements, the name of Masaryk will survive. His enemies may demolish the stone memorials commemorating his name. They can never reach the shrine in which he is steadily revered, the hearts of his countrymen and indeed of the people of all the world.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

Eisenhower-Nixon Teamwork Elevates Vice Presidency to Proper Importance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the new status of the office of Vice President as in fact the Nation's No. 2 spot in dignity, tone, and importance has been noted by Columnist Walter T. Ridder. He gives credit to President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon for this New Look in the Nation's table of organization in the following article:

NIXON GIVES DIGNITY TO VICE SPOT
(By Walter T. Ridder)

WASHINGTON.—One thing you've got to give President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon. Working together, they have lifted the Vice Presidency out of the Alexander Throttlebottom class. They have given the Nation's No. 2 spot a dignity, tone, and importance which it rarely had in the past.

A good deal of this is due to Eisenhower's firm intent not to leave the Vice President in utter darkness as to what's going on in the White House. He is very conscious of the fact that something might happen to him and he wants NIXON to know what has been going on and why. He does not want a repetition of Harry S. Truman's uneasy entrance into the White House.

In later years, Truman told friends that he spent his first few months in the President's office merely trying to find out what policy and plans President Roosevelt had been following. Vice President Truman had been pretty much relegated to his job of presiding over the Senate, which gave him a

picture of domestic affairs, but he was utterly in the dark as to what was happening on the international front.

This is precisely what Eisenhower is seeking to avoid. NIXON, when in Washington, acts as the President's representative at many official affairs; he sits with the National Security Council, he attends Cabinet meetings. He takes on special jobs for the President, such as his good-will tour to the Far East and his present journey through Central America. He is, in every sense of the word, a working Vice President.

Much of the credit for the expansion of the Vice President's job must go to Nixon himself, who has thrown himself into his work with a marked energy and a tirelessness which is remarkable to see. He takes on back room political tasks on Capitol Hill, tries to keep himself abreast of international development, and shoulders as much of the social routine as he can in order to free the President for other work.

Time was when the Vice Presidency was a treadmill to political obscurity. The holder of the job sat up in his office in the Senate, swapped jokes, drinks and card games with the boys, and sauntered every now and then to the Senate floor where he cast votes only to break a tie.

All that has now been changed.

If Nixon and Eisenhower between them can change the character of the Vice Presidency, it may result in high-caliber men seeking the job and more care at national conventions in the choosing of vice presidential candidates.

United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, Now in Good Condition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, some consideration has been given to increasing the number of judges on the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, which now has nine judges.

My own view is that a court of 11 or 12 judges would be administratively awkward and cumbersome. These judges sit in panels of three. Already, I understand, there are often instances where two different panels considering similar cases are almost simultaneously rendering opposite decisions. Increasing the size of the court would increase this possibility.

Another suggestion has been to divide the circuit, putting Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska in a new circuit. Most of the bar associations in these States have passed resolutions against such a division. The Montana Bar Association was unanimous in its opposition the last time this suggestion was voted on.

The following article from the February 28, 1955, San Francisco News indicates that the Ninth Circuit Court is in excellent condition, with litigants able to go to trial within a month or two after their case is ready. It also is anticipated that with a drop in new cases, and faster handling of decisions by increased use of the service of district judges, the court will have cleaned up its backlog by next January and then can stay current with

its nine judges, probably making additional judges unnecessary.

MORE JUDGES NEEDED IN COURTS?

(By Tom Hall)

Are the requests to Congress for more Federal judges justifiable?

Those asking for additional judges point to heavy workloads and quote figures showing how, at least in this ninth circuit of seven western States, that population increases are going to make the situation worse.

Actually, as previous articles have pointed out, the district court is in excellent condition with litigants able to go to trial within a month or two after their case is ready.

And statistics in the office of clerk Carl Calbreath show there is a decrease in the amount of civil cases being filed.

In the fiscal year 1952-53 a total of 1,875 civil cases were filed. That included approximately 700 Chinese citizenship cases, filed in large volume to beat a deadline set by McCarran-Walter Act provisions.

FEWER FILINGS

The fiscal year 1953-54 saw 1,591 civil cases filed. But so far this year only 627 docketings have been recorded. Projecting that figure for the rest of the year, an estimated 940 cases would be filed by July 1.

Many cases filed in past years, however, were the type which took a short time to try, such as OPA violations. Many now being filed, advocates of more judges say, are more substantial and take longer to try.

This decreasing amount of filings in the district court, naturally, is reflected in the circuit court's appellate calendar, which also shows a decrease in docketings.

JUDGES DISAGREE

Circuit clerk Paul O'Brien's statistics show 515 cases docketed for the fiscal year 1953-1954, while projected figures show an estimated 400 will be filed this fiscal year.

All concerned caution that filings could suddenly soar, but that's the way the statistics stand now.

All judges of the appellate bench do not see eye-to-eye on the need for additional help.

Last year, even, at their annual judicial council here, 1 group thought that with the help of the district judges, as well as the additional judgeships created last year, they could get their calendar current.

To some degree the prediction has come true, but they are hearing 400 to 450 cases a year now to prior years' average of the 225 in order to accomplish it.

Last year one looked ahead nearly 2 years to secure a date to argue an appeal. Now it takes about a year.

FIVE COULD RETIRE

One solution is not publicly discussed, but expected to be offered by some Congressmen when the additional judgeship bill comes up for debate. That is, why don't retriable judges of this circuit retire?

There is no mandatory retirement rule, but Federal judges may retire at age 70 after 10 years service, or at age 65 after 15 years service, all on full pay.

And though retired, they may still sit actively on as many cases as they physically can handle.

Clifton Mathews, who retired 2 years ago, is still a very familiar figure on the bench here.

Age average of the 9-judge circuit court here is 70.

Five are more than 70 years old and could retire while at least 1 other could retire under the 65-year-old provision.

Those opposing more judges note that retirement of the eligibles would leave vacancies to be filled by younger men, but not mean the loss of experience and legal knowledge of the older judges.

They also point out that if Congress refused to give more judges, it would be one way the circuit could take the matter into its own hands to get additional help.

Democracy's Answer to the Marxian Dialectic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, last November 8-10, there was held in Washington a unique convention—the first national conference on the Spiritual Foundations of American Democracy.

The conference was sponsored by the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, a nonsectarian educational organization headed by Dr. Charles W. Lowry, a well-known Episcopal clergyman, and Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, pastor of the National Presbyterian Church in Washington. The foundation has offices in the Dupont Circle Building, Washington. Its national advisory council is made up of distinguished American clergymen and laymen, representing all faiths and including a former President of the United States, Catholic, Episcopal, and Methodist bishops, and several university and college presidents.

The conference speakers included eminent Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders of thought. President Eisenhower spoke briefly at noon on the second day, commending the aims of the movement and emphasizing the religious basis in his view of our democratic form of government. At this same session Senator STUART SYMINGTON and Judge Matthew F. McGuire spoke on God and Government.

The final session was addressed by the chairman of the foundation, Dr. Charles W. Lowry. Dr. Lowry is a graduate of Washington and Lee, Harvard, and Oxford Universities and has pioneered in helping Americans understand the philosophy and psychology of communism. His address is more than a brilliant logical refutation of Marxism-Leninism. It is a profound, passionate affirmation of the truth and meaning of democracy for the 20th century.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Lowry's address:

DEMOCRACY'S ANSWER TO THE MARXIAN DIALECTIC

(By Charles W. Lowry)

I approved but did not originate this impressive subject. I assented to but did not initiate my assignment to discuss it. The responsibility for both actions falls primarily upon Dr. Elson and Dr. Trueblood, and secondarily upon Father Cronin and Rabbi Gerstenfeld.

I am, however, stirred in a deep way by the challenge of a theme that goes so surely to the very heart of the issue which, like a powerful spear, transfixes the body of this time and demands a clear resolution as the price of cauterizing a mortal wound. We

are living at this moment not in an ordinary period with events continuing in a normal succession, but in what can only be called an interruption of history. This lucid and original expression I owe to my friend, Dr. Carlos Davila, the secretary general of the Pan American Union. What we all desire to see, and what our world groans to feel, is a return of history and the rescue of a future.

This happy consummation is not just going to take place; it is not an inevitable which we can take for granted. It rather represents a deed which must in some sense be performed by us, albeit with the aid of divine grace. It consists of an act of collective will which presupposes hard thinking, bold imagining, sympathetic identification, and dedicated passion. It must come by a deep, creative thrust of vision, of courage, of faith, and of love propagated by the energy of many hearts.

To assist however humbly such a nissus or drive of the spirit is the purpose of our meeting and deliberating here. It is the meaning of this national conference. It is the test, and so far as I am concerned the sole test, of the validity of the movement expressing itself in the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order.

"Son of Man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God, Thou knowest. Again He said to me, 'Prophecy to these bones, and say to them, O dry bones, hear the word of the Lord.' Thus says the Lord God to these bones: 'Behold, I will cause breath to enter you, and you shall live. And I will lay sinews upon you, and will cause flesh to come upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you, and you shall live; and you shall know that I am the Lord.'" (Ezekiel 37: 3-6.)

That is a parable of modern man and his worldly wisdom and his secular civilization, so imposing in grandeur and so sterile in things of the spirit. It is an allegory of democracy in the 20th century. How dry and impotent must democracy have become when men and women reach out hungrily to the words of the Marxian dialectic and receive its heavy sophisms as a gospel of life. Yet assuredly it is in a rekindled and resurrected democracy, child of a Jewish father and a Christian mother, and not in a totalitarian materialism, stripped of soul and mind, of mercy and pity, of freedom and love, that man's hope lies.

To speak so almost mystically of democracy and its answer in terms of resurrection may seem obscure and it will certainly seem to some wayward and obstinate. Yet it is just this dimension of the American dream, a dream which for a century the world adopted for its own, that we have all but lost. This near loss explains our curious impotence in the area of ideological struggle and psychological warfare. It explains also the appeal of the Marxian dialectic—communism's cumbersome substitute for the providence and power of God, its secular replacement for mysticism as a factor in politics and society.

THE MARXIAN DIALECTIC

Thus we come forcefully up against our theme and it looms up before us as truly gigantic in scope and magnitude. Yet clasp it and wrestle with it we must, for in such encounter lies the task and the destiny of our age.

What is the Marxian dialectic? To this question many brilliant men have addressed themselves, and quite a few not so brilliant have had their day in the court of attempted explanation. In the second category I may place myself and an ambitious effort at simple exposition of a complex subject in the first chapter of my book, *Communism and Christ*. Here I am going to say very briefly and I hope intelligibly that dialectic was Karl Marx' way of rationalizing the com-

plexity of history and society, including his own doctrine of violence, revolution, and transitional dictatorship. It was his formula for making all these contradictions compatible with his faith that history was moving toward a final goal of good and that this ultimate stage was a universal classless society.

Of course the word "dialectic" is related to "dialog" and for centuries meant the same thing as logic. It denotes the fact that truth like reality is not a simple thing, but is a matter of opposites which somehow produce together a larger actuality. This idea and observation is older than Plato. It was elaborated in its most systematic form by the German philosopher Hegel with his division of the dialectical process into the three stages of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

This analysis and terminology was appropriated lock, stock, and barrel by Marx and his friend Engels, the founders of modern systematic communism. In spite of their brutal rejection of mysticism and God, they applied to raw, unsupported, uncreated, and uncoordinated matter in motion these dialectical attributes. Otherwise they would have had no message and no tools with which to move the minds of men but would have been saddled with the cold frigidity of classical, deterministic materialism. This was the last thing Marx wanted. In his *Theses on Feuerbach*, worked out in 1845 but unpublished till the appearance in 1888 of a new edition of Engels' book *Ludwig Feuerbach*, he exclaimed: "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point, however, is to change it."

I could not help recalling this sentence of Marx when in 1953 at the annual meeting of the British Labor Party at Hargate Aneurin Bevan shouted: "We are the people who want to change the world." The problem of course is not the desirability of change and improvement. The problem is, in what direction, at what pace, and to what end shall we move?

But to return to the subject of dialectic, it was this concept derived from Hegel and the long history of spiritual philosophy that enabled Marxism to become international communism and to generate the ideological drive and appeal which has been the cutting edge of the most powerful tyranny in the twentieth century. Without its dialectic Marxism could not have become a plan of secular salvation; it could not have carried concealed within its materialistic armor a faith capable of turning the world upside down; it could not have found an intellectual framework on which to hang its dogmas and buttress its prophecy both of revolution and of a new world.

KEY TO UNDERSTANDING COMMUNISM

Even now it is impossible to understand communism and its claims without constant reference to the key of dialectic. It is only from a dialectical standpoint that one can comprehend the possibility of capitalism (a new thesis) undermining itself and turning by inexorable historic processes into its opposite (or antithesis) of socialistic dictatorship. Beyond this contradiction, embracing even the most savage and arbitrary tyranny, there lies from the standpoint of dialectical insight the certainty that a great, final, climactic synthesis will arise, a social utopia in which all things will be held in common by all people, and in which there will be no more classes, no more competition, no more want, and no more war.

People often ask, what makes educated men, university men, even wealthy men, susceptible to the lure of communism? What is the mysterious attraction of this new system which obviously has in it so much of ancient tyranny and primitive brutality?

The answer is to be found in the accomplishments for communism of the concept of dialectic. By this theft from Hegelian idealism—for materialism logically can gain

no benefit from logic—the Marxist can claim an understanding of reality and history which appeals to the intellectual; he can parade a scientific approach to economics and sociology which makes contact with the immense prestige of science in western and now also in eastern education; and he can point to the advent of an ideal social order with the certainty of a heartwarming reaction among the generality of optimistic liberals, garden variety socialists, and modernistic religionists in the world of the west.

At least this was true for a generation after 1917 and has not yet ceased to be a factor with which Europe and America, North and South, must reckon. In Asia and Africa we can discern a similar pattern, adapted to differing conditions and slower and more promising from the Communist standpoint in its tempo of evolution.

SIX WITNESSES FOR COMMUNISM

Let me set down for illustrative and comparative purposes several excerpts from basic Communist writings, covering a sweep of approximately 75 years. I believe that a scrutiny of these texts will be illuminating to the ordinary American, and they will bring home the lesson that we must, first of all, take the time and effort necessary to understand what communism is in structure and psychology. The texts I choose are all nontechnical and are pointed in some way to the social goal of communism. But bear in mind, please, that every one could be matched with a quotation from the same source asserting the rightfulness of violence and the necessity of immediate, absolute military dictatorship as the way to bring in, first, socialism and, ultimately, pure communism. And do not forget that the reconciling key to these apparent contradictions is supplied by our friendly ever so helpful formula, dialectic—dialectic joined to an ultimate and unqualified materialism.

Our first witness is Karl Marx himself, the Moses of communism as the German Engels was its Aaron. He wrote in *Capital*:

"We can then foresee the advent of social conditions under which everyone will be relieved of the burden of material difficulty and distress. . . . In this society of the future, personal freedom and the well-being of all without exception will, for the first time in history, become realities, and the individual will, at the same time, be able to develop fully his personal aptitudes and capacities." (Marx: *Capital*.)

Our second witness is Engels. In his work, *Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, he made a prophecy that might well prove an inconvenient reminder of many things to Communists and fellow travelers of today. Said Engels:

"The society that organizes production on the basis of the free and equal association of the producers will put the whole state machine where it will then belong: in the museum of antiquities, side by side with the spinning wheel and the bronze ax."

The third witness we now call to the box is Lenin, the Russian conspirator and Marxian zealot, who became the most successful revolutionary of all time. He wrote in his authoritative book, *The State and Revolution*:

"There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to conjure up a utopia. . . . Marx treats the question of communism in the same way as a naturalist would treat the question of the development, say, of a new biologic species, if he knew that such and such was its origin, and such and such was the direction in which it was changing."

The fourth witness is an American, William Z. Foster, and my quotation is from his suppressed and rare volume, *Toward Soviet America*, published in 1932:

"Communism will inaugurate a new era for the human race. . . . (It) will bring about the immediate or eventual solution of many great social problems. . . . war, re-

ligious superstition, prostitution, famine, pestilence, crime, poverty, alcoholism, unemployment, illiteracy, race and national chauvinism, the suppression of woman, and every form of slavery and exploitation of one class by another. . . . the revolution, in its upward course, will carry humanity to heights of happiness and achievement far beyond the dreams of even the most hopeful utopians."

The fifth witness is the *Short History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, dated 1939 and published over the unwritten imprimatur of Joseph Stalin, if not indeed written by him. This sentence is compact and summary in character; it partakes, in fact, of the catechetical character and purpose of the *Short History*. I quote:

"Marx and Engels taught that it was impossible to get rid of the power of capital and convert capitalist property into public property by peaceful means, and that the working class could achieve this only by revolutionary violence against the bourgeoisie, by a proletarian revolution, by establishing its own political rule—the dictatorship of the proletariat—which must crush the resistance of the exploiters and create a new, classless, Communist society."

Our sixth and final witness is an Asiatic—another man of steel who holds sway, we are told, over nearly one-fourth of the human race. I refer to Mao Tse-tung, who in his book, *China's New Democracy* (1940), wrote:

"Communism is the proletarian system of thought, and is also a new kind of social system. It is different from any other ideological system or social system in that it is the most complete, the most progressive, the most revolutionary, and the most rational system in human history. . . . It is only the Communist ideology and social system that grow and spread in the world, with a mighty, thundering force that can level mountains and overturn seas, and maintain their flowering youth. . . . The world now depends upon communism as its star of salvation, and so does China."

DEMOCRACY'S ANSWER A DIALOG

In these quotations we see the Marxian dialectic in its practical operation. And we are warned—that the answer must be concrete and positive, not merely an academic refutation.

Such refutation is as simple as it is fruitless. Any philosopher with even an elementary training in logic can see that the Hegelian theory of dialectic and materialism are incompatible. They mix about as well as oil and water. The validity of dialectic as a tool for understanding natural and historical development is dependent entirely on the analogy of the human to the divine mind. The Marxian expropriation of the fruit of this analogy without regard to its root and origin represents one of the really monstrous hoaxes, one of the palpable, immense fudges, in the history of thought.

Man, unfortunately for the rationalist, does not live by logic. He lives by something deeper, something that offers or seems to offer food for his spirit. This may include food and other necessities for his body, for the spirit of man justly craves enough transcendence of physical needs to have the freedom to live at a higher level. It is here that Marxian communism has made contact first with Western and then with Eastern man. It has moved into a spiritual and moral vacuum with the power of an elemental force. It will be answered and expelled only by a comparable force that can add to truth subjective depth, social passion, and immediate relevance to man's actual situation of need.

Democracy, honestly conceived and spiritually apprehended, has such an answer. Of this we have no slightest doubt. Yet it must be confessed that there is a problem here which is very searching and very profound. This problem involves the mystery of faith and of the relation of faith to ideology. It

involves the paradox that man must believe in order to live and yet is powerless to create in himself or in others a lively faith. This is always something done in man. It is always finally a mystery.

The problem, therefore, which democracy faces today is one that cannot be solved without taking into account the outreach of the multitudes in every continent for meaning and new life. The same point applies also to intellectuals, for their quest and crisis and aberrations involve the question of man's existence and destiny in an age of science, technology, war, depression, and planetary unification. It has often been remarked from Dostoevski to Whittaker Chambers that the problem of communism is ultimately not one of economics but is the problem of faith.

The answer of democracy, accordingly, must be humble and profound. It must be dialectical in the true meaning of this ancient and oft-abused phrase. It must take the form of a dialog and must eschew easy dogmatism and false simplicity. It must look at all sides of the complex prism of truth and at the same time must believe in Truth and accept her majestic compulsion upon the human conscience. It must not be afraid of the role of the dogmatic and the mythological in human experience. Plato as well as Christianity and all religions of power, whether classified as higher or lower, are our teachers from this standpoint. Finally, this answer must proceed out of self-examination by democracy and must be manifested in a new will to repentance and amendment of life.

In this spirit it is right that freemen should take the false ideology of communism apart and expose it for what it is. They should point out the massive contradiction, approaching social and moral schizophrenia, between the doctrine of Communists and their works whenever and wherever they are in power. Such a contradiction is inexplicable and untenable, even on the basis of the Marxian dialectic pilfered from Hegelian idealism. Communism is not really for man and against the state, but is against man and for the omniscient, absolute state as the abiding organ of a tyranny both unable and unwilling to yield any part of its unlimited power. In this sense communism is Red fascism, and it does not have the excuse of Hitler's national socialism that at least it stated openly and candidly its nihilistic doctrine and program. The Soviet revolution is not in reality revolution, and is in no sense continuous, as both Marx and Lenin assumed, with the classic democratic tradition of the overthrow of tyranny and the increase of self-government. Instead, beginning with January 19, 1918 when Lenin dissolved by armed force the constituent assembly gathered at St. Petersburg to give Russia a democratic constitution, communism has represented counterrevolution and reaction and has extended its way not to liberate but to enslave human beings.

THE GOD THAT FAILED

The choicest spirits who accepted the Communist system in terms of its own ideological valuation as a liberating force have revolted and have had the courage to bear witness before mankind of their error. I think of the six intellectuals who make their respective confessions and bear a common testimony in a remarkable volume *The God That Failed* (1949). A rollcall of these witnesses is suggestive and invigorating: Arthur Koestler, a Hungarian; Ignazio Silone, an Italian; Richard Wright, an American Negro; André Gide, a Frenchman; Louis Fischer, an American (son of David Kantapolsky); and Stephen Spender, an Englishman.

To these names should be added that of a man who was more deeply mired in the sticky amalgam that is communism than most of them but who came to himself and who was ready with a willing sacrifice when

his country called. I refer to Whittaker Chambers, and I beg permission to share with you a passage which records a milestone of spiritual progress in a century that without doubt will be known for its atheism and barbarity as well as for its inventive genius and colossal strides in the mastery of nature.

What modern man has to a large degree lost and what he must rediscover is the knowledge of the reality of good and evil. This is the starting point of the Bible and the foundation of health both for the individual and for civil society. Marx, like Nietzsche, set out from the terrible twin convictions that "God is dead" and that man in his freedom is "beyond good and evil." Communism, like national socialism, may be defined as a particular course of action designed to carry out logically the consequences of these two premises.

In the following passage Chambers records in a moving way a Communist's rediscovery of the reality of evil:

"It will be impossible for a non-Communist to conceive the fever with which I decided to read my first anti-Communist book. I mean fever quite literally; and furtiveness as if I were committing an unpardonable sin, as I was. For the fact that I voluntarily opened such a book could mean only one thing: I had begun to doubt. By chance, and I will let that evasive word stand for something which I do not hold to be chance at all, the first book I read was the book best calculated to shake me to the depths. It was called *I Speak for the Silent*. Its author was Prof. Vladimir Tchernavin.

"Professor Tchernavin was not a Communist. He was a Russian technician of some kind. He was a little man in the Communist world, gentle, humane, good. He went about his routine chores, finding what happiness he could in his love for his wife and small son. Suddenly, for no reason at all, he was arrested and carried away by the secret police. He began that long transit of the Soviet prisons, like a gummed fly slipping from strand to strand in the web of a spider that was always waiting to pounce. At last he was sent to a sub-Arctic prison camp (from which together with his wife and son he later made a sensational escape to Finland). In freedom, he wrote of the horrors of that slave-labor camp, simply, factually; it was their monstrousness, not his pathos, that sickened the soul. Some years before, a British trade-union delegation had toured Russia and reported that there were no slave-labor camps, and that had been good enough for me. I wrote off the recurring rumors as propaganda. Now, for the first time, I believed that slave-labor camps existed.

"A year before, that would not have mattered much to me. I would have put down Tchernavin's book and would not have reopened it. I would have known that, even if some of it were true, it was the price of social progress. I would have known, as what Communist does not know, that terror is an instrument of policy, right if the Communist is right, justified by history, enjoined by the balance of forces in the social wars of this century. Now, too, I put down *I Speak for the Silent*. But for a different reason; because I could not go on, because I could not endure the question that it raised. I was that Communist whom I have described in the foreword to this book. About me had closed a separating silence—the deathly silence of those for whom Tchernavin spoke—and in that silence I heard their screams. 'He hears them for the first time. For they do not merely reach his mind. They pierce beyond. They pierce to his soul. He hears them for the first time because a soul in extremity has communicated with that which alone can hear it—another human soul.'

"I did not know what had happened to me. I denied the very existence of a soul.

But I said: 'This is evil, absolute evil. Of this evil I am a part.'

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

So far what we have said implies an identity of some kind between a religious view of the world and democracy as a particular form of society and civil government. This implication is a correct one if we agree that by democracy we mean not a political abstraction but a movement in modern history expressive of a certain faith, a certain spirit, and a certain body of ideas.

People often use the word "democracy" very loosely. Indeed this assembly should not even for a moment lose sight of the fact that communism, abandoning the usage of Lenin and Stalin in his more imitative phase, has brazenly appropriated this word for the standard dictatorship which it sets up whenever it seizes power in any given society. I have acquaintances who say, "Let them have it after all 'republic' and 'Republican' were good enough for our Founding Fathers." I cannot agree with this counsel; and I hardly need add that I indicate no political preference in a current or party sense in affirming such a conclusion.

Words are as tricky as they are fascinating. Their evolution is often as deep a mystery as the development and inner springs of personality. In the case of democracy two things impress me. One is the extraordinary, across-the-board appreciation of this verbal coin during the last 150 years. The other is the growing zeal of the Communists to exploit the prestige of this term despite definite statements of Lenin to the effect that the word "democracy" cannot be scientifically applied to the Communist Party and is a shackle or a blind hindering a revolutionary nation from building up a truly Soviet form of power. Here are two strong reasons for our holding on to the term "democracy" and to what it naturally and logically denotes as the fundamental focus of the ideology which we have and which we seek to pass on to other peoples and nations in our day.

Only, we must be willing to do some thinking and analyzing and defining. We must mean something more than a vague platitude, a least common denominator of governmental mechanism, when we speak of democracy.

When I first went to New England as a graduate student at Harvard, I made friends with a native son of Massachusetts who was born and bred a Unitarian. He used to say that "a Unitarian was a person with a very lively and sustaining faith in he knows not what." That is our problem in talking about democracy and democracy's answer. We are sure that democracy is real and that it is a good thing. We are certain that it represents a tremendous and perhaps an all-conquering force of history. The world, however, of the 20th century is unconvinced. It is a world in transition, peopled with a humanity which in General Smuts' phrase "has struck its tents and is on the march." It is a postcolonial world with immense masses in commotion mutely prophesying the advent of vast alterations in the affairs of men. This contemporary world, which is our world, wants to know what we in the United States really believe. It wants to know what we have to offer. It is ready to listen and eager to follow, but only if it can detect in the voice and words of those who hail democracy the accent of sincerity and an authentic intimation of sympathy and understanding.

A DEMOCRATIC IDEOLOGY

Accordingly, with great boldness and in full realization that my effort may be only as a child's halting step along a road that winds far and is strewn with boulders, I propose to outline a democratic credo or ideology. An ideology, it should be noted, is not just any set of ideas—political, social, moral, or religious—but is a particular body of concepts and propositions through which actual

men think and by which they live. The most acute commentary I know on the real import of the ideological in the struggle and confusion of our age goes back to World War I and was penned by a brilliant Englishman who, with so many of his most promising young fellow countrymen, fell in that tragic struggle. I refer to T. E. Hulme and this acute commentary:

"There are certain doctrines which for a particular period seem not doctrines, but inevitable categories of the human mind. Men do not look on them merely as correct opinion, for they have become so much a part of the mind, and lie so far back that they are never really conscious of them at all. They do not see them but other things through them. It is these abstract ideas at the center, the things which they take for granted, that characterize a period. . . . It is these abstract things at the center, these doctrines felt as facts, which are the source of all the other more material characteristics of a period."

What Hulme is talking about is what we mean today when we speak of ideology. An ideology always has in it a religious element, or that which is an equivalent of religion psychologically and in motivating force. It is generally wider than religion and always involves politics and social arrangements and relationships. Democracy is an ideology and is wider than religion but it has its starting point in religion. Indeed, in its modern development, which is what we mean when we use the word with an upper case "D," Democracy is the deposit and the impact of the Judaeo-Christian religious tradition in the field of politics and civil society.

First, then, democracy is a faith. Second, it is a political principle. Third, it is an economic doctrine. Fourth, it is a vision of a good society.

1. Faith

Democracy in its modern form, in the living stream of which we are a part, began as a faith. It affirmed faith in man because of faith in God. To the Christian men who wrote and signed in the year 1620 the Mayflower Compact it came as naturally to conclude, "In the name of God. Amen," as it does for you and me to breathe.

The same is true of the more highly educated and the somewhat more rationalistic men who in 1776 accepted and signed the composition of Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, known to history as the Declaration of Independence. This manifesto, which is less than 75 years older than A Communist Manifesto, appeals as a matter of course to a Creator God and to the conscience and reason of mankind. The last thing of which the American signers would have dreamed was an appeal to inevitable economic law and absolute social processes. Between America in 1776 and Europe in 1848 there was a difference not of 75 years but of the antipodes of the spirit and hope of man. How prophetically did this infinite qualitative difference forecast the planetary conflict of the 20th century with its cosmic overtones?

Liberalism

The accent of the American Declaration, in line with the ideas of the political mentor of this classical revolutionary struggle, John Locke, was on the natural freedom of equal men. There was asserted, in other words, not a counsel of perfection or even of desirability but a dogmatic expression of what is. As we have seen, there is a dogmatic core to every ideology. The ideology that was expressing itself in Locke and in the American Revolution as well as in Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) is what should be known technically as liberalism. It is very remarkable that Karl Marx regarded himself as primarily an economist and set out in *Capital* to outdo his British predecessors, Smith and Ricardo, in analyzing

immutable economic law and drawing correct conclusions as to the direction in which society was inevitably moving.

A clue to the really astonishing outcome of history in the first half of the 20th century, with America unconsciously making herself the principal instrument of promoting the world advance of international communism, is to be found in the retention by some New Deal braintrusts as well as by the political leaders under their influence of the term liberalism for an ideology actually much closer to Marxian socialism. It is tempting to say that these extraordinary and ironical developments are the witness of facts (which can be misread but cannot lie) to a dialectical relationship between liberalism and Marxism. Such a conclusion would contain an element of truth. It would, however, concede too much to the exaggerated view of dialectic held by Hegel and all his followers. It would obscure the commanding role of man's freedom and will both in the founding of the Marxian system and in the deed by which Lenin a generation later harnessed to this system the Russian Revolution of 1917.

These events constitute one of the best refutations of economic determinism or any other doctrine supporting the concept of a block universe. They reveal a future that is not a cast-iron affair but an adventure filled with the free deeds of courageous men. They show that there is nothing inevitable about a Communist world and inspire us to dream with equal daring of a truly democratic world, in which peace and social concord shall be restored and freedom and brotherhood shall march hand in hand.

Words we have said are fascinating things. This fascination is inseparable from the drama of meanings conveyed by them. We must seek always to penetrate to the meanings, using key words as our provisional guides but taking care not to become victims of terms.

Liberty, Equality, Fraternity

So we return now to democracy, which we view as a spacious and growing reality destined to dominate the next age of history. The first wave of democracy as a definite ideology was liberalism, accenting freedom but affirming also as a natural fact equality. In the French phase of the new revolutionary drive for liberation and freedom, there was a clear accent upon equality and to the two watchwords "liberty" and "equality," a third was added, "fraternity."

There was in this instinctive Gallic phraseology something very logical. From the angle of the ideal meaning of democracy, it represented a kind of final achievement, a magna carta, one might say, of a new phase of human development. For ever after, to the very end of time, to progress could only mean to move nearer the realization in actual society of the triune motto of the French Revolution.

Unfortunately the third aspect of the Gallic trilogy fell speedily into neglect. Equality, and the problem of its relation to liberty, riveted the attention, first, of French, and, then, of other European intellectuals. Out of this preoccupation arose the Socialist complex, including the bold ideological demarche of communism, the supreme example of raids in the history of ideas.

The heart of this ideology, as we have seen, is the notion of an inevitable dialectic process in which liberalism (capitalism) produces dictatorial socialism and socialism will turn into pure communism. Against this entirely unfounded but undeniably seductive system of illusion democracy's answer is simple but far-reaching. It is that liberty and equality are fulfilled in love and that love is the supreme instance of the truth of dialectic.

Dialectic of Love

Man, we commonly say, is a being related vertically to God his Creator and horizontally to his fellow man or neighbor. These spatial metaphors, while not without point or limited usefulness, are misleading and have often operated to blunt the thrust of religious truth as a unitive factor in the social and civil spheres of life. In reality the two relations of man are different aspects of one whole, for God is not related to man spatially or in a limited way but in His Divine presence and meaning comprehends and enfolds all human beings and all finite relationships.

This means, as both Holy Scripture and the Judaeo-Christian tradition at their deepest levels have plainly glimpsed and taught, that love is not many but one. The love of God is not one reality and the love of neighbor a secondary real added on, but the second love "is like unto" the first and is its inseparable expression and partial definition. Divine love undergirds, sanctions, and hallows human affection and will to the good of another but it is in the knowledge of the power of human love alone that we understand and enter into the mystery of the love of God. This seems to be the clear teaching of the Parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan, and receives vital reinforcement in 1 Corinthians 13 and the First Epistle of St. John.

"Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love."

These words carry in them a force so elemental and yet so elevating that argument about them seems out of place. Yet they are true or false. Their significance admits of no gradations and allows of no evasions. We in this conference know and feel that they are real and true. What we perhaps have not realized is that in this Johannine dialectic of love, Divine and human, human and Divine, there lies the power of a new outlook and a new age.

This truth has been understood sometimes partially, sometimes blindingly, by many saints throughout the Christian era. I do not detract from numerous examples that could be given when I say that for me there is a modern artist and poet who has been my teacher in the dialectic of love. I refer to William Blake and I think it is very important to remember that he watched without losing his vision of spiritual reality both the rise and the fall of the French Revolution. Equally important he saw into the human meaning of the new industrial revolution.

"And was Jerusalem builded here among these dark Satanic mills?"

But unlike Marx and Engels a generation later Blake did not embrace vengeance and the spirit of violence. Instead in his prophetic poem *Jerusalem* (which mystically understood meant England), he wrote:

"Jesus said, Would'st thou love one who had never died

For thee, or ever die for one who had not died for thee?

And if God dieth not for man, and giveth not Himself

Eternally for man, man could not exist, for man is love.

As God is love. Every kindness to another is a little Death

In the Divine Image, nor can man exist but by brotherhood."

Such is the dialectic of brotherhood in which alone liberty and equality are saved from self-destruction and are perpetually renewed in their meaning for the life of man.

2. A political principle

Democracy sets out from religion at the point of its absolute intersection with ethics. But it is, after all, a form of social polity.

It denotes a system of government. It stands for a theory and plan of politics. It cannot meet the demand of our world unless it is demonstrably relevant to the political nature of man and the special political ferment of the present generation.

Democracy is to be distinguished, as Plato and Aristotle taught their contemporaries and all subsequent generations, from tyranny, monarchy, aristocracy, and oligarchy. It denotes, in contradistinction to all these alternative politics, the rule of the people. When the great Greeks wrote, it was against the decline of Athenian power and they were pessimistic about the prospects of democracy. This fact explains the unpopularity of the term and the idea at the time of the American Revolution and with the generality of the Founding Fathers. It was a conditioning factor in the origin of our Federal Constitution, with its mixed character from the standpoint of clear politics and its distributed emphasis upon both a strong central government and a proper system of checks and balances.

Nevertheless, the new stream of democracy was flowing with ever increasing power and gathering into itself the fruits of sound constitutional experience and theory. When fourscore and seven years after the beginning of American Independence Abraham Lincoln undertook to describe our political system, the words that came to him were inspired. They were: "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Add this phrase to the French motto of "Liberty, equality, and fraternity," and add both to the assertion of the American Declaration that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; and you have a pretty comprehensive and a pretty satisfactory summary of democracy as a social and political principle.

People and Individual

Democracy in its maturity means two things with respect to man and man, and man and the state. It means that sovereignty inheres in the people and that government rests by right upon the consent of the governed, not upon the arbitrary will of a monarch or a dictator or a committee of tyrants. It means, secondly, that man's dignity as an individual is a sacred principle which qualifies even the will of a majority at a particular time and which operates as a perpetual check upon the abuse of power even by elected officials of the people. Thus a constitution to be truly democratic must have a bill of rights or its equivalent.

Here, I suggest, is the political essence of democracy as distinct from constitutional devices, details, and methods. There are many possible constitutions which will embody the principle of democracy; the principle is one which is true and right and therefore cannot change. This principle is one whole in two related parts: the sovereignty of the people in government and the value and rights of the individual as an end in himself.

What is the future of democracy? Is it the answer for which the new as well as the old peoples of our seething world are in search? I am persuaded that it is the answer in a very definite way to the aspirations of the awakening nations of the post-colonial era and that there is no other answer. It is the high mission of the United States to be at once a witness to the truth of democracy and to remain the patient friend of peoples who are inexperienced in self-government and are determined to find out for themselves the way that is good. If we are faithful to our mission, we will stand guard without rest at the gates of an open future until all the peoples shall pass through them and enter into the light of an ampler and a happier age.

3. An economic doctrine

Democracy is not only a religious faith. It is not only a political principle. It is also an economic doctrine of teaching. It has something clear and definite and constructive to say about the wealth of nations.

If this were not the case, it would not be necessary for the opponent of democracy to find any other condemnation of this system. It would be a fruitless and sterile plan for human life. One does not have to be a Marxist to realize that economics is very basic and deeply penetrative in its effect upon society, politics, morals, and religion. It is valuable for us to reflect on the fact that Adam Smith was first professor of logic and then professor of moral philosophy at the University of Glasgow. Before he wrote his *Wealth of Nations*, he had published a book entitled "Theory of Moral Sentiments."

Democracy makes three fundamental assertions with respect to economics. These propositions are not concerned with the detailed complexities and relative applications of principle that pertain to any science involving the behavior of human beings. Democracy repudiates without compromise the claim of Lenin that Marx treated the problem of communism (from the angle of course of economic determinism) in the same way as a naturalist would treat the question of the development of a new biological species. Such a claim is fraudulent outside the sphere of the physical and biological sciences. In the sphere of the human sciences the data which constitute the subject matter have a necessary role in determining method.

First Principles

It is another matter with first principles. All sciences assume certain dogmas and would be without the ability to function or achieve if they were devoid of unproven assumptions. These first principles are less obvious and more concealed in the case of the natural sciences than they are when we come to the operations of the human sciences. In the latter case the presence and potency of given assumptions is a fact that cannot be hidden. This is true of ethics, of psychology, and of sociology. It is true of economics.

Our three propositions, therefore, are in the nature of first economics principles. We state them dogmatically not because they are self-evident or with any thought that they are not debatable. We set them forth rather as the meaning and impact of democracy as a total ideology upon the wealth, or material welfare, of individuals and nations.

First, freedom is the fundamental form of economic life, as it is of political order and personal existence. Second, private property is a right inseparable from the dignity of the individual, the integrity of the family, and the wise limitation of the state. Third, it is the function of moderate government, in accordance with justice and the responsibility of the general welfare, to act as regulator and balancer in relation to the impersonal character of economic forces.

Each of these propositions could be discussed at length. Here I prefer instead to present as a background for such discussion a short resumé of broad trends in the relationship of the state and economic practice.

Historical Summary

In classic thought politics is thought of as prior to economics. Man is thought of as a political animal. His dependence upon the community of which he is a part is accented, and the reality and power of the state are seen as the direct reflex of this social, economic, and psychological dependence. Economics without doubt assumes various degrees of partial distinctness and autonomy but always regulation and subordination to state policy are taken for granted. This holds down through the mercantilism of the 17th century.

Meanwhile, however, the development of the individual, first in consciousness, then in philosophy, politics, and economics, was taking place and was becoming more and more emphatic. Finally, in the 18th century the age-old cocoon of state supremacy burst, and we witness not only a new birth of political democracy but a new concept of society known as political economy. According to the new idea, politics is to take a back seat and economics is to be endowed with complete autonomy. A corollary is the dictum that the least government is the best government.

Now we see spread out for our instruction one of the real ironies of history. Adam Smith brought out his *Wealth of Nations* in 1776—the very year of the American Declaration of Independence and of the birth of a new English-speaking nation. His work was essentially an extension of the French doctrine of physiocracy or the rule of nature. In Paris in the 1750's Smith met Vincent de Gournay, author of the phrase *laissez faire, laissez aller*, and he met also another physiocrat, a friend of de Gournay named DuPont de Nemours. The great idea was to let economic forces alone, to release them from artificial control and make them as free as the atoms of physics.

We know the sequel. Immense power was released. The new industrial age came in with a bang. But there were some unexpected results. One of them was what we called the socialist complex. Another was Karl Marx, who, we repeat, set out with the picture of himself standing on the shoulders of *laissez faire* economics and in his book *Capital* expounding, with the fullness of science informed by dialectics, the thesis of classic political economy that economics determines or should determine politics.

Marx, of course, was self-deluded. The condition of our world at this moment shows the extent of his error. He brought in not communism, as he visualized it, a condition of perfected universal anarchy based upon an economic sufficiency automatically passed out to all men, but the most powerful example in modern history of the revived and enlarged omniscient, totalitarian state. To find any real analogy for the actual communism that has come about, we have to go behind the Christian era and even the Graeco-Roman period to the age of the Pharaohs and of the despots of Babylon.

Lessons

Thus the wheel swings full circle, and hard lessons are forced upon us. The Marxian error was only partly economic; it was moral, philosophical, and political as well. But it points a fundamental lesson, namely, that man is not and must never be viewed as simply or mainly an economic being. When this happens, no matter how liberal or benevolent the intent, the door is opened for disastrous error. Man's personal dignity is lost. His moral and spiritual nature are forfeit. He ceases to be an end in himself. He, and not merely his labor, becomes the commodity and value of abstract economic theory.

Yet *laissez faire* doctrine was right in its judgment that political freedom presupposes economic freedom. This is perhaps the supreme lesson of the modern flirtation with socialism including its extreme of communism. There is a second and corollary lesson—and "the second is like unto the first"—namely, that the freedom and integrity of religion presuppose both political and economic freedom. Freedom is, in fact, one and it is indivisible.

The error of *laissez faire* political economy was in having too negative a view of freedom and too rationalistic a view of economic law in relation to the general welfare. Again we see illustrated the deep and abiding truth of the dialectical principle rightly understood. Truth is not a simple affair but is always a complex involving the synthesis or

union in tension of opposites. Applied to Democracy as an economic doctrine, this means that freedom is an absolute but that the State under God has the duty of seeing to it that this principle does not result in concrete tyranny and in heartlessness from the standpoint of plain human beings.

Mrs. Humphrey Ward, in the last century, once had occasion to write a member of the Parliament of Great Britain on behalf of one of his constituents who needed his help. The distinguished leader in politics replied that he was sorry but that he was so busy planning for the good of the race that he had no time for the individual. "Ah," said Mrs. Ward on receiving this reply, "our blessed Lord, when last heard from, had not achieved this sublime altitude."

The meaning of democracy is that the government has time for the smallest individual. Parliaments and congresses, presidents and judiciaries, are not ends in themselves, but are dedicated to the service of "the least of these" our brethren. Man is not made for the state, but the state for man. In the words of our own President, Dwight David Eisenhower, "Government must have a heart as well as a head."

4. A vision of a good society

Every ideology is three things. It is a body of ideas. It is a faith. And it is a concrete vision—a picture of a good society toward which man strives.

Examples leap to mind. Plato is an evident instance. The medieval idea is another. The humanism of St. Thomas More is a third, with a Utopia sketched out to make the main points clear. Communism is the outstanding modern example, with its hard-core dogmas, its dynamic psychology expressive of something that can only be called a secular mysticism, and its social dream posited as the inevitable, scientifically certain outcome of the dialectical processes of history.

What of democracy? Is it an ideology in search of a vision? Or does it know where it is going?

The answer to both questions is, "Yes." Democracy was born when modern man, conscious of his origin and nature as a child of God and convinced that his life should embody both reason and freedom, posited a social contract as the basis of society and government. This theory we now realize was an artificial construct from the standpoint of actual origins. But it tells us a great deal about the ideas, values, and expectations of the first democratic believers. The real meaning of the social contract lies in transposing it from past to future. It was the first installment of democracy's vision of a good society, and it remains, seen in this light, essentially valid.

Developing and Dogmatic

Yet there is truth also in saying that democracy is by its very nature a thing incomplete and is today as in the past an idea and a faith searching for an adequate vision of its goal. Some will condemn this, and point out the obvious superficial superiority of communism in this respect. Others—representing the mentality which absolutizes open-mindedness and the non-dogmatic and which is sometimes called today liberalism of the American type, as distinct from the European—will seize on this aspect as the very essence and justification of democracy.

We reject both attitudes and emphasize with all possible force that the tentative and undogmatic side of democracy concerns its relationship to the growth of man in history and his liability to error because of finitude and sin. With the first principles of democracy—religious, moral, philosophical, political, and economic—the case is otherwise. The foundation must be a dogmatic one. Here communism is partially correct, and we can learn from it.

I refer, of course, to the dogmatic character or form of Communist first principles, not to their erroneous content. When the architects and continuators of this system then go on, as they do, to ascribe an equally dogmatic certainty to social goals, the main processes of history, and the plasticity and infinite malleableness of human nature, error is piled grievously upon error and the grand result is a totalitarian monstrosity without parallel.

This colossal idol has three faces. One is political. One is social. The third is religious—religious in the sense of unlimited claims to truth and value and in the sense also of the arrogation to man of the power, meaning, and loyalty normally ascribed to God alone. But behind each of these faces is a single dynamic idea. This idea, as we have emphasized earlier, is given status in the Communist system by the device of dialectic. It is the idea of a perfect social order—a Utopia in time where all men shall be happy and free, and where there shall be no more evil.

This is the concrete vision which since 1848 has been the mainspring of Communist ideology. It is by this social dream that it has swayed the minds of men.

Democracy did not begin as a starry utopian plan, and it cannot and must not attempt to outbid communism at this point. But from its first beginnings in modern history democracy has spelled man and his dignity, man and his hope of ceaseless growth and improvement. Since man is a social being, and therefore a political animal, as the Greeks taught, it follows that democracy is inseparable from the concept of the general welfare and the will to its promotion and advance.

A New Social Goal

In our century a step is indicated which was impossible in the 18th century and which was really inept and unfeasible in the 19th, as contemporary history proves to the hilt. This step is the projection of a clear social goal, a vision of a world society in which is posited a progressive solution of the basic material problems of mankind hitherto regarded by wise and good men as objectively beyond the capacity of the human race.

The meaning of modern technology, symbolized in dramatic terms by the artificial fission and fusion of the atom, is that within man's grasp for the first time in history is abundance for all. An age of plenty has dawned. A solution is in sight of the basic, age-long problem of material existence for the masses of all continents.

The atom is the Creator's first handiwork. It is the building block of all creation. As unveiled in its surprising and marvelous inner texture, it is a symbol both of the power and the restraint of God. Are we not as believing men compelled to see God at work in our time and to hail the good news of atomic energy?

To ask such a question is to answer it. It is for democracy in the strength of the vision which is opened up by this answer, the answer of the presence and purpose of God, to resume its arrested progress and to meet with boldness the dreams of newly awakened peoples. It must affirm the end of mass poverty and wretchedness as it proclaims with a new vibrancy the ideals of liberty, equality, and brotherhood. It must speak in tones of confidence and clarity, for all men to hear, the words of Isaiah the Hebrew prophet, taken by Jesus of Nazareth as His own at the beginning of His ministry in the synagogue of His home city:

"The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me to bring good tidings to the poor; He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to those who are bound; to proclaim

the year of the Lord's favor. (Isaiah 61: 1, 2 cf. St. Luke 4: 18, 19.)

A Servant of the Nations

There is one qualification. To use words like these imposes a costing commitment. Democracy can clothe itself in such liberating words only if its adherents know that sacrifice is required of them. We dare not speak of deliverance, concern, brotherhood, human solidarity, the solution of ancient, chronic, deep-seated problems of the general welfare, unless we are moved by the spirit of love and are prepared to count the cost of proclaiming a new age.

All of us know in our hearts that in a special way at this mighty hour of history our great country is called to be, in the spirit of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, the servant of the nations. The problems and difficulties are vast, but who will say that we lack the power and ability to make a decisive contribution, if we can find the vision and the will?

Economics and Spirituality

But, it may be asked, are you not saying that the solution is economic? Are you not saying in effect, set in motion a larger point 4 program, perhaps under some other name, and we will extend democracy, defeat communism, and save the present uncertain day? Is not this Marxist doctrine in concealed and honeyed phrases?

The answer is emphatically in the negative. Economics by itself or even as a first installment of good will is not enough. Man does not live by bread alone. We insult him if we think he can be won by rice or wheat or technological crumbs from the rich American Nation's table.

We must begin with what we believe in our deepest soul and have the humble daring to share the truth that is from God with men and women who are hungry above all for the bread of life. We know that a part of this truth is the affirmation of human dignity expressed in respect, readiness to learn, simple self-giving, and brotherly love. We know that we cannot truly love God and show a right faith in Him unless there is lodged in our heart and conscience the Commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Having said this with all possible emphasis, let me remind us all that one of the supreme assets of the Hebrew-Christian tradition is its understanding of the relationship of spirit and matter. In this tradition there is no illusion of pure spirituality; there is no hollow separation of soul and body. St. Thomas Aquinas represents a mountain peak of this outlook and of humanism for all time when he says that though the soul is nobler than the body, the human person constituted by the union of soul and body is nobler than the soul. Beside this I may place a pregnant sentence from a modern Anglican theologian, Archbishop William Temple: "Christianity is the most avowedly materialist of all the great religions."

Such a tradition is uniquely fitted to deal with the age of the atom—new symbol of technological mastery and harbinger of coming material abundance. It is prepared to interpret the exciting advances of science as encompassed in a divine plan and at the same time to affirm the utter necessity of transcending the plane of the material and sensate. For the miracle of man is that, though formed of atoms, molecules, and chemical elements, he is created in his totality in the image and likeness of God, with the gift of reason and "with power on his own act and on the world."

CONCLUSION

This means, to sum up, that economics and ethics, politics and religion, are not diverse and unrelated areas of human concern; rather, they belong together and constitute not a hierarchy but a rich, interrelated com-

plex of life interwoven throughout with the two complementary patterns of individual salvation and the common good. The will of God for His human children is abundant life, both in this order of His creation and in the larger, veiled life of the world to come. Therefore, the needs and pain and material aspirations of the masses of our world must be met. A new and more humane and kindly order of society must be projected as a goal for our time. Labor for the fulfillment of this vision must be undertaken by good men everywhere as a sacred religious task.

But we must be warned and our matter-conscious, engineering-centered world must be warned of one thing. This warning was voiced nearly three decades ago by a modern Plato — a mathematician-philosopher with the style of a poet named Alfred North Whitehead. In the intervening period neither Marxian materialism nor scientific humanism in any form has brought forth fruits that justify changing in the slightest degree the tone or substance of this prophetic word:

"The fact of religious vision and its history of persistent expansion is our one ground for optimism. Apart from it, human life is a flash of occasional enjoyments lighting up a mass of pain and misery; a bagatelle of transient experience."

Labor Unity: A Vast Power Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the March 4, 1955, issue of the new Jackson (Miss.) State Times:

LABOR UNITY: A VAST POWER POTENTIAL

Merger of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations now seems certain. Approval of the unity plan proposed after long study and negotiation by a joint committee is up to the executive bodies of the two groups. There is little likelihood that they will turn down what George Meany and Walter Reuther have agreed on.

Labor unity has been talked of so long and argued so vehemently that we tend to forget the Nation has had a single great organization before, although not in the sense of the potential of this merger. Until 20 years ago, the AFL counted within its affiliated memberships virtually every laboring man who belonged to a union.

The AFL's tardiness in recognizing the changes inherent in the development and vast growth of the mass industries brought about the creation of the CIO in which workers were organized horizontally by industry rather than vertically by crafts. But the AFL was never the force, either politically or economically, that is promised by the merger at hand now.

For one thing, the real growth of organized labor did not begin until the early 1930s, and the major expansion in numbers has been in the industrial unions of the CIO. For another, organized labor rarely attempted to exert itself politically until it was plunged by power-seeking leaders into the political battles accompanying the creation and maintenance of the New Deal. Consciousness of labor's influence at the ballot box and in the halls of legislatures has been a major development of these same years.

Nearly 16 million Americans are listed as members of unions now affiliated with one or the other of the two organizations. Virtually all are of voting age and are being constantly exhorted by their leaders to qualify themselves as voters. Numerically, they represent fully a quarter of the voters in a modern presidential election—a proportion which theoretically should hand them control of the situation on a silver platter.

But does it? Not necessarily, by any means. Regardless of the talk of the labor vote, the truth is that it does not exist as a solid bloc, subject to the dictates of any small group of bosses. American workers mark their ballots—when they mark them, for as a group they are as negligent about the fulfillment of this vital responsibility of citizenship as are the rest of us—as Americans first and labor-union members second. Some are Republicans, some are Democrats, a few are radicals but each is an individual scarcely more subject to outside pressures than their fellows.

The recent decision in the DuPont monopoly case said that industrial bigness of itself is not evil. It recognized that size brings power, but held that as long as that power was wielded with responsibility and without damage to others, it was not legally wrong.

The same reasoning can be applied to the labor merger. The Nation will look to the labor leaders to handle the potential force of their merged organizations in the best interests of the Nation and not for narrow purposes.

The best checkmate against its use otherwise is still the free American worker who as an individual has the fortitude to speak his mind and vote his convictions, inside the labor union and out.

"Just the Facts, Ma'am"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there is hardly among us anyone who has not at one time or another heard over the radio or the television, the expression which has become almost a household phrase, "Just the facts, ma'am."

Of course you recognize the phrase as that of Sergeant Joe Friday in the radio-television series "Dragnet."

Facts have always been a fetish with me.

For long years I dealt with the facts as a newspaper reporter. In those days I always attempted to portray the facts in the pieces which I wrote, as reliably and accurately as I knew them.

But facts, like statistics, are a rather tricky medium in the hands of individuals.

It has been said that statistics can prove anything.

I have always made the assertion that the same set of facts in the hands of an adroit and able reporter can be used for any purpose.

Give any reporter a set of facts and he can write a piece in any one of three ways: up, down, and in the middle. Facts can be slanted with adjectives and phrases to convey an idea or a conclusion

which the reporter desires instead of what the cold facts actually are.

Give me a page 1 story and you can have 50 editorials on the editorial page of a newspaper and I will direct your conclusions.

An individual approaches an editorial page in one of three different attitudes.

If he is in agreement with the policy of the newspaper which he reads he approaches the editorial with a kindly and sympathetic feeling.

If he disagrees with the policy of the newspaper then he approaches the editorial with an antagonistic attitude and in a resentful mood.

If he has no feelings on the policy of the newspaper then he approaches the editorial with an open, but certainly argumentative frame of mind.

With the news story it is entirely different.

The average American newspaper reader accepts a news story at its face value as he does the remarks of the radio commentator, who in turn has gotten his information from the newspaper story.

Without suspicion the clever and adroit reporter can make his reader believe anything he wants him to believe. He can mold him like clay in the hands of a sculptor. And the very first to indignantly deny that he is being led by the average news article is the very individual himself who was affected.

Now what does all this lead to?

Having worked the other side of the street and with cause, believing that I know most of the tricks of the trade, it has annoyed me considerably to read some of the so-called objective and unbiased news articles which have appeared in the Nation's press on the recent congressional and judicial salary boosts.

Objectivity—or the lack of it—in news reporting has always intrigued me and I am sure it would intrigue all of you if you ever stopped long enough to analyze some of these objective reports.

Seldom has there been such clever misrepresentation of the facts as during the consideration of the congressional and judiciary pay raise bills. In fairness to the press it must be stated that they were given very able assistance by some of our own Members.

I had hoped that these misrepresentations would cease with the final action on the measure. It was indeed a forlorn hope.

The most annoying thing about the whole business is that these misleading articles do deal in factual statements and in the facts but they are presented in such a manner and fashion that a completely erroneous conclusion is drawn from such articles.

I have a case in point.

Under the Associated Press credit line an article appeared in the Washington Post of Friday March 4 under the heading "Congressmen To Get Big Pension Hike."

Now that is true. Under the recent pay boost Members of Congress will get a big pension hike. But there is still more truth to such a statement—that part of the truth and the facts which have not been printed and which are necessary to complete the picture.

Any individual reading the article would immediately come to the conclusion that Members of Congress boosted their retirement pay by \$5,625 to \$16,875.

The article did not say that in order to receive such a retirement payment a Member would have to serve 30 years beginning March 1, 1955, through March 1, 1985, that he would have to pay a total of \$40,500 from his paycheck and that he would have to have reached the age of 62 years.

In order to demonstrate what I have been talking about I have used this article and headline as an example of how a certain set of facts can be used to distort conclusions.

I am reproducing the article as it appeared in the Washington Post under the Associated Press credit line. I then have taken the same story and written another story around the same set of facts but painting an entirely different and favorable picture. In order to be most accurate and to clearly and vividly demonstrate my point I have taken the exact words of the Associated Press story and incorporated them into my rewritten story and see what you have.

Here is the original story by the Associated Press:

CONGRESSMEN TO GET BIG PENSION HIKE

The \$7,500 annual pay rise Congress voted its Members this year adds \$5,625 a year to maximum congressional pension benefits.

The maximum payment goes only to those who complete 30 years or more of congressional service. To qualify for the new top pension of \$16,875 a year, a Member would have to serve 30 years under the new pay scale.

Pension payments to Congressmen are based on average annual salary during a Member's tenure in office, with a limit of 75 percent of full pay.

President Eisenhower signed into law Wednesday a bill raising Congress Members' salaries from \$15,000 to \$22,500 a year as of March 1.

The top pension any Member could draw under the salary scale in effect when the present Congress convened was \$11,250.

Pension payments are at the rate of 2½ percent of average pay multiplied by the number of years of service.

Contributions to the pension fund also will increase as a result of the pay rise, since Members pay 6 percent of their salary into the fund. Participation is voluntary.

Now here is the same story around which has been written all the facts in the case.

For the purpose of emphasis I have quoted those portions of the following story which appeared in the original Associated Press story. I have also written a new headline which is also as factual as the original headline but which carries a different suggestion and most certainly has a different flavor.

Here is the story which will never be printed except in these columns.

CONGRESSMEN MUST PAY HEAVY ADDITIONAL TAX

(Disassociated Press)

As a result of the recent \$7,500 congressional pay rise, Members of Congress will be compelled to pay out of their checks an additional \$3,300 annually, reducing the "take-home pay" of the new amount by approximately 40 percent.

Part of the deductions from the monthly paycheck of Members of Con-

gress are compulsory, part of it voluntary.

The compulsory withholding sum for income-tax purposes will amount to \$2,850 more annually assuming that the new pay rise, exclusive of other income, places a Member of Congress in the 38-percent bracket. In at least one instance the new pay rise will result in only \$75 a year additional "take-home pay." The Member affected is already in the 90-percent bracket and voted against the pay raise.

The voluntary deduction, which qualifies a Member for participation in a retirement fund only after he has reached the age of 60, at a lesser rate, or the age of 62, at full rate, after he has served at least 5 years, will amount to \$450 additional annually. Those Members of Congress who have elected to participate in the retirement fund are now paying annually \$900 per year. The new pay raise will bring this contribution up to \$1,350 annually, the highest it has ever been in congressional history.

"The annual pay rise Congress voted its Members this year adds \$5,625 a year to maximum congressional benefits."

"The maximum payment goes only to those who complete 30 years or more of congressional service. To qualify for the new top pension of \$16,875 a year a Member must serve 30 years under the new pay scale." No present Member of the House could, therefore, qualify for the maximum figure unless he is reelected to the next Congress and serves 30 years after that. Because the pay raise did not become effective until March 1, 2 months short of a complete year for service in the 83d Congress, no Member of the House would be eligible until 1984 for the maximum.

"Pension payment to Congressmen are based on average annual salary during a Member's tenure in office with a limit of 75 percent of full pay."

Pension payments are also made to members of the judiciary who were given pay rises in excess of the amount given Members of Congress. Unlike Members of Congress who elect to participate in the retirement plan, judges do not contribute anything to their retirement payments which are automatic at retirement age regardless of years of service.

While the retirement amount for Members of Congress is based on the average salary during tenure of office the retirement pay of other Government workers coming under retirement plans is based on the 5 years' highest salary during Government service.

Members of the armed services, who also do not contribute to their retirement fund, receive an amount based on the pay of rank at their retirement regardless of age.

"President Eisenhower signed into law Wednesday a bill raising Congress Members' salary from \$15,000 to \$22,500 a year as of March 1."

"The top pension any Member could draw under the salary scale in effect when the present Congress convened was \$11,250." Only a relatively few Members of the present Congress could qualify for this amount, however, since it is based on 30 years' service at a salary of \$15,000. For retirement purposes the \$15,000 sal-

ary figure became applicable during the 82d Congress, thus only those elected to the last Congress and who serve for 30 years, to the year 1983, would have become eligible for this amount. "Pension payments are at the rate of 2½ percent of average pay multiplied by the number of years of service." Any Member to qualify for the maximum retirement pay under the recent pay rise must voluntarily contribute from his salary the sum of \$40,500, serve 30 years, and reach the age of 62 years.

"Contributions to the pension fund also will increase as a result of the pay rise bill, since Members pay 6 percent of their salary into the fund. Participation is voluntary."

To further illustrate exactly how misleading the Associated Press story is, there are men serving in the present Congress for 30 years and over who never, never could or will qualify for the maximum retirement pay. These men, if they are in the retirement plan, will have their retirement computed on the basis of a salary ranging from \$7,500 to \$22,500 per year. A provision which would have enabled Members of Congress to enjoy the same privilege as all other Government civil service workers in the retirement plan by basing the retirement pay on the 5 highest consecutive years was knocked out of the proposed legislation.

To be specific take my own individual case. I could remain here 30 years and never receive either the new maximum of \$16,875 or the most prior maximum of \$11,250. When I first came to Congress the salary was \$10,000, then it became \$12,500 and then \$15,000 for retirement purposes and now \$22,500. I am in my 15th year. I will qualify when I become 62 years of age which is 8 years away. Then I would have had 22 years service and my retirement would be computed on the average ranging between \$10,000 and \$22,500. And incidentally I had to pay \$3,000 cash in order to qualify for retirement when the system was opened to Members of Congress. There are many other cases similar to mine. I only cite it for example.

Anybody, however, reading this Associated Press article would come away with the conclusion that every Member of Congress just had to wait until he retired to collect this handsome sum of money.

Oh yes; "Just the facts, m'am" are rather confusing when presented by some people who really do not want you to have all the facts about the facts.

What good will all this do?

None.

At least I have gotten it off my chest.

The Bank Holding Company Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the hearings before the

House Committee on Banking and Currency on H. R. 2674, to regulate bank holding companies, we were privileged to hear W. J. Bryan, president of the Independent Bankers Association of America.

The background material that he presented, in my opinion, is of extreme importance.

Every Member should be acquainted therewith in order to act intelligently on this proposed legislation. I, therefore, commend it to their attention, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is W. J. Bryan, and I appear here as president of the Independent Bankers Association of America. This association has a membership of more than 5,200 banks from States other than those in the 12th Federal Reserve District. Those States have their separate association, which is represented here by its president, Mr. Harry J. Harding. Our members are predominantly small and medium-size banks, which are unable, individually, to send representatives here to plead their cause. We do not maintain a Washington office or have any paid lobbyists. None of us who will testify to you in behalf of H. R. 2674 receives any pay from either association.

We heartily endorse H. R. 2674 as urgently needed to stop the evasion of Federal and State laws that were designed to prevent concentrated control over money and credit. We should like to emphasize the fact that this is the only country left where most communities are served by home-owned and home-managed banks which are aware of and responsive to the needs of the people of their areas. We believe that this has been the most important single factor in the development of the United States. Like yeast cells in a loaf of bread, each working in its immediate area, our banks scattered throughout the country have cooperated to produce the greatest and most general economic development the world has known.

Other countries must depend on 3, 4, or 5 banks having up to thousands of branches. Policies and important credit decisions are made hundreds or thousands of miles from many of the branches. The interest of an enterprising local customer may run counter to that of a large main office account, in which event the former might suffer. This inevitably tends toward concentration in all lines, cartels, the stifling of new enterprises, and stagnation—what has been termed the "mature economy." When forced to choose between such monopoly and some ism, countries invariably have chosen the latter.

Recognition that political freedom and economic freedom are interdependent is prominent in American history. I should like therefore to review some of this history for the purpose of bringing up to date this old and recurring struggle for and against centralized power, and to present the present problem in its proper focus.

The Bank of the United States, chartered by Congress in 1791, was authorized to have branches. It proved unsatisfactory, and its charter expired in 1811. A second Bank of the United States was chartered by Congress in 1816. It had as many as 27 branches in various cities. One of these was in Cincinnati. Illustrative of the tendency to abuse power, the bank in 1818 ordered the Cincinnati branch to collect its loans at the rate of 20 percent each month. The effect was disastrous to people and businesses in that city, as the bank foreclosed a great amount of real estate upon which it later realized much profit. This action precipitated the panic of 1818-19. The bank became so powerful, politically as well as financially, that it attempted to force President Jackson to renew its charter 4 years before it expired.

Jackson's veto of a renewal bill passed by a Congress friendly to the bank was a paramount issue in the election of 1832, and his election doomed the bank. Thus ended our first and only nationwide branch banking system.

In the same year, 1836, Rhode Island adopted legislation against branch banking. The Free Banking Act of New York in 1838 prohibited branches. Massachusetts passed similar legislation, and the bank commissioners of Connecticut charged that branches had not been recognized by law and should be prohibited. Whether recognized by law or not—and mostly not—banks operated branches in most of the States on a broad scale, but practically all ended in failure. This caused Congress to insert in the original National Bank Act of 1863 a prohibition against branches of national banks, but it was amended in 1865 to permit State banks with branches to come into the system and retain their branches. Notwithstanding this concession, the branches which came in did so as independent units. As a result, there appears to have been only one branch (of a State bank) left in the country in 1865.

From then until 1910 there were relatively few banks with branches outside their home cities. In 1910 29 States apparently had no laws on branches, pro or con. Nine prohibited them, and five restricted them to cities or parish.

After 1910 the spectacular and rapid expansion of the Bank of Italy in California begot imitators around the country. Banks in many States started branches, which led to the adoption of State laws which prohibited or restricted branches within limited areas, but the existing branches were left. By 1929, 22 States had prohibited branches, 10 permitted them within narrow limitations such as cities, counties, etc., 9 permitted them statewide, and 7 had no laws on the subject.

It will be recalled that the late 1920's was a period of expansion, mergers, and speculation. In almost every field there was great rivalry to be the biggest. Banking was no exception. When the possibilities of growth by absorbing competitors were exploited, other means were sought. Stopped by Federal and State laws from branching out into other areas, ambitious bank promoters turned to the holding company device, which was working so successfully in other fields, notably public utilities. So bank-holding companies began to spring up in States that prohibited branch banking. Most of these were intrastate operations, but some were interstate. The organization of one holding company under the sponsorship of a bank usually led to the formation of another by its principal competitor, which felt it must do so to maintain its competitive position. Other rivals sometimes followed suit. In my State, three such holding companies were organized between the adoption of our anti-branch-bank law (in 1925) and 1930. The Federal Reserve Bulletin of February 1938 reveals that on December 31, 1931, there were 97 bank-holding companies in existence, an average of more than 2 for each State.

I should like to emphasize that as branch banking started without any lawful basis for existence, being neither specifically permitted nor prohibited, which omission was corrected in most States by prohibitory laws, bank holding companies likewise were organized not only without any lawful recognition, but for the purpose of evading the laws on branch banking. The very circumstances of their origin is proof of this. The Federal Reserve Bulletin of April, 1930, noted that, "the area within which these developments have been relatively more considerable in extent is composed largely of States which have prohibited the establishment of branch banking offices." Business Week of September 21, 1929, declared bluntly, "Chains are evasions of law." Dr. Gaines T. Cart-

inhour, in his book, *Branch, Group and Chain Banking* published in 1931, listed "The desire to circumvent Federal and State laws prohibiting or limiting branch banking in anticipation of legislation removing the restriction" as the primary motive for establishing them. The principal exponent of the branch and holding company movement, Mr. A. P. Gianini, stated to this committee at hearings in 1930: "I believe branch banking should be extended on a nationwide and worldwide basis, for if you do not have direct branch banking you are going to have it indirectly through holding companies." The then chairman of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, stated to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency of the 80th Congress: "Under existing law . . . there is nothing to prevent it (a holding company) from acquiring stock of an existing bank and operating it as a branch of the entire holding company system." Mr. Eccles' successor as chairman of the board, Mr. Thomas B. McCabe, stated to the same Committee of the 81st Congress: "Through the acquisition by the holding company of the stock of an existing bank which thereafter may be operated for all practical purposes, as a branch of the holding company system the denial of a branch application of a (holding company) controlled bank may become almost meaningless." The present chairman of the board of governors, Mr. William McChesney Martin, has stated in a letter to the chairman of your committee that a holding company can evade laws as to branches of banks and as to engaging in nonbanking businesses. That they can and do evade these laws is a self-evident fact.

Although there were no laws regarding bank-holding companies, an opinion issued by the Solicitor General of the United States on November 6, 1911 held that a bank-holding company (perhaps the first of the modern type) "in its holding of national bank stocks is in usurpation of Federal authority and in violation of Federal law." As a result, this holding company disposed of its bank stocks. We may well ask why this opinion was not evoked in connection with later holding companies? Or why it is not applicable now? The facts and laws cited therein appear relevant. In fact, they are so pertinent to the consideration of H. R. 2674 that I should like to review the opinion and quote portions of it.

The Solicitor General, Hon. Frederick W. Lehmann, considered "the purposes which the framers of the national banking act had in view. The first, the paramount, purpose was to secure a uniform national system of currency, and to do this without the creation of a great central institution like the old United States Bank. The opposit to such an institution was deep-seated and widespread. . . . It was affirmed that frequently great inconvenience and sometimes terrible disaster resulted to the trade and commerce of different localities by the mother bank of the United States arbitrarily interfering with the management of the branches by reducing suddenly their loans and sometimes withdrawing large amounts of their specie for political effect. . . . It (the National Bank system) will be as if the bank of the United States had been divided into many parts, and each part . . . revolving on its own orbit, managed by its own board of directors, attending to the business interest of its own locality."

The first Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. Hugh McCulloch, was quoted: "It is not to be a mammoth corporation, with power to increase and diminish its discounts and circulation, at the will of its managers, thus enabling a board of directors to control the business and politics of the country. It can have no concentrated political power. . . . It will concentrate in the hands of no privileged persons a monopoly of bank-

ing. . . . The banks created by the National Banking Act were, and were designed to be, local institutions and independent of each other," said General Lehmann.

He quotes section 5133 of the National Bank Act: "Associations for carrying on the business of banking under this title may be formed by any number of natural persons, not less in any case than five." He emphasizes: "It should be noticed in passing that only natural persons may engage in the formation of a bank." He quotes section 5146: "Every director must, during his whole term of service, be a citizen of the United States and at least three-fourths of the directors must have resided in the State, Territory, or district in which the association is located for at least 1 year, immediately preceding their election, and must be residents therein during their continuance of office. Every director must own, in his own right, at least 10 shares of the capital stock of the association of which he is a director. Any director who ceases to be the owner of 10 shares . . . shall thereby vacate his office." Again he emphasizes: "Here the local character of the bank is secured. The directors must all be shareholders, they must all be citizens of the United States and three-fourths of them must be residents of the State." It should be noted here that the law regarding directors of national banks and their ownership of bank stock remains in effect identically the same as quoted above. Mr. Ben DuBois, secretary of the Independent Bankers Association, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency at hearings June 23, 1954, pointed out that some holding companies retain a hold on the directors' qualifying shares through a repurchase agreement or option to buy them back when they cease being directors. Since the holding companies can remove them at will by not reelecting them, they serve as directors and even hold their qualifying shares at the pleasure of the holding companies. Thus a feature of the National Bank Act upon which its founders laid great stress has been practically nullified.

Furthermore, every application for a new bank, national or State, receives a very thorough investigation by the Comptroller of the Currency or appropriate State bank supervisor. They investigate the need for the bank, its prospects, and particularly the qualifications of the proposed officers and directors. Yet on the very day it opens for business a holding company, an intangible corporation located anywhere in this country and controlled by people of whatsoever character, can acquire control of the bank, and the supervisory authority has no power whatsoever to prevent it. H. R. 2674 gives the supervisor who assumed the responsibility for chartering the bank the rightful power to veto such acquisition.

Returning to the opinion of General Lehmann, he quotes from a court decision regarding ownership of national bank stock by another national bank: "Another evil that might result, if large and wealthy banks were permitted to buy and hold the capital stock of other banks, would be that in that way the banking capital of a community might be concentrated in one concern. . . . Such accumulation of capital would be in disregard of the policy of the national banking law. . . . The smaller banks, in such a case, would be in fact, though not in form, branches of the larger ones."

His conclusion was: "Certainly there can be no holding of such shares by any corporation when the result is to defeat the policy of the National Banking Act; that is, to destroy the local character of the bank, break down its independence, vest its control in another corporation, and link it in substantial proprietary interest with some other business than national banking. . . . We are dealing with corporations of a public

character, with national banks, which have public duties to perform, and of these it is a peculiar obligation 'to maintain independent corporate existence and not surrender control of their affairs or the exercise of their powers to another corporation.' No authority is given by the Federal statutes to the National Banking Association for assigning their powers and delegating their duties to a corporation created by a State, and which, under its charter from the State, may engage in a business and exercise powers denied to the banking association by the law of its creation.

"Here again it is to be observed that if the power in question exists, it exists without limit. The company may extend its power to the full control of all the banks into which it has made entrance. Nor need it stop with these. As it grows by what it feeds upon it may expand into a great central bank, with branches in every section of the country. It is in incipient stage, a holding company of banks, with added power to hold whatever else it may find to be to its advantage.

"Where public law and public policy are involved, forms and fictions are disregarded and the facts are dealt with as facts.

" . . . Indirection, if it accomplishes the same purpose, stands upon the same footing with direction."

Our courts, Federal and State, have consistently supported the conclusion reached in the above opinion:

"The spirit as well as the letter of a statute must be respected." (Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court Marshall, *Durossseau v. United States* (307, 314, 6 Cranch 307, 3 L. ed. 232).)

"It is a well-known maxim of the law that one cannot do indirectly what the law prohibits being done directly." (Justice Campbell of the Supreme Court of Oregon, *Friedenthal v. Thompson* (146 Oreg. 640, 31 P. 2d 643, 645).)

"It is a rule of law that a party is forbidden to do indirectly what it cannot do directly." (Justice Griffin of the California Supreme Court of Appeals, *Shenson v. Fresno Meat Packing Co.* (96 C. A. 2d 725, 216 P. 2d 156, 160).)

"The corporation cannot do indirectly what it is prohibited by law from doing directly." (Hon. PRICE DANIEL, now a Member of the U. S. Senate while attorney general for the State of Texas, in opinion rendered Texas Banking Department in 1952, which led to the dissolution of bank holding companies in Texas.)

As stated above, the finding that the holding company was "in usurpation of Federal authority and in violation of Federal law" caused it to divest itself of its bank stocks, and itself was later liquidated. Why was this opinion not used to prevent the later information of bank holding companies? Senator Carter Glass charged that it had been "suppressed" when he found it in the Comptroller's office. The Comptroller at that time was an outspoken and active advocate of interstate branch banking, which may have kept him from proceeding against these effective fifth columns for branch banking. This illustrates one reason the advocates of H. R. 2674 want definite laws to regulate holding companies, rather than leaving it to discretionary authority.

We have mentioned that there were 97 bank holding companies on December 31, 1931. While those remaining in existence now claim much credit for "stabilizing" banking during the 1930's, these claims are open to serious question. Their public statements when they were organized were to the effect that they were buying only "the strongest and best banks." They could hardly have sold stock for the purpose playing the Good Samaritan to failing banks. One would be naive indeed to believe they did so except where it was to their advantage, one way or another. Independent banks

throughout the country helped in various ways to save their weaker brothers, not necessarily from the goodness of heart, but to restore confidence in banks. Actually, the areas which were hardest hit by failure were those where holding companies most nearly monopolized banking. Much has been made of a statement that a governor asked an out-of-State holding company to organize a bank in his State. He would not have had to do this except for the failure of a large chain which paralyzed his State.

The holding companies and their banks were leaders of the agitation during the early 1930's for Federal and State legislation to permit branch banking. They claimed they wanted this so they could save small independent banks from failing by taking them over as branches, and in fact had support from some such banks on this premise. A probably stronger reason, however, was that by converting their affiliates into branches, most of the capital funds of the affiliates would be recovered, as the parent bank would not be required to have capital equal to the aggregate capital of itself and its affiliates. Evidence that this was a desperation move for some of the holding companies is furnished by a statement of Senator Carter Glass during hearings conducted by him as chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Mr. GLASS. It is the view of the committee, upon information presented, that if we do not adopt statewide branch banking, the holding companies and the banks which they hold are going to be pretty soon wrecked. I do not know that it ought to be stated here, but we want to consider this whole problem in frankness. If the existing requirements of the law were put into effect by the Comptroller of the Currency, there are thousands of banks which have not yet closed their doors, whose capital and surplus have been impaired, which would have to be closed up today, and unless we do something of this nature, that part of the country where these holding companies exist—and they are not confined to any one section, though perhaps they are more numerous in the northwestern section of the country than in any other section—are going to find themselves in inextricable difficulties."

You will note that Senator Glass put the blame squarely on the holding companies: The worst banking troubles were in the areas where holding companies existed; the reason for passing the bill to permit national banks to have statewide branches, regardless of State laws to the contrary, was to save the holding companies and the banks which they hold from being wrecked, and that part of the country where these holding companies exist from finding themselves in inextricable difficulties.

However, in States where there were no leaders to organize opposition and present the facts, the anti-branch-bank laws were repealed or altered. Where such leadership was found, the laws usually remained unchanged. The Independent Bankers Association started with a small group that waged a successful fight in Minnesota. Much of its early financial support came from banks that were so afraid of the big holding companies that they would not join openly. Intimidation was tried in other States, where holding company representatives muscled in on meetings of independents.

The net result was that between 1929 and 1939 the number of States that prohibited branch banking declined from 22 to 9; the number permitting it increased from 19 to 35; the number without legislation on the subject was reduced from 7 to 4.

On the other hand, between the ends of 1931 and 1936 the number of bank holding companies dropped from 97 to 52; 24 (almost 25 percent) had failed, 17 had converted

their banks to branches, 7 had sold their banks—usually to people in the respective communities. Only 42 groups were in operation on both the above dates.

These figures show that bank holding companies have been very effective Trojan horses for opening breaches in our laws after circumventing them. By breaking down State laws they have brought about changes in the National Bank Act, in order that national banks could compete on an equal basis with State banks. But the Congress has steadfastly respected the rights of the States to specify the extent to which branch banking shall be practiced within their respective borders. Practically all the States have done so, but they have no way to protect themselves against an outside corporation's coming in and buying stock in their banks and gaining control. H. R. 2674 affords them that protection. Discretionary control would not do so.

The fundamental strength of H. R. 2674 is that it is founded solidly and firmly on existing law, Federal and State. It states in clear language what has long been a basic rule of law, that one cannot do indirectly what is forbidden to be done directly. Federal law forbids banks having branches across State lines. H. R. 2674 forbids holding companies from buying banks across State lines. State laws limit branches within their borders in varying degrees. H. R. 2674 accordingly limits the acquisition of banks by holding companies. National and State laws prohibit banks from owning other types of businesses. H. R. 2674 provides that a company that controls two or more banks shall not own such businesses.

The opponents of this bill have contended that to base holding company legislation on branch banking law is wrong, because there is a difference between branches and affiliated, or subsidiary, banks. Great stress is placed on their difference in form, which everyone of course recognizes. But they are differences without a distinction. For, as was shown by authoritative quotations above, subsidiary banks are to all purposes and effect branch banks. Other than in form, what is a practical difference between a branch and a bank the stock of which is owned by a holding company that selects the bank's directors and changes them at its pleasure, even holding repurchase rights to the directors' qualifying shares; that hires and fires the bank's personnel and otherwise supervises its operations; that makes its investments, handles its insurance, buys its supplies, originates and places its advertising; passes on its loans to local firms and individuals, usually receiving a fee for all these services? "Where public law and public policy are involved, forms and fiction are disregarded and the facts are dealt with as facts. Indirection, if it accomplishes the same purpose, stands upon the same footing with direction," to quote Solicitor General Lehmann. H. R. 2674 treats facts as facts.

Thus far I have dwelt on the moral side of this issue: Whether laws and their clear intent are to be respected or whether by clever utilization of what courts have called the corporate veil an illegal act is legalized? Whether precedents established by failure to enforce a law shall become the basis for changing that law? I should like now to point out some compelling reasons why H. R. 2674 is urgently needed.

According to information furnished by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on June 10, 1953, there were 34 bank holding company groups as of December 31, 1952. Four of these are now in process of being liquidated as a result of a ruling by the attorney general of Texas in

1952 that they were in violation of Texas' anti-branch-bank law. Two others have converted their controlled banks into branches after a change in State law. That leaves 28. In addition, there are several chains not classed as holding companies, but operating in the same manner. Some of both types are small—in some instances family holding companies. But 12 of the holding companies had banks in from 2 to 7 States, as of December 31, 1952. One of these controlled banks having 44.88 percent of the deposits of one State, 76.75 percent of another, and 45.59 percent of a third; in addition to controlling a large number of nonbanking companies—manufacturing and processing, insurance, mortgage and financing, etc. In another State one holding company controlled 36.65 percent of that State's deposits, with another holding company having 11.13 percent—or 47.78 percent between them. Another holding company controlled 30.12 percent and 24.40 percent respectively in two additional States. Two other holding companies competing in still other States controlled 57 percent, 44 percent, 29 percent, and 32 percent respectively in four States. These last two holding companies control almost half of the deposits of an entire Federal Reserve district.

Further acquisitions and mergers since December 31, 1952, reveal increased and startling concentration of bank deposits. Nine of the 26 largest banks in the country, as of December 31, 1954, absorbed 46 banks that year. Thirty-two of these were taken over by 2 banks in different States, both controlled by the same holding company. Such acquisitions brought the deposits of one of these banks to 44.6 percent of its State's total. But a competitor bank also acquired 2 banks with 10 branches to attain 42.6 percent, giving 2 banks 87.2 percent of that State's deposits. The same holding company has a bank in another State which has two-thirds of that State's deposits; yet this bank apparently felt constrained to take over one of its 7 competitors last year. This same holding company has another bank which has 20 percent of still another State's deposits. But another bank in this State, with over 49 percent of the deposits on June 30, 1954, formed a holding company to acquire control of a competitor having 8 percent. Thus, one holding company now controls 58 percent of another 20 percent—over 78 percent for the 2.

This amazing and alarming concentration has been possible only because of the holding-company device. H. 2674 would have prevented it, had it been enacted in time. It can still prevent the same from happening to the rest of the country. But immediate action is urgently needed. Ambition is insatiable. Having acquired the banks in the areas where they now operate, the holding companies will look for new fields to conquer. New companies will be organized as a protective measure. Then the larger holding companies will absorb the smaller ones. Within a generation most of our banks will have disappeared, and we shall have a very few very large systems. Do we want this? Do we dare risk it?

From the early days of this Republic, it has been public policy to encourage small business. "In this year's Economic Report of the President he stated, 'The public policy to encourage the expansion of a free economy must assign a high place to measures that keep the doors to opportunity open for new and small enterprises. . . . The Government has a responsibility to maintain easy entry into trade and industry, to check monopoly, and to preserve a competitive environment. . . . Most of our leading companies were once small, and got started because local banks had confidence

in the ability of the founders. Ideas and ability are to be found everywhere. And who is so likely to recognize these as the local banker who has the power to act on his judgment, and who will benefit his bank and his community by developing a substantial customer and employer. I am sure your home districts, like mine, offer many such examples. As the Commercial and Financial Chronicle has so well stated:

"Unit banking is peculiarly suited to the genius of the American people, to the democratic republican form of government which we have developed, to the nature of our business and industrial organization, to our social institutions, and to the individualism which is the foundation of our national progress. . . . Let us never despise the day of small beginnings nor the virtue inherent in small things."

Contrary to possible opinion, bank support for H. R. 2674 is not for selfish reasons. Holding companies offer the best market to those wishing to sell, which is the reason for their growth. Independent banks are more than holding their own with them in competition. Holding companies offer better salaries to management of banks to enlist their aid in buying stock. Some of us might find it profitable to form holding companies of our own. So we are really working against our financial interest. But we know what the end result will be. We want to see our communities continue to grow. We are fearful of what will happen to our customers needing character loans based on our personal knowledge; to our small merchants and manufacturers who are competing with national organizations; to our local papers who depend on local businesses, as do our lawyers, insurance agents, and other professional people. We have read some history, both American and foreign, and have observed that all power corrupts. Absolute power corrupts absolutely. We know that it can happen here.

We do not contend, nor do we believe, that those representing or connected with holding companies are motivated by any evil design. They are able and ambitious men, who are representing the corporations that employ them. We are not trying to put them out of business. H. R. 2674 is not punitive legislation. It takes none of their banks away from them. It simply requires them to respect our laws in future expansion.

There is cause for grave concern over the increasing trend toward concentration of control over our country's money and credit. We are rapidly following the example of England, whose many banks became the Big Five. She finally passed a law against further concentration. Do we dare wait so long? The Bank of England has been nationalized. France has nationalized its few banks. There are only a very few in all the other countries. The same will inevitably come to pass here unless we forestall it by legislation.

There is no question about what the reaction of the American people would be to such a condition. A nation that would not allow a monopoly over tobacco certainly will not condone one over the life blood of its economy—money and credit. Through their Representatives in Congress and the State legislatures they have at various periods erected legal barriers against such centralization. Some of these have fallen, some have corroded. It is urgently necessary that we stop the remaining laws from being eroded. H. R. 2674 would do this. Its adoption by the Congress is necessary if we are to preserve our free enterprise banking system, the economic counterpart of our political system. Each is essential to the other.

**The American Medical Association:
Power, Purpose, and Politics in Or-
ganized Medicine—Part I**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, an article in the Yale Law Journal of May 1954, concerning the American Medical Association, was called to my attention. Feeling that this piece of research should receive wider attention, I wrote to the Journal indicating my desire to insert the body of the article, minus footnotes, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and to the president of the AMA asking him to comment, if he wished, on any part of the article which seemed inaccurate or unfair.

I have received the approval of Mr. Gerald Walpin, the managing editor of the Yale Law Journal, to omit for the sake of brevity the article's 709 footnotes, which, he states, contain authority and explanation for almost every sentence in the text. In his reply, Mr. Walpin also said that they would be interested in my response from the AMA. "Before the article was published," he added, "we mailed galleys of the text and footnotes to the AMA requesting their criticisms and/or corrections. Instead, in the letter that the AMA released to the papers at the same time our article was published, they limited their comments to generalities."

In his reply to my letter to the AMA, Dr. George Lull, secretary and general manager, enclosed a press release of the Yale University News Bureau and a press release issued by the American Medical Association. The latter is printed below: I am omitting the former since it seems largely a restatement of the AMA release. Dr. Lull also said, "I might say that the students who wrote the article never visited American Medical Association headquarters, and many of the statements contained in the article are given an incorrect slant entirely."

There follows the American Medical Association statement on the Yale Law Journal article, The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

**AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION STATEMENT
ON YALE LAW JOURNAL ARTICLE**

(INFORMATIVE NOTE.—The July issue of the Yale Law Journal carried an article entitled: "The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine." The soundness and worth of the article's conclusions are completely undermined by cumulative misstatements and distortion of facts, many of which are not even in accord with references presented in the footnotes. Herewith is the American Medical Association's answer to this article.)

CHICAGO.—An 84-page study of the American Medical Association, prepared by student editors of the Yale Law Journal, was branded by Secretary George F. Lull today as a mixture of misinformation and distortion.

The article, which criticizes the AMA for failure to use its excessive authority over medical practice as an instrument of progress, was written by student editors headed by David R. Hyde and Payson Wolff, both of whom received their law degrees from Yale last June.

The students, whose study required 2 years, claim that their conclusions are based upon studies of the American Medical Association's published records, interviews with both its critics and proponents, and a questionnaire directed to State medical societies.

"Yet," Dr. Lull said in Chicago, "the editors took neither the time nor trouble to visit the AMA headquarters office nor interview any of the AMA officers or staff people to get their facts correct."

FACTS ARE GIVEN NEGATIVE SLANT

"The real danger in this distorted article," Dr. Lull added, "is that nearly all of the facts are given a negative slant whereas they could have been presented in a positive light to reflect the major accomplishments of the American Medical Association since it was founded 107 years ago. It is very apparent that the young authors built up a strawman and then proceeded to knock him down; an obvious attempt to neutralize the conservative influence of one of America's great voluntary organizations."

"The attempt," Dr. Lull continued, "recalls the publicity fanfare in the summer of 1951 when the same publication, the Yale Law Journal, attacked the Federal Bureau of Investigation for allegedly invading academic freedom by pouncing on any student who joins a liberal organization."

"FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover charged at the time that the pages of the Yale Journal had been used to distort and misrepresent the truth."

"Like the FBI, it is very difficult for the American Medical Association to understand how so many factual mistakes could have been made in the writing of this article. The errors, of course, will be plain to anyone familiar with the subject. Unfortunately, the article will be read by many without such knowledge."

JOURNAL CARRIES ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS

The Yale Journal articles finds that "no other voluntary association commands such power within its area of interest as does the AMA. It holds a position of authority over the individual doctor, wields a determining voice in medical education, controls the conditions of practice, and occupies a unique position of influence in shaping Government health policies."

For example, the authors charge that the AMA's power has been used to block virtually all plans for providing low-cost health and medical care unless subjected to medical society control. At present, the article continues, the AMA is opposing President Eisenhower's proposal for Federal Government reinsurance of voluntary health plans on the thesis that this might lead to socialized medicine.

Commenting on this statement, Dr. Lull said that "the American Medical Association opposed the Federal reinsurance plan because it was unnecessary and represents the intrusion of the Federal Government into a phenomenally successful area of private enterprise. Evidently the House of Representatives felt the same way because it recently killed the bill by an overwhelming majority—238 to 134."

The Yale Law Journal pointed out that although many physicians are critical of AMA policies, the AMA, with its total national income of \$9 million a year, is not truly representative of the Nation's doctors and does not tolerate conflicting opinions within its membership. The article claims further that the Journal of the AMA "rarely prints opinions in disagreement with posi-

tions taken by the organization's governing boards."

Dr. Lull branded this statement as false. "On the contrary, the AMA is so representative of its membership that many other organizations, including the American Bar Association, have modeled their organizational structure after the AMA. Furthermore, one sentence of the article carried this conflicting statement: 'The AMA . . . enjoys the consent and loyalty of an overwhelming majority of physicians.'"

ANOTHER FALSE STATEMENT

Doctors who defy AMA authority, the Yale students found, may be subjected to professional ostracism, which could cut them off from patients referrals and consultations, deny them advancement in hospitals, or bar them from professional appointments.

Dr. Lull also branded this statement as false. "The American Medical Association, as well informed people know, has almost no authority over individual physicians. It is the county medical society that disciplines members who are guilty of unethical practices."

"Despite the dangers inherent in such a concentration of power," the Yale article continues, "no interest group enjoys more freedom from Federal control than organized medicine."

Several steps are recommended by the authors to curb these powers.

First, to protect the individual doctor from unreasonable exercise of organized medicine's authority, the importance of society membership should be deemphasized in order to mitigate the severe consequences of its disciplinary powers. As one step, the writers suggest that this could be done by insuring availability of hospital privileges to non-members.

AMA HAS NO CONTROL OVER HOSPITAL STAFFS

Commenting on this statement, Dr. Lull said, "The American Medical Association has no control whatsoever over hospital staff appointments which are made by the local hospital board of trustees."

Second, the students urged that organized medicine should be divested of its control over the Nation's supply of doctors. This step could be accomplished by Federal aid to medical schools without impairing AMA powers to set educational requirements and to inspect these schools, according to the authors.

Dr. Lull termed this accusation "false and malicious." "The AMA," he said, "has no control over the Nation's supply of doctors. The Yale Medical School admission committee and all similar committees throughout the United States determine the number to be admitted. The AMA has nothing to do with control over the supply of doctors. The statement is ridiculous."

The students also argue that legislatures should divest State medical societies of their control over the formation of new methods of providing low-cost prepaid care. At present State statutes requiring approval or participation by the medical society or a majority of the doctors have foreclosed experimentation in solving pressing medicoeconomic problems.

"Independent groups of doctors, cooperatives, unions, and employers—as well as the medical societies—should be free to work out their own solutions. Government assistance to plans for low-income subscribers may also be required," they write.

Finally, the authors say, the AMA should provide a forum for dissenting opinions and conflicting viewpoints.

"This," Dr. Lull commented, "has been provided long ago. Twice a year the AMA house of delegates meet to discuss pro and con the policy issues of the association."

"New ideas," the article concludes, "which the association has accepted have been forced

upon it; by assuming leadership in experimentation with unproved systems of practice and payment, the AMA could become an instrument of progress."

To this statement, Dr. Lull said that the students' article, on the contrary, refers to innumerable instances where the facts belie this conclusion.

CITE ARTICLE'S INACCURACIES

Following are just a few examples of the article's inaccuracies, contradictions, and false implications:

In claiming the "lack of an effective forum for dissident opinion," the authors first make the untrue statement that the Journal of AMA rarely prints opinions contrary to organization policy. They also ignore the existence of Medical Economics, Modern Medicine, and other national medical publications, not to mention the many journals of the autonomous State and county medical societies. They further neglect the fact that any doctor member can appear before a reference committee of the AMA house of delegates to express his opinion. Above all, they minimize the basic fact that the policies of the AMA are established at the grassroots level by the members of county and State medical societies—just as the Nation's policies are established by the voters at the polls.

The article further demolishes its own point by naming several other organizations to which doctors can belong and through which they can express themselves—such as the American College of Physicians, American College of Surgeons, the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care, the Physicians Forum, the specialty organizations, and others.

FAILS TO CITE PUBLIC BENEFITS

The article dwells heavily on the penalties and disadvantages suffered by physicians who are denied membership or suspended from membership in medical societies. In fostering the impression of monopoly and coercion on this score, the authors fail to bring out the salient fact that the standards based have been formulated for the protection of the public, not for the protection of physicians.

As an example of an outright misstatement of fact, the article says that one of the purposes of Today's Health, the AMA monthly publication for the general public, is to gain public backing for health measures supported by organized medicine. Quite to the contrary, Today's Health avoids material of a medico-political nature and devotes itself to public-health education in such matters as disease prevention, family health problems, and medical advances.

As one of its major points the article hauls out the old, oft-repeated, and thoroughly discredited accusation that the AMA controls and curtails the supply of doctors in this country through its program of inspecting and approving medical schools. The only purpose of that inspection program is to maintain high standards of medical education so that the American public can be assured of properly trained physicians. It makes no difference to the AMA whether a medical school doubles, triples, or quadruples its enrollment, just so long as the school maintains high standards relative to its faculty, facilities, equipment, and teaching methods. The AMA never—before, during, or since the economic depression of the early thirties—has attempted to impose enrollment quotas on the Nation's medical schools; in fact, it has in the past turned down all such suggestions and is now actively encouraging the current expansion of medical schools which already are at record-breaking levels of enrollment.

ARTICLE MISREPRESENTS AMA PAST

The article has distorted or misrepresented the association's past and present attitudes toward such things as group prac-

tice, voluntary health insurance, public-health programs, and financial aid for medical education, while at the same time ignoring the constant AMA study and effort to bring about evolutionary, progressive developments based on sound medical and financial principles and a sincere concern for the public welfare.

The article, by mixing various portions of truth, half-truth, untruth, opinion, and implication, has greatly exaggerated the power and authority of the American Medical Association and has greatly understated the autonomy and independence of the individual physician, the country medical society, the hospital governing body, and the many other elements which make up the American medical system.

The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part II of the American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION: POWER, PURPOSE, AND POLITICS IN ORGANIZED MEDICINE

INTRODUCTION

In its hundred-odd years of existence the American Medical Association has attained a position of undeniable authority and influence over medical affairs. The power of organized medicine affects not only the physician but also everyone who requires the assistance of the healing arts. AMA successes in raising the quality of medical education, practice, and care are beyond question. However, in these endeavors it has acquired such power over both public and practitioner that it can channel the development of American medicine. Dangers inherent in such power are compounded by the layman's ignorance of medical matters and the AMA's monopoly position as spokesman for the profession. Out of this situation arise questions of grave significance. The AMA is motivated both by obligations to the public and loyalties to its own members. The demands on it from these two points of view underlie all its activities and suggest the possibility of conflict. To what extent does professional self-restraint, combined with present laws and institutions, assure that this conflict will be resolved in favor of the public interest?

THE AMA STRUCTURE

Membership

The American Medical Association consists of 53 State and Territorial (constituent) societies and 1,987 county (component) societies. Each county society sets its own qualifications for membership and its members automatically belong to the State association. Aside from racial barriers in most southern counties, all reputable and ethical licensed M. D.'s are eligible for membership. And in most areas virtually every practicing physician belongs to his local society. Until recently, all members of county and State medical societies were also automatically members of the national association. But in 1950 payment of dues, previously assessed only by the county and State groups, became a prerequisite to AMA mem-

bership. Now some physicians belong only to their county and State societies, and are not members of the American Medical Association. On the other hand, since belonging to a county society is a prerequisite to admission at all levels, membership in the AMA depends upon acceptance by the local organization.

Reasons for membership: Many factors contribute to the high percentage of physician membership in organized medicine—a proportion unique among voluntary professional associations. With membership in the society, the doctor receives ready access to the social and professional contacts indispensable to the growth of his practice—contacts which may lead to patient referrals and consultations. Additionally, there is the all-important factor of association with men engaged in his own science, with opportunities for exchange of knowledge and acquisition of professional status. The medical societies disseminate the latest scientific information through professional journals which are available to members either at no cost or at reduced rates, and through lectures, exhibits, and medical libraries which the societies support. In addition to these professional services, the local and State societies aid members by providing group malpractice insurance, and by offering legal advice. Many of the larger societies maintain bill-collection agencies. There may also be direct economic benefits incident to membership. Since the societies often contract to furnish medical care to indigents and veterans, participating physicians have a supplementary source of income from these programs. Membership can also be a conduit to such professional advancements as hospital staff appointments, teaching positions, and specialty ratings.

Beyond the advantages which accrue to the member physicians, there are services which the society renders to the profession as a whole. The AMA has improved curricula and facilities in American medical schools. It gives financial support to research projects and publicizes medical discoveries through its journals and meetings. Moreover, many doctors look to the American Medical Association to protect their interests against encroachment. Thus, the AMA spearheaded the drive against compulsory health insurance and other governmental inroads into private medical practice. And the association has worked to rid the profession of quacks, as well as licensed physicians thought guilty of malpractice, and to limit the activities of nonmedical practitioners. Since the entire profession profits by these efforts of the AMA, physicians may feel obligated to join and give their material and moral support.

Reasons for nonmembership: However, a substantial number of American doctors do not belong to the American Medical Association or its component units. Many of these are retired physicians who let their membership lapse, or young practitioners who have not yet fulfilled the residence requirements for their local society. Doctors who do not conform to the code of medical ethics are not eligible for membership. And many southern societies exclude Negro physicians. Salaried doctors, such as those on the staffs of universities and research institutes, and civil servants often do not join medical societies; here professional advancement is available through channels other than medical society membership. In remote areas services which the society can render may be so negligible that doctors have little incentive to join. Some physicians may find the dues prohibitive; for example, in parts of California the total of county, State, and National dues runs as high as \$190 annually. Undoubtedly some doctors do not join because of apathy, while a small minority of physicians do not choose to belong because they disapprove of the policies of the AMA.

Formal structure

The formal structure of the American Medical Association provides for the largest measure of direct democratic control in the county medical societies, and increasingly indirect representation at the State and National levels. Members vote directly for county officials and representatives to the State legislature, usually known as the house of delegates. These delegates select their own State officers and elect the State representatives to the national house of delegates. This body elects the president and other AMA officers and the nine-man board of trustees.

In theory, the policymaking function of the American Medical Association is vested in the house of delegates. However, since the house meets semiannually, many administrative and policy decisions are necessarily left to the board of trustees. Although it is responsible to the house of delegates, the board functions with little supervision when the house is not in session. The members of the board perform the typical role of corporate directors: they approve all AMA expenditures, and generally the chiefs of the association's operating bureaus are responsible to them. The trustees also appoint the secretary-general manager and the editor of the Journal. The president has little formal power in formulating AMA policy, although he enjoys tremendous prestige as chief spokesman for the organization.

The AMA functions through standing committees or councils elected by the house of delegates or appointed by the board of trustees. Each council directs the activities of the association in a particular field with the assistance of a full-time staff. The 900 employees of the national organization are supervised by the secretary-general manager of the association, who has chief responsibility for the day-to-day decisions of the organization between meetings of the board of trustees.

Real power structure

While democratic procedures exist at the county level, many members do not have sufficient interest in activities to attend meetings. Doctors are extremely busy with their practice and have little time to devote to the problems of organized medicine. In New York, for example, 25-percent attendance at a business meeting is considered good. Thus, the few doctors who are interested in medical politics can easily wield power and influence out of proportion to their numerical strength.

The nominating process for elections within the American Medical Association allows the officers in power to have the dominant influence in deciding who shall succeed them in office. At the county level, the president appoints a nominating committee which puts up a slate of officers and delegates for the State house of delegates. The State president functions in the same way in the selection of national delegates. These elections are rarely contested. In at least one State, Alabama, the delegates are appointed by the president. The election of the official slate is made easier by the fact that the State and national organizations forbid electioneering and soliciting votes for office. Even where the official slate offers alternative nominees, basic differences between the candidates are unlikely.

The nominating process, in combination with the apathy of the average doctor, assures domination by a single faction within the AMA. In New York—one of the few States where an organized opposition has developed—these challengers have had little success. State societies report that reelection of delegates is common, the same names appearing on the ballot year after year. Frequently officers progress steadily from county, to State, to national prominence as they acquire seniority.

One of the major obstacles to the formation of any opposition is the lack of an effective forum for dissident opinion. The Journal of the American Medical Association, which is the publication most widely read by members, rarely prints opinions in disagreement with positions taken by the house of delegates or board of trustees. In response to criticism of this policy the American Medical Association asserts that members can present their views initially in their county societies; that if these views win approval, delegates will present them to the State society, and finally the members' opinions will be presented to the national house of delegates for consideration. In practice, however, because of the indirect system of elections, such a procedure eliminates any dissident viewpoints above the county level unless they win majority support. And while a member can oppose official policy in his local society, the structure of organized medicine makes it almost impossible for him to effectuate his opinions within this framework.

One study of the American Medical Association has concluded that the physicians who rise to power within the medical societies are predominantly urban practitioners and specialists. Although there is only a slightly larger number of specialists in the United States than general practitioners, usually over 90 percent of the officers of the AMA are specialists. Specialists, whose incomes are above those of the average practitioner, are probably better able to devote time to medical politics. Statistics also reveal that cities contribute a larger proportion of officers than rural areas. And in the AMA house of delegates those who have served long terms are primarily from urban localities, while the shorter term delegates tend to be from the rural areas.

Although these officers are not average American doctors, it would not be accurate to say that their policies are unrepresentative. The support of the membership is clearly shown in the immediate response of most members to a voluntary assessment voted by the house of delegates. Most members also seem willing to distribute literature and advocate AMA policies. But perhaps the most indicative fact is that groups organized to oppose AMA policies regarding the economic and political aspects of medical practice have never gained widespread support among the doctors. No group of any significance that has been formed to modify or review AMA policy has offered itself as an alternative to the AMA. Doctors are free to join such organizations while retaining their AMA membership but few have enrolled. Even though the actively controlling group within the American Medical Association is a self-perpetrating minority its viewpoint is readily accepted by the passive majority. This acquiescence assists that governing minority in excluding dissident opinion from organized medicine.

SOURCES OF AMA POWER AND INFLUENCE

The essence of AMA strength is found in its power over the medical profession, its economic position, and the status of the doctor in society. Moreover, due to the character of its membership, organized medicine probably has a greater potential influence than organizations of other professions. And it has capitalized upon its latent strength by a skillful application of all the resources at its disposal.

Power over the profession

Consent: Fundamental to medical practice is the concept of professionalism. Practitioners are bound by a common interest in increasing the effectiveness and maintaining the integrity and prestige of the profession. This derives from recognition of a duty toward the public, as well as a desire to benefit individual members. In addition, problems and affairs of medical practice are

assumed to be beyond the comprehension of the layman. So, in order to realize its objectives, the profession must govern itself through an effective organization. The American Medical Association fulfills this function and enjoys the consent and loyalty of an overwhelming majority of physicians. Even potential dissenters may remain silent in the belief that the interest of the profession is best served by presenting a united front to the public.

Monopoly: This consent has enabled the AMA to attain a monopoly position within the profession. Doctors may believe rivalry between competing professional associations would be injurious to both public and practitioner. Consequently, other medical groups formed to fulfill specific needs have tended to cooperate or affiliate with the AMA. And until recently there was almost no disagreement within the profession concerning its proper interests. So the small minority which would today challenge AMA authority is confronted with an organization that has already built its position into one of natural monopoly.

No independent medical association provides the doctor with an alternative to membership in his local medical society. In the scientific realm there are such groups as the American College of Physicians, the American College of Surgeons, and organizations representing the recognized specialties. In the field of medical economics and politics the Committee of Physicians for the Improvement of Medical Care and the Physicians Forum actively oppose AMA policies. And the National Medical Association, composed of Negro physicians, is concerned with the problems of a minority group and seeks constituent membership within the AMA. These groups, whose members are usually AMA members as well, supplement its work or compete with it only in a limited sphere. None possesses the membership size, power, and influence of the AMA, nor can any challenge its claims to speak on behalf of the profession.

Coercion: To maintain what it considers the integrity and standing of the profession, the American Medical Association has established a code of ethics to govern the behavior of practitioners. The most basic of its standards have usually been enacted into State medical practice laws. For example the felon, abortionist, alcoholic, and in some States the fee-splitter is subject to suspension or revocation of licensure. But the medical societies have more exacting standards governing virtually every aspect of medical practice and care. Because almost all physicians recognize the need for some such standards, application of sanctions is rarely necessary. However, this nearly unanimous agreement does not extend to some ethical interpretations which inhibit experimentation in solving problems of medical economics.

Because the AMA has the consent and support of a great majority of doctors, its standards can often be enforced against an offender without formal action. The physician who is suspected of unethical practice may be subjected to professional ostracism. This may involve denial by member physicians of patient referrals and consultations, and the loss of advancement in hospital and other professional appointments. The mere availability of such sanctions is usually enough to deter possible violators of AMA's code of conduct.

If a physician does not respond to such techniques, formal sanctions may also be invoked. County medical societies generally have boards of censors to hear charges against members. A system of appeals is provided, culminating in the judicial council of the AMA. However, this body is bound by findings of fact made at the local level. Those found guilty of violating the standards of the organization may be subjected to rep-

rimand, suspension, or expulsion. Such safeguards as the requirement that charges be specified and proved and the right of appeal limit the availability of these sanctions.

The consequences of a denial of an application for membership are just as serious as those of expulsion. But admission is entirely at the discretion of the county society; there is no right to a hearing and no appeal from the society's verdict. In one extreme case a county medical society dissolved itself and then reformed without an alleged offender, who was then denied admission and had no further recourse. The threat of denial is particularly effective in controlling the behavior of the young physician who desires membership, as well as of the doctor who has transferred his residence.

The importance and effectiveness of these formal sanctions is reflected by their severe consequences. In addition to the imposition of the informal sanctions mentioned above, the physician who is expelled or denied membership loses the positive benefits and economic advantages conferred by organized medicine. Membership in organized medicine has also been adopted by some outside groups as a criterion of professional competency. Nonmembership may raise questions regarding the character of an applicant for reciprocal licensing privileges. The nonmember will also find it difficult to obtain malpractice insurance on terms comparable to those offered members, if he can obtain it at all. In one instance doctors were forced to obtain insurance from Lloyds of London after being refused by American companies.

The most serious consequences of rejection or denial are those which handicap the physician in the actual practice of his profession. As a nonmember, he is ineligible for specialty board examinations and ratings. Referrals and consultations, so essential to the growth of a new practice, are denied him. Expulsion or denial carries the stigma of unethical practice so that members who have professional relations with a rejected practitioner may themselves be considered unethical. Thus, as part of its enforcement program one medical society circulated a "white list" of approved doctors to its members. The disapproved physician will also be handicapped in caring for his patients. Unless he relinquishes control over the patient he may be unable to secure assistance in time of emergency. Perhaps most important, he will be denied the use of most hospital facilities. The Mundt resolution, passed by the AMA house of delegates in 1934, advises that the staffs of hospitals accredited for internship training be composed solely of members of local medical societies. Accordingly, hospitals with a combined total of up to 99 percent of their State's bed capacity require membership. Others give nonmembers limited privileges, or extend staff membership only to society members and those qualified for membership.

The medical societies will rarely choose to disrupt the professional life of nonmembers eligible for membership, or those excluded only by racial barriers. Member physicians will often cooperate with such doctors; they may find less difficulty in obtaining hospital appointments and may be invited to participate in the scientific programs of the medical society. It is the practitioner who is expelled or denied membership who finds the punitive tactics of organized medicine employed to their fullest against him. In those cases nonmembership amounts to a partial revocation of licensure to practice medicine. It is only the established physician with guaranteed tenure on hospital staffs and specialty boards, or one who has the security of a faculty or governmental position who can afford to challenge the ethical standards of the AMA. Few doctors enjoy such a status, and defiance of AMA authority means professional suicide for the majority.

The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part III of the American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

The financial basis of power

Physicians receive an average income higher than that of any other professional group. Consequently, organized medicine can receive considerable financial support by drawing on the resources of its membership. On the county level, where dues are the major source of revenue, assessments vary from nominal amounts to as much as \$125 per year. State dues range from \$20 to \$55 annually, while the AMA itself assesses each of its members \$25. On the State and national levels considerable income is also derived from subscriptions and the sale of advertising in the societies' publications. Total revenues of the national organization exceed \$9,000,000 per year. State societies have incomes ranging as high as \$500,000. With only 1,601 dues-paying members the Colorado State Medical Society, for example, has an annual income of \$120,000. Similarly, the financial strength of many of the county societies assumes considerable proportions. This substantial economic support enables organized medicine to attract new members, and to engage in a variety of costly activities which serve to enlarge its power and influence.

The political basis of power

Prestige: The political strength of the AMA is to a large degree attributable to the status of the doctor in society. Because of his services to humanity, his learning, and economic position, the physician enjoys prestige and public confidence. The public looks to the doctor for advice and gives great weight to his opinion. This trust, unchallenged in the realm of medical science, extends also into economic and political aspects of health. Because of the AMA's high percentage of physician membership and its status as spokesman for the doctor, the lawmaker turns to organized medicine to ascertain medical opinion.

Mastery of political tactics: Attempting to influence governmental decision is one of the historic purposes of organized medicine. Without encouraging public action of a regulatory nature, the early medical societies could not have fully realized their objective of raising medical standards. But regulation of the profession is a function of the States, and medical legislation has been, until recently, devoted primarily to policing medical practice rather than providing medical care. So the American Medical Association had few occasions to influence political action on the national level. However, with growing public acknowledgment of governmental responsibilities in furnishing medical care, the political activities of the AMA have expanded enormously. This development, most pronounced on the Federal level, has also been manifest in the States. But while the public may have confidence in the judgment of individual doctors, it may be suspicious of selfish motivations in an organized group. Therefore, organized medicine's new lobbying has developed techniques of creating a favorable public opinion to supplement the older techniques of direct contact with lawmakers.

The American Medical Association is considered by some observers the most powerful legislative lobby in Washington. Measures apparently assured of passage have been voted down, buried in committee, or substantially amended upon the announcement of AMA disapproval. In physical size the AMA's lobbying facilities are not impressive. Yet, during 1949 and 1950, the AMA reported the highest expenditures of any group registered under the Federal lobbying law. While its financial outlay has since declined, its potential influence remains unimpaired.

Both national and State organizations have public relations programs to present the views of organized medicine. Attempts are made to solicit editorial support and societies have purchased advertising in the press and on radio and television. These efforts are generally designed to illustrate the achievements of American medicine; sometimes they may be directed to medico-political issues. Member physicians are urged to participate in these political endeavors by delivering public addresses—the texts of which are often furnished by State or national headquarters, and by distributing literature in waiting rooms and with monthly bills. Doctors' wives, working through medical society auxiliaries, are also active in this type of work.

Organized medicine also attempts to demonstrate numerical support for its position by getting outside groups to "go on record" as allies. Related professions in particular share common political interests with medicine. The recently formed Inter-Association Committee on Health, consisting of the AMA and the American Dental, Hospital, Public Health, Nursing, and Public Welfare Associations, serves as liaison in this area. During health insurance controversies, medical supply houses, pharmaceutical firms, and insurance companies cooperated closely with the AMA, rendering financial assistance and publishing tie-in advertising furnished by the medical societies.

Some of organized medicine's present political power may be attributable to the increased activity of its members in political affairs. The AMA supports no party or candidate, but in many localities physicians organize separate "healing arts" committees to campaign for candidates favorable to the association's views. The formation of these committees has been approved and their choice of candidates endorsed in some instances by local medical societies, although the latter practice is not common. The work of these healing arts committees is thought to have been influential in several close congressional contests and primaries.

The medical societies also exert great influence over medical legislation on the State and local levels. The enactment of favored measures and the defeat of those opposed can usually be secured. State societies have a lobbyist or legislative agent, often the executive secretary. The societies also actively encourage their members to run for legislative positions to insure adequate representation of the organization's interests. Personal contact with each legislator, if possible by his own physician, is stressed. County societies may also endeavor to have prominent local doctors write their legislators and encourage their patients to do likewise. Much State medical legislation originates with the State societies, bills are often drafted with the aid of counsel, and such measures are easily introduced.

While influencing the actions of legislative bodies constitutes the most apparent means of determining governmental action, the continuing relationships of organized medicine with administrative agencies are no less important. It is at this level that much public health legislation originates and is implemented by rules and regulations; here also enforcement takes place. The AMA and its constituent societies have many councils and committees which serve public agencies in an advisory capacity. Such

bodies can gather information of a professional nature not readily available to Government officials. And by receiving the views of the profession on specific regulations the public agency obtains the opinion of one of the groups vitally affected and whose cooperation is necessary for the success of most programs.

The medical societies have also attempted to increase the profession's influence in administrative decisions by trying to make medical licensure a prerequisite for positions of control over health or medical programs. The influence of medicine upon administrative agencies is probably stronger on the State than on the national level. Many State health officials are appointed on the recommendation of the medical society, and it is often through their offices that Federal health grants are administered. Health officials, knowing the legislative influence of the medical societies, are not likely to incur their antagonism. Having accused Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing of sympathies toward socialized medicine, the AMA consistently opposed provisions which would grant his agency discretionary authority in administering health programs. But such outright enmity between organized medicine and health agencies is the exception rather than the rule.

Legal recognition. As a consequence of its monopoly position, financial resources, and political strength, organized medicine is able to maintain a quasilegal status in medical affairs. In many States, laws authorize State and local medical societies to appoint or recommend members of regulatory bodies. AMA standards in medical education, training, and practice are usually adopted by law. In addition, AMA inspection to determine whether its own standards have been satisfied is seldom subject to judicial review. Thus the political authority of the State itself has in effect been delegated to organized medicine.

THE APPLICATION OF AMA POWER

No aspect of medical affairs—from Hadacol to health insurance—is outside the scope of AMA interest. The power of organized medicine is exerted in a wide variety of ways. Its activities may conveniently be categorized as raising the quality of medical services, determining the conditions of practice and payment, and controlling an ever-expanding governmental interest in the national health.

Promoting the quality of medical services

Scientific Activities

Historically, the AMA has exerted influence and directed more than half its yearly expenditures into "scientific activities." It has felt a vital interest in the quality of products closely related to the practice of medicine. In the early years, the AMA's efforts in this respect were designed primarily to eliminate extravagantly advertised nostrums. Since then it has adopted a more positive approach—the policing and promotion of higher standards for recognized medical products.

Through laboratory tests and expert evaluation, AMA councils examine new drugs and medicines, dietary and other special-purpose foods, and therapeutic and diagnostic devices. A manufacturer of any such product may obtain an evaluation at no charge, or the AMA may investigate on its own initiative. Standards are above the bare minimum of harmlessness; requirements as to purity, effectiveness, and the truthfulness of the manufacturer's claims must be met. Even AMA critics concede the impartial scientific basis upon which the judgment is rendered. Products which meet AMA standards receive the privilege of displaying the Seal of Acceptance in their medical journal or lay publication advertisements. But the Seal of Acceptance is of greater value to a manufacturer than a mere advertising device. A medical product must be "accepted" before its manufacturer can buy advertising space

in the Journal or in the great majority of State society journals. Thus, products which depend to a great extent upon a doctor's prescription or recommendation cannot advertise in the medium which best reaches the medical profession unless AMA standards are met.

To buttress its work in this field, organized medicine has campaigned for legislation to protect the consumer further. The AMA was a sponsor of the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906 and it has promoted similar State measures. Moreover, a provision in the AMA code of ethics forbids member-doctors from prescribing "unknown or secret remedies." Infractions are rare, for few physicians would risk use of a medicine untested by the association's staff.

The AMA does not attempt to develop new medical products directly, but it does foster independent research. The Committee on Research awards grants to projects which have particular medical significance. The committee also obtains outside sponsorship, often from pharmaceutical firms, for clinical studies of disease, nutrition, and long-term effects of new medicines.

Postgraduate Medical Education

The practicing physician must keep himself informed of improvements constantly being made in the field of medicine. And the average doctor has come to depend on his society as a highly important source of new medical knowledge. The process of instruction on the local level is carried on at society meetings largely by speakers from medical school faculties or the staffs of large hospitals. This service is of particular importance to country doctors whose contact with medical progress might otherwise be limited. The societies provide specialized courses of instruction, and, at their annual meetings, arrange for a concentrated series of scientific papers, demonstrations, and exhibits. Moreover, most State societies, or a small group of State societies, publish a journal, largely devoted to scientific matters. The national organization's most effective means of keeping physicians informed is through its publications. The Journal, published weekly, has the largest circulation and is one of the most respected of the world's medical periodicals. Its staff selects about 600 of the most outstanding of several thousand manuscripts submitted annually for publication. Its special departments, in addition to organizational and political news of interest to doctors, include reports of the tests conducted by various AMA councils and committees, medical book reviews, a medical question and answer column, and medical information.

The AMA's scientific sections, representing the various medical specialties, each present full programs at their annual national conventions. Nine of these specialties also publish their own monthly journals geared to the specialist's needs. Also valuable to the physician are the AMA's quarterly index of medical literature, a directory of licensed physicians in the United States and Canada, and various handbooks on drugs and diseases.

SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC

Much of the AMA's contact with the public is in the field of health education. Today's Health, a monthly publication, is written for the lay reader; its purposes are to gain public backing for health measures supported by organized medicine, and to foster understanding of the developments in medical science. The Bureau of Health Education also maintains a speaker's bureau, offers an extensive radio transcription service, and has recently added a series of packaged television shows. Another type of AMA educational work is directed toward making the member physician a more effective health educator. Materials on public speaking, radio presentation, health column writing,

and program planning are available to members.

The AMA also engages in extensive activities within specialized areas of public health. Association officers have cooperated with the National Education Association and other interested groups in formulating school health policies and programs. The Chicago headquarters has full-time personnel engaged in industrial health, rural health, and civil defense work. In all of these activities the AMA works closely with lay organizations to cosponsor conferences, stimulate interest, and publish materials.

The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part IV of the American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

Setting the qualitative and quantitative standards for medical practitioners

The Campaign Against Nonmedical Practitioners

To protect the public against treatment by improperly trained practitioners, all States have passed statutes making a license prerequisite to the rendering of healing-art services. Legislative pressure by State medical societies has been largely responsible for the original passage and periodic revision of these Medical Practice Acts. Licensing requirements provide for minimum educational standards and successful completion of an examination given by a State examining board.

Quacks: One of the AMA's first goals was to bar from practice a wide variety of completely unqualified healers. This campaign complemented its role in removing non-scientific remedies from the market. Licensing requirements forced the quacks to withdraw or practice illegally. Since passage of these laws, the AMA's function in this field has been primarily one of policing. Advertising often provides a clue; the quack still relies upon ballyhoo to attract patients. Since the turn of the century, various medical societies have exposed mail-order diagnosis by urinalysis, vacuum treatments, cancer cures, diabetes cures, virility regenerators, and a wide variety of electric, radioactive, or otherwise miraculous remedies—all dispensed by unlicensed practitioners. The Association's Bureau of Investigation in Chicago keeps a file of known offenders and supports county and State societies in their detection and prosecution of the unlicensed invader.

Chiropractors and osteopaths: The emergence of conflicting theories of disease, particularly chiropractic and osteopathy, has complicated State medical licensing. Chiropractors are able to acquire licenses to practice in nearly all States but, due to strenuous opposition from State medical societies and the AMA, theirs is a limited privilege. Usually the practice acts restrict treatment by a chiropractor to manual adjustment of the spinal column and forbid administering or prescribing drugs, puncturing the skin, or practicing obstetrics. A few States limit the osteopath to almost the same narrow privileges granted chiropractors, but most allow

him to administer drugs or to perform surgery, although only upon a showing of additional special training. Several States license the osteopath for the same unrestricted practice as the doctor of medicine.

Despite limitations, these groups continue to provide the medical profession with active competition. Each year, 2 million Americans consult one of the Nation's 32,000 licensed chiropractors for the first time. There are over 11,000 licensed osteopaths in the United States; they maintain fully equipped hospitals, they sometimes serve in city and State health departments. And, although organized medicine's justification for limited licensing of the "cults" is expressed in terms of protecting the consumer from unqualified practitioners, there may also be present an element of self-protection from this economic encroachment.

Organized medicine's campaign against the chiropractor is presently a battle of containment. In four States the requirements for licensing are the same as those for a doctor of medicine; practically, the chiropractor has been excluded. Elsewhere, medical societies police the legal boundaries of a chiropractor's limited license and oppose legislative extension of his privilege.

Basic science requirements, although originally designed as a method of raising the standards of medical practice generally, are a weapon of great potential in organized medicine's struggle against chiropractic and other limited healing arts. But it is a weapon that has thus far failed. These requirements, adopted by law in 19 States and the District of Columbia, direct all applicants for any healing art licensure to pass examinations in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, bacteriology, and pathology. But often the examination taken by candidates for medical licensure is different from the chiropractic basic science test. Medical men have termed the chiropractic basic science exam a farce. Consequently, the AMA has proposed a uniform basic science act, applicable to "nonsectarian medicine, osteopathy, chiropractic, naturopathy, sanipractic, and other modes of healing." AMA's stand is: "Whatever may be said of separate licensing boards for the nonsectarian practitioner and the cultists, there seems to be no valid argument against a uniform examination in the basic sciences." Widespread adoption of this act could mean the end of the cults' challenge to organized medicine.

Recently, the National Chiropractic Association has engaged the AMA in a top-level clash of competing interest groups. The NCA was successful in having chiropractic colleges certified for the G. I. bill; by 1949 the Government had paid the tuition of 1,700 veterans studying chiropractic. And now the NCA is campaigning for Veterans' Administration recognition of—and reimbursement for—chiropractic care. In 1950 AMA spokesmen appeared before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and helped defeat this proposal, arguing that chiropractic does not recognize the bacterial theory of disease, is not taught at any university or college supported by public funds, and therefore should not be recognized by the VA. So the NCA has moved the fight to the American Legion, from which it has sought backing. Thereupon the AMA urged its member veterans to become active Legionnaires in order to forestall any possible pressure from an organization equipped with lobbying power on a par with its own.

Historically organized medicine's struggle to limit the practice of osteopathy took the same form as that against the chiropractors. Courts have upheld the constitutionality of AMA-fostered differentials in licensing privileges granted an M. D. and a D. O. despite apparent similarity of training. Furthermore the United States Supreme Court has upheld the right of governing boards of public (and a fortiori of private) hospitals to

deny osteopaths use of their facilities. And hospitals seeking AMA accreditation for internship and residency training usually must bar osteopaths from their staffs.

Recently the City Council of Bay City, Mich., voted to allow osteopaths to use municipal hospital facilities. The 70 staff M. D.'s then walked out rather than "jeopardize their own ethical standings," and the AMA Council on Medical Education and Hospitals immediately withdrew registration and approval of the hospital. The struggle between local physicians and osteopaths was finally resolved by a referendum in which the voters chose nearly 3 to 1 to exclude osteopaths from their city's hospital staff.

An important recent change in the AMA attitude toward osteopaths has been a policy tending toward their absorption into the medical profession. Precedent for this trend exists in the case of the homeopathic physicians, who formerly were considered cultists but who now have approved medical schools, unlimited rights of practice, and membership in the AMA. Evidence of a similar policy toward osteopaths is clear. Although the AMA code of ethics provides that "[a]ll voluntarily associated activities with cultists are unethical," the judicial council has recently approved limited medical consultation with osteopaths, as well as sharing facilities with them in small, outlying hospitals. In many States medical society-sponsored Blue Shield plans allow osteopaths to participate. A resolution urging immediate action toward an eventual amalgamation of medicine and osteopathy was voted down by the house of delegates, yet AMA and AOA leaders have conferred with amalgamation in mind.

The basis for amalgamation is the present approximation of medical standards by osteopathic schools. The osteopathic curriculum is nearly the same as the medical, but includes osteopathic science, which to the AMA carries the stigma of cultism. Virtual abandonment of this teaching would probably permit M. D.'s to instruct in osteopathic schools, leading to eventual approval. Indeed, osteopathic services are already approved by the Veterans' Administration and the United States Public Health Service.

But AMA approval seems to depend upon economic as well as strictly medical factors. Amalgamation is opposed in rural States where general practice prevails and the osteopath provides strong competition to the physician. Support for amalgamation comes from large urban centers where specialists dominate medical practice. Probably a continued high demand for medical services, mitigating competition, will accelerate organized medicine's acceptance of the osteopath as an equal.

Psychologists: Originally the practice of medicine was limited to the care of physical disturbances; many State medical-practice acts still do not specifically require licensure for the treatment of behavioral or mental disorders. Both medical and nonmedical specialists have contributed to knowledge in the behavioral sciences. The psychiatrist claims exclusive jurisdiction in diagnosis and treatment of mental disease, asserting that his medical training gives him physiological knowledge requisite to an appreciation of the patient's overall condition. He regards the psychologist's role as ancillary, similar to that of the nurse or X-ray technician. Psychologists, who presently provide many diagnostic and therapeutic services to mental patients, do not agree that psychotherapy should be the sole province of the M. D.'s.

The American Psychological Association, much like the AMA, has attempted to raise the level of psychological practice. Since many States do not regulate the treatment of mental disorders, unqualified persons hold themselves out as competent psychologists. To set the qualified practitioner apart, many psychologists have urged passage of certification acts, whereby those meeting educa-

tional requirements and passing examinations may receive the privilege of calling themselves "Certified Psychologists." These acts, adopted in only a few States, do not limit psychological practice to those certified, but they do provide the public with a possible guide to competence. Bills have also been proposed in a few jurisdictions requiring licensure of psychologists and prohibiting practice by those not meeting prescribed standards. But psychiatrists, fearing that their sphere of competence might be invaded, have secured the support of organized medicine to defeat these measures. Governor Dewey vetoed the New York licensing bill and cited the "vigorous and impressive objections" of the State medical society and American Psychiatric Association. After this setback, the psychologists refrained from seeking legislation pending conferences with the medical profession designed to define each profession's scope of competency.

Recently, however, the psychiatrists have taken affirmative action to prevent the further encroachment of non-medical practitioners. The Medical Society of the State of New York, in cooperation with psychiatric groups, has unsuccessfully sought revision of the New York medical practice act to make only the M. D. competent to treat "mental and nervous disorders." Both the American Psychiatric Association and the AMA favor such legislation. But these laws would freeze the status of two professions which often work in a flexible and cooperative relationship. Under such circumstances, joint efforts to define each specialty's qualifications should be encouraged. This would leave both groups free to cooperate in eliminating the unqualified practice of psychotherapy.

Controlling the Quality and Supply of Doctors

Another key function of the AMA is its inspection of medical schools and its annual listing of those approved. All States require that an applicant for medical licensure be a graduate of an acceptable medical school. Standards of acceptability are set by statute, or by formal rule or informal policy of the State medical examining boards. These statutes or rules provide that the board will consider only graduates of schools approved by the AMA and/or the American Association of Medical Colleges, whose lists are identical. Since it is impossible for each State board to make an independent inspection of every medical school whose graduates apply for licensure, these boards must rely on an outside agency. The AMA fulfills this need and its list thereby acquires the force of law.

Through their reliance upon the AMA to inspect the Nation's medical schools, the States tacitly confer upon it the power to set the standards for approval. These standards, of course, fix the quality of medical education, but they also indirectly determine the size of classes in each school. Maximum student/faculty or student/cadaver ratios, for example, make expansion costly.

Moreover, many States require a medical school graduate to serve an internship in an approved hospital as an additional training requirement. Again, practical considerations require licensing boards to utilize the AMA standards and list of approved hospitals. AMA approval is vital to a hospital; without it, the hospital cannot obtain the low-cost services of interns. This power gives organized medicine a device to enforce conformity with policies occasionally unrelated to medical training.

Medical education: The improvement of medical education was one motive for the founding of the American Medical Association. Early attempts, however, were not successful. In 1910, the Carnegie Foundation's Flexner Report publicized the serious inadequacy of many of the medical schools in the country. Strong public opinion and State medical association pressure has since

forced State examining boards and medical schools to recognize the standards set by the AMA Council on Medical Education. Although 81 substandard schools have been forced out of existence, some formerly inadequate schools have managed to survive by rapidly improving in quality. Today there are 79 medical schools in the United States, all approved.

When adoption of AMA requirements forced disapproved medical schools to close, the annual graduating class of doctors was cut in half. But these numerical losses have been recouped. Existing schools have gradually expanded their facilities to a point where annual output exceeds the 1910 level. For the past 5 years, each freshman class has surpassed the previous year's record-breaking enrollment. The AMA has provided technical assistance to schools planning expansion. And State societies have sometimes advocated the formation of new medical schools, as in Maine and New Jersey, or supported the conversion of 2-year "basic science" schools into full 4-year schools, as in North Carolina and West Virginia. The resulting increase in physician supply has raised the American doctor/patient ratio to 136 per 100,000, second only to Israel with its large number of refugee Jewish physicians. This ratio is expected to hold despite rapid population gains.

But the AMA has not consistently pursued a policy of increasing the doctor supply. Moved by a desire to mitigate competition among doctors during the depression, the association attempted to reduce medical school enrollments. By 1932 the AAMC and AMA had become alarmed about an increasing surplus of doctors. In 1933 the AMA council on medical education invited the active support of the Association of American Medical Colleges in bringing about a substantial reduction of their enrollment. The council's secretary, in a speech before the AAMC, mentioned the alleged surplus of doctors and deplored the practice of making up classes in medical schools without any regard to the needs of the profession or of the country as a whole. He concluded: "The time has come when we must still further limit the enrollment of our medical schools. By 1934 the council could report that several schools were decreasing enrollments in adherence to the council's principles."

Even today, AMA's limited support for expansion in medical education may not be adequate to meet growing demand for physicians. Increased military needs, coupled with expanded public-health programs and private requirements, have created a doctor shortage which is becoming progressively more acute. Estimates of the adequacy of the doctor supply by 1960 vary greatly, depending on an intangible variable: desirable level of medical care. Maldistribution of physicians, resulting from the emphasis on specialization and the concentration of physicians in urban centers, has compounded the shortage. Local action by doctor-needy communities—guarantees and special inducements to young graduates seeking a location—may be a partial solution. Local and State medical society scholarships, granted on the stipulation that the recipient will practice in a small community, have also helped. A recent AMA campaign glorifying the general practitioner may have some effect. But the need for long-term regional or nationwide planning of the supply and distribution of doctors has not been met under AMA guidance.

Indeed, the wisdom of lodging quasi-legal authority over medical schools in the AMA may also be open to question. Without doubt, the quality of medical education has improved enormously under AMA guidance. And experienced medical educators and practitioners are best fitted to adjust standards to the needs and potentialities of the school

and student. But the power to determine supply, which resides inevitably within the power to set standards, should not rest solely in the hands of a private group which is neither directly responsible to the public nor necessarily responsive to the Nation's requirements.

Licensing of foreign-trained doctors: The establishment of licensure requirements for foreign-trained physicians was not a pressing problem until the late 1930's. With the rise and spread of European totalitarianism, however, the States received an increasing number of requests for recognition of foreign credentials. Today there are few displaced European physicians left. But in their place increasing numbers of Americans, unable to gain admission to medical schools at home, have gone abroad to study and now seek accreditation.

The official attitude of the State examining boards toward foreign-trained doctors has largely been the result of State medical society and AMA policies. By the 1930's, 22 States would not accept foreign physicians at all. In several others, full citizenship and additional training requirements achieved the same purpose. The exclusion of refugee physicians was accomplished over the protest of farmer and labor medical cooperatives, particularly in States suffering from doctor shortages.

Since the war, the AMA Council on Medical Education has established a less restrictive policy toward foreign medical school graduates. The AMA and AAMC have jointly issued a list of 50 European schools which they suggest for State board acceptance. But the list does not include institutions from which refugee doctors are likely to come—those of Germany and Austria. For these doctors an AMA spokesman has recommended adoption of the procedure followed by the Iowa Board of Medical Examiners. There the foreign doctor is placed as an assistant in a State institution for 1 year, during which he receives supervision, refresher courses, and grades from his physicians in charge. At the end of his trial period his file is considered by the State board and he is accepted or rejected.

It is of great importance to American students educated abroad that 23 licensing boards have reported willingness to consider graduates of foreign schools recommended by the AMA. But, despite the AMA's insistence that the list is "tentative," and that "absence of a school from the list does not necessarily imply disapproval," the tendency among these boards has been to consider only graduates of already approved schools. Yet, of the 1,121 American students in foreign schools in 1951, only half were enrolled in approved schools. Furthermore, 11 States still do not accept any foreign credits. And even in States which do allow foreign graduates to take the board examinations, the percentage of failures among them has been high. A European medical education is still not a reliable path to licensure in the United States.

The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part V of the American Medical

Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

Determining the conditions of practice and payment

The AMA "Principles of Medical Ethics" is a codification of the doctor's professional conscience as well as a blueprint for the organization of medical practice. In theory, the principles are not "laws to govern" but rather "guides to correct conduct." However, for the doctor they approach legal status since unethical conduct is a ground for expulsion from every county medical society. The code regulates, in general terms, a wide range of the doctor's conduct toward his patients, other physicians, and the public at large. Thus it is applicable to most matters affecting medical practice.

This code of ethics is geared to the typical unit of medical practice in America—the individual practitioner, remunerated on the basis of a fee for service rendered. But the pressure of changed conditions is forcing modifications in this pattern. Increased medical knowledge and new techniques have created the specialties, with consequent increased interdependence among doctors; much modern medicine is practiced by a team rather than by a lone practitioner. The need for expensive equipment and reliance upon technicians has made individual entrepreneurship difficult; hospitals, medical consumer organizations, and groups of doctors—able to supply needed capital—have hired physicians on a salary basis, shifting risk of loss or chance for gain to themselves. And a desire to anticipate unpredictable medical expenses has led the consumer to demand an application of the insurance principle to the cost of sickness. Each of these modifications—group practice, salaried practice, lay sponsorship, and prepayment—is still in the experimental stage.

Throughout this period, organized medicine has resisted or attempted to control change, rather than allow free experimentation. The physicians in positions of power within the AMA have risen to the top of the profession via the individual fee-for-service system. Any significant change in that system represents a threat to a familiar and tested method of practice.

The AMA has expressed or rationalized its opposition to change in terms of ethics. In so doing it has often failed to meet the economic issues realistically. By counterproposals, predicated on the fee-for-service system, it has attempted to satisfy the same needs which brought forth the new methods of practice. Organized medicine's purpose has thus been to contain developments within the orthodox pattern. Its effort to do so has called forth all the power at its command.

Methods of Practice

The vast majority of physicians in the United States practice alone. Yet group practice offers advantages both to patient and physician. It affords fuller use of, and a chance to spread the cost of, technical equipment and personnel. The doctor has ready consultation with other specialist-partners—a convenience to the patient, and a means of retaining control of the fee. Moreover, younger men in the profession, schooled in a dependence upon other members of the medical care team, often favor medical partnerships.

In the almost automatic referral from partner to partner, characteristic of group practice, critics have seen an infringement of the patient's free choice of physician. And they consider the division of income according to any partnership agreement other than value of services rendered, as akin to fee splitting. Early groups were disparaged as unethical. But within recent years active steps have been taken only against those groups offering a plan for some type of flat-

fee prepayment. Rather, the AMA has mildly discouraged combined practice by repeatedly denying the necessity for, or success of groups. Its studies have emphasized negative aspects of group practice, such as causes for frequent dissolution of groups and the legal snarls of partnership agreements. Failing to curb the spread of group practice, organized medicine has tried to keep existing groups within traditional bounds through the ethical code: "The ethical principles actuating and governing a group or clinic are exactly the same as those applicable to the individual."

Methods of Remunerating the Physician

Eight out of 10 practicing physicians are self-employed, either as individual entrepreneurs or as members of a partnership firm. But the number of salaried practitioners has been increasing. Organized medicine disapproves of this trend and has condemned some types of salaried practice as unethical, fearing that a doctor's primary loyalty will be to his employer rather than his patient.

For many years certain familiar types of salaried practice have been acceptable to the AMA. Physicians engaged in research, public-health work, and teaching do not establish a close relationship with patients, nor could the fee-for-service system be readily adapted to suit their circumstances. Military medicine, too, is far removed from the context of private practice. And one physician may hire another on a salary; the employer is subject to the same ethical requirements as the employee, and the patient commands the primary loyalty of both. Furthermore, such employment is usually for training purposes and temporary, similar to internship or residency.

But organized medicine has not accepted some of the newer developments in salaried practice. One of the most widespread has been the hiring of doctors by hospitals. The practice of radiology, anesthesiology, and pathology is most commonly associated with large institutions. Each involves large outlay for equipment and deals chiefly with hospitalized patients; none involves the customary strong doctor-patient relationship. And since these specialty departments—staffed by salaried M. D.'s—often provide profits which cover other operating deficits, hospital management is reluctant to abandon this system. But the average net income of the salaried specialist ranges well below that of his self-employed counterpart. The salaried anesthesiologist averages \$10,000 annually; the independent, \$12,700. The hired radiologist averages \$12,300 and the independent \$18,500. These differentials may have contributed impetus to AMA disapproval and action against hospital practice.

Medical societies have characterized hospital practice as primarily a moral problem; they fear exploitation and lowering the dignity of the profession, and envision lay-employer control as forcing a lower standard of care for the patient. The specially appointed Hess committee reaffirmed and clarified the AMA's long-standing position against salaried purvey of medical service. The committee condemned hospital practice and urged component societies to act against institutions and member physicians who work within this disapproved framework.

But there has been neither extensive nor highly successful activity on the lower levels. The head of anesthesiology of a Boston hospital attempted to change its salary-plus-share-of-profits system, charging that he was being forced to split fees with an institution. Although the hospital admitted making a profit in that department, the local medical society upheld the arrangement. And similar charges of unethical practices against the Yale Medical School were dropped. The school was retaining the fees paid to its affiliated hospital by patients for

services of salaried medical-school professors. While State specialty societies have impeded the spread of salaried practice to new hospitals by refusing to recommend, or threatening to expel a member who accepts salaried terms, they have not effected any appreciable change where the practice is already entrenched.

The national organization is unable to initiate action in cases of individual violations of the Hess report since it is bound by its constitution to wait for charges to proceed through regular channels. Instead, its officers have tried to work out agreements that can deter salaried hospitals. They have requested Blue Cross to refuse to pay hospital bills covering charges for salaried doctors' services. Conferences have been held with American Hospital Association officials in an effort to work out a compromise arrangement. Both sides have denied an irreconcilable conflict, but after 4 years of negotiation there is still no agreement.

Methods of Payment by the Consumer

In meeting the cost of illness, the consumer is faced with two alternatives. Under the traditional method, he pays in accordance with services actually rendered. But the need for medical attention is unpredictable and falls unevenly throughout the population. The costs of serious illness, particularly among low-income families, may be financially disastrous. Prepaid health insurance can alleviate such consequences by spreading the risk and expense over a large group. Under prepayment, the consumer pays in advance to receive medical care and treatment if and when they are needed—not for services actually received. Consequently he can budget a regular portion of his income to cover such potential medical needs as hospitalization, surgery, or complete medical care.

The AMA endorses the principle of health insurance provided participation is voluntary. However, organized medicine has not always had this favorable attitude. In 1932, the report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, advocating expansion and development of voluntary prepayment plans, was severely condemned. Experimentation with various methods of prepaid hospitalization, such as Blue Cross, was disparaged and discouraged. The AMA today explains this early opposition on the grounds of inadequate standards of care under existing plans, insufficient payment to physicians, and a fear of governmental domination leading to compulsory participation. However, although some early plans did exploit both patient and physician, medical society opposition was directed against almost all such schemes. Not until serious proposals for governmental compulsory health insurance materialized did organized medicine enthusiastically espouse voluntary prepayment. State societies, encouraged by the AMA, then took the lead in establishing insurance plans. At the same time, the AMA attempted to shape voluntary plans into an approved pattern.

Prepayment plans may insure against the costs of hospitalization and/or the expense of physicians' services. The most common type of health insurance covers only specified hospital services. Commercial insurance companies, as well as the familiar nonprofit Blue Cross plans, offer such policies. State medical societies have approved the Blue Cross plans, but have objected to the reimbursement to hospitals for services of their salaried doctors. Other than this objection, and concern over the economic soundness of some insurers, hospitalization plans have caused no recent controversy within organized medicine.

The recent development of insurance covering the costs of physicians' services, however, has raised more fundamental problems. Two major types of medical care plans have appeared. Under the cash indemnity system,

money benefits are paid to cover specified medical expenses when incurred by the insured. The patient consults his own physician and is reimbursed by the insurance company according to a stipulated schedule. The insurance check may or may not equal the full amount of the doctor's bill. The physician has no contractual relationship with the insurer; he enjoys complete freedom as to the method of rendering his service and determining his fee. Such policies are offered by commercial firms or by several State medical societies under nonprofit Blue Shield incorporation.

In contrast, medical service plans offer their benefits in terms of physicians' services. The patient can consult only a participating physician, from whom he receives any needed care for which he has contracted. The physician is reimbursed for his services by the insurer according to a previous agreement, which may also determine the manner of practice. Lay organizations, independent groups of physicians, and a few State medical societies have sponsored such plans. The majority of medical society plans employ a combination of the two methods, providing for service coverage to lower income groups and cash indemnification for others. This permits the physician to collect from higher income groups a fee above that granted him by the insurer.

Only under medical service plans does the insurer become a middleman dealing with both physician and patient. He contracts with consumers to furnish care and must then obtain this care by securing physicians' services. As contractee with both parties, the insurer is in a strategic position to determine the standard of medical care, services covered, financial arrangements with both parties, consumer membership eligibility, and type of physician participation. For this reason, organized medicine has laid great stress on the sponsorship and control of service plans.

If a medical service plan is operated for profit, the AMA fears exploitation of both patient (through lowering of standards) and physician (by reduction of income). This objection cannot pertain to cash-indemnity systems—even those operated commercially—because the doctor deals only with the patient and retains control over standards and fee setting. Service plans controlled by State medical societies are said to provide professional safeguards for the patient and a free choice of physician; also, the AMA believes that medical society sponsorship shifts the consequences of financial failure. Subscribers of some early insolvent service plans never received paid-for benefits since funds were insufficient to engage doctors. But in medical society plans participating doctors guarantee to provide their services, bearing the risk of the insurer's financial inadequacy. More important from the standpoint of the profession, medical society plans are open to all member doctors and therefore do not affect competition within the membership group. Furthermore, remuneration rates are set on an individual fee-for-service basis and at a level determined by medical society representatives.

At one time, organized medicine vigorously attacked prepaid service plans operated by independent physicians; some of these arrangements now receive qualified approval. These plans have uniformly combined prepayment with group practice. The choice of physician is thus limited to those practicing as a unit; subscribers are removed from the doctor's competitive market for patients. The economies of group practice may also enhance the plan's competitive position. But because the insurer is a group of doctors, themselves subject to ethical precepts, the AMA does not fear exploitation of this favorable economic position. Rates to subscribers, compensation to participating practitioners, and standards of practice are all under professional control. Medical socie-

ties do not encourage such plans, but, unless they violate the professional code by such tactics as advertising, neither do they actively oppose them.

The major area of controversy over voluntary health insurance concerns lay-sponsored service plans. There has been little change in organized medicine's tenacious opposition to provisions found in such plans. However, the AMA has provided a method for approval of these schemes if they conform to certain principles. The concessions necessary to gain organized medicine's approval are so severe that, as yet, virtually none have complied.

The earliest of the lay-sponsored service plans were formed by industrial employers. Employee groups, often under collective-bargaining agreements calling for management support, soon followed. Schools and universities often employ this device to insure their student bodies. The number of potential subscribers in each instance is limited to the size of the specified group. On the other hand, groups of consumers outside of industry have formed cooperatives or community-sponsored nonprofit corporations to provide prepaid medical services. These are open to the entire community, subject only to the limitations of available facilities. AMA opposition to this latter type has been much more pronounced than to restricted membership plans.

Regardless of the nature of the sponsoring body, the AMA has laid great stress upon placing control in professional hands. Such control involves two aspects: Over standards of medical care, and over terms of physician participation. Lay sponsoring bodies readily grant the former. But the power to set terms of physician participation means determination of the method of practice and the type and level of doctor remuneration. This, in effect, means control over the table of fees which the plan pays the physician and consequently the rates which the plan must charge the consumer. Furthermore, this latter aspect of professional control must, to meet AMA approval, be vested in a committee representing all the doctors in the community, not just those serving the plan. So in order to qualify for approval, the lay-sponsored plan must duplicate the essential elements of medical society plans. Thus it would relinquish the very power which might enable it to outbid individual practitioners and other prepayment systems in the medical market.

Virtually all disapproved service plans render medical care through group practice. The combination of lay-sponsored prepayment and group practice has been condemned by the AMA as panel medicine. The subscriber must seek his medical services from the limited number of doctors in the group; the AMA views this as a denial of his free choice of physician. But from the non-participating doctor's standpoint, there is also a denial of access to potential patients. Another reason for medical society hostility to the panel medicine combination is its tendency to employed disfavored methods of remunerating the doctor. Distribution of the group's income on a fee-for-service basis is apparently not utilized. Payment according to the number of patients treated, another possible method, is condemned as tending to lower the quality of care to each individual. The most common form of physician payment is by salary.

From the consumer's standpoint, prepayment group practice schemes offer several advantages. Aside from the economies of group practice, these plans tend to offer more thorough coverage. Subscribers may contract to receive comprehensive medical care, often with hospitalization as well. Because it is to the advantage of the plan to minimize illness among members preventive medicine is often stressed. In contrast, most medical society plans limit benefits, up to

a stipulated maximum, to surgery and medical care for hospitalized cases. To justify the exclusion of such low cost services as occasional house and office calls, the AMA contends that these costs are not susceptible to the insurance principle. The risk falls evenly and widely throughout the population so that the administrative costs of such insurance are unjustified. But this argument does not apply to a vast range of unusual medical exigencies which do not require hospitalization.

The public demand for broader coverage and competition with lay-sponsored prepayment systems has forced many medical society plans to liberalize their terms. Some now offer disaster riders, covering costs above the standard maximum. A few have removed income discrimination while others have expanded benefits to cover complete medical care.

The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine—Part VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part VI of the American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

Methods of Controlling Disapproved Voluntary Prepaid Health Insurance Plans

Even a close analysis of the AMA attitude toward various types of prepaid insurance schemes does not provide absolute predictability of medical society reaction to any given plan. All nonmedical society plans contain a diversity of features any of which may be objectionable either alone or in combination with others. Intangible factors, such as the climate of political and public opinion, the prestige and influence of the lay sponsors, and the intensity of professional attitude, also govern medical society responses. Yet the two broad considerations of professional integrity and economic interest set outer limits beyond which no privately sponsored plan can venture without incurring vigorous opposition. And these factors provide clues to probable intensity of resistance against any plan containing objectionable features.

Discrimination against participating physicians: For many years attempts to form medical-service plans were opposed by organized medicine through direct disciplinary action against participating physicians. The medical practitioner has much to lose when membership in his medical society or the good will of fellow physicians are denied him. It was, therefore, inevitable that organized medicine would apply its strongest weapon in opposing early attempts to form medical-service plans. The AMA's record contains various examples of techniques for disciplining physicians associated with disapproved schemes.

In 1929 the employees of the Los Angeles department of water and power entered into a doctor-sponsored prepayment service through an agreement with the newly established Ross-Loos Clinic. The plan called for comprehensive medical care by the clinic group's participating physicians as well as hospitalization insurance benefits. Subsequently, some of the clinic's doctors, including a former president of the Los Angeles County Medical Society, were expelled by

that society. They were later reinstated on appeal by the AMA's judicial council because of procedural defects in the local society's action. Since that time the Ross-Loos Clinic has not encountered further opposition from organized medicine, neither has it accepted opportunities for normal expansion of its facilities or enrollment.

In 1937 HOLC employees in the District of Columbia organized Group Health Association, a nonprofit, prepayment medical care and hospitalization program for a limited number of qualified Government employees. Physicians were hired on a full-time salary basis to provide low-cost medical care for members and their families. The local medical society, however, objected to this lay-sponsored group and employed its coercive powers to destroy this competitive threat to private practitioners. The District Medical Society expelled or otherwise disciplined several of the doctors hired by Group Health; in some instances mere threats of such action led to resignations from the GHA staff. Moreover, the society circulated a "white list" of approved organizations and individuals, from which GHA was excluded, thereby making it impossible for GHA doctors to obtain consultation with fellow physicians. Furthermore, Group Health had no hospital of its own but depended upon the availability and cooperation of local institutions. The AMA and the District Medical Society virtually crippled GHA by enlisting nearly all the hospitals in the District to deny GHA physicians staff privileges and bed space for their patients. The effective combination of these tactics resulted in the Justice Department's successful criminal prosecution of organized medicine under the Sherman Act.

In the State of Washington, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound was created in 1946 to give prepaid medical and hospital service to members of several granges, unions, and consumer cooperatives. It hired a staff of 20 doctors to be remunerated by salary and participation with subscribers in a profit-sharing arrangement. Like the District of Columbia group, it lacked hospital facilities of its own. Again local medical society intervention caused hospitals throughout the area to refuse GHA doctors staff privileges, and even emergency surgical facilities. The society's characterization of GHA's staff as unethical resulted in its withholding or withdrawing membership from several physicians who consequently lost consultation privileges and certification by specialty boards requiring society membership. In 1949 group-health doctors sued to enjoin the county medical society under a provision of the Washington State constitution forbidding combinations or agreements to fix prices or limit production of any commodity. In 1951, the Washington Supreme Court decided for the cooperative and delivered a forceful condemnation of organized medicine's tactics in attempting to halt the development of private medical programs in the State.

Sponsorship and promotion of competing plans and restrictive legislation: Despite determined medical-society disciplinary action against staff members of disapproved prepayment groups, various forms of medical service plans have continued to grow steadily. Furthermore, the use of discriminatory tactics has been found illegal under both Federal and State law. Consequently, organized medicine has softened the use of such techniques, and adopted subtler, but possibly more effective methods of meeting the threat of prepayment plans.

A concerted effort to set up competing medical society sponsored and controlled plans was the first of these. Before 1940 three such plans, California Physicians' Service, Michigan Medical Service, and Western New York Medical Plan, were in actual operation. But their formation focused at-

tention upon two legal questions: whether these plans were subject to State laws governing insurance companies and insurance contracts; and whether these plans constituted the unlawful corporate practice of medicine. In several jurisdictions, these obstacles had proved fatal to nonsociety plans. While the elimination of these obstacles to the development of medical society plans provided much of the incentive for organized medicine's promotion of special enabling legislation, many of the resulting laws were also designed to insure medical control of all ensuing prepayment schemes.

To a varying degree most of these statutes restrict the formation and operation of plans to those with medical society approval or control. One type of statute requires that a majority of directors be doctors or they may provide for State medical society approval of directors. Other statutes bar any prepayment plan from providing medical services unless it includes a majority of the licensed physicians in the area of service. The practical effect of such laws is to prevent lay sponsors or small medical groups from offering prepaid services.

The increased threat of compulsory national health insurance in the 1940's gave added impetus to organized medicine's development of its own voluntary medical care plans. Although disapproved voluntary plans gained little or no respite from organized medicine, society sponsored plans provided the AMA's positive answer to the argument for governmental action. In 1942 the AMA could point only to 11 medical society sponsored or approved plans; by 1951 the total was 104 such plans. Medical society plans frequently offer less comprehensive coverage than the independent plans with which they compete. However, they have exploited their competitive advantages through "medical public education" campaigns and word-of-mouth promotion by family physicians to effect an impressive growth of membership.

The struggle against HIP: Organized medicine is presently bringing the utmost power at its disposal against the health-insurance plan of Greater New York. HIP, with almost 400,000 subscribers, is one of the largest group practice, prepayment medical service plans in America. It was originally promoted by Mayor La Guardia to provide comprehensive health insurance for New York City government employees and their families; half of the premium is borne by the city and half by the insured. Since its formation, HIP has opened its enrollment to other employed groups and some individuals.

HIP's organization resembles that of the typical lay-sponsored plan. The plan is headed by a doctor, but a majority of directors are laymen. The board has control over the premium rates and contracts with groups of physicians who, in turn provide medical care to subscribers. Each of the 30 affiliated groups receives a per capita payment based on the number of subscribers registering with it. The group divides its receipts among member-doctors as it wishes; most choose salaried practice, with annual earnings ranging from \$7,500 for starting physicians, to \$18,000 for senior partners. The subscriber may select any one of the 30 groups, from which he receives comprehensive medical care. And the enrollee may choose any doctor within his group as his family physician. Preventive medicine is particularly stressed since it is to the advantage of the group to minimize illness among its patients. Premium rates vary according to income and size of family: an individual with an income under \$5,000 pays \$42.72 per year; a family earning under \$6,500 pays a maximum of \$155.52. HIP does not cover hospitalization; its subscribers are required to enroll in Blue Cross or an equivalent.

From its inception, HIP has steadily grown in size, and the local medical societies' pressure against it has increased proportionately. When Mayor La Guardia suggested the formation of a comprehensive health plan for city employees the medical societies urged utilization of existing services, and liberalized the benefits of the society-sponsored United Medical Service. Since then, a controversy between these two competing plans has ensued over the right to advertise. The ethical code permits society plans to attract subscribers through advertising on the theory that all doctors benefit equally. Although the local medical societies initially tolerated advertising by HIP, they recently have changed their view and branded the practice as unethical. An appeal from this ruling has recently been denied at the State level.

Rather than inviting comparison of their plan with HIP in terms of quality, coverage, and premiums, the local medical societies have disparaged HIP for its alleged denial of free choice of physician. It is true that HIP subscribers can obtain services only from doctors in a participating group. But the independent subscriber can exercise a free choice originally between any available plan, or no plan at all. And if he chooses to join HIP, he has a choice of several groups and of numerous doctors within each group. Perhaps the doctors' hostility stems from HIP's denying their free access to 400,000 potential patients.

Condemning HIP as unethical conveys a threat of possible disciplinary action against affiliated doctors, and may implant the fear that fellow physicians will view their participation as detrimental to the profession's welfare. Nevertheless, increasing numbers of doctors have joined HIP affiliated groups. Consequently the New York medical societies have advocated State legislation designed to destroy the HIP panel practice system. Under the guise of guaranteeing free choice of physician, the proposed act would have forced prepayment group plans to compensate any physician rendering services to subscribers. But the 1954 New York Legislature adjourned without passing this measure: Now the State medical society is attempting to secure its objective of destroying panel practice groups by "clarifying" its own ethical code. One new interpretation condemns the salaried practice of medicine except in institutions where patients are public charges; this ruling would necessitate a fundamental change in the income distribution system of HIP affiliated groups, but would not destroy the plan. Another interpretation, asserting free choice to be denied whenever the patient must choose a physician from a panel or group, would inevitably outlaw any group practice prepayment system. Whether the New York medical societies will enforce this ruling by disciplinary action against participating physicians is the crucial question.

AMA attitudes toward health measures under Government auspices

Governmental activities in the field of public health have steadily increased. This expansion has occurred not only through changes in our social and economic philosophies, but also from advances in scientific knowledge. Communicable disease was once thought to result from environmental defects with a consequent limitation of public health activities to sanitation. But bacteriological knowledge has demonstrated personal communicability, and led to a public concern for the welfare of the individual as well as his environment. Consequently, public health functions have come to include such programs as diagnosis, treatment, and hospitalization. More recently these programs have been broadened so as to cover not only communicable, but degenerative disease, and maternal and child-welfare projects as well.

The development of many public-health activities has met with hostility from the medical profession. Physicians often resisted such early programs as smallpox inoculations, diphtheria immunizations, and venereal disease clinics as invasions of the domain of private practice. Often State health departments, their personnel being influenced by the medical societies, were themselves opposed to expansion into areas of general medical care. Where health officials did institute new programs, they sometimes had to resign from their local medical societies because of opposition to these ventures. And where medical societies gave approval to diagnosis and treatment by public-health agencies, they have favored furnishing care by private practitioners on a free choice, fee-for-service basis, rather than by the less costly salaried physician hired by the State.

Measures providing public medical care directly to the patient have usually met with the opposition of organized medicine when made available to those able to pay for private services. These programs, it is charged, put the State in competition with private practitioners of medicine. As a consequence of opposition from medical societies, the initiative for most public-health development has come from outside the medical profession. Although the American Medical Association today approves a number of public-health measures once opposed by medical societies, it would still define the scope of public health more narrowly than most public-health officials. A recent resolution would limit health departments to such activities as vital statistics, health education, sanitation, communicable disease, and laboratory and clinical services essential to the control of such diseases. This concept of public health excludes programs in the field of maternal and child welfare, sight and hearing conservation, care of crippled children, degenerative disease, and mental health.

Governmental Level of Sponsorship and Control

AMA opposition to governmental health measures, occasionally expressed in terms of general principles, is more often aimed at particular features of administration, sponsorship, or control. Medical Society opposition increases in intensity as local administration is bypassed and control is lodged in the Federal Government. Most State medical societies do not uniformly follow AMA pronouncements defining the proper sphere of public health. In many instances State societies formerly in opposition, now cooperate and participate in State administered maternal and child health or degenerative disease programs for the benefit of indigents. Nevertheless, similar programs under Federal sponsorship have encountered AMA opposition. Organized medicine primarily expresses objection to centralization of control in the Federal Government, not the purposes of the particular program. Possibly a further explanation for the differential in State and national activity lies in the State society's relatively greater control over health programs within its jurisdiction.

On the State level, medical society control is facilitated by the State health department's relative freedom from legislative and executive supervision over enforcement, regulation, and development of new programs. And, under Federal grant-in-aid programs, funds originating in Washington, but destined for local communities, are routed through the State health office, which thus occupies a strategic position in indirectly determining national policy. Joint coordinating committees of State health department and medical society representatives often draw up regulations and allotments under various specified programs. Such a relationship may promote the efficient administration of public-health meas-

ures. But medical society influence goes deeper, pervading health department activity. In many States, the department head is nominated, appointed, or recommended by the State medical society; in a few States membership in a county medical society is a requirement for departmental appointments. And, since the statewide cooperation of doctors is essential to the success of any program, health departments must permit the medical societies to participate in the formulation of policy. This leverage enables organized medicine to protect the interests of the profession against governmental encroachment.

The national organization has been less influential in shaping Federal administrative policy. In fact, health leaders of the recent Democratic administrations were openly hostile toward organized medicine. Since 1876 the AMA has advocated assembling the medical functions of the Federal Government into a single agency of cabinet rank headed by a physician. The AMA opposed and contributed to the defeat of two reorganization proposals submitted by President Truman consolidating health services together with welfare and education. Hostility was grounded upon the fear that Oscar Ewing, advocate of compulsory health insurance and the AMA's arch-enemy, would gain control over medical matters, and that health services would not be independent of other agencies. However, after the 1952 election, the same proposal was submitted by President Eisenhower, and on this occasion organized medicine abandoned its former stand. This reversal followed Presidential assurances that the new office would not advocate compulsion in the medical field. Organized medicine probably anticipates a relationship on the national level similar to that enjoyed in the States.

The American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine—Part VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part VII of the American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

Federal Grants-in-Aid for Health Purposes

Federal grants-in-aid in the health field began with the Chamberlain-Kahn Act of 1918 for control of venereal disease. Three years later the Shepard-Towner Act was passed providing for grants to the States for maternal and child welfare. The 1918 act received qualified approval from the medical societies, but the latter measure was denounced as "a form of bureaucratic interference with the sacred rights of the American home." The AMA based its objections not on public activity in this field, but on Federal participation in it. Shortly thereafter the association announced its blanket opposition to Federal grants-in-aid for medical services. After a few years both of these grants were allowed to die, and the AMA successfully resisted efforts to revive them until the passage of the Social Security Act. Under this measure both programs were reactivated, and grants were established for general public health activities as well. At the present time funds are allocated for a wide variety of public-health services, research, and hospital construction.

Grants for health services: The American Medical Association now accepts the allotment of Federal grants to the States as a well-established principle in our Government. In fact, it has itself called for the extension of public-health services to areas where needed. However, the association emphasizes that public health is primarily a local responsibility, and that there must be a showing of actual need by the States. Similarly, the AMA favors local autonomy in administration. Professional advisory committees are favored, especially if their recommendations are made binding on administrators. Even when these conditions are met the AMA will resist grants for treatment of all but the most contagious diseases unless made contingent on the recipient's inability to pay.

Thus, the AMA opposed the Pepper bill of 1945 which would have increased the authorized expenditures for maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare. The association protested that the measure contained no means test—grants being available without regard to need—and also that the chief of the Children's Bureau had too much discretionary authority in administering the program. However, the AMA gave its approval to the Priest bill in the last Congress. This authorized financial assistance to States and subdivisions for local public health units, particularly in national-defense areas. Approval followed the adoption of amendments suggested by the association to guarantee local autonomy and to clarify the types of service that might be rendered.

Grants for medical research: When grants-in-aid for medical research were first proposed in the late 1930's the AMA expressed its disapproval. Their objections were said to be based on a fear that Federal subsidies would discourage private gifts, and that such subsidies would not be given without Federal control over the manner in which funds were to be used. But the AMA's position changed after grants for such purposes had been passed. The work of the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the war had demonstrated that Federal funds could be applied advantageously for promoting research and accelerating the use of medical discoveries. Since that time the AMA has usually favored measures providing for research grants. The creation of a National Science Foundation, as well as a National Cancer Institute and National Heart Institute, has been approved; such Federal institutes direct important research projects in medicine.

Grants for hospital construction: The AMA has consistently favored Federal grants for hospital construction, provided that local need is shown. Thus the association approved the original Hill-Burton Act of 1946 for hospital surveys, construction, renovation, and improvement. Hill-Burton funds are applied only to the physical plant of hospitals, not for medical services. Also this program has operated primarily to assist hospitals of small capacity in rural areas where need is greatest. And Federal funds, as in most grant programs, are channeled through State health departments.

Grants for medical education: The increased cost of medical education has led to recent proposals for Federal aid. No measure submitted thus far has received organized medicine's approval—and none has been enacted—despite AMA denial that it opposes Federal grants to medical schools. At first such grants were incorporated into the omnibus National Health Act along with controversial compulsory health insurance proposals. In the hope of expediting bipartisan action on the aid to education portion, Senators Murray, Pepper, Taft, and Donnell sponsored a separate bill in 1949. This measure and its House counterpart, after committee consultation with AMA representa-

tives, were amended to limit Federal participation in the budget of any medical school to 40 percent, and to give a professional advisory council, responsible to Congress, the duty of making recommendations to the United States Surgeon General before he could promulgate regulations under the program. In addition, any Federal direction, supervision, or control with regard to personnel, curriculum, or instruction was expressly forbidden. After Senate passage of this measure by unanimous vote the American Medical Association announced its opposition to the measure. In accordance with the association's recommendations, the House then placed a 30-percent limit on Federal participation, but AMA still opposed the bill, and it died in committee. Similar measures introduced since that time have met a like fate. The AMA has announced that it would support single installment Federal grants for the construction and renovation of medical school plants similar in terms to the Hill-Burton grants for hospital construction.

The AMA bases its opposition to medical education subsidies on a fear that Federal domination over the schools will result, and that educational standards will deteriorate. Critics of this argument, particularly the deans of the medical schools, who have been overwhelmingly in favor of Federal aid, point out that the schools are already receiving large grants for research and these have resulted in no Federal control. Some observers attribute organized medicine's attitude to a fear that medical education subsidies would constitute a further acknowledgment of Federal responsibility in providing medical care and thus pave the way for socialized medicine. And perhaps the AMA fears loss of some of its present power to influence the size of medical school enrollment.

Furthermore the AMA contends that adequate support for medical education may be had from voluntary sources, that the availability of such sources has not been fully explored, and that Federal subsidies would discourage the development of private support. The AMA has supported the efforts of the National Fund for Medical Education in obtaining contributions from private and corporate sources. And in 1951 the association announced the formation of its own American Medical Education Foundation to aid the National Fund. The foundation has received large amounts from the AMA and its constituent and component societies, as well as individual physicians. Critics charge that the fund is a mere diversionary action to shift attention from the need for Federal aid, and is sure to be inadequate to meet the annual deficits of the medical schools. Indeed, while estimates of medical school needs above present income range from \$10 million to \$40 million annually, the fund contributed less than \$2 million in 1953. However, the AMA claims that private contributions can provide a solution to the financial crisis facing medical education.

Federal Health Services

United States Public Health Service: Many Federal health measures are carried out through grants-in-aid whereby the Public Health Service is responsible only for overall administration, with most discretionary authority being delegated to the States. But the Service itself directly administers numerous programs. Many of these are old-line public-health functions such as vital statistics, pollution control, and international quarantine. In addition, the Service now operates direct programs for the treatment of narcotic addicts, employees of certain governmental services, and seamen, and for the provision of a wide variety of other health services. The development of such projects has not met with the opposition from

organized medicine that have some of the grant proposals. Most Public Health Service programs are of a limited nature, not competitive with private practitioners.

Military and veterans' medicine: During World War II, Congress instituted an emergency maternal and infant care program to provide medical care for servicemen's wives and children. Although the AMA endorsed the program it opposed direct EMIC cash payments to participating physicians, and some medical societies refused to cooperate unless payments were made to servicemen's wives. Today, the national organization is resisting efforts to revive any form of EMIC. Servicemen's dependents can now receive medical care in military hospitals on the post provided there is sufficient capacity. Families not living within range of the post hospital must arrange and pay for treatment on their own. A series of recent bills introduced to provide off-the-post care has been unsuccessful and the AMA no longer fears the likelihood of a broader EMIC program.

Ever since the establishment of governmental medical services for World War I veterans the AMA has consistently led efforts to block the extension of Veterans' Administration care to include non-service-connected disabilities. Under present law VA hospitals are permitted to care for such cases to the limit of available beds and if the recipient cannot defray the expense of private treatment.

The VA's intensive hospital construction program is constantly increasing available facilities. During its campaign against compulsory health insurance, the AMA, not wishing to alienate the American Legion, soft-pedaled its opposition to the growth of VA medicine. But more recently, organized medicine has opposed further construction of VA hospitals and urged that treatment even of service-incurred disabilities be kept within the limits of existing facilities. The AMA is against any Federal care of non-service-connected disabilities; it advocates State or local care for veterans unable to pay for private care. In lieu of this, however, it has urged a more exacting means test to disqualify financially able veterans. Of 24 bills concerning veterans' medicine pending in the 1954 Congress, the AMA has announced its active approval of only 1—a bill to investigate the VA.

Compulsory Health Insurance

Federal health insurance proposals were a culmination of two lines of development: The recognition of the insurance principle as adaptable to meeting medical costs, and the increasing scope of governmental interest and participation in the provision of medical care. The public and many individual doctors have accepted both patterns, often from direct contact with voluntary prepayment schemes on the one hand, and with State and Federal health services for fractional segments of the population on the other. Organized medicine has generally resisted each of these developments. However, these encounters with innovation seem but skirmishes in comparison to the bitter struggle which followed the merging of the two lines into compulsory health insurance.

Development of a national health program: While prepaid governmental medical care has become a major issue in this country only recently, European experiences stimulated some mild interest here nearly 40 years ago. The AMA at this time received reports from abroad with equanimity and began to consider the possibility of adopting such programs in the United States. But by 1920 its position was clearly one of opposition to Government controlled or regulated medical service. In 1932 the majority report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care indicated tentative approval of tax-supported health insurance, and received wide atten-

tion in medical circles. It was in 1935 that the New Deal became interested in the passage of a health-insurance law as part of the social-security program. By 1938 the issue of compulsory health insurance had assumed more threatening proportions for the AMA. The President's Technical Committee on Medical Care, appointed to study the 1935 Social Security Act, recommended a program of medical care and sickness insurance. In an address to the Congress, President Roosevelt asserted that medical care for the people was a matter of public concern.

At this point the AMA abandoned its resistance to the insurance principle for meeting the costs of medical care. The issue became whether medical society or governmental auspices for health insurance provided the best solution. Organized medicine opposed anything which might divest it of any part of its control over medical services.

The first serious legislative proposal for a national health program was introduced by Senator Robert Wagner, of New York, in 1939. It followed closely the program of the President's Technical Committee and provided for grants-in-aid to the States to enable them to develop plans of their own choosing—subject to basic standards set by the Federal Government. Despite a favorable interim report from the subcommittee which studied the bill, the AMA's own study committee submitted 22 distinct arguments against it and no further action was taken. The next significant health measure was the first Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill of 1943. This provided for a Federal system of medical and hospital benefits, with medical care payments from a fund composed of equal payroll contributions from employer and employee. Senator Wagner denied that the bill would socialize the medical profession, pointing to provisions maintaining the doctor's freedom to remain outside the program, to choose his own patients, and to determine by what method he should be paid. However, the bill provided that each patient could select the doctor of his choice only from participating physicians. Moreover, the Surgeon General was given extensive powers to set fee schedules and limit the size of the doctor's panel of patients. These proposals brought forth violent reaction from organized medicine and the bill died in committee. A similar Wagner-Murray-Dingell proposal followed President Truman's special message to Congress in November 1945, but even with outspoken administration support the bill was no more successful than its predecessor.

In 1946 and 1947, however, Senator Robert A. Taft sponsored an alternative measure to the administration's program. The Taft bill, instead of health insurance, proposed locally-administered Federal subsidies to the States to assist "those families and individuals in the State having insufficient income to pay the whole cost of" health services. The AMA did not react unfavorably, but fearing the possibility of lay administration at the local level, it was unenthusiastic. Also in 1947 the newly-elected Republican Congress considered a significantly modified Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Conforming to criticism of the earlier bills, the sponsors assigned the duties formerly designated for the Surgeon General to a 5-man board in the Federal Security Agency, and control of the proposed program was further decentralized; but more services were offered, and more groups were covered.

The last major administration health insurance bill was inspired by the Ewing report of 1948. This report endorsed a national health program and was instrumental in the identification of its author with compulsory health insurance. Ewing's proposals received the full backing of President Truman in the 1948 presidential campaign.

AMA anxiety was heightened by the election returns and the prompt introduction in January, 1949, of a bill similar to the 1947 Wagner-Murray-Dingell proposal.

AMA tactics of opposition: Organized medicine's earlier attempts to block the passage of compulsory health insurance displayed an essentially ad hoc approach. The earliest proposals for national health insurance required little more than vocal opposition by medical spokesmen. With the introduction of Senator Wagner's 1939 bill, however, the AMA and many State societies intensified their campaign against Government medicine. The AMA's cause was almost entirely taken up by the newly formed National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Service, which served as the propaganda arm of organized medicine. Although the AMA denied any official connection with this organization, the NPC was headed by AMA members and supported by its fund-raising machinery. For nearly 10 years the AMA itself confined its official opposition to State insurance to public addresses, to editorials in the Journal, resolutions in the House of Delegates, and testimony before legislative committees.

The NPC undertook organized medicine's first concerted effort to influence public opinion. Working largely through doctors, the committee is reported to have distributed 25 million pamphlets. But the occasional crudeness of its methods reduced its effectiveness. In 1948 the press protested the NPC's "attempt to buy editorial opinion" through a \$3,000 prize offered for the best published antinational health insurance cartoon. And when the NPC distributed copies of a letter signed by "Reverend" Dan Gilbert, editor of the notorious Defender and former associate of Silver Shirt Gerald Winrod, severe criticism from AMA members followed. By the end of 1948 the NPC's utility as a rallying point for organized medicine was negligible.

Similarly, Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal and the recognized spokesman for organized medicine had become the symbol of old reactionary leadership in the profession, at a time when favorable public opinion was becoming increasingly important. The AMA's decision in 1946 to hire a special public relations counsel was an important step officially taken to curtail Fishbein's activities. Finally, in 1949, the board of trustees announced the retirement of Dr. Fishbein after 37 years of devoted service.

By the end of 1948 it was apparent to AMA leadership that a more positive and drastic program was needed to forestall the enactment of compulsory health insurance. The Ewing report, followed by the Democratic victories in the fall, increased the likelihood that Congress would pass a national health program. Moreover, the new British experiment in socialized medicine had fostered public interest and discussion concerning the adoption of a similar program in the United States. The discrediting of the National Physicians Committee and the retirement of Dr. Fishbein cleared the road for new, more effective opposition techniques.

The interim session of the house of delegates convened in St. Louis the month following the November elections in a spirit of great urgency. The delegates voted to assess each AMA member \$25 to build a \$3,500,000 political war chest to fight socialized medicine. Despite considerable adverse criticism from members the AMA went ahead with plans for an enlarged Washington office and an advertising campaign to educate the American people. And it soon announced that its national education campaign would be conducted by the public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter.

**The American Medical Association:
Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organ-
ized Medicine—Part VIII**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there follows part VIII of the American Medical Association: Power, Purpose, and Politics in Organized Medicine:

The experts whom the AMA chose to lead its campaign were already well known for their successes in California politics. Chief among these was their victory, on behalf of the California Medical Association, over Governor Warren's proposal for statewide compulsory health insurance. Whitaker & Baxter were called in immediately after Governor Warren announced his legislative program in January 1945. In accordance with the procedure they had evolved for short, urgent campaigns, they "started at the top and worked down." They obtained public endorsement from the leaders of more than 100 State organizations, enlisted the support of more than 200 newspapers, made speeches to some 9,000 physicians, and induced doctors, druggists, insurance executives, and dentists to speak to hundreds of thought leaders. A statewide Voluntary Health Insurance Week promoted membership in the society-sponsored California Physicians Service. Medical groups bought 40,000 inches of paid advertisements, and sympathetic merchants another 30,000. At the end of 3 months, Warren's bill was defeated by 1 vote. In 1947 a similar bill failed by a wider margin, and today State health insurance is given little or no chance of passage in California.

The Chicago office of the AMA's national education campaign, with a staff of 37, was established in January 1949. To overcome opposition from within the profession to the campaign and its \$25 assessment, public-speaking tours and circulars were successfully employed and intense doctor support was stimulated. During the first year of the campaign all but a few members displayed posters and nearly 20 million pamphlets were distributed to patients; Congressmen were contacted by their personal physicians and urged to support AMA views. A campaign blueprint published in February indicated that the first year's strategy would be to mobilize lay group leaders who, in turn, would urge the membership of their groups to back the AMA in communications to legislators.

By December 1949, the national education campaign headquarters reported that it had the public endorsement of 1,829 separate organizations, ranging in size from a few to more than 5 million members. In addition nearly 55 million pieces of literature had been distributed to an estimated 100 million people at a cost of more than \$1 million. Traveling press representatives and selected spokesmen operating through speakers bureaus, and 250,000 physicians, druggists, and insurance men under less formal organization, had spoken, written, and distributed AMA material. Half of the first year's budget was allocated to defense and attack, the other half to extending and improving the services of the voluntary health insurance system. The latter was to be organized medicine's affirmative answer to the Ewing program. Insurance companies and doctors were urged to promote the sale of voluntary health insurance policies under

the slogan "The voluntary way is the American way." The rate of enrollment in 1949 was nearly 1 million each month.

The national education campaign soon produced a marked effect. Former congressional supporters of the President's plan began to withdraw their backing, and by November many sponsors conceded that there was no hope of enacting any health insurance law in the first session of the 81st Congress.

Realizing that its 1949 success provided only temporary respite, organized medicine planned its 1950 campaign to end conclusively the threat of national health insurance. The house of delegates, in December 1949, voted to impose permanent yearly dues of \$25 for all AMA members. There were fringe bills to defeat and, most important, there was a decisive congressional election to be won.

Much of the strategy of the 1950 campaign was a continuation of the previous year's blueprint. Furthermore, an intensive 2-week advertising campaign was timed to influence the congressional elections. \$1,100,000 was set aside—one-half for newspaper advertisements and the remainder equally divided for radio time and magazine space—to arouse public opposition to compulsory health insurance.

Since the AMA could not openly endorse any candidates, it urged individual members to engage in political action supplementary to the national education campaign. Member doctors formed healing arts or medical-dental committees to help defeat supporters of national health insurance. Previous experience in special elections had demonstrated the effectiveness of such committees. During the 1949 election in the 26th Pennsylvania Congressional District the healing arts committees mailed more than 190,000 letters, made more than 120,000 personal telephone calls, placed a series of 12 advertisements in every newspaper in the district, and purchased radio time to urge the election of JOHN P. SAYLOR and the defeat of his Democratic opponent, who had endorsed the President's program. The total vote approached the district's turnout for the 1948 Presidential election and more than 20,000 Democrats switched their votes to elect SAYLOR.

During the 1950 campaign, doctors in many congressional districts formed their own political committees. In Wisconsin, the Physicians for Freedom helped to defeat Representative Andrew Biemiller through posters, advertisements, and campaign literature included with monthly bills to patients. In Florida, similar tactics were used against Senator Claude Pepper in his unsuccessful bid for renomination. Tallahassee hospital patients received breakfast trays upon which were placed cards reading, "This is the season for canning Pepper." And in Ohio the Physicians Committee for Taft was politically active in enlisting support.

The national education campaign and the healing arts committees were rewarded by the election returns. Some of national health insurance's most active supporters were defeated. The president of the AMA called the results very reassuring and announced to the House of Delegates that in the light of the recent campaign any compulsory health insurance bill in Congress today would go down to defeat by at least a 2-to-1 vote.

Despite the fact that national health insurance seems a dead issue, organized medicine has maintained a continuing interest in political affairs. The Democratic platform in 1952 made no mention of national health insurance. Governor Stevenson stated his opposition to such a plan but commented on the need for assistance in financing the costs of illness. The Republican platform unequivocally stated opposition to Federal health insurance and General Eisenhower left no doubt that he was opposed to social-

ized medicine. A nonpartisan organization, the AMA took no official sides. But by October a National Professional Committee for Eisenhower and Nixon was mailing letters from the National Education Campaign's former address, urging that medical and related groups support the Republican ticket. The letterhead featured the names of former AMA presidents Henderson as chairman, and Cline and Irons as vice chairmen, as well as Whitaker and Baxter.

Since the defeat of the Truman-Ewing plan, controversy concerning the role of the Federal Government in the health-insurance field has centered around proposals to aid voluntary projects. The Magnuson report, prepared by President Truman's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, recommended Federal grants to subsidize either these plans or potential subscribers having low incomes. In a 1954 message to Congress, President Eisenhower advocated a different measure: Federal "reinsurance" of voluntary plans. At present, most voluntary schemes place a limit upon the protection given their subscribers. This leaves the cost of catastrophic illness to be borne largely by the individual. Under reinsurance the Federal Government, in return for premiums received from the plans, would insure against claims over a certain figure so that coverage could be extended to include high-cost services. The AMA opposed the Magnuson recommendations because they called for Government subsidies. They have similarly condemned reinsurance, fearing that it might lead to subsidization and constitute an "opening wedge to socialized medicine."

Throughout its recent campaign to halt governmental inroads into medical affairs the AMA has adopted an essentially emotional approach. The basic issues are obscured by the AMA's use of catch phrases, like "socialized medicine," and such devices as mass distribution of the famous Sir Luke Flides painting, "The Doctor," captioned "Keep politics out of this picture." Organized medicine's counterproposals, advocating local controls or private, voluntary remedies, often provide inadequate or partial solutions. By presenting the profession's views realistically, the AMA's campaign against Government health programs could lead to enlightened discussion of the merits rather than exchange of invective.

LIMITATIONS ON AMA POWER

No other voluntary association commands such power within its area of interest as does the AMA. It holds a position of authority over the individual doctor, wields a determining voice in medical education, controls the conditions of practice, and occupies a unique position of influence in shaping Government health policies. Despite the dangers inherent in such a concentration of power, no interest group enjoys more freedom from formal control than organized medicine. The individual physician, subjected to disciplinary authority of the medical society in his local community, has little redress outside the framework of organized medicine. Courts, comparing society membership to affiliation in fraternal or benevolent organizations, find that expulsion or denial of membership deprives the doctor of no property right, and are reluctant to interfere unless the society's own prescribed formalities were not observed. Even if the scope of judicial review encompassed an examination of the merits, and resulted in admission or reinstatement of unreasonably disciplined physicians, the remedy might still be of little use. Legal process cannot prevent informal sanctions and ostracism. And within the framework of organized medicine, the doctor who challenges AMA authority to determine his method of practice is tried and judged by his fellow physicians who may have an economic interest in proscribing his allegedly offensive conduct.

Moreover, while the disapproved prepaid medical service plan is better able to cope with some of organized medicine's weapons, the legal protections available to it are probably inadequate. True, in *American Medical Association v. United States*, the Supreme Court held organized medicine in violation of the Sherman Act for its conspiracy to destroy Group Health Association in Washington, D. C. The Court viewed the furnishing of prepaid health services as a trade or business within the scope of the antitrust laws. It found the conduct of group health doctors to be prohibited by the principles of medical ethics, but refused to give legal status to the principles by holding that the societies' attempt to enforce them constituted a restraint. However, the Government was not required to show an effect upon interstate commerce; this case was brought under the Sherman Act's section 3, which regulates activities within the District of Columbia.

United States v. Oregon State Medical Society demonstrates the practical difficulty of such an action under sections 1 and 2. There, nonmedical society plans and organized medicine had been engaged in a bitter "tooth-and-claw struggle." One charge, alleging a conspiracy to restrain competition between several medical society sponsored plans, was dismissed because these plans did not operate across State lines. The other charge, alleging conspiracy by organized medicine to destroy private plans which were operating across State lines, was dismissed for failure of proof, thus avoiding the necessity for deciding the question of interstate commerce. Even if interstate commerce had been involved here, the commerce clause remains an obstacle to Sherman Act relief; practically all other private plans operate within the confines of a single State. Local sponsorship of such groups plus variations in restrictive State medical service acts have prevented expansion into neighboring States.

Actions such as *Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound v. King County Medical Society*, brought under the Washington State constitution, do not encounter this problem. However, State courts may not construe antimonopoly provisions as broadly as did the Washington supreme court. And, most important, in a majority of States medical societies have obtained restrictive legislation which makes their plans legal monopolies.

Perhaps the major obstacle to antitrust prosecution under either State or Federal law is the difficulty of proving a conspiracy. The District of Columbia and Washington State cases were characterized by such acts as expulsion and denial of hospital facilities. But in the Oregon case, medical societies had abandoned such tactics in 1941, 7 years before the action was brought. Recently, organized medicine has conveyed veiled threats to doctors participating in disapproved plans by outspoken condemnation of such plans in ethical terms. Such indirect, less overt opposition probably discourages physicians from affiliating with disapproved plans, but is less susceptible to antitrust prosecution.

Perhaps a more effective limitation on the power of organized medicine stems from developments in medical technology and public demand for more medical care. The growth of group practice has been inevitable, despite AMA discouragement, because of advances in medical science, increased specialization, and interdependence among doctors. And increased public awareness of the necessity for more frequent and complete medical attention has created an incentive to provide medical services under systems which encourage lower costs, facilitate budgeting, and utilize governmental assistance. These tendencies constitute an underlying limitation on organized medicine's ability to control the development of medical practice.

CONCLUSION

To protect the individual doctor from unreasonable exercise of organized medicine's authority, the crucial importance of society membership should be deemphasized. This approach would mitigate the severe consequences of the medical society's disciplinary powers. Dissident physicians might better be able to resist AMA views if, for example, Government and specialty board appointments were not dependent upon membership. The societies' power to punish serious medical offenses would be weakened, but the medical practice acts can afford the public adequate protection. And revocation or suspension of licensure, unlike medical society disciplinary action, is subject to the impartial scrutiny of judicial review.

Perhaps the most effective method of deemphasizing membership would be to insure availability of hospital privileges to nonmembers. Montana has achieved this through legislation prohibiting discrimination by hospitals against any licensed physician. If he is qualified to practice under State law, the Montana doctor may send his patient to any hospital. This type of provision might require qualification in teaching hospitals and in urban areas where variations in the desirability of hospitals would necessitate some limitation on use of facilities. However, its primary effect is to remove organized medicine's coercive power over doctors without impairing professional standards.

Secondly, to promote greater responsiveness to the public's medical requirements, organized medicine should be divested of its control over the Nation's supply of doctors. Presently the AMA sets educational standards and the State societies dominate licensing boards. It is desirable that agencies composed of physicians control qualifications for admission. But organized medicine's resulting power over supply can be diminished without sacrificing the quality of a doctor's training. Existing high AMA standards, combined with lack of funds, impose a practical limitation upon the number of M. D.'s graduated each year. The doctor supply, so crucial to the Nation's well-being, should not hinge upon the financial condition of medical schools. Federal aid to medical education would help divorce the size of classes from standards of quality. AMA power to set educational requirements and to inspect schools would not be impaired. But the public's need for physicians, rather than financial considerations, would determine our doctor resources.

Organized medicine also exercises quasi-legal authority over the formation of health insurance plans. To foster the development of new methods for providing low-cost prepaid care legislatures should divest the State societies of this control. State statutes requiring approval or participation by the medical society or a majority of doctors have foreclosed experimentation in solving pressing medico-economic problems. No existing plan, irrespective of sponsorship, satisfies all requirements. Variations among the needs and financial capacity of medical consumers necessitate different types of practice, coverage, and sponsorship. While indemnity insurance against hospitalization and surgical costs may be adequate for some, comprehensive coverage under group practice may be highly desirable for others. Independent groups of doctors, cooperatives, unions, and employers—as well as the medical societies—should be free to work out their own solutions. Governmental assistance to plans or low-income subscribers may also be required.

The Illinois Voluntary Health Services Plans Act of 1951 is a unique example of progressive health insurance legislation. This statute enables the formation of nonprofit medical service plans under consumer sponsorship. Thirty percent of the trustees of

such groups must be licensed physicians; doctor representation is assured, but lay control is permitted. Group practice is facilitated because there is no requirement that all or a majority of doctors in the area participate. The Illinois State Medical Society assisted in securing the passage of this legislation. But other medical societies have not been so forward looking.

Finally, there is a range of activity which external restraints upon organized medicine cannot reach. Certainly no legislation can require the AMA to provide a forum for dissenting opinion. But so long as conflicting viewpoints are sidetracked at the lower levels and denied space in the Journal, the AMA cannot accurately claim to speak for the profession. Similarly, no legislation can prevent organized medicine from prejudging new ideas and disparaging them in evasive ethical terms. In the past, the AMA has condemned as unethical various medical practices which it now approves and advocates; the "principles," as interpreted by the medical societies, are not unchanging. And until organized medicine meets questions of medical economics in terms of the real issues, it will not contribute to the solution of current problems. New ideas which the association has accepted have been forced upon it; by assuming leadership in experimentation with unproved systems of practice and payment, the AMA could become an instrument of progress.

Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, from explorations made by citizens of this country in the Antarctic, there is no question but what, if followed up, the claim of the United States to large areas of this great continent would be recognized. If we do nothing about it, time will obliterate any claims we have. I desire to present herewith an article by Miss E. A. Kendall, of Chevy Chase, Md., which appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* under date of January 5, 1955:

INTO ANTARCTICA

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

The recent column (December 28) by Mr. Chamberlin quoting Herbert Hoover's splendid words about nationalism and patriotism, and the tone of some letters from your readers at times, would seem to indicate that there is considerable thought nowadays about whether or not this Nation is behaving as a sovereign nation. At this point this is a most healthy trend, for it often appears (judging from our statesmen's attitudes and actions) that perhaps we are not much longer to be a sovereign nation. Let us hope this is merely surface appearance. Deep down we all know that a sincere nationalism treated always with altruism and common sense can be all to the good, both for ourselves and for our neighbors everywhere.

I should here like to comment apropos of this, and most urgently, that there is one step probably we should take at once in the role of a sovereign nation. I speak of the matter of claiming our rightful territory in Antarctica. Taxayers with whom I have talked about this feel that there is no overriding reason for delay in making land

claims. The Antarctic Continent is almost 6 million square miles in area and obviously whatever countries are interested in development of minerals and ocean products thereabouts will find that there is room for each one in proportion to her earnest activity and attention. It is to be hoped that decency and love of freedom will prevail in such activity and attention. Ten percent of the planet's land surface is in question. Profound study of any complications in its development, whether political, economic, physical, or psychological is in order. And, as a taxpayer, I consider this one of the most urgent problems for our Nation to handle. Congress has had measures in pigeonholes and these may well be brought next session into the full light of public attention. The whole citizenry, it would seem, should have knowledge and a part in decisions of what to do about Antarctica. It is no small matter and no thing that we can postpone indefinitely. We can and should act as a sovereign nation with the kind of nationalism and patriotism that has proven of value to us and to the whole world through us.

E. A. KENDALL.

CHEVY CHASE, Md.

Paper Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Paper Revolution," which appeared in the February 27, 1955, issue of the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

PAPER REVOLUTION

We hear a lot of talk about the industrial revolution that started us on the path we are traveling today at such breakneck speed. But we do not hear enough about the paper revolution that went right along with it.

If you asked them, most people probably would say the steel mill stack or the electric dynamo was the perfect symbol of our civilization. But maybe it ought to be the filing cabinet. Or the wastebasket.

In and out of our offices (not to mention our homes) pours a torrent of paper—letters, reports, appeals, advertising material, documents, and so on.

This deluge of white stuff is almost overwhelming at times. After the material is shuffled about for awhile, it usually heads for one of two destinations—the basket or the file cabinet. Some of the toughest decisions in government and business hinge on which place to pitch a paper you hold in your hand.

The school of thought that automatically thinks "file it" is the right choice evidently believes we're living in such a marvelous age that nothing ever recorded on paper should ever be destroyed.

At the other end of the scale are those who seem to figure that so much happens every day that nobody will care much what occurred a week or two back. They're the wastebasket feeders.

Recently the new Hoover Commission had occasion to report on the paper flood as it affects government. What the Commission found was pretty staggering. The Federal Establishment creates or handles about 25 billion pieces of paper a year, not counting

untold tons of pamphlets, technical manuscripts, and so on. Wastepaper consequently is the largest item shipped out of Washington for industrial use.

Office space for the 750,000 workers engaged in full-time paper handling—one way or another—is equal to 36 Empire State buildings. The space required for the 24 million cubic feet of Federal records equals 7 Pentagons.

The Commission estimates all this costs the Government \$4 billion a year. And this averages out to \$100 in taxes for a family of four.

The investigators thought about \$255 million savings might be managed on paperwork. Not a paltry sum, yet hardly large enough to suggest great confidence that the paper snowstorm can be reduced to harmless flurries.

The cost is only one sad aspect of this thing. Think of all those trees.

Mexican Press Shouts Praise of Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of February 17, 1955:

MEXICAN PRESS SHOUTS PRAISE OF NIXON

(By David Hellyer, Inter-American Affairs Editor)

The reception accorded Vice President and Mrs. Nixon and their party in the Mexican capital went way beyond the bounds of mere protocol. A courteous reception usually is guaranteed all visiting diplomats. But such a tumultuous, spontaneous, and joyous welcome, stemming from the grassroots, and reflected in the plaudits of the nation's press—this is something different.

Press reaction in Mexico is significant. Sentiments expressed by the capital newspapers usually mirror accurately the sentiments of Mexico's Government leaders. Thus it is interesting to note the markedly friendly reaction in two of the capital's principal dailies, *Excelsior* and *Novedades*.

Calling Nixon a great and sincere friend of Mexico, and referring to Mrs. Nixon as a charming lady, *Novedades* said in a front-page editorial:

"We must say, loudly, that this eminent ambassador of friendship which the United States has sent us has made a definite impact on the heart of Mexico, and has inspired the confidence of our people."

In visiting Mexico's famed Basilica of Guadalupe, the Vice President endeared himself even more firmly. Both newspapers commented editorially on the visit. *Excelsior* quoted Nixon as saying on the occasion: "Fortunately, the peoples of the United States and Mexico have in common the conviction that man does not live by bread alone, but must also elevate his spirit toward God."

This statement hit the heart of the Mexican people, who are deeply religious. Commented *Excelsior*: "It is very satisfying to thus confirm that North America's leadership understands the way of life of our people. . . . It is this understanding and mutual respect on which is built authentic and lasting friendship between the United States and Mexico."

Nixon's natural personal warmth won him hosts of friends among the Mexican people. Too often our diplomats and leaders have kept themselves aloof, either because they have felt unsure of themselves, or out of an ill-concealed sense of superiority. Nixon's ingenuous readiness to shake hands with every comer thus was a refreshing change from the coldness to which many had become accustomed.

Nor did the Vice President lose any friends for the United States with his statement of frank admiration for President Ruiz Cortines. After 3 or 4 hours of cordial visiting with Mexico's Chief Executive, Nixon termed Ruiz Cortines one of the great national leaders of this age. This is an appraisal on which many agree, both within Mexico and outside it, and was not mere political sugar talk.

The Vice President again is proving to be a great statesman.

The Nixon visit to Mexico will go down in both Mexican and United States history as a major contribution to lasting understanding between our peoples, and as a master stroke in United States diplomacy.

Radio Report by Hon. George S. Long to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE S. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1955

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station KALB, Alexandria, La.:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, this is your Congressman George S. Long speaking to you from Washington, D. C., by tape recording.

A great deal of discussion has been had through the newspapers and by various individuals regarding the salary raise just voted to the Congressmen, Senators, and Federal judges. Inasmuch as it concerns me, your Congressman, I shall devote a brief part of this talk to discussing this subject. In the first place, this is the first salary raise that the Congress has had for many, many years. Like all others, the Congressmen's expenses have increased year by year. I have been in Congress now for almost 3 years and on the present salary have not been able to save \$1. To the contrary, I have used money derived from other sources to help bolster my expenses in order that I might stay in Congress and represent you.

Briefly, may I say that I have to keep 2 homes—one in the District and I in Washington. While I do not entertain a great deal, I do entertain some of those coming to Washington on business. I felt that a salary raise was due; I voted for it honestly. I have only this to say to my constituents. You have 2 years now in which to watch my work and see if you think I am worth the salary I am receiving.

At the end of 2 years, if you do not feel I am worth the money, then this will afford you the opportunity to select a man who is. May I say with all candor that you do not need a cheap man in Congress. You need one who is worth the salary he will receive and if I am not that man, I shall find no fault with you should you elect someone else to serve in my stead.

On Thursday, February 24, the United States House of Representatives was again

considering legislation designed to provide tax relief for our taxpayers. The bill, H. R. 4259, was sponsored by the Democrats and, unlike last year's Republican-sponsored bill which gave relief only to the favored wealthy, this bill will provide, among other things, a \$20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. It goes right home to the individual taxpayer whether he be wealthy or poor.

I recall that last year I tried to get the tax exemption for each individual raised from the \$600 allowed to \$1,000. This was blocked, and the figure was lowered to \$900. This, too, failed and an exemption of \$700 was sought. The Republicans opposed even that small relief for our taxpayers and the bill they forced through Congress bypassed the little man completely.

That bill, H. R. 8300, can be explained this way. In our area in Louisiana we have a lot of people who work with their hands and who earn \$3,000 and less. Take a man with a family who earns \$3,500 farming. He works with his hands 12 months in the year. His wife works, and all of his children work. They make \$3,500 in 12 months—if they are lucky. His tax under this bill approximately is \$60. But take the man who uses 12 minutes of his time, instead of 12 months. A man who clips bond coupons in the amount of \$3,500—his tax is in the neighborhood of \$20. Now have you helped the little man or have you helped the big man? Those are the facts.

Last year's tax bill contained 875 pages. On every page you find help for the big taxpayer. On every page he turns, he finds a golden nugget which takes care of him. But for the little fellow in the low brackets you might just as well send him a Sears Roebuck catalog, which would do him more good than this bill, H. R. 8300, did for him. Republicans say that this \$20 tax reduction will not do anyone any good and that it is a phony. A \$20 bill, my friends, is never a phony. You will find that one \$20 bill will buy just as much food for empty stomachs as another. Twenty dollars is \$20 in anybody's language. This is not just \$20 to the taxpayer. His wife gets \$20 and each of the children get \$20. A family of 5 get \$100.

The Republicans say this is politics. You bet this is politics. H. R. 8300 was politics. That was Republican politics and it did not help the little man in this Nation. But now this is politics, too—this is Democratic politics that believes in filling the stomachs of the hungry people of America. While I admit that \$20 is very small, it goes to every man, woman, and dependent in this great Nation of ours. This will bolster the economy of this country and will put purchasing power in the hands of the people. This is an extra \$20 that all of us will have to spend. We do not hesitate to give relief to other nations when they are in need. Then why in all good reason should we not give relief at home? Let me repeat, the only thing wrong with this tax cut, it is not enough.

I was very pleased when this tax-relief bill passed the House on Friday, February 25, despite the opposition of the Republicans. I am pleased because it is a definite step in the right direction. While small, it begins the journey which I hope will lead us to greater tax relief.

In my humble opinion, we must have relief from the burdensome taxes we are now paying. This small cut that we are making now could be easily cared for by just a little of the money being curtailed that we are giving to the foreign-aid program.

Thank you for allowing me the privilege of coming into your home, and may God bless you.

William Wallace Royster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. Gottfrid Lindsten, of Minneapolis, Minn., commending Mr. William Wallace Royster, a former Soo Line locomotive engineer, for originating the basis and essentials of the railroad pension law, and extending congratulations to him on reaching the age of 83 years.

Mr. Lindsten's letter follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., February 12, 1955.

HON. ROY W. WIER,

Representative in Congress,

Third Minnesota District,

House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIER: May I take this occasion to remind you once again that March 7 is just around the corner, and I trust that I and thousands of more railroad employees here in the upper Midwest can prevail upon you to join with us in paying homage and our deep respect and reverence to a man whose birthday always will be an important milestone in the hearts and minds of thousands and thousands of railroad employees for whom he strove so long and arduously to bring a little security into the future for us oldtimers on the rails.

William Wallace Royster resides in Vallejo, Calif. He will be 83 years of age on March 7, 1955. The Board of County Commissioners of Pope County, Minn., appropriately recognized the monumental work of their former resident of Glenwood, Minn., through assigning an excellent space in the main lobby of the courthouse in the county seat, Glenwood, for the bronze plaque memorializing Mr. Royster, following an impressive dedication and unveiling ceremony in the high school there September 27, 1952.

The plaque was largely purchased through voluntary subscriptions of railroad employees. A few weekly newspapers in Minnesota, including the dailies, the Minneapolis Star and the Vallejo, Calif., Times-Herald, published excellent articles re: the Royster railroad pension plan project and efforts extended by him in the development of the plan, and the memorial to him now erected in the courthouse in Glenwood, Minn. Aside from this press recognition, I do not recall of any national press recognition being given Mr. Royster, except in a limited way when President Roosevelt was photographed with a group of railroad brotherhood officials when he signed the Railroad Retirement Act, which photographic cut appeared in the railroad union's weekly Labor. The cut included Mr. Royster of the National Pension Association.

Some time ago, a young switchman in the St. Paul Union Depot Co. yard, observed to me that he thought "the Government gave the pension to the railroad employees." This must be the reaction of thousands upon thousands of railroad employees in this country who do not know how the railroad pension law originated, nor its procedural enactment. The Government, incidentally, does not finance the railroad retirement pen-

sion, this being done by the carriers, the employees, on an equal contributory basis.

Quite naturally, many railroad employees who knew Mr. Royster, or about him and his masterful pension work, revere their great benefactor. The large balance of railroad employees, with newer employees in mind, have not had the benefit of a public relations expert to publicize the Royster pension project. Aside from the devoted, informed, he is literally unhonored and unsung. This would appear incomprehensible, considering his contribution to a pension system—outstanding welfare measure of its type, so beneficial and utterly necessary that its value cannot be over-estimated or over-emphasized.

An appropriate congressional resolution for the official record indicative of the Royster pension achievement would, per se., be an unparalleled recognition of his work.

I have conferred with the Honorable JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., Member of Congress, Sixth California District, in which district Mr. William Wallace Royster resides at 2 Short Street, Vallejo, Calif., regarding a congressional resolution as afore discussed. Perhaps a joint effort could be established in the premises as pertains to such resolution.

Thanking you for your interest, I am
Respectfully yours,

GOTTFRID LINSTEN.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT: AN APPRECIATION

Numerous railroad employees, especially those of more recent carrier employment connection, are unaware of the origin of the concept of the railroad pension plan as developed through the indefatigable efforts and applied genius of William Wallace Royster, a former Soo Line locomotive engineer in Minnesota, now retired and residing in California. Old timers express the deepest and most heartfelt gratitude for Royster's successful crusade in behalf of retirement pensions for railroad employees. The project, forerunner of the present Federal pension law—Railroad Retirement Act—formulated by William Wallace Royster, working until early hours in the morning at his home in Glenwood, Minn., after completing his run, represents the outstanding achievement of this type in our national railroad annals.

Essentials of the pension plan were developed by Royster in 1928. Various railroads afforded a gratuity pension to such employees as management deemed worthy. The pensions could be terminated at will by the carriers. Obviously, too, discrimination could be evidenced. Royster's formal pension plan of February, 1929, later printed in pamphlet form—copies lodged with the Minnesota Historical Society and the Smithsonian Institute Washington D. C., eliminated injustice incident to gratuity pensions, and made it compulsory to pay a pension to any qualified employee.

Equal carrier-employee pension contribution obtains in the present Railroad Retirement Act, which sustains the fund and administration thereof.

Royster's plan met with spontaneous rank and file response. Enthusiastic "rails" rallied nationwide to Royster's pension crusade, despite some railroad brotherhood officialdom opposition. Subsequently, accord was attained between both groups as in requesting congressional support for the joint proposed pension law, which assistance was procured, defects in the first enactment being corrected in a later enactment, signed by President Franklin Roosevelt. The organic act represents the first plan for providing a retirement pension for industrial employees ever offered in the United States of America, becoming a Federal law before

legislation for the Social Security Act was submitted as a bill in Congress.

"Ralls" salute William Wallace Royster, intellectual pioneer of their large group and time, a benign personality, preeminent benefactor of railroad employees, a real American.

Two Schools of Thought Sometimes Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am placing an editorial from the Oklahoma City Times in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it deals with one of the most difficult problems in the Congress, a conflict of interest in national affairs. At a later time I may discuss again how well the advice and logic of this editorial, and others like it, has been received in the community served by this newspaper. The editorial follows:

[From the Oklahoma City Times of March 1, 1955]

Two Schools of Thought Sometimes Conflict

A few months ago the Denver Chamber of Commerce issued a notable declaration which said, in substance, that from now on this organization will refrain from asking for Federal funds for local improvements. The reasons back of such a pronouncement are compelling and inescapable.

The national debt has risen to an all-time high. When President Eisenhower took office 2 years ago he expressed high hopes that this debt could be progressively reduced, and that the era of lavish Federal spending was over. The previous 20 years had been marked by reckless involvement in all kinds of Government handouts and pork-barrel projects. It was obvious that a halt had to be called, or the Nation would face the extremely serious possibility of insolvency and repudiation of its sacred obligations. In short, ruin.

President Eisenhower found, however, that a combination of factors made the economy program difficult.

First, of course, is the Federal bureaucracy which had been progressively infiltrated and dominated by the "gimme" school of thought, and that policymaking could not be taken over by elected officials. The old crowd of spenders continued to call the signals.

In the second place there are countless special-interest organizations throughout the land which continue to make Federal grants one of their foremost objectives, and it is impossible to muster the necessary congressional support for economy when our national lawmakers are continually being prodded and needled for Federal grants in aid for local projects.

In this set of circumstances the old familiar line always appears: "The Federal Government may be going broke—it looks like it is going broke—but it continues to hand out money, and if we don't get that money someone else will; we are paying taxes to replenish the Treasury, so we had better get ours while the getting is good."

This is an insidious and seductive doctrine ("after us, the deluge"). More and more dope until the patient dies.

Is there any way of getting off the dope and embarking on a course of action that will save our children and children's children from national insolvency?

The Denver Chamber of Commerce realized the potency of this question and adopted the resolution.

However, sad to relate, it wasn't long before a special appeal was made for the Federal financing of the vast Upper Colorado and Frying Pan projects in Colorado, and the chamber was put on the spot, since many leading Denver citizens demanded this pork-barrel item. It is not plain that the chamber got off the spot, but at any rate it did not rebuke this vast new raid on the public treasury.

Tomorrow, in Oklahoma City, will be held the annual meeting of the Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council—an organization aimed chiefly against governmental extravagance. In its leadership are found many men who also belong to many other civic organizations.

There is a conflict between some of the objectives.

Should communities and States demand as many Federal handouts as possible, or should they stand solidly back of the taxpayers' organizations who have frequently and forcefully demanded economy in all government—municipal, county, State, and Federal? There is the critical question. Certainly it doesn't make sense when one influential organization demands one thing and another demands the opposite, especially when memberships overlap from one into the other.

It is a hard choice that must be made, but we are repeatedly, patriotically, solemnly, and convincingly warned that if we don't "get off the dope," our country is sure to face disaster. And this process, like charity, begins at home.

Our Soldiers Convicted Under Foreign Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, we always thought the Constitution follows the flag, but that idea now is purely a myth. Congress passed an act making our soldiers subject to the laws of the country in which they are stationed.

Here is a case where a soldier assaulted a taxi driver in France and was given a 5-year sentence. In this country he would have probably been fined and perhaps given a few days jail sentence.

The following item appeared in the Washington Daily News of March 1, 1955:

The Supreme Court yesterday refused to review the case of Pfc. Richard T. Keefe, 26, formerly of 5310 Hamilton Street, Riverdale, who was sentenced to 5 years in jail in 1953 for assaulting a taxicab driver in Orleans, France. His wife, Gladys, contended that he was deprived of his rights in the French trial.

In view of the act passed by Congress, the Supreme Court could make no other decision.

Time of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following column which appeared in the New York Post of Thursday, March 3, is worthy of our most serious consideration:

TIME OF DECISION

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—This seems none too early to direct attention to an opportunity which, if missed, could endanger something very vital to us and the world and something seemingly very much endowed with the hopes and ideals of the American people.

That something is the U. N., and the opportunity is to make it stronger and better. Such an opportunity will be offered this fall when the U. N. General Assembly is to decide whether to call a conference for review of the U. N. Charter and possible revision to improve the machinery for preserving peace. The charter adopted at San Francisco in 1945 provided that the General Assembly at its 10th annual session should take up the question of review and revision.

In the tumult and confusion of events in the tense times of recent months, this important decision bearing on the whole future of the U. N. has been pushed to the background. Now the date for the decision is slipping up on us.

If our Nation and the rest of the nations are to capitalize upon the opportunity, it is very clear that enthusiasm and determination must replace a presently apathetic attitude that is noticeable both in our Government and among our people. While friends of the U. N. have been passive, its enemies have been most active. They have busily exploited the frustrations natural to this unsettled and troubled era to try to weaken or destroy the international organization we created here on our soil with such high hopes.

About all that seems fairly positive now is that our government will support a U. N. review conference when the issue comes before the General Assembly in a few months. That assurance came from Secretary of State Dulles when he appeared over a year ago, January 18, 1954, before a special Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee which is exploring the whole subject of U. N. review and possible revision. At that time the Secretary said that "present indications are that a review conference will be held."

State Department officials charged with U. N. affairs are studying the possibilities of a review conference, though, it is reported, with rather a negative, pessimistic attitude because of the veto power of the permanent members of the U. N. Security Council, including ourselves, Russia, and Great Britain, which applies to proposed amendments to the charter as it applies to regular operations. A similarly discouraged attitude was manifested at the convention here this week of the American Association for the U. N. It has been one of the most active promoters of the U. N.

There are two events between now and the General Assembly meeting in New York this autumn which offer a means of generating interest, that is, if properly capitalized by our leaders.

For one, the special Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on U. N. review and re-

vision will resume hearings about the middle of next month on proposals for revision which it began over a year ago. Last year the committee visited several cities in the Middle West where scores of individuals representing all sorts of groups flocked before the committee to submit ideas about how the U. N. might be strengthened. It was a heartening demonstration.

On April 18, the committee will hold a public hearing in Atlanta, and on the next day at Miami. Thereafter it plans to visit the Pacific coast and Far West and New England for further hearings before it winds up with concluding hearings here and makes a report to the Senate.

As for the second event—in late June—there will be the celebration in San Francisco lasting for over a week of the 10th anniversary of the U. N., which was created in that city. The occasion, which will be attended by representatives of the 60 member nations, offers another opportunity for a revival of interest in the UN and ways to improve and strengthen it.

What our people need so desperately in their groping and searching for peace through improvement of the machinery embodied in the U. N. is leadership that can arouse their hope and faith and direct it.

It is equally clear that President Eisenhower, who is himself so firm an advocate of the U. N., must assume that leadership and exert it forcefully if the apathy and confusion in our government and among our people are to be dispelled. His voice carries weight also among people all over the world who, likewise, must be aroused if the U. N. is to become more useful.

We face a great opportunity which we cannot afford to forfeit to indifference, cynicism, or delay.

Supreme Court and U. N. Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, every day adds cumulative evidence to the proposition that we should get out of the United Nations at the earliest possible moment. This we can do by an act of Congress, as I have explained heretofore. We do not need any constitutional amendment to do it, although that would accomplish the purpose and further would make future so-called treaties like the Charter of the United Nations impossible.

The question came up squarely in the Steel Seizure case, where an attempt was made to declare the Charter of the United Nations superior to the provisions of the Constitution. Five Justices of the Supreme Court said "No," but the Chief Justice and three others said "Yes" or took no part. This decision saved the Constitution, and I thought it not likely that another attempt would be made to assault its authority. But it came up in the Iowa Supreme Court, where the decision declared unequivocally for the Constitution, and held that the Charter of the United Nations could not override the State laws of Iowa.

That decision was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States, where

4 Justices declared for the Charter of the United Nations and 4 declared against it. One vacancy on the Court caused this 4-to-4 decision, and, there not being a majority of the Court ready to declare the charter superior to a law of Iowa, the Constitution was saved again.

This last case was a close call, for if it had gone the other way the Charter of the United Nations would have been declared superior to any law in any State.

You cannot, therefore, blame the Members of the Senate of the United States for being suspicious of the appointment of John Marshall Harlan, for, being a Rhodes scholar, and knowing the purpose of the Rhodes scholarships from their own definition, the chances are that this new Judge would be more apt to uphold the Charter of the United Nations as being superior to any State law. Senator EASTLAND, in opposing the confirmation of Mr. Harlan, has put his finger on the danger to the Constitution that could easily arise from the confirmation.

Two Finnish Holidays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. COYA KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring attention to two Finnish holidays, that of February 5 and February 28, which are tributes to a hardy, hard-working people. Under leave to extend my remarks of these significant holidays, I include the following:

JOHAN LUDVIG RUNEBERG: FINLAND'S
NATIONAL POET

February has a double significance in Finnish literature. February 5 is the birthday of the great Finnish poet, Johan Ludvig Runeberg. In the early part of the 19th century Finland was under the rule of Russia, but in 1820 a nationalistic movement began which was accompanied by a keen interest in Finnish folklore. Johan Runeberg's poems, with their idealistic depiction of rural life inspired the patriotic love of the people for their sleeping nation. Later, political philosophers encouraged the idea of a Finnish national state and guided the awakening from the literary to the political sphere. It would be difficult to overestimate the value of Runeberg's patriotic poems in this early awakening. He is now considered the Finnish national poet, and one of his poems has been adopted as the Finnish national anthem.

KALEWALA DAY

Each year on February 28, the Finnish people commemorate the Kalewala—the great Finnish national epic poem. Well they might, for the influence of the Kalewala in Finland has been extensive and profound. Literature, painting, music, and scholarship have found inspiration in this long epic poem. Its fame abroad has also been remarkable for it has been translated into many languages, including English. It has served as a model for poets in other countries, in fact, our own American poet, Longfellow, was very much influenced by the Kalewala in his own epic poem Hiawatha.

Until the 19th century, the Kalewala existed only in fragments in the memories and on the lips of the peasants of Finland. But in 1835, Dr. Elias Lonnrot wandered about the country, into the most remote places and took down in writing these favorite songs of the people. After unwearied diligence, Dr. Lonnrot succeeded in collecting 12,000 lines and arranged them systematically in story form.

Today, the great Finnish people, who deeply cherish their freedom and their national heritage, recite in song and verse, the beautiful Kalewala. From generation to generation the great epic is treasured in the memories and in the writings of the people. We Americans have our own favorite poems and songs which reveal the stories and the ideals of our own national heritage. It is not hard, therefore, for us to imagine the pride and happiness with which the Finnish people set aside February 28 as a day of celebration of this great epic song.

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1850, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was born in southeastern Moravia. He later became the first President of Czechoslovakia. A Slovak by birth and the son of poor parents, he entered the University of Vienna in 1869. There he studied and later lectured on philosophy. In 1891 he was elected to Parliament as a member of the Young Czech—Liberal—Party. However, soon thereafter he resigned his seat and during the next 15 years wrote a series of books on the Czech question, the principles of nationality, and social philosophy. In 1900 he founded the small but influential Realist, or Popular, Party.

At the outbreak of the First World War he envisaged the breakup of Austria and the emergence of the Czechoslovak state. He fled to Italy and then to France, England, Russia, and the United States. In May 1917 Masaryk founded the Czech National Council, with its headquarters in Paris. He then went to Russia and created the Czech Legion out of Czech deserters from the Austrian Army. After the Bolshevik Revolution he secured the consent of the Soviet government for the exit of the legion through Siberia.

He came to the United States, and to a great extent through President Wilson's support for the Czech cause, the Republic of Czechoslovakia was recognized in 1918 by Italy, Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. The Czechoslovak Declaration of Independence was formally published at Washington, D. C., on October 18, 1918, and the Republic was formally proclaimed at Prague on October 28, 1918. Masaryk was elected the first President of the Republic. As President-Liberator, he wisely guided his country's affairs until 1935, when he resigned for reasons of

health. Two years later Masaryk died, beloved by all his countrymen.

Masaryk ranks among the great as a philosopher and a statesman. Above all, he will take his place in history as a devoted Czechoslovak patriot who dedicated both himself and his country to the ideals of liberty and democracy. He was a friend and admirer of the United States and the principles for which it stands. He was an enemy of tyranny and a friend of freedom. As long as his memory and his teachings endure in the minds and hearts of the Czechoslovaks, the Communist regime which now oppresses them is doomed to fail. The Czechoslovaks can be sure that they have the sympathy and support of the American people in the trials through which they are passing.

Foreign Aid Cost to the United States for 1954 Exceeded All Payments to Operate Our Government, Including Checks to Individuals, by \$831,661,737

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the following tables will point out just how our Government expense account audits up, and shows how much money we spent and on what project spent, during 1953. We hear many complaints about the cost for old-age assistance, assistance to dependent children, the crippled and the blind, aid to veterans and hospitals for veterans, the agricultural conservation program, unemployment compensation, readjustment benefits to veterans.

Here is the actual accounting sheet:

Grants to States and local units

ACTIVITY AND TOTAL AMOUNT TO ALL STATES

Agricultural experiment stations, grants.....	\$12,285,308
Cooperative agricultural extension work.....	31,485,726
National school-lunch program, grants.....	81,665,047
National forest fund, shared revenues.....	17,608,984
Submarginal land program, payments for.....	448,049
State and private forestry cooperation.....	10,275,566
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities.....	66,024,948
Commodities donated by CCC to schools.....	12,986
Federal airport program, CAA.....	26,990,836
Bureau of Public Roads, highway grants.....	515,444,540
Bureau of Public Roads, emergency grants.....	1,866,254
Support of State maritime schools.....	266,432
Lease of flood-control lands, Army.....	869,051
Federal aid, wildlife restoration.....	12,474,131
Distribution under Minerals Leasing Act.....	17,010,013
Distribution from receipts, Migratory Bird Act.....	485,694

Payments to States from grazing receipts.....	\$7,190,714
Unemployment compensation and service.....	197,779,364
American Printing House for the Blind.....	185,000
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	22,244,093
Colleges for agricultural and mechanical arts.....	5,030,000
Cooperative vocational education.....	25,420,754
School construction, and survey, grants.....	118,308,139
Maintenance and operation of schools, grants.....	65,994,669
Venerable disease control, grants.....	7,162,260
Tuberculosis control, grants.....	5,300,000
General health assistance, grants.....	13,536,970
Mental health activities, grants.....	3,049,736
Cancer control, grants.....	2,894,606
Heart disease control, grants.....	1,348,104
Water pollution control, waste, studies.....	1,113,416
Hospital construction and survey.....	109,302,421
National Cancer Institute, grants.....	2,301,773
National Heart Institute, grants.....	1,685,740
Old-Age Assistance, regular grants.....	899,390,252
Aid to dependent children, grants.....	338,549,221
Aid to permanently disabled, grants.....	59,317,125
Aid to the blind, grants.....	32,668,872
Maternal and child health services, grants.....	13,299,919
Services for crippled children, grants.....	11,814,776
Child welfare services, grants.....	6,388,437
Housing aids of all kinds, grants.....	30,715,401
Disaster relief.....	4,629,128
Civil Defense Administration, grants.....	13,890,743
Federal Power Commission, payment to States.....	33,531
State and Territorial homes for veterans.....	3,722,190
Supervision, on-the-job training, veterans.....	1,890,574
Self-employment allowances for vets.....	242,156

Grants-in-aid..... 2,802,365,266

PAYMENTS DIRECT TO INDIVIDUALS

Agricultural conservation program.....	\$206,797,815
Administration Sugar Act, subsidies.....	61,210,169
Farm Housing Repair program, grants.....	56,310
Forest Highways, Bureau of Public Roads.....	22,334,373
State marine schools (4 States only).....	273,298
National Guard and Air Guard.....	150,941,660
Unemployment compensation for veterans.....	25,907,392
Research grants, several fields, total.....	21,052,428
Traineeship awards, several fields, total.....	2,230,488
Teaching grants, etc.....	6,661,928
Fellowship awards, grants, total.....	1,784,673
Autos for disabled veterans.....	18,223,614
Readjustment benefits for veterans.....	734,073,888
Total payments to individuals.....	1,251,576,528
Plus grants-in-aid.....	2,802,365,266
Grand total (1953).....	4,053,941,794

For all of the purposes, which in a great republic like ours was necessary. Compare that total of \$4,053,941,794 to the total handed out to foreign countries during the same period of time. This total was \$4,885,003,528.

The only place we can save money, and take off the backs of the people the onerous load of taxes, is to do it by cutting down this foreign aid. We cannot reduce our appropriations for national defense; we cannot do less than we have for the people of the United States—we should do more—but we can plug up this hole through which our billions are going in foreign aid.

The figures are taken from the News Bulletin No. 45, issued by Paul Peters.

Atomic Energy Progress Confronts Upper Colorado River Project With New Obstacle

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the age of nuclear power has arrived and electric power companies are now building at their own expense new plants which will supply electricity produced by atomic fission.

What does this mean to conscientious legislators who must evaluate proposals to invest large sums of money in new Federal hydroelectric projects?

Simply that they must look at them, not only in the light of all factors heretofore considered, but with this additional question in mind: In the foreseeable future will nuclear power be transformed into electric energy at cheaper rates than electric energy can be obtained from water power?

If the answer is "Yes," then our vast hydroelectric plants may become obsolete white elephants, giving way to more efficient nuclear-electric plants just as the horse and buggy gave way to the more efficient automobile. If this should happen, the Federal Treasury would never recover the millions it might pour into hydroelectric and related developments.

With millions, and possibly billions at stake, consideration of this possibility is absolutely essential if Congress is to act with responsibility in this day of swiftly moving scientific progress.

The proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River storage project is a specific instance.

Bills now before the Congress call for a spending authorization ranging from \$1 billion to \$1.8 billion on the upper Colorado River. They would construct numerous irrigation projects, the revenues from which could repay only 10 percent of their cost. Tied in the bills are expensive hydroelectric projects, the power revenues from which would be expected to repay not only the cost of the power dams and installations, but also 90 percent of the cost of the irrigation projects.

Planning figures show that it may take up to 100 years to pay for these projects out of the hydroelectric power cash register.

Thus, for financial success, nuclear-electric energy must not be produced more cheaply than hydroelectric energy for at least 100 years.

What are the prospects in this regard?

Simply, that not in 100 years, not in 50 years, but in a much shorter time nuclear-electric energy will be produced much cheaper than hydroelectric energy.

Remember, just 15 years ago, in 1940 nuclear power was practically unheard of. By 1945, 5 short years later, the first A-bomb had exploded over Hiroshima. Research for peacetime use was so concentrated during the subsequent 10 years that today commercial nuclear-electric energy generating plants actually are being constructed.

The British Government announced a 10-year program for building 12 atomic power stations at an estimated cost of \$840 million. The British say these plants will produce electricity at a cost of 6 mills per kilowatt-hour in comparison with their present convention generating cost of 7.2 mills.

United States cost figures prepared by James A. Lane, of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, show the average figure in this country for producing electricity in conventional steam plants is 7 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the cost in a nuclear plant would be 6.7 mills.

That is without considering that nuclear-electric plants can actually produce plutonium as a byproduct which can be sold for a high price, in the neighborhood of \$100 a gram.

If this be done, there is little cost left for power generation to bear, and a reactor plant could put on the transmission line 1 or 2 mill current instead of 6.7 mill current. Even if the military demands become satisfied and the price of plutonium eases back to its fuel value of about \$20 a gram, the sale of byproduct plutonium can be a substantial source of operating revenue.

That is why Representative CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, Vice Chairman of the Joint House-Senate Atomic Energy Committee, just a few days ago predicted that atomic experts will develop a reactor in the next 2 years that will produce power as cheaply as oil, coal, or water.

Within 5 years, he said, atomic powerplants should be commercially competitive with present lower cost sources of power, which, of course are the hydroelectric plants.

During a speech in Los Angeles on February 15, Floyd B. Odum, financier and president of Atlas Corp., predicted that by 1975 all electricity in the United States will be generated by uranium-based powerplants. He, too, said that even at present atomic energy is practically competitive with other fuels for the generation of electric power.

Using a cubic-inch block of wood as a symbol representing a similar block of uranium 235, Odum said that 20 such little blocks of U-235 would supply enough energy to provide New York City with all its electrical needs for a 24-hour period.

Of course, there are numerous technical difficulties yet to be overcome in the production of nuclear electricity. But the fact is they are being overcome and sometimes in the very process of building nuclear-electric facilities.

Consolidated Edison of New York, one of the Nation's leading power producers, boldly announced only a month ago that it will soon build a nuclear-electric generating plant to add to its system.

Thus the problem is facing us squarely, and we cannot dodge it in connection with the Upper Colorado proposal. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Congress must have their eyes open to these facts of modern day life. There must be a clear-cut determination as to whether or not nuclear-electric energy developments will turn this proposed multi-billion-dollar expenditure into a dead loss. We cannot inflict such an enormous new burden on the Nation's taxpayers for several generations to come.

Therefore, Congress must hold thorough hearings on this point. It must even delay consideration of the legislation for a year or two, if need be, so that it may be evaluated in the light of results of nuclear-electric energy research and development now underway.

So that the Congress may be further informed I am backing up this plea by citing additional information collected over the past few weeks.

On March 27, 1954, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said in a report that—

Economically competitive atomic power will be a reality in the United States within the next 10 years.

On March 9, 1954, Henry D. Smyth, member of the Atomic Energy Commission, said in an address:

It is evident that we can build powerplants which will convert the energy released in nuclear fission into electrical energy to be fed into transmission lines.

The electric companies public information program said in a 1953 report:

Nuclear power looms on the horizon as an energy source which might well become competitive with coal, oil, gas, or falling water in the next few years. Within the past 2 years nuclear heat has converted water to steam, from which electricity was generated.

In a report to Congress in July 1954, the AEC stated it could be reasonably expected that nuclear fuel would be economical enough to compete with conventional fuels in the foreseeable future. Atomic material costs have been brought to a record low, and ore processing developments have resulted in major reductions in the cost of fissionable materials and paid for themselves many times.

Thorium, which can be converted by atomic reactions into a fissionable material, is 3 or 4 times as plentiful as uranium, the report said.

Dr. John R. Dunning, dean of engineering at Columbia University, said on June 3, 1954:

The important conclusion from the data is that already, with only about 10 years of any appreciable searching for uranium, we have completely reversed our position held in the immediate postwar period when most so-called experts were saying we couldn't possibly have enough uranium to build an atomic power economy.

In this short space of time, there has come general agreement that our uranium reserves constitute the major fuel reserves in the world for the future. A figure something like 25 times as much energy in uranium as in coal, oil, and gas is now usually quoted.

There, again, this figure has to be viewed as a tentative figure. It wouldn't surprise some of us too much to find there were 100 times as much energy in the form of atomic fuels as future progress develops in atomic energy release methods, atomic fuel recovery methods, raw material prospecting, and so on down the line.

The important lesson is that our future energy reserves are abundant in the atomic field.

On December 20, 1954, the Associated Press reported from Washington in the Salt Lake Tribune:

Within 20 years about twice as much electric power will be furnished by the atom as is now generated by waterpower, according to a private study prepared for the use of investor groups.

The growth will represent conservatively a private investment of about \$6 billion in nuclear-powered electric plants, it was estimated, of which more than \$1 billion will go into reactors alone.

The survey was made by H. Dewayne Kreager, metal and power specialist associated with John R. Steelman. Steelman, a top assistant to former President Harry S. Truman, now is an industry consultant here. Kreager until mid-1953 was the executive officer of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Labeled "an economic timetable," the survey predicted that from 1975 to the end of the century, 80 percent of all new generating capacity installed in this country will be atom-powered.

"The first 10 years should be regarded as an experimental period," the study says. "Nineteen hundred and sixty-five is the estimated and somewhat arbitrary date at which power from nuclear reactors is expected to become economically competitive with existing thermal (coal- or oil-fueled) plants."

"However, 1965 is an outside date; competitive electric power from nuclear energy may come as early as 1960."

A 5-year program of the AEC will embrace 5 different reactor projects costing a total of \$241 million.

The projects are:

First. A full-scale nuclear powerplant to be built by Westinghouse Electric and Duquesne Light near Pittsburgh.

Second. A boiling-water reactor to be built by the Argonne National Laboratory. This reactor promises to cut power costs substantially.

Third. A sodium-graphite reactor to be built by North American Aviation, Inc. This reactor may produce more atomic fuel than it burns.

Fourth. A fast breeder reactor to be built by Argonne.

Fifth. A homogeneous reactor to be built at Oak Ridge.

In March 1954 a report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy stated:

There is real confidence that atomic power can be produced at a cost competitive with fossil fuels such as coal and oil within the next decade by exploring these five approaches.

Lawrence R. Hafstad, Director of Reactor Development for the AEC, said, on July 21, 1954:

In uranium we have what promises to be both a compact and a cheap source of energy. * * * One pound of uranium, about a

cubic inch, contains as much energy as * * * 1,500 tons of coal. That this energy promises to be cheap, we can see by calculating the cost of the 1,500 tons of coal. At \$8 a ton, this would be in the neighborhood of \$10,000, whereas the cost of 1 pound of uranium is more like \$20.

A story in the New York Times, December 12, 1954, said:

Leaders of the Nation's \$25 billion electric light and power industry have come to the conclusion that they must build nuclear reactors. This decision has been reached despite the greater efficiency of coal at present for generating steam for power.

In a private report being sent to the executives and engineers of the country's power companies, emphasis is placed on atomic fission as the future source of energy. * * *

Some of the finest atomic engineering minds in the country put the findings together after considerable research. The report is being issued by the electric power companies information program (PIP).

"The consensus of opinion is that within 10 years, or possibly sooner, private industry will cross the threshold of economic nuclear power," the study says.

Congress has appropriated more than \$13 billion for atomic energy activities.

The Atomic Energy Commission already is the world's third largest business. Only Metropolitan Life Insurance and American Telephone & Telegraph have greater assets. Physical assets owned by the AEC is considerably larger than such assets of General Motors and Standard Oil of New Jersey. If the present expansion program continues, the AEC will soon be the world's largest single enterprise.

More than 150,000 persons were given employment under the AEC program in 1953.

Faced with a growing shortage of coal for power generation, Great Britain has turned to the development of commercial nuclear power reactors as before noted. "This is a historic day for Britain," declared Geoffrey Lloyd, Minister of Fuel and Power, when he announced the plan to Parliament February 15. He spoke of tremendous prospects that offer possibility of a new industrial revolution.

Canada is completing a big reactor, after which private enterprise will be permitted to develop commercial nuclear power.

Norway and Sweden are engaged in extensive work to develop nuclear power for commercial use.

Brazil, Australia, and India are at work to develop nuclear power for commercial use.

The Edison Electrical Institute said in its 1953 report:

Commercial utilization of nuclear energy * * * could result in important conservation of the Nation's reserve of fossil fuels, a highly desirable long-range objective. Moreover, this potential source of fuel may ultimately provide a means for reducing fuel costs at central stations.

On February 17, 1954, President Eisenhower said in a message to Congress:

In 1946, too, economic industrial power from atomic energy sources seemed very remote; today, it is clearly in sight * * * largely a matter of further research and development.

Coal Age View of the 1955 Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal Age View of the 1955 Picture," which appeared in the February 28, 1955, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL AGE VIEW OF THE 1955 PICTURE

The bituminous coal industry will continue its upward trend in 1955, with a maximum production gain of 5 to 10 percent, or 20 to 25 million tons over 1954. Coal Age, McGraw-Hill publication, predicts. Anthracite production, however, is expected to continue its downward course this year, due to home-heating competition from natural gas and oil.

Total bituminous production was down to 392 million tons in 1954, or 14.3 percent under 1953. However, much of the loss occurred in the first 3 months of the year, and, from April on, the general trend was up. Output of anthracite, which totaled 27,118,000 tons last year and was 12.4 percent under 1953, is expected to drop another 10 percent or more in 1955. Coal prices, which were down for both bituminous and anthracite in 1954, should remain steady this year, with no major price rise expected.

Electric utilities, steel, and other industry will be coal's best market in 1955, the magazine says. Coal for kilowatts, for example, should increase by 20 million tons this year, while steel consumption of coal should rise by about 12 million tons to a total of 100 million tons, as compared to about 88 million tons in 1954. Decreased steel consumption last year, the magazine notes, was responsible for the coal industry's biggest loss.

Industrial consumption of coal, down some 16,450,000 tons to 89,350,000 tons in 1954, showed a 15.5 percent drop from the 105,799,000 tons in 1953, primarily because of decreased business activity. This year, however, increased business should bring the total up by 7 to 10 million tons.

Railroad and retail coal consumption, on the other hand, are expected to drop 3 to 5 million tons apiece during 1955. In 1954, railroads used only 17 million tons of coal—a drop of 25.9 percent under 1953, while diesel fuel, coal's chief competitor in the rail market, rose and will continue to rise this year, the magazine reports. In the retail market, natural gas should register a gain this year, while oil sales will rise, but more modestly.

Although bituminous coal exports overseas increased last year to 15,088,000 tons over 14,176,000 tons in 1953, shipments to Canada dropped sharply from 19,590,000 tons in 1953 to 15,838,000 tons last year. Further railroad dieselization in Canada is expected to continue a downward trend for bituminous exports to that country.

Although losses to competitive fuels continued to plague bituminous coal in 1954, they were far outstripped by losses resulting from the 1954 business recession, particularly in steel. The bright spot last year was electric utilities, which increased their burn by 2 million tons. Even with this gain, however, total loss over 1953 is estimated at 63 million tons. Production suffered by

an additional 10 million tons taken out of stockpiles.

However, changes in the competitive picture, at least in the heavy-fuel market, are favoring coal. And Government authorities, it appears, are alert now to the plight of coal, and the need for maintaining a strong industry.

As Things Look to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following speech by Mr. Ancher Nelson, Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration, entitled "As Things Look to Me":

AS THINGS LOOK TO ME

(Address by Ancher Nelson, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration)

Years ago in Minnesota we had a farm magazine called the Farm Stock and Home, and a former editor of that paper by the name of Harry Owens used to write a column entitled "As Things Look to Me." Harry would tell us each month just exactly what was on his mind, what he thought was right and what he thought was wrong. He gave his own opinion and appraisal of happenings of the day and these expressions represented his honest views. As a result, his readers eagerly followed his column month after month.

I am going to borrow that column heading to use as the title of my speech here today. I want to emulate also Harry's forthrightness in stating the facts as I see them as I give my annual report to the farm people who make up this rural electrification program.

This opportunity to speak to so many of you people who have the first-hand responsibility to your farm neighbors for the management of the rural electric system over the country is to me a real challenge. As co-op directors, you are carrying a responsibility which I used to have in my own co-op, and actually I feel more at home talking with you whom I consider fellow directors than in talking as REA administrator.

As directors and officials of the rural electric systems, you are the custodians of a great trust which your neighbors and friends have placed in you. You share in responsibilities which are common to all of us in this program. The fact that more than 9 out of 10 of our farms today are enjoying central station electric service does not mean that the trust has been discharged. No, not by any means. In some respects, your responsibilities are just starting.

We in REA have responsibilities too. Most of them are similar to yours, area coverage, financial soundness, adequate low cost power, self-reliance. These are among the things that concern you as well as REA.

Since coming to REA from my local co-op now nearly 2 years ago, I have tried to keep a clear picture in my mind as to what our job should be and with the help of the many dedicated people we have in REA, we have sought to shape a program of action aimed at getting those jobs done. What we have is a program that is working effectively on many fronts.

I want to make use of this opportunity here today to give you a report of that comprehensive action program and the progress we are making toward the major REA goals. If you will accept this report with an open mind, weighing fairly what has been done, I am convinced you will agree that REA has gone forward so that today rural electrification stands more firmly on solid ground than ever before.

Let us outline the major jobs that we have before us and then appraise what we have done about them.

First, there is area coverage.

REA was established in the first place to accomplish this job. The REA borrowers came into being to accomplish this job. It is a responsibility that is shifting more and more to you, the borrowers. REA continues to have the financing part of the job but, in the final analysis, whether or not area coverage is achieved depends upon what you do.

During the last year the percentage of farms electrified moved a little nearer the 95-percent mark. REA approved loans in calendar 1954 that will finance central-station electric service to a total of 116,000 consumers, a substantial increase over the year before.

Loans are the first step in area coverage and we have sought to speed up our handling of loan applications. We adopted a fast, hard-hitting type of organization, with competent people in the key jobs, and we cut redtape to the bone. This has speeded up our handling of loan applications, and we have been able to cut down the backlog of applications to just about half of what it was a couple of years ago. There will, of course, always be some backlog but the present situation means that there is a minimum of delay for borrowers in getting their loans approved.

Moving over into the telephone program, we have proceeded diligently to speed up operations there too, and we believe that new preloan engineering procedures now in effect will speed things up still more. In calendar 1954 we made more than \$66 million in telephone loans, more than in any other calendar year since the program began. More than 100,000 rural homes now have received new or improved service through the program, and construction is proceeding at a good pace.

One of the big difficulties in the telephone program is to get enough qualified telephone engineers. We need them for our own staff and there is also a need for more private consulting engineers to work with borrowers.

Good progress in the telephone program requires a high degree of industrywide cooperation. Every borrower must have connecting arrangements of some sort—always for nationwide long-distance service and usually for local service into trading centers as well.

Our endeavor has been to cultivate an atmosphere of understanding and cooperation with the industry. In turn we have expected their cooperation. Gradually much of the distrust and misunderstanding is being overcome. We have repeatedly indicated that we are not interested in building an empire in the telephone field. We are only interested in making telephones available to the farmers. To the extent the industry is financially able and willing to do this, that is fine. Where the industry can't, REA will push ahead as hard as it can to find ways for doing the job.

From President Eisenhower on down the administration objective in both the electric and telephone programs is to meet the needs. The needs are being met and there is going to be money left over.

When this fiscal year has been completed, we will have made another reduction in the backlog of loan applications and there will

be a total of \$56 million of surplus loan funds that will not have been used. Remember that statement.

In one State as of now, it seems likely that the State allotment formula will handicap the making of loans, but keep this one thing in mind: more money is not the solution to that difficulty.

If we were going to circumvent the law by asking Congress to pour extra appropriations into the State allotment formula, it would take a truly fantastic additional loan authorization. The figure would be something like \$250 to \$350 million and we would end the year with a carryover of unused loan funds of about \$300 million.

The sensible answer is to remove the State allotment formula from the law. That is exactly what we have asked the Congress to do.

In the early days of the REA program this formula served a useful purpose in making sure that the lines were built where the need was the greatest. Today, it is no longer needed with almost every State at or above the 90 percent level of connected farms. It is obvious that the greatest need for loan funds will be in those States where improvements are needed in systems already built and in those States that need new or extra sources of power.

Briefly, the need of funds in the various States can no longer be measured accurately on the basis of farms without electricity. On the contrary, the size of the REA program in the State will be the principal determining factor as to how much will be needed.

As to our new budget it recognizes greater loan requirements next fiscal year than this. The 1956 budget provides for \$20 million more than the amount loaned in each of the last 3 years.

Incidentally, I want to thank all the borrowers which cooperated with us so extensively in our survey of loan needs. We obtained responses from more than 80 percent of the borrowers.

In addition to the funds being provided in new loan authorization, there is still nearly a half billion dollars of approved loans that has not yet been drawn by the borrowers, so it is hard to think that any borrower can be hurting for lack of construction funds. If there is, I would ask this fact be brought to our attention.

In this 20th year of the program, however, area coverage is primarily a responsibility of the systems serving the rural areas. Area coverage can never be completely realized unless they continue to forge ahead toward this objective.

How many of REA's borrowers actually have 100 percent area coverage in their proper service area? That is a question that you should ask yourselves. Here are some of the questions you ought to consider:

Have you determined the geographical area within which you should be responsible for seeing that electric power is available?

Have you recently surveyed this area? If not, shouldn't you do so to determine if there are people without service who rightfully look to you for service?

Have you developed plans which you are carrying out that will make electric service available on a sound and businesslike basis to all those people?

If not, what should you do about it? What do you think REA should do to help you?

We can see as we travel over the country that progress toward area coverage has been made. What's before us now is a challenge of seeing to it that you, with the help of REA, can finish the job so well begun.

The second major responsibility, as I see it, is to build financially sound systems. That is another responsibility shared by both REA and the borrowers. Certainly the Government's stake is great. The REA loans will soon total \$3 billion, and the only way

to get this repaid—as it is being repaid—is to have financially sound businesses.

Although the Government's stake is large, ours as rural people is even larger. We must build financially sound electric systems so that we can be sure of continuing to have the benefits of electricity in our homes and in our farming operations.

From REA's standpoint, our action program is geared to approach this matter of loan security from several angles.

First of all, I would like to say a good word about the work of the Management Advisory Committee which represents your association in the field of management. The group executive training meetings and management improvement activities that this committee has helped push along constitute one of the most significant developments of the last year. If this work is continued and expanded as it should be, it will do more for the future safety of rural electrification than any other single thing that I can think of.

Conversely, if serious financial reverses or defaults should occur, it would give the program a real body blow. Just at this time, we face one of the most serious threats of this type that has ever confronted the program. We have one borrower that is in a hopeless financial condition, and a loss amounting to upward of a half million dollars is possible if it goes under. Even though this loan was made before I became Administrator, I certainly don't want to see the program get such a black eye and we are giving the situation our closest attention, working with every agency we know of that can help.

In the program as a whole, we are working with co-op directors and managers not only in identifying the difficulties that may lie in the future but in drawing upon the kind of practical and tested skill and experience that is needed if we are going to have financially sound systems in the future.

One point on which we have the opportunity to draw upon this experience resource is in connection with capital credits. A number of people from many areas have raised questions with us as to the capital credits plan and we have it under examination with the air of bringing about improvements as these can be developed.

We proudly point to the fact that of the approximately 1,000 borrowers, only 14 are delinquent in their loan repayments. However, a look at the principal and interest payments that will come due in the period ahead will illustrate that we cannot be complacent but must plan carefully for the future. In 1954, the amount due on loans was about \$72 million. By 1958, it will amount to \$116 million. In other words, this debt amortization load will increase 50 percent within a short period of 4 years.

How well prepared is your cooperative to meet your future obligations so that you can maintain a sound, enduring business?

One way to answer this is to calculate how you would stand if you faced your full amortization schedule today. We have made that calculation for all of the borrowers, and we have found that nearly a fourth of the borrowers would be in some financial trouble to a major or minor degree in that case. I am happy to report that as a result of our joint efforts with borrowers, about three-fourths of those systems with financial problems have achieved some improvement in their position during the past year.

Another interesting thing we have found is this: Of the total number which need to do something to improve their future outlook, about half are selling less electricity than was figured at the time the loan was made. If they were meeting these estimates, they would be out of the woods.

That is one of the reasons why we started last spring to strengthen the power use program and get some results in the form of load-building. This program is tremendously important to you as a director respon-

sible for the successful operation of your power system and it is even more important to you as a farmer who has much to gain from the use of electric power.

The big thing that was done in this program was to organize the Inter-Industry Farm Electric Utilization Council, headed by Deputy Administrator Fred Strong. Today, through this council's efforts, borrowers in most States are working in cooperation with all segments of the electric industry and with the colleges and extension service. It is a game where everybody wins—the REA borrowers, the electric appliance people, the power companies, who serve part of the farms directly and sell you more than \$50 million a year in wholesale power. And the one who will benefit the most from this power-use program is the farmer himself as he makes more profitable use of electric power on his farm and in his home.

My third point has to do with our goal of adequate low-cost power.

During 1954, we made major progress in improving the supply of electric power in rural areas. REA has been determined to work with borrowers in whatever direction promises better and cheaper service for the farmer, whether it be generation or buying wholesale or a little of both. We have made generation and transmission loans where these have been necessary and we have encouraged integration and interconnection where this approach has been to the borrowers' advantage. From the standpoint of the long-range view, we are keeping a careful eye on developments which may lead to lower cost power whether it involves conventional fuels or atomic energy.

As I have previously stated, I believe the REA authority to make G-T loans is important to the farmers. It is a fundamental part of the REA program and must be preserved. To keep it we must use it wisely. This is our aim and we are making G-T loans where they are the means to lower cost electricity for the farmer.

We approved G-T loans in 1954 in the amount of more than \$40 million. This was nearly a quarter of all the loans approved by the Agency during the year, slightly higher than usual for the Agency through the years.

We were providing financing that will boost the generating capacity of the cooperatives by something over 100,000 kilowatts. At the same time, loans already approved were making possible the construction of a record-breaking amount of generating capacity. During the calendar year 1954, REA borrowers in 10 States and Alaska put into service more than 200,000 kilowatts of generating capacity. This is more capacity than there was in service on all REA-financed generating plants on January 1, 1948. This new capacity sets a record for any one year of the program.

You don't get very far into this matter of power supply before you run up against the question: Do we get it alone or do we engage in an effective cooperative effort with all other segments of the electric industry?

It seems to me that the only sound approach to that question is to think about what is best for the farmer, because the program was set up to benefit him. Looked at from that viewpoint, the cases where it will pay to go it alone are might few and far between.

We have learned by experience that an isolated system of relatively small capacity means high-energy costs and requires stand-by capacity that adds to the expense. During the past year, an alarming number of distribution borrowers have come to us because they feel their rates are higher than their distribution systems can continue to stand. Some are paying their wholesale bills under protest and some have requested that we agree to their release from their contracts to buy power from their own G-T systems. Developments of this kind, unless solutions

are worked out, might well be a threat to the future of the G-T co-op which in turn would be a blow to the whole program. It underscores the need to move forward soundly and carefully.

These are some of the reasons why we have recommended that consideration be given to interconnections where capacity can be merchandised into a power pool and peaking capacity purchased, resulting in a better power rate to the farmer and in turn protecting the distribution cooperatives. Interconnection and integration agreements were actually completed in three States during the past year, while in other instances studies are under way to see what the possibilities might be for savings. In one case, the co-op saved about \$3 million in transmission lines, and in another a co-op saved close to a million dollars by exchanging with a power company and alternating the installation of new generating capacity.

Half the power input of your systems is being purchased from power companies at this time. Generally speaking, you are getting rates than in earlier years. The average rate of power company purchases today is 8.2 mills as compared with 12.4 mills 15 years ago. The cost of power through G-T federations is higher, although it is improving gradually. I anticipate that further reductions in costs of power produced in REA-financed generating plants will be achieved through the marketing arrangements like the ones I have mentioned.

Another question for us to consider as Government officials and as electric co-op people is: What about the challenge of atomic energy?

Nobody can say for sure that atomic energy will lead to cheaper production of power than the fuels we are presently using. However, we have tried to gear our operations on the assumption that this will be the case because we want the farmer to benefit along with other consumers if it is.

For approximately a year, we have been working with the Atomic Energy Commission. We have asked for and received security clearance for five of our top people and through them we keep advised on the progress and research and development in that field and also are able to keep the Commission informed as to our needs.

The suggestion has been made that REA should employ physicists, metallurgists, and other specialized personnel for experimental work in the atomic field. However, we have been assured by AEC that people on its staff will give us the help we need at no additional cost to REA or to the taxpayers. This would appear to be the wise and effective course, and it is the course we intend to follow.

At the present time, we are contacting borrowers which are planning construction of generation plants. We are seeking to determine their interest in looking into the possibilities of nuclear power as a source for generating electricity. Where any of them is interested, we will help them get security clearance so that they can work with AEC and us in getting the up-to-date information they need to make their decision.

On the basis of information available to our people who are working with the Atomic Energy Commission, the prospects are not bright for obtaining power cost reductions in the near future through the use of atomic energy. As of now, nuclear power reactors are in a developmental state and their costs are therefore high. Commercially atomic energy is not yet competitive. Moreover, there are questions of service interruptions, site of plant locations and liability that have a bearing on the consideration of this matter.

At the same time, AEC's research is steadily going forward and we must keep up with it. In that way, we will keep informed and we will take advantage of every development

that gives concrete assurance of a lower cost power source that will be dependable and feasible. We are determined that the REA co-ops will be able to move into the atomic age just as soon as it makes economic sense to do so.

In these days we are in the midst of a great debate on what our national power policies ought to be for the future. It is good that this debate is going on. But let us not permit emotionalism to decide the course for us. One of the questions before us is this: What is the proper role of the Government in the electric-power picture? We know that many have decidedly strong points of view on what the answer should be. I do not pretend to be a judge on this but I am impressed by that large group of our citizens who do not see a solution in any extreme—rather in a moderate program that will harness both our natural resources and our private capital for the benefit of all our people.

What is the role of government?

Lincoln said—as we have frequently heard quoted—"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves."

That certainly spells out a job for government. But the rest of that Lincoln quotation is this, and I quote: "In all that the people can individually do so well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

And that spells out a job for you and me as private citizens. I am convinced we will be better off if we spend at least as much time and thought trying to figure out how we can do things for ourselves as we sometimes spend trying to figure out how we can get government to do things for us.

Thomas Jefferson's view on that subject was this: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

And that brings me to my fourth point—that of borrower self-reliance. The rural electrification program is free enterprise. We own and operate our system. We have borrowed money to build our lines. We intend to pay it back. We are proud of our accomplishments to date. Likewise, we need to remember that there are others who have invested their savings and facilities who also deserve tolerant consideration on our part. We should always be willing to give the same degree of attention, respect, and recognition to the problems that others face. Common-sense and mutual understanding are not always easy to achieve, and the test of leadership is to find answers through those means.

It is sometimes tempting and easy to be critical, but there are many constructive things to be talking about. In the words of the popular song, let's "count our blessings instead of sheep."

Counting our blessings, we find that Congress in its wisdom and generosity has made some \$3 billion available as loans to you and me so that we might have electric and telephone service.

We find that human ingenuity has designed and built more efficient equipment so that in spite of commodity cost increases, you and I are able to buy electricity cheaper today than ever before.

We find that a farm today can enjoy a telephone, running water, freezer, television, and countless other home appliances, as well as milking machines, hay driers, and motor-driven devices by the score for farmstead chores.

Taking stock of these and the many other blessings we enjoy, let us not lose sight of the fact that these are times of international tension and peril. We must keep our program in its proper perspective, mindful always of the overall interests and problems of our country. As President Eisenhower has said, "Citizenship is not just a privilege, but also a responsibility."

Looking to the future, we, the directors, managers, and officials in this rural electrification program need always remember that the best insurance we can get for the program is to establish in other people confidence in us and in our integrity.

I know that every employee of REA joins with me in expressing the hope that our handling of your business with REA will merit your confidence because of our performance.

If all of us in the program are fair, tolerant, and sound—if we are willing to hear all the facts in regard to a question—we will be accepted with dignity and we need have no fear that any force can destroy the program.

Think back to your own community and recall the men well regarded and who have earned roles of leadership and influence. You will find their stature has grown from conduct guided by fairness, soundness, and reasonableness.

So as we look to the future of our program let us remember the principles that have proved to be of enduring quality. There is a quotation hanging on the wall in a Missouri co-op which goes like this:

"Four ways to test:

"1. Is it the truth?

"2. Is it fair to all concerned?

"3. Will it bring good will and friendship?

"4. Will it be beneficial to all concerned?"

Proceeding on such a basis, I am sure, will lead the way to a great future for rural electrification.

Rural Delivery Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, on February 7 I introduced H. R. 3655, which would extend rural delivery mail service to persons desiring such service and residing on or near improved roads. Since that time I have received favorable response to this proposed measure, not only from my own constituents, but from others who feel that rural patrons are entitled to this improved service. I submit the following letter which typifies the comments which I have received.

DEAR MR. BETTS: We were so pleased to see your item in the Marion Star (our daily paper) in reference to rural mail route extensions. We have lived in our present home 45 years and have gone one-fourth mile for our mail. This means a long wait sometimes or miss the mailman, which is getting to be quite a problem for us as we are in our seventies and in very poor health. We pay taxes on 190 acres and we feel like we are entitled to adequate mail service if we share the tax burden, as was mentioned in the article. It was also mentioned there should be 3 families to the mile; there isn't and never will be another house on this mile as we own the three-fourths mile south of us on our side of the road and the owners on the other side live on east and west roads and get their mail at their door. We have a good black-top road and a good drive for the mailman to turn in and we will appreciate it very much if you can help us get the extension. Thanks so much, and we hope and pray that your bill will pass.

We will be glad to hear from you if possible. We hope you won't forget us when extensions are being made.

AN EIGHTH DISTRICT, OHIO, CONSTITUENT.

The Future of the Arab Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following statement made by Ambassador Michael Comay before the U. N. General Assembly's Ad Hoc—Political—Committee on November 26, 1954, is deserving of our attention. Mr. Comay is the Ambassador of Israel to Canada and acting chairman of the Israel delegation to the ninth session of the U. N. General Assembly.

THE FUTURE OF THE ARAB REFUGEES

Year after year, this Committee has sought to discuss the task of UNWRA in a humane and constructive spirit, free from rancor and political controversy. Year after year, to our deep regret, the Arab representatives have exploited this item for propaganda warfare against Israel. My delegation has now asked itself whether it should react at all. The facts about the origins of the problem have repeatedly been placed on record at previous sessions. Many of the attacks are irrelevant to this issue. To repeat these stale and unprofitable debates can only reduce the chances of peace in the Middle East, without helping a single refugee. Prompted by what we believe to be in the interests of Arab-Israel relations, and in the best interests of the refugees themselves, my delegation will therefore refrain from replying in detail to a number of provocative statements made in this Committee and I shall confine myself to a few general observations.

For one thing, Arab speakers are welcome to establish by copious quotation that Jews criticize each other, or that opposition papers in Israel find fault with the Government. That fact need not claim our special notice. Nor do I propose discussing the excerpts from Professor Toynbee which have been read out. In his historical philosophy, there does not appear to be any place for small states. In particular, he seems seriously displeased that the Jewish people should be creating a vigorous young state, despite the fact that he has dismissed us as a "dead relic of a vanished civilization."

It is the professor's privilege to be a vehement anti-Zionist if he so chooses, but the historical record must be allowed to speak for itself. The cardinal and undisputed feature of that record is that the Palestine Arab leaders announced they would resort to arms, and did so; that the Arab states announced they would invade Palestine, and did so—proudly announcing the fact in a telegram to the President of the Security Council.

Nobody can foresee how a war will alter the lives of persons and nations. This refugee problem, like other refugee problems, is the bitter fruit of war. Those who started it cannot now cast the blame upon the United Nations, the great powers, Israel, and everyone else. But for the Arabs' fateful decision there would never have been a single refugee. Arab and Jew would have been allowed quietly to work out their common destiny and the world might have been allowed to relax about the relations between the two semitic peoples. That is what we wanted, and that is what we offered. It did not happen. We have little inclination to dwell on the might have been or to continue an exercise in the apportionment of past blame. Unless I am mistaken, there is even less such inclination among the rest of you, members of the international community, who find

yourself saddled with the tragic aftermath of a war which was not your war. I shall therefore proceed without much ado to a sober restatement of my Government's attitude upon the central problem raised by the Director's report: the problem of the refugees' future.

I. THE CONTRIBUTION BY ISRAEL

Though Israel did not create this problem, it cannot be insensitive to the human tragedy involved. We have done and will do what we can to alleviate it, and I shall refer to a series of practical measures.

A measure of reintegration

I would first of all direct the committee's attention to the first of the tables annexed to the Director's Report on page 7. When the agency was set up, 4 years ago, it had 48,500 refugees on its relief rolls in Israel territory. By 1952, we had progressively reduced this number, by absorption, to some 20,000. The Israel Government thereupon relieved UNWRA of all further financial or administrative responsibility for the remaining refugees. This meant a large annual saving to the agency, and enabled it to wind up its operations in Israel, transfer its personnel, and devote the whole of its funds and attention to its work elsewhere. For us this was no facile gesture. As my government wrote to Mr. Blanford, the former director of the agency, on May 18, 1952, it "would throw a substantial additional burden on the Government, particularly as up to half the remaining refugees are social cases who are not expected to become self-supporting and will remain a permanent charge on the community." The same letter states, "The Government contemplates that there will then cease to exist in Israel a distinct category of Palestinian refugees, with a status which differs from that of other inhabitants of the country." In this way, a part of the problem, concerning nearly 50,000 persons, has been settled by reintegration. This is only a small part of the whole, but it compares favorably with the total of 8,000 refugees taken off the relief rolls by other means. Incidentally, the position of the Israel Arabs, with whom these former refugees have now been merged, is quite unlike the picture of misery which has been painted here. This is not a matter before the United Nations and I do not want to dwell on it, although we take some pride in the rapid progress our Arab community is making.

I would only express regret that a hostile frontier evidently acts as a distorting mirror. I would be happy to have the distinguished delegate of Iraq visit my country as our guest; he would be relieved to see for himself that the Arabs in Israel are first-class citizens, participating fully in our democratic life and already enjoying standards of well-being from which the corresponding classes of Arab society elsewhere are still remote.

While the refugees within our borders were thus being integrated, a measure of repatriation was also taking place. Certain categories of relatives of Arabs living in Israel were permitted to come in, in order to reunite broken families. Also, a large number who had filtered illegally into the country were permitted to remain as legal residents. These two processes contributed to the rapid growth of our Arab population, which numbered less than 100,000 in 1948, and is by now over 180,000. For reasons which I shall shortly explain there is little prospect that Israel will be able to take in any more of the refugees now in the Arab countries.

Release of blocked accounts

Next, there is the question of blocked accounts. In his opening statement, Mr. Labrousse made a somewhat critical comment on this matter, but I fear he had not been fully informed about its progress. In the first phase of releasing these frozen bank

accounts, which is still in progress, nearly \$2 million are being paid out to refugees in Arab countries. Arrangements have since been concluded to pay out the balance, amounting to over \$8½ million. Any slight delay there might have been was solely due to the Israel Government's wish to obviate the obstructions and difficulties which presented themselves in the first release, by inviting the representatives of the account holders themselves to suggest improvements in the procedure. This they did, with the result that the procedure has been simplified, and the Government has been able to satisfy all their requests about the conditions of the release.

The Committee might take note of this as a case where Israel and the persons directly concerned have reached a satisfactory agreement by sensible negotiation.

On November 16, the same day that the Director of UNWRA spoke in this Committee, my Government made a public statement in Jerusalem. In view of the various inaccurate stories put before the Committee, I shall take the liberty of reading this statement, and would request that it be fully inserted into the record. It reads:

"On September 27, 1954, the Israel Government announced its intention, which was elaborated on November 3, 1954, to proceed with the release to absentee or refugee owners, of outstanding balances of their accounts with banks in Israel and of articles held in safe custody and the contents of lockers. The Israel Government has since been considering practical proposals for implementing its decision and is now able to announce the following release procedure:

"All account holders already receiving releases at a monthly rate of 50 pounds to 500 pounds maximum will shortly receive letters addressed to them at the address given on their previous application forms, enclosing a simple form of request for release and transfer of the remaining balance. The completed form should be submitted either directly or by the applicant or through any local organization he may select, to the nearest branch of Barclay's Bank or the Ottoman Bank, or to the London offices of these banks, or through the nearest UNWRA office. Account holders who have not yet submitted applications, or those whose applications were not eligible under the previous scheme, are required to make application in the above manner on special forms which should be available within 2 weeks at branches of Barclays and Ottoman Banks and UNWRA offices in neighboring countries. Application forms will also be available at the London offices of the two banks.

"The Israel Government will ensure that applications are dealt with expeditiously and certainly within 14 working days of receipt. All amounts deducted under the 10 percent compulsory loan, and all amounts transferred to the custodian from balances of accounts exceeding 500 pounds, will be refunded and included in the final release. The transfer of the amount released will be made in sterling at the rate of 1 Israel pound equal to 1 sterling, in a single payment.

"Applicants requiring release of safe custody articles of contents of lockers must complete a special application form. After verification by the bank and approval by the Israel Government, articles can be released in one of the following ways:

"(a) To the depositor on personal application.

"(b) To his representative on production of an adequate letter of authority.

"(c) By posting the articles either to a bank nominated by the applicant or to the applicant himself on his written application, subject to compliance with normal customs regulations in force at the time, but not to any currency or exchange control regulations, which will not be applied in respect of any article released by the custodian.

"If in terms of (a) the depositor wishes to make a personal application, the Israel Government is prepared to facilitate this by providing an escort and transportation for depositors and their property. The Israel Government reserves the right to refuse entry to any person at its discretion."

I would merely add that since then the forms have been printed and distributed to the banks, and we are awaiting the applications, which as the notice says, will be dealt with in at most 14 days.

The question of compensation

My government reaffirms its willingness to consider a measure of compensation for abandoned Arab lands. Our original position, a perfectly logical one, I submit, was that this question was one aspect of the larger problem, and could best be dealt with in the context of a general Israel-Arab settlement. Subsequently, because of the humanitarian nature of the refugee problem, my government announced that it was prepared to enter into discussions on compensation with any appropriate United Nations organ, in advance of any general settlement.

My government is now giving fresh consideration to ways and means whereby a measure of compensation might be made available, and might be used to help in the process of integration. This is a complex matter, and in order that the committee should have a realistic picture of it, I must mention the two main difficulties which have to be surmounted.

The first, quite simply, is money—the ability to pay. It will be understood, that such a financial operation does not depend only on us, and with the best will in the world, it would be premature to make specific proposals until we have found means of making the necessary sums available.

Provided the necessary funds become available, we are willing in principle to incur these heavy obligations. But here there arises the second of the two problems to which I have referred. This is the state of economic siege which the surrounding Arab countries maintain against Israel. It takes a number of forms: the severing of all communication ties, the outlawing of all trade relations, the illegal blockade of the Suez Canal, the pressures on third parties to cease dealing with Israel, and so forth. We suffer severe losses from this economic warfare. In 6 years of this it had directly and indirectly cost the Israel economy an amount which is probably not less than that of the value of abandoned Arab property, estimated by an expert U. N. body at a figure of 100 million pounds. These losses spell a harder life and sharper austerities in the daily lives of our people. Yet it is poor psychology, for tightening our belts only tightens our resolve and spurs us to greater efforts. The Arabs suffer losses too, particularly Jordan, which denies itself access to our Mediterranean ports and our markets. In fact nobody gains from this wasteful situation, except for such emotional satisfaction as it may give to short-sighted political leaders. Among those who suffer most are the refugees, for no compensation scheme could operate in such an abnormal setting of economic warfare. It would not make sense if Israel were to pump large sums of precious foreign currency into the economies of countries which were at that very time doing their best to ruin Israel's economy. In the formal sense the two issues could be separated; in practice, they are organically connected. The host governments must choose which is more important to them—carrying on a war against Israel in the economic field or making it possible for compensation to be paid. The committee must surely hope that they will adopt the latter course, thus liberating the economic energies of our region for constructive purposes, and above all for resettlement and compensation of the refugees.

Jordan-Yarmuk project

The distinguished delegate of the United States has referred to the negotiations which Mr. Eric Johnston has been carrying on with the governments concerned, including Israel, about the Jordan-Yarmuk development project. As this scheme holds such a central place in UNWRA's plans, I would put on record my interest in it. The Israel Prime Minister and Foreign Minister recently referred to it in the course of an interview which appeared in the U. S. News & World Report on September 17 last. He stated that the idea was eminently sound, "both for its own sake—that is, for the sake of the water settlement—and as a means of getting the parties to realize that they can only achieve something worthwhile if they pull together and not apart. So, from both these standpoints, it is the right approach." Asked about the basic proposals, Mr. Sharett added that "everything depends on the details of the actual plan. That means primarily on the allocation of the waters. If water is going to be used as a political bribe, no agreement will be possible. But if the water will be allocated on the principle of how much water each state actually needs and how much water it can put to beneficial use, that is another thing." Pointing out that our whole future depended on the possibilities of irrigation, Mr. Sharett hoped that Mr. Johnston would hammer out something acceptable to all parties.

These discussions are continuing, and I understand Mr. Johnston will be visiting the area again shortly. Meanwhile the committee may safely discount the distorted Arab accounts given here about this important mediation effort.

Border adjustments

There has been some discussion in the committee on the passages in the director's report dealing with the so-called economic refugees—that is to say, persons who have lost their livelihoods because the demarcation lines between Israel and the Arab States deprive them of access to part of their former farmlands in Israel. It should be remembered that the demarcation lines were determined by negotiation between Israel and the Arab States concerned and incorporated in the armistice agreements between them, which were approved by the Security Council.

Where the demarcation line follows the old frontier of western Palestine, there is no problem of village lands. That is generally the case with the Lebanese and Syrian borders, and in the south with the Egyptian and Jordan borders. But in the central region, a large irregular part of former Palestine territory was occupied by Jordan forces and annexed to Jordan. Between this area and Israel territory the armistice agreement created a new border, which unavoidably cut across village lands in a number of cases. Undoubtedly hardship was caused on the local level wherever a village was thus deprived of a portion of the lands which it used to cultivate. On a lesser scale, the same situation exists with regard to the Gaza strip, another Palestinian area which was occupied and is held by Egypt. Here again, a new border has come into existence.

The distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom has asked whether this problem could not to some extent be relieved by local adjustments of the demarcation line. It is not always feasible for an armistice line, which is also an international border, to zigzag back and forth so as to fit around village boundaries. However, my Government has always been willing to explore the possibility of adjustment.

The armistice agreements themselves lay down that the line can only be altered by the mutual consent of the signatory governments. From time to time we have attempted to deal with the situation by land

exchanges which would overcome some of the anomalies in the frontier. Thus in January 1951 we proposed such an exchange which would have improved the situation in the Qalyubiya area. On May 9, 1952, the Jordan representative informed us that our suggestion was rejected.

On January 30, 1952, negotiations took place for the division of the Latrun no-man's-land. Under this transaction, Israel would have gained some 20,000 dunams and Jordan 25,000 dunams. An agreement was provisionally worked out in the Mixed Armistice Commission. On May 29, 1952, however, we were informed that Jordan had rejected the agreement.

Again, an arrangement for the exchange of land in the Zeita area, suggested by Israel was worked out as a joint plan in the Mixed Armistice Commission by Israel and Jordan representatives, in the presence of United Nations observers. In November 1952, the Jordanians withdrew their agreement to the suggested exchange.

The Israel Government is ready to reopen negotiations on this matter at any time with the Arab governments concerned, within the context of the armistice agreements. Although this subject is outside UNWRA's terms of reference, I have set out the relevant facts because they have a bearing on the question of the economic refugees.

II. REPATRIATION OR RESETTLEMENT

In the various ways with which I have dealt, Israel has tried to contribute to a solution of the problem. We hope to contribute in the future by way of compensation. But it is obvious that Israel cannot solve it. For several years past, it has been clear that the basic solution lies in the permanent integration of the refugees amongst their own kin, in the Arab countries. During these years a number of the most responsible delegations of the United Nations have had the realism to state this view, however unpopular it might be in some quarters. During the present debate there have been fresh affirmations of this evident truth, in particular by the distinguished representatives of the Netherlands, the United States, and France. My delegation owes it to the committee to set out the Israel position on repatriation with complete frankness.

Problem of security

Many governments are concerned with sensitive problems of internal security, and carefully inquire whether those who wish to cross their borders and settle in their countries might not be a danger to the State. Is Israel, of all countries in the world, so fortunately placed that it need take no thought for its own safety? The refugees we are discussing have never identified themselves with our State. On the contrary, they left their former homes, at their leaders' behest, in the course of an armed struggle. The express object of that war was to prevent Israel from being established, in accordance with the General Assembly resolution of November 29, 1947.

The host governments who demand the right of the refugee to return to Israel refuse even now to concede Israel's right to exist, and make it clear that they would destroy it if they could. Their state of mind is unhappily only too clear from their own recent actions and declarations, including statements made in this debate.

Against such a background, is it probable that the refugees would enter our borders in order to become loyal citizens of the state, giving their full allegiance to its government and its laws, willing to defend it against any threat; would they now accept the national objectives of a country which is Jewish by definition, and is dedicated to fulfilling the historic tasks of Zionism? I regret that there is little sign of such a change of sentiment. My distinguished colleagues have

had the benefit of hearing a refugee point of view, and it must have struck them how fully Dr. Tannous corroborated what I have just said. The really significant aspect of his statement was the state of mind it revealed. Since he and his fellow refugees evidently believe that Israel is in illegal occupation of the country, that it is enemy No. 1, that the Arab minority within it is suffering persecution, that this is a hundred years' war—how could we safely throw open our borders to a fresh influx of such people? What is likely is that Israel, beleaguered as it is by hostile neighbors, would also be fatally disrupted from within.

A larger state could perhaps minimize the risk by settling elements of dubious loyalty well within its interior, where contact with unfriendly neighbors might be difficult. Unfortunately Israel has not been endowed with an interior. Our state is 70 miles across at its widest part, 10 miles at its narrowest. The whole country is a border strip, with frontiers that from their length and physical nature cannot be sealed off. What this lack of depth means for our security has been only too plain to us, in our efforts to curb infiltration and marauding. Were there to be repatriation, our internal-security problem would become insoluble, and our country indefensible.

A sovereign right

Israel is deeply concerned with retaining the good will of the world—particularly of those countries which have sympathized with the need of our ancient and sorely tried people to have a home of its own once more. That is why, when the United Nations is faced with this painful problem, we wish to gain your understanding for what has been called our negative attitude on repatriation. It is not a question for us of the semantics of resolutions or the tactics of debates. The question is whether any government and any state can be required to do things inconsistent with its own survival. Here I should like to say a word on our right of decision to admit or not to admit people from neighboring territories. We have listened with deep interest to the views of other governments on this matter. But the determination whether the admission of any person or group of persons to our territory is or is not conducive to the national security or welfare is a sovereign right of the Government of Israel, just as all other countries possess and do not hesitate to apply a similar sovereign right. I am grateful to those of my colleagues who have shown understanding of this problem.

Economic aspect

Reluctance to create a Trojan horse in Israel is a decisive obstacle to repatriation, but not the only one. From the economic point of view it is a mistake to think of repatriation as simply allowing refugees to trek back across the border, and pick up the threads of their former lives in their former homes. One can understand the tendency of all uprooted persons to live in the past. That is a human and a natural feeling which merits our compassion. But the world they once knew has vanished. Their businesses and jobs disappeared during the Arab exodus. The derelict villages have crumbled away; the abandoned lands have been resettled. The repatriates would be, in effect, new immigrants, to be settled afresh in a country which has been rapidly transformed, and bears little resemblance to the territory they once left. In the economic sense, therefore, repatriation is a misleading term. In practice it would not be an alternative to resettlement, but a more difficult and more costly resettlement than elsewhere.

Exchange of minorities

There is a further aspect we must examine. Would repatriation, even a partial repatriation, pave the way to peace between

Israel and the Arab States? In the face of every discouragement, we continue to believe that such peace will come—that Israel and its neighbors will live and work together as good neighbors should, for the benefit of our region as a whole. But we are convinced that nothing could be more calculated to bedevil Israel-Arab relations for all time, than creating in Israel a large Arab irredenta, having the deepest ties with its conational States which surround us. The world is only too familiar with the impact of such minority problems on relations between States. Nearly 20 years ago, when a British Royal Commission first proposed the partition of Palestine, it also suggested an exchange of minorities, for the sake of harmony. This is in fact what has happened, through the rough surgery of a war which was none of our seeking. The bulk of the Palestine Arabs are in the Arab lands; the bulk of the Jews from those lands have been resettled in Israel. This two-way movement has created a factual situation which cannot be rubbed out, but on which a better future could be built.

The 1948 resolution

The General Assembly Resolution of 1948, which spoke of a right to return was adopted only a few months after the end of the mandate, at a time when the fighting was not yet over. Even at that time, when the realities of the problem were less plain than they are now, the Assembly qualified its recommendation with reference to two criteria: peace and practicability. The views I have expressed today do not offend against the original resolution. The two stipulated conditions for return do not exist, and it is not helpful to the refugees themselves to keep the idea alive in their minds.

Lessons from other areas

It may be instructive to glance at the experience of other areas. The political changes which took place in the immediate postwar period, including no less than five partitions, produced a number of large-scale refugee movements. I would refer, for instance, to the 13 million refugees in West and East Germany, the 15 million in India and Pakistan; the 400,000 Karelians in Finland; the 350,000 Volksdeutsche in Austria; the 2½ millions who moved from North to South Korea and an unknown number in Indochina. The circumstances may have differed in each of these problems, but they have certain striking features in common, to which I would draw the Committee's attention:

Firstly, in no case was repatriation the answer to the problem;

Secondly, in each case the problem was solved because there was no conational or coreligious host country which was willing to solve it;

Thirdly, international organizations or private charitable bodies could assist a willing host country, but could not be a substitute for one.

Jewish experience

These conclusions are also borne out by Jewish experience since Hitler came to power. I do not need to recall the prewar problem of finding new homes for Nazi victims. There was no Jewish State, but there was a community in Mandatory Palestine which had the international status of a Jewish National Home, and which was eager to take in as many as possible of its persecuted brethren. As a result, nearly 200,000 found a new life there—a large slice of the total problem. After the war, the world once more faced the pitiful challenge of the Jewish DP's in European camps, and the Jewish communities which faced persecution in a number of countries. The problem seemed insoluble until the birth of Israel. Jewish homelessness was no longer an international concern, because now there was a national

State prepared to take the problem on to itself.

Challenge to Arab statesmanship

The only solvent for mass refugee problems in our time has been through the refugees being able to invoke the family sentiment of kindred host countries. That lesson has a bearing on the present case too. The problem presents a major challenge to Arab statesmanship—which is whether it has the capacity to make a home for these refugees who live amongst their own relatives. Nobody would wish to minimize the size of the task, its real difficulties, or the time it will take. The director has referred to some of these factors in his able report. One special difficulty is that the great bulk of the refugees have remained concentrated around the armistice lines, whereas the most promising resettlement areas are farther afield in the Arab hinterland.

But the elements of a solution do exist. I was surprised at the talk we have heard about foreigners. The Arab peoples insist that they are a single people, and that no Arab is a foreigner in any of their countries. Surely this makes it feasible to resettle the refugees among 40 million of their kin in 8 sovereign states—with unexploited land and water in some—with huge oil revenues in some, and with international funds and assistance available in generous measure. The ultimate factor is not physical resources, but the will to do so, and the courage to say to their own people and the refugees that it must be done.

The present discussion has revealed very mixed feelings. Our admiration for the splendid work done by the director and the agency in feeding the refugees and providing them with essential services, is tempered with dismay at the lack of progress toward a solution, after 6 years of international effort. The United Nations and the contributing governments are now being asked to carry the burden for 5 more years. We can but hope that during that time the problem will be substantially settled. That will only happen if it is lifted out of the political and emotional bog in which it is now so unhappily embedded, and if it is clearly and frankly examined. I have tried to put the Israel Government's views before the committee in that spirit.

William Wallace Royster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, is the 83d birthday of William Wallace Royster, a former resident of Glenwood, Minn., and now of Vallejo, Calif.

Numerous railroad employees, especially those of the old days, value the contribution that Mr. Royster made to the idea of a pension plan for railroad employees. Many old-timers of the railroads have expressed deep and heartfelt gratitude for Mr. Royster's efforts.

His story, as told to me by Gottfrid Lindsten, is that after completing his run as a Soo Line engineer in Minnesota, Mr. Royster worked into the late night hours to develop a railroad pension plan that was one of the earliest of these plans.

The essentials of a pension plan were developed in 1928 by Mr. Royster, when various railroads offered gratuity pensions to such employees as the management considered worthy, which pensions could be terminated at will by the railroads. In these plans discrimination was possible, but Mr. Royster's plan sought to eliminate possible injustices of the gratuity plans, making it obligatory for the railroads to pay pensions to qualified employees. His plan, printed in pamphlet form, was filed with the Minnesota Historical Society in St. Paul and with the Smithsonian Institution in Washington.

Many railroad employees supported Mr. Royster's plan; many joined his movement to effect such a plan. Their efforts, as well as those of many others, were successful when the Railroad Retirement Act was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

It is fitting, therefore, that William Wallace Royster be remembered publicly today as he is remembered by many of his friends and coworkers, the old-timers of the Nation's railroads.

Mr. Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of March 1, 1955:

MR. GOOD NEIGHBOR

In the realm of inter-American relations, the term "good neighbor" has become a diplomatic catchword in recent years. Deplorably, the term has sometimes proved to be little more than a mere catchword. We have often been charged by the Latin Americans, and not always unjustly, with caring more for the show than the substance of good neighborliness.

In helping to restore the spirit of the term, the present tour of Vice President Nixon through the Central American Republics is performing an invaluable service to our foreign policy in that area. The Central Americans have found a genuine friend in Mr. Nixon, and his warm personality has done much to restore amity between their nations and ours.

In the realm of diplomacy, Mr. Nixon's visits with Central American chiefs of state already have produced significant results. Without appearing to meddle in their internal affairs, Mr. Nixon has succeeded in bringing the Presidents of Nicaragua and Costa Rica closer to a peaceable settlement of their long dispute than they have been for many months. This he has been able to do because these leaders recognized and respected Mr. Nixon's sincere friendship, and his desire to serve the cause of inter-American amity.

For years to come, RICHARD NIXON will live in the minds and hearts of these people as Mr. Good Neighbor himself.

The Tyranny of Labels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe all our colleagues are vitally interested in the health of this Nation and are, therefore, also interested in a good health program. With this in mind, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very fine article written by Dr. Max Seham, which appeared in the February 28, 1955, issue of the New Republic magazine. Dr. Seham, a practicing physician in Minneapolis, is a member of the Committee for the Nation's Health.

THE TYRANNY OF LABELS

(By Max Seham)

President Eisenhower, in his 1955 health message to the Congress, has placed major emphasis on the renewal of a proposal rejected by the 83d Congress last year—a limited reinsurance plan. This plan, in the President's view, "is the only logical alternative to socialized medicine." He counts on it to solve the problem of the continually rising costs of medical care by extending health insurance to farm families, providing more protection against the costs of prolonged illness, and insuring low-income families against doctor bills, as well as hospital bills.

Briefly, the Eisenhower reinsurance scheme would set up a \$25 million governmental fund to stimulate insurance companies into offering better health coverage by providing for "broad sharing among health insurance organizations of risks of experimentation."

The fund would pay 75 percent of a private company's losses in any one year, if according to designated yardsticks such losses were unavoidable. The theory is that with this Federal guaranty behind them, insurance companies will take the risk of giving better coverage to the 100 million present holders of bona fide voluntary insurance, and that they would be encouraged to enroll a large segment of the 63 million people who now have no health insurance at all.

But the administration-sponsored health bill of 1955 does nothing to require significantly more comprehensive benefits from insurance companies. In fact, the bill's suggested model plan for lower-income families would leave the insured to pay such an appreciably large and unpredictable portion of his medical bills that it is difficult to see how a low-income man could find such a policy attractive, and hence, why any insurance company would want to bother about it.

What is badly needed if health standards in the United States are to be raised is lowering of premiums for low-income groups and lowering the cost of enrolling rural groups and self-employed persons. The reinsurance plan does nothing in the direction of cutting the high cost (reflected in premiums) of enrollment. And it cannot of itself improve benefits without increasing the costs which essentially determine premiums. The reinsurance plan cannot, in effect, lower the cost of health insurance. All it encourages is experimentation with different arrangements of benefits, which needs no encouragement at all.

By placing the health of the people in the hands of the commercial insurance companies, the administration's plan does not provide for social health insurance in any accepted meaning of the term. Premiums

still would be too high for those who need protection most.

When the President's plan went to Congress last year the odds were in its favor. American Medical Association leaders before they analyzed the bill were elated by the President's assurance that it would "forever lay the ghost of compulsory health insurance." They were so sure of the New Look that they even dropped their multimillion-dollar national education campaign against progressive health legislation.

Insurance company representatives were invited to the White House and handed the program with luncheon. New and Fair Dealers in the House and Senate offered no active opposition. The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the bill with no important changes. The House Rules Committee approved it unanimously. Then came a stunning bipartisan defeat, 238 to 134, 75 Republicans joining 163 Democrats to kill it.

Why was this pet administration project—which denied the label of subsidy, claimed to embody the principle of self-help, and placated an economy-minded Congress—so decisively defeated? It now seems clear that Eisenhower was hit from four sides—by the commercial insurance companies, by the AMA, by the Democrats, and by the spokesmen for the public. The plan satisfied no one.

The insurance companies rejected the plan because, as they put it, the impaired health of a large minority of the population made it unprofitable to insure these people: "To attempt to insure the indigent would impair if not eventually destroy voluntary insurance." They also said, with more candor than the administration could muster, that the Federal reinsurance fund would bring Government into direct competition with private business. They disagreed with Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Oveta Culp Hobby's assertion that the plan would reduce the cost of health insurance, and make it available to groups or areas not now within the reach of insurers. They concluded that they saw "no need for such a plan at the present time." They declared their confidence in this administration, but they feared the plan might become more socialized under another administration. The AMA, which deserves most credit for defeat of the bill, gave practically the same arguments, stressing the danger of Government interference and calling the plan "an entering wedge toward state medicine." So much for the administration's private enterprise allies.

On the other side of the fence, Members of both Houses also spoke their opposition, but for entirely different reasons. SAM RAYBURN called the bill a "blundering stupid way to start a health program." Senator JAMES MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, thought it was "puny, paitry, and parameciumlike." Representatives of organized labor, farmers, and white-collar workers joined against the bill. People from both urban centers and neglected rural areas told tragic stories of their's and neighbor's experiences with disease that is allied to poverty. Negroes related incidents of discrimination which cut them off from hospital care. The testimony added up to a demand for nothing less than early and continuous, preventive, diagnostic, and curative care for the entire family.

This year's plan has been completely rewritten in an attempt to meet some of the criticism leveled against it last year; but the changes are superficial; it is the same plan.

Studying the President's message, I find myself confused by his semantics. He seems

to be speaking with two voices. As chief spokesman for the new look he repeatedly insists that he is "flatly opposed to socialized medicine and will continue to reject it." As Chief Executive of our country he urges Congress to enact into law a health program supported by Federal tax funds. Nowhere has he defined what he means by "socialized medicine." Does he have in mind a pure State medicine system like that in Russia, with the State in complete control of the entire medical system? Does he agree with those who label President Truman's compulsory (contributory) pre-payment plan, Kremlin directed? The cold war over socialized medicine has created a babel of language. Whether on the floor of Congress or in town hall debates, it has become a popular sport for opponents of social progress to call anyone who proposes national health legislation a Socialist. Reforms in health legislation have too long been retarded or defeated, not because the programs were impractical or revolutionary, but because the tyranny of labels has frightened legislators from backing health measures.

Whether we recognize it or not, the American medical system today is a mixture of what may be called limited State medicine—socialization through Government financing and/or control—and private practice. Of total 1954 medical expenditures amounting to \$14 billion, Federal tax funds supplied some \$4.5 billion. And the programs this Federal money is spent on all are continued in Eisenhower's plan: Vocational rehabilitation; hospital, nursing-home, and convalescent-home construction; public-assistance grants; public-health services; research on air and water pollution; mental-illness control; medical research; and medical care for the 500,000 Indians in America. These matters, he has even said, required boldness and imagination (qualities conspicuously absent from his recommendations) and a little more money. Our system could not function without such a partnership.

Unless we get rid of the phrase "socialized medicine" or agree upon an exact meaning for it, there will never be a meeting of the minds. Precise and meaningful adjectives like compulsory, or contributory, Government, tax-supported, grants-in-aid, etc., might help. The test after all is not whether a health program is private or public, Federal, State, or local, but whether it is a sound, practical, democratic way to do the job.

Like the President's semantic confusion about socialized medicine is that about another abused term—subsidy. Why does Eisenhower deny so vehemently that his reinsurance plan is a subsidy? Are all subsidies pure socialism? And what about the subsidies for farmers and banks and airlines, etc.?

Yet despite the confusion there is reason to think that the 20-year cold war in medical economics may reach a decisive stage in the 84th Congress this year.

For many years the American people, confused by political propaganda, frightened by the bogey of socialized medicine, were complacent and indifferent to their best health interests. But through firsthand, cumulative experience with the financial hazards of illness, they have become aware of the pressing needs for better financial protection and more equitable distribution of medical services. The present system of private practice plus the limited benefits offered by commercial and medical-society prepayment plans are but a stopgap for millions of people who suffer preventable sickness and die prematurely because they do not have the dollars to buy the miracles of modern medicine, surgery, and hospitalization.

New 50-Star Flag Designed by Orpha Klinker, Noted California Artist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, now that statehood for Hawaii and Alaska is a definite possibility, it is appropriate to give some advance consideration to the necessary change in the design of our flag which must be made when statehood is granted.

Too often while much time is given to the deliberation on the question of so vital an issue as statehood for a Territory, little attention is given to the necessary flag changes until statehood is granted and an immediate change is necessary so that our flag will carry the white star to represent the new State on the field of blue, which represents the whole of our Union.

Miss Orpha Klinker, of Los Angeles, Calif., one of our outstanding artists whose paintings have been exhibited in public and private showings, has become interested in probable change in our flag design, and has developed one of the most appropriate suggestions, in my opinion, to be submitted for consideration since the original design was completed by Betsy Ross.

Miss Klinker is a native daughter of the Golden State of California, from one of the first families of the State. She is established as an artist of great creative ability, and is especially noted for her portrait and landscape paintings.

She is also the creator of a series of paintings of historical events and sites depicting the history of the State of California. Among her famous works is her painting of The Four Freedoms in which freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom from want, and freedom to petition the Government of the United States are represented.

Miss Klinker has conceived a new and unique design of the American flag which includes two additional white stars on the blue field to represent Hawaii and Alaska, when they are admitted as new States in the Union.

The total of 50 white stars are arranged on the blue field to spell the word "Freedom." Nothing else in the design of our flag is changed.

I have seen the design and it is very inspiring, patriotic, and carries a message to the world of the precious freedom the people of the United States enjoy under the United States Constitution and the Government of the United States.

In my opinion, Miss Klinker's design adds beauty and additional interest to the flag of the United States, and it has already been submitted to the Heraldic Branch of the Department of Defense for consideration with any other new designs proposed for the flag when

Hawaii and Alaska are admitted to the Union.

The proposed freedom design is most appropriate because the flag of the United States of America is an emblem which stands for freedom from oppression to people of every other land on earth. It represents a Nation where there is equal opportunity for every citizen, where there is complete freedom of religion, where a free press can publish the truth to the people uncensored by Government dictatorship.

We seldom hear of a citizen of the United States renouncing his native land and leaving America to take up citizenship in some foreign land.

But millions upon millions of people from all other parts of the world are constantly seeking admission to the United States, eagerly awaiting the day when they can leave their native lands to come to America where they may enjoy the benefits found nowhere else in the world.

The United States has established in the world a unique experiment in human relations. Here under the stars and stripes, the American people established a nation dedicated to the individual liberty of every citizen. This is a far cry from many other parts of the world where men for generations have been ruled by monarchs or dictators, and have never known true freedom.

Today it is of vital importance, if we are to preserve our Nation and our American way of life, that our citizens be aware of the blessings that are our heritage, and that we realize that only through constant vigilance can we maintain the freedoms which were guaranteed to us by our Constitution and Bill of Rights when the United States was founded.

Our flag is the symbol of all that America represents, of the opportunity offered to us in this Nation, of the wealth of our land which supplies our food and daily needs, of the freedom which makes each man the master of his own destiny.

On June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress adopted a resolution which stated that "the flag of the 13 United States shall be of 13 stripes of alternate red and white, with a union of 13 stars of white in a blue field representing the new constellation." This resolution was promulgated by the Secretary of the Congress on September 3, 1777.

Since that date the Stars and Stripes has proudly flown as the official emblem of our great Nation. It was first carried into battle in the Battle of the Brandywine on September 11, 1777, and has gone with our troops into every battle since that day on land, on sea, and in the air, and from our own shores to the far corners of the earth.

Since that day in 1777 when the Stars and Stripes first unfurled as the emblem of our great Nation, the country has steadily expanded, and with each forward step new States have been admitted to the Union, each State a new star in the flag.

The rearrangement of the constellation on the field of blue has followed the admission of each new State, and now, once again the American frontier has

expanded so that two more Territories clamor for admission to statehood.

They cannot be long denied, and again we must consider a change in the design of stars on the flag. The design created by Miss Klinker symbolizes the spirit of freedom which has ever represented the guiding principle of our American way of life, and when we again rearrange the stars of the flag, adoption of this design would truly represent within our flag the spirit of America.

Lack of Understanding Poses Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Lack of Understanding Poses Problem" which appeared in the February 26, 1955, issue of the Messenger and Inquirer of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

LACK OF UNDERSTANDING POSES PROBLEM

Correspondents traveling about Europe and Asia keep talking about the continuing current of anti-American feeling that exists in many places. We would be foolish if we were not disturbed about this.

Basically the catalog of complaints is all too familiar. We're imperialistic, our policies are confused, we're rattling the sword, we're insensitive to the real needs of other nations, we won't take advice, we're brash and inexperienced, and so on.

Much of the criticism is unfair, but not all of it. And just because we know a good deal is unsound, we must not fail to search out and seek to meet the reasonable complaints. We are not the perfect people some Congressmen like to say we are. Any adult American knows we have our shortcomings, that we have made many mistakes, and will make more.

Still, we are not as bad as some unhappy foreigners would paint us. Their tendency to overstress our failings, and even to manufacture some, is gravely puzzling unless we look hard at these people's history and their current difficulties.

Some of these nations once were great leaders in their own right. They cannot help feeling resentment at the young America which now has become world leader. Prodded by envy, bitter at their lost power and status, they assail what seems to them the symbol of their troubles, though it be a country avowedly their friend and helper.

Other nations never have had power and have either just cast off or are trying to cast off the yoke of outside rule. As the colonial grip on them has weakened, they have been chagrined to learn they are moving into a tense world where two colossi—Russia and the United States—stand at the head of great rival forces contending for dominance.

They can see America only as the friend of the colonial powers. They are unimpressed by argument that the Communist conqueror is a greater threat than any they ever knew.

Moreover, they have not found the uses of their long-sought freedom so easy as they may have imagined. Confronted by today's harsh realities, they have been plagued by frustrations and defeats. "As most men do—

especially including Americans—they have sought a scapegoat. The United States, rich friend of the hated colonial overlord, was the logical choice: We are to blame for all their ills.

As France worries more about her ancient despoiler, Germany, so the lands of Asia can find scant room for fear of a new enemy in minds crowded with the old colonial hatreds.

We are loved even less because we, having been burned twice in great wars, are alert this time to the menace to peace, and are pressing these peoples to join old enemies—whom they know firsthand—to stand against a new enemy whom they know only second-hand.

In all this they are showing themselves to be terribly human. Probably these attitudes will change only with the long passage of time. All we can do to assist the change is try unflinchingly to show these peoples what we really are, and extend to them more understanding and more generosity of spirit than they seem willing to offer us in return.

Israel's Border and Security Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following very interesting article written by Maj. Gen. Moshe Dayan, which appeared in the January 1955 issue of Foreign Affairs:

ISRAEL'S BORDER AND SECURITY PROBLEMS

(By Maj. Gen. Moshe Dayan)

I

Seven years after its war of independence the State of Israel still faces a security problem of unusual complexity. The area of the country is only 8,100 square miles. But owing to the configuration of its territory there are 400 miles of frontier. Three-quarters of the population of Israel lives in the coastal plain, running from north of Haifa to south of Tel Aviv, with a slender salient branching off to Jerusalem. This densely settled area has an average width of no more than 12 miles between the Mediterranean and the Jordanian border. From the Israel Parliament buildings in Jerusalem the armed sentries of the Jordan Arab Legion can be seen a few hundred yards away. The headquarters of the Israel general staff in the coastal plain are within clear view from the hills which mark the Jordan frontier. The country's main roads and railways are exposed to swift and easy incursion. Scarcely anywhere in Israel can a man live or work beyond the easy range of enemy fire. Indeed, except in the Negev, no settlement is at a distance of more than 20 miles from an Arab frontier.

Thus the term "frontier security" has little meaning in the context of Israel's geography. The entire country is a frontier, and the whole rhythm of national life is affected by any hostile activity from the territory of neighboring states. On the other hand, the Arab States are in no such position. Border tensions affect a narrow fringe of their territories, beyond which stretch deep hinterlands entirely remote from the hazards and strains of frontier life. An American citizen who can cross a vast continent without seeing a foreign, let alone a hostile, face may require an unusual measure of imagination and humility to un-

derstand the unique vulnerability which geography imposes upon the people of Israel.

The effects of geographical vulnerability are aggravated by the fierce antagonism directed against Israel across her embattled frontiers. There is no other state in the world community whose very right to existence is so persistently challenged by all its contiguous neighbors. This is not the classic pattern of international conflict in which neighboring peoples recognize each other's statehood but are divided by specific disputes which they have failed to reconcile. The hostility of the Arab governments toward Israel is more fundamental. It has passed through three phases: First, before 1948, there was a determination to prevent the establishment of an independent Israel; second, in 1948, there was an unsuccessful attempt to destroy Israel's independence at its birth by armed assault; and, third, in the period 1948-54, there has been an attitude of inveterate revenge based on nonrecognition and the undying hope of Israel's extinction. The elementary duty of members of the United Nations to recognize each other's right to sovereignty and integrity has never found any reflection in the relations of the Arab world with Israel.

More than 15 years ago a British Royal Commission had recorded the official Arab view presented by the Mufti of Jerusalem that the Jewish population of Palestine was too large and should be reduced by military action. In November 1947 the United Nations' recommendation for the establishment of a sovereign Jewish State in Palestine was the signal for a purposeful attempt to put this doctrine into effect. In the General Assembly, Arab spokesmen frankly asserted their refusal to acquiesce in the new international policy or even to abstain from using force against it. Six delegates mounted the rostrum of the world peace organization to announce their intention of violently destroying the community whose right to independence had just received international confirmation. On November 30, 1947, this assault began with the slaughter of 36 Jews in the first week of hostilities commenced by Palestinian Arab guerrillas. A liberation army organized by Arab governments moved into Palestine to continue the carnage. Finally, on May 15, 1948, when the British Mandate expired, the armies of all the Arab States invaded Israel with the avowed aim of destroying her independence. Iraqi and Jordanian battalions took over the Arab half of Palestine, then pressed on toward the coastal plain while Israel stood with her back against the sea. Syrian tanks crashed into farming villages in the upper Jordan Valley. Lebanese regulars and irregulars from Syria converged upon Galilee. Egyptian forces began what was intended as a triumphal march on Tel Aviv, coming within 9 miles of the city's suburbs. Aircraft bombed Israel's undefended cities. A ring of fire encircled Jerusalem and exposed its population to the horrors of bombardment, famine, and siege.

There has never been any serious dispute about the origins of this assault of its aggressive character. In the spring of 1948 a United Nations Commission reported: "Powerful Arab forces are defying the resolution of the General Assembly and attempting to overthrow by force the recommendations contained therein." The authoritative international view was further expressed in the United Nations by Ambassador Warren Austin, speaking for the United States, in the Security Council, on May 22, 1948:

"Probably the most important and the best evidence we have on that subject is contained in the admissions of the countries whose five armies have invaded Palestine that they are carrying on a war.

"Their statements are the best evidence we have of the international character of this aggression. They tell us quite frankly that their business in Palestine is political and

that they are there to establish a unitary state. Of course, the statement that they are there to make peace is rather remarkable in view of the fact that they are waging war."¹

The American representative then invited his colleagues to determine that this "aggression of international character" constituted a breach of the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the U. N. Charter. The fighting between May 15 and June 13, when a 30-day truce was concluded, had involved the Arab governments in the open rejection of the Security Council's 3 cease-fire orders.

When the 30-day truce expired, the United Nations ordered its renewal. The Arab States refused to accede, arguing with frankness that if there no fighting it would be impossible to prevent the State of Israel from continuing to exist. In a resolution adopted on July 15, 1948, the Security Council renewed its verdict of Arab responsibility by resolving that the Arab refusal to prolong the truce constituted a breach of international peace and security. This was the first time that such a determination under chapter VII of the Charter had been made by the United Nations on any issue.

The repulse by ill-equipped defenders of this assault was Israel's first achievement, and it won her high renown. But both the Army and the civilian population sustained cruel loss of life. Some of the patient rewards of five decades of pioneering had been ravaged. The State of Israel had come into existence in the shadow of imminent destruction, and the memories of escape from fearful dangers have attended the people of Israel from the very dawn of their independence. These memories abide with us still, and go far to explain the depth of our preoccupation with security. Nor have the Israel people ever forgotten that in their supreme ordeal they received no direct assistance from outside, although waves of sympathy flowed in from free peoples everywhere and provided a valued consolation.

The acceptance of a permanent truce in July 1948 did not signify the end of the war. Contrary to the terms of the truce and to the rulings of the United Nations Truce Supervision Board, the Egyptian Army blocked the supply road to the Jewish villages in the south and renewed the attack on Israel positions in the Negev. A convoy was sent to supply the Negev villages. It was heavily attacked by the Egyptian forces from positions secured after the truce. Seven days' more fighting ensued, which gave to the Israel forces control of Beersheba, center of the Negev, as well as of the northern Negev with the exception of the Gaza strip and the Faluja pocket. In a statement made on October 25, 1948, by the United Nations Chief of the Truce Supervision Board to the Egyptian commander in chief in Gaza, he attributed the renewal of the fighting in the Negev primarily to the failure of the Egyptians to comply with ruling No. 13 of the Truce Supervision Board regarding the passage of convoys to the Jewish villages in the south. In March 1949 the Israel forces occupied the Wadi Araba up to the Gulf of Elath and thus gained control of the Negev—a desert area which had been part of Israel since her establishment but had been unoccupied by any forces up to that time. Neither the Egyptians nor the Jordanians had ever possessed international sanction to occupy this part of Israel in the first place, and if their patrols had ever crossed or scantily supervised it prior to its occupation by Israel—a claim that was never substantiated—their expulsion was a blow against aggressive conquest.

The purpose of the Arab invasion had been the destruction of the state of Israel and the ejection of the Jewish population from

the soil of Palestine. In a statement made by Azzam Pasha, then Secretary General of the Arab League, on May 15, 1948, the eve of the invasion of the Arab armies, the Arab war aim was formulated in unambiguous terms: "This," he said, "will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacre and the crusades." Indeed, the Arab attack, especially in its first guerrilla stage, did not lack cases of disregard of the rules of war.

There are at present more than 180,000 Arabs living in the state of Israel, but not a single Jew survives in any part of Palestine that came to be occupied by the invading Arab armies. The Jewish quarter in the old city of Jerusalem, with its ancient synagogues and monuments, was completely destroyed; even the Jewish cemetery of the Mount of Olives was desecrated and laid waste.

II

In 1949 a series of armistice agreements were concluded under United Nations auspices between Israel and each of the Arab states which had participated in the war, with the exception of Iraq. It was assumed that this step marked the conclusion of the war and that the armistice would herald the early advent of a lasting peace. Indeed, in their preambles, the armistice agreements were described as designed to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine. They provided that no aggressive action should be undertaken or threatened by either party against the other and that the right of each party to its security and freedom from fear of attack by the armed forces of the other was to be fully respected. The conclusion of the armistice was described as an indispensable step toward the liquidation of armed conflict and the restoration of peace in Palestine.

The events of the past 5 years have belied these hopeful expectations. No sooner had the Arab States recovered from the shock of Israel's successful resistance than they began to question the character of the armistice agreements as a phase in the progress toward a final settlement. So far from regarding them as an arrangement "to facilitate the transition to permanent peace," the Arab signatories, in a joint statement issued on April 1, 1950, pledged themselves not to conduct peace negotiations with Israel and declared that any Arab State doing so would be treated as a traitor and an outcast. Subsequent policy has been in full accord with that declaration. Instead of abstaining, as required by the terms of the armistice, from all threats of aggressive action, their spokesmen in parliament, press, and radio have incessantly warned Israel of a coming second round.

This concept of Israel as a temporary bridgehead to be eliminated by war or blockade still dominates Arab official utterances. "In demanding the restoration of the refugees to Palestine," wrote Muhammad Salah-ad-Din, a former foreign minister of Egypt, "the Arabs intend to annihilate the State of Israel."² No less outspoken was King Saud in a statement made in Riyadh soon after his accession to the throne: "The only way which the Arab States must go is to draw Israel up by her roots. Why should we not sacrifice 10 million out of 50 million Arabs so that we may live in greatness and honor?"³ Against this mood of war and revenge, reason has little chance of prevailing. "The Jews are our enemies," Baghdad radio told its listeners on June 28, 1949, "and it does not matter how peace-loving they may be. We shall never cease to prepare for the day of reckoning, for the second round, when the Jews will be driven off our soil."

¹Footnotes at end of speech.

²Footnotes at end of speech.

In this matter, the new regime in Egypt, contrary to early expectations, has not diverged from the traditional slogans. In his opening address to the Arab armistice delegations, made in Cairo on April 13, 1953, Mohammed Naguib, then President of Egypt, said: "The existence of Israel is a cancer in the body of the Arab nation." Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser, Prime Minister of Egypt, was equally frank: "Israel is an artificial state which must disappear," he said on May 8, 1954, to a representative of the Greek newspaper Kathimerini. During his visit at the Lebanese Parliament on July 1, 1954, the Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, Maj. Salah Salem stated: "The evacuation of the occupation forces from our country will free essential forces of ours. We shall then be able to raise our voice and to liberate Palestine. We shall prepare the forces that will liberate Palestine. And, with the help of God, there will be a great revival."

It has been a habit of Arab propaganda to assert that their refusal to make peace is justified by the prior demand to have the original recommendation of the United Nations fulfilled. There is no juridical or moral force in the contention that Israel has a duty to set aside its rights under existing treaties in favor of the recommendations which Arab governments themselves destroyed by force. Indeed, it was because of Arab opposition that the United Nations abandoned its 1947 resolution and called upon the parties to reach their own binding agreements. This they have done; and nothing in the armistice system may now be changed without consent. In December 1952 the General Assembly of the United Nations rejected by vote the Arab thesis that fulfillment of old recommendations was a prior condition of a negotiated peace. But in any case, this argument belongs to the tactics of controversy, not to the reality of the Arab position. Mohammed Salah-ad-Din said recently: "The Arabs will not be satisfied with the implementation of United Nations resolutions. We shall only have complete satisfaction when Israel is finally blotted out from the map of the Middle East. The Arabs will find no rest until this cancer has been removed from their heart." While on November 3, 1954, the Syrian Prime Minister, Faris Al Khoury, declared in Parliament:

"Certain Arab leaders say that there can be no peace with Israel before the implementation of the U. N. resolutions. . . . They link peace with Israel with these terms. I denounce such a statement, and I say that there is no connection between peace with Israel and the return of the refugees and the U. N. resolutions. . . . Whether they return the refugees or not, peace must not be concluded with Israel in any form. I do not believe that the Arabs would approve peace so long as the Jews remain settled in that spot, the heart of the Arab States, threatening all those around them, and spreading corruption and evil. . . . How can we possibly make peace with them while they remain there? This was the first round and, unfortunately, it was not successful. The Arabs, we included, should prepare for a second round and do their utmost."

In such an atmosphere, the idea of progress towards peace with Israel is regarded as a form of treason: "Whoever thinks of making peace with the enemy signs the death warrant of all the Arab nations," said Dr. Fadhl Jamali, the Foreign Minister of Iraq, on his way to Washington to negotiate for the receipt of weapons for the Iraq Army.

Such statements cannot be lightly regarded in any discussion of Israel's security problem. No other state has Israel's experience of being constantly threatened with violent destruction by hostile neighbors a few miles away.

Nor has Arab hostility been confined to warlike propaganda. From the very incep-

tion of the State of Israel, an economic boycott has been enforced against it by the Arab States, of which the most significant aspect is the closing of the Suez Canal to all Israel shipping and the interference with the passage of ships of other nations carrying cargoes to Israel. This action of the Egyptian Government is a violation of the Constantinople Convention of 1888, under which the power contiguous to the Suez Canal is bound to keep the canal "always . . . free and open in time of war as in time of peace to every vessel of commerce or of war without distinction of flag." The Security Council of the United Nations on September 1, 1951, ruled that under the Armistice Agreement neither party could assert that it was actively a belligerent or entitled to exercise the right of visit, search, and seizure. The Council found that Egyptian interference with the passage through the Suez Canal of goods destined for Israel was "inconsistent with the purpose of the armistice agreement" and "an abuse of the exercise of the right of visit, search, and seizure." It called upon Egypt to terminate all such restrictions. No heed has been paid to this decision, and the Egyptian blockade has recently taken the form of the flagrant seizure of an unarmed Israel ship in the international waterway.

A widely ramified boycott machinery has been set up, with headquarters in Cairo, to prevent trade between the Arab States and Israel, indeed between Israel and other countries. International firms trading with Israel are blacklisted, airlines and shipping companies are denied servicing in Arab airports, and harbors, if they maintain contact with Israel. A conspicuous example of this policy was the campaign of intimidation conducted by the Arab States against the German Federal Republic which had signed a reparations agreement with Israel. Danger to international air traffic has been caused by the refusal of Arab airports to provide flight information to aircraft proceeding to or from Israel. The boycott of the Arab States against Israel extends even to the denial of information on the movement of infectious diseases or locusts. Neither considerations of humanity nor the common ills of nature have prevailed against this intense hostility.

III

The facts already enumerated would themselves be sufficient to give a disquieting picture of the threat to Israel's security. No state is as vulnerable as Israel in the configuration of its frontier; none has such memories of recent aggression; none is beset by the nerve-racking experience of hearing the renewal of aggression repeatedly threatened; none is assailed even now by every form of hostility short of regular warfare. But the picture is still not complete without reference to the wider international context, which subjects Israel's fragile security to additional strains.

Israel, while subjected to regional hostility, is not immune from any of the dangers which might ensue from a world conflict reaching into the Middle East. Indeed, a great power conflict in the Middle East would face Israel with a double peril—attack by an invading great power and a simultaneous assault by neighboring Arab states.

Moreover, Israel faces these manifold dangers with no sure prospect of assistance from any quarter. Israel is not integrated into any system of defense pacts or security guarantees. The Arab League collective security pact, the British treaties with Iraq, Jordan, and Egypt, the defense association growing up around Turkey and Pakistan, and American arms aid agreements in the Middle East are all oriented exclusively toward the Arab states and are based on Israel's exclusion. There is thus not a single country in the world which has contracted a firm, unequivocal obligation to help defend Israel by armed force in the event of aggression. Recourse

to the United Nations Charter which in 1948 had some effect in limiting the duration of the war and localizing its effects is now a dubious safeguard. In the present conflict between the great powers and in the light of the veto provision twice exercised in the Arab-Israel context by the Soviet Union, it may be doubted whether Israel, if attacked, could even obtain a cease-fire resolution from the Security Council. Six years ago the Security Council was able to adopt five such resolutions, two of which the Arab States obeyed and three of which they defied. Thus not only does Israel face formidable dangers; she also faces them in unusual solitude.

The effect of great-power policies in the present international situation has been to increase this already grave disadvantage. For, while the Soviet Union has twice prevented any action in the Security Council favorable to Israel's security, the Western Powers have embarked upon a policy of unilateral Arab rearmament. The British treaties with Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt constitute guarantees of Arab security of a kind which Israel entirely lacks. But now, in addition, Egypt under the new treaty with Britain is about to inherit one of the greatest military bases in the world, with its airfields, installations, and factories. Iraq has signed an agreement for military aid from the United States, and a similar agreement has been offered to Egypt. In thus increasing the strength of Israel's neighbors, the Western Powers have so far failed to maintain the principle of equality by offering similar arrangements to Israel. Nor have they sought from Arab governments any relaxation of their hostility to Israel as a condition of Western assistance. This policy of one-sided reinforcement of Israel's neighbors appears to the Israel people as a deviation from the best standards of international morality or prudence. It also implies a retreat by the Western Powers from the undertakings contained in the Tripartite Declaration of May 1950, under which they pledged themselves to maintain the military balance between the Arab states and Israel and to enable "Israel and the Arab states" (not the Arab states alone) to contribute to the defense of the area against aggression.

These policies increase the existing advantage which the Arabs possess as a result of their geographic and demographic preponderance. They have vast expanses of territory and vital strategic strong points. They have huge resources of oil. They have enormous reserves of manpower. Their financial and economic resources are vastly superior to those of Israel. These advantages may or may not be reflected in their current military posture. But this is of small moment. In discussing a regional security problem the criterion is one of basic potential, not of current military strength, and in such terms the Arab States possess an advantage even without the treaties and arms agreements showered on them and withheld from Israel by the United States and Britain. In recent years all the Arab States have been strengthening their armies, their military industry, and their equipment. Huge military budgets that cannot be matched by Israel's struggling have enabled them to purchase modern western equipment, such as jet planes, artillery, tanks, and armored war machines. The military budgets of the Arab States in the current year exceed the total of Israel's entire budget for all purposes, civil and military.

It is against this background that the specific problem of border insecurity, of marauding and infiltration, should be viewed. An intermittent guerrilla war on Israel's borders, especially those with Jordan and the Egyptian-occupied Gaza strip, is the spearhead of comprehensive hostility. It is difficult to imagine that a quiet border could coexist with the political and emotional

attitudes of the Arab leaders which I have described. An improvement of relations between governments is a prerequisite of a more peaceful frontier life. Yet specific consideration is needed for the movement of Arab infiltration, which is acknowledged by both parties and by the United Nations to be the primary specific cause of recent outbreaks.

The process of infiltration began in the period immediately following the conclusion of the armistice agreements. It was at first a sporadic trickle of illegal crossings actuated in part by motives of family reunion. Efforts made by Israel to regulate this movement by agreement with the Arab States failed owing to the Arab refusal to legalize any transit of persons between their respective territories and Israel. As a result, these illegal crossings became a regular practice, which after a time degenerated into wholesale infiltration accompanied by theft and smuggling. The Government of Israel first took no steps to suppress this movement, regarding it as a temporary phase. It also put into operation an official scheme of its own for the reunion of Arab families separated by the war, and as a result several thousand Arabs have rejoined their kinsfolk in Israel. Contrary to expectations, however, the movement showed no sign of abating. Theft, robbery, holdups, and eventually murder and sabotage became of frequent occurrence. As the border region became more tense with constant violence, the Israeli villagers in the area were authorized to organize their own defense against invaders.

It has been asserted quite wrongly that this infiltration is conducted primarily by refugees. The nightly incursions into Israel territory, which in most cases show careful planning, are not the work of destitute refugees but of highly trained gunmen acting on paramilitary lines. They openly sell their booty in the markets of the Arab border towns, not infrequently sharing their gains with the appointed organs of security. In a number of cases, where the Israel authorities supplied to the Arab Governments data on the identity and the crimes of the infiltrators, these were not brought to trial, and only rarely have the stolen goods been returned.

There can be little doubt that much of this guerrilla war is of a military character. The targets chosen, the form of attack, the types of arms used, and the methods employed indicate that many of these raids are planned on military lines. The setting of mines, the ambushing of watchmen, and firing at guards are clearly not the work of hapless refugees. In more than one case the raids have been well synchronized and carefully planned military operations executed with a high degree of precision. This campaign affords first-class opportunities for instructing men in guerrilla tactics, gathering military information and making the raiders familiar with the territory in which the second round may one day be fought.

The dimensions which the guerrilla war against Israel has assumed in recent years may be gathered from the following data. From 1949 to the middle of 1954 there have been an average of 1,000 cases of infiltration per month along the several frontiers, the majority of them on the Israel-Jordan border. The number of clashes with armed marauders on the latter border alone amounted during the last 4 years to 1,069, the incidents of theft, burglary, and armed robbery to 3,573. Livestock, seed, fertilizers, agricultural implements, and irrigation pipes have been among the principal booty of these marauding expeditions. Miles of telephone wires have been stolen and telephone poles destroyed, while the cutting of electric wires has seriously interfered with agricultural and industrial activities. All this material damage, however, is overshadowed

by the fearful toll of human life. On the Jordan border alone 513 Israelis were killed and wounded during the past 4 years. The commander of the Arab Legion proclaims the innocence of a process which, unless checked, may bring ruin to the whole armistice regime.

A summary of incidents within a brief period of time and along a single sector of the Jordan frontier was presented by the Israel representative at the United Nations to the Security Council on November 12, 1953. The nightly attacks there recorded, with their ever-increasing toll of lives, have created nervous tension in the Israel border villages which militates against the self-restraint maintained during the early phases of this war. It is not the first time that the Jews of Palestine have been exposed to this trying ordeal. In 1920, 1921 and 1929 there were serious Arab attacks in Jerusalem, Jaffa, the coastal plain, Hebron and Safad, in which hundreds of Jews were massacred and a number of Jewish villages destroyed. In 1936, countrywide disturbances began which lasted intermittently until the outbreak of the Second World War. In these conflicts it was the policy of the Jewish authorities, upheld by the bulk of the community, to abstain from retaliation. The same restraint was maintained when after the establishment of the State of Israel, the old guerrilla attacks and marauding expeditions were resumed. Tension in the border areas, however, has of late become so acute as sometimes to result in a breakdown of that traditional attitude.

Many of the attacks have occurred not along the "frontier" but deep inside Israel territory. The innumerable wadies and tracks covered by sand make it easy for raiders to enter and escape undetected. Not infrequently Israel watchmen and border police wounded by shots have been dragged across the frontier and cruelly done to death, their mutilated bodies then being presented as evidence of Israel aggression against Jordan. The Jordan Government has distributed arms and ammunition to village youths in the border areas, labelling them "national guards," without effective control or training. Its agreement has not yet been received for any radical measures to stop guerrilla activities along the border, such as the regular policing of the area, the division of no man's land or the marking of the armistice line.

According to a report of the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization to the Secretary-General of the U. N., dated October 30, 1952, no effective system of frontier demarcation could be set up "since the Jordan authorities have been unwilling to agree to any 'permanent' scheme for the marking of the demarcation line." According to the same report, "an Israel survey team engaged in the marking of the border was fired on from Jordan-controlled territory," and the "officer in charge of the surveying team was seriously wounded." This has happened in many instances. The case of the Lebanese frontier, which is clearly marked by cairns placed every few hundred yards and where the local gendarmerie maintains order, indicates that where there is a will, an end can be put to violence across the border. In articles and interviews¹ the Commander of the Arab Legion has said that "in international practice every nation is responsible for the prevention of illegal entry into its frontiers" and that "the Israelis must deal with such incidents in their country and not expect the military command in Jordan to do so"—the implication clearly being that notwithstanding the terms of the armistice agreement, the Jordan military authorities do not feel obliged to stop the evil at its source. In July 1954 the United States, Britain, and France proposed the de-

Footnotes at end of speech.

marcation of the frontier and the erection of barriers as a measure to prevent infiltration and reprisals. This suggestion was accepted by Israel and again rejected by Jordan. It is hard to see how refusal to mark the border and consolidate its defenses can be reconciled with peaceful intention or purpose.

A serious situation, second in gravity only to that on the Jordan frontier, has developed in recent months on the Egyptian border. Though the constant raids into Israel territory across the Egyptian armistice line do not, like those from Jordan, operate in populous areas, they have created in the wide expanses of the Negev a state of insecurity necessitating exceptional measures of vigilance to safeguard the lives and property of the rural population. Many of these raids reveal paramilitary training and careful reconnaissance of the ground and of the local farmers' habits. Flocks numbering many hundred heads of sheep have been driven off, plantations uprooted, and vital communications mined. A special problem is presented by the Bedouin in the area. The Egyptian authorities frequently employ their own Bedouin for attacks on the Israeli Bedouin, particularly at times of political tension.

IV

The prospects of removing such a profound tension by palliative measures are not hopeful. A development of the armistice agreement into a peace settlement is the only radical cure. But if there were a desire to move progressively toward peace, many effective steps could be taken. The first would be to stop the campaign of incitement in the Arabic press and radio, and the public statements of political leaders. A second step would be the elimination of the economic boycott against Israel which is doing the Arab countries no less, if not indeed more harm than Israel. Third, a number of specific measures could be adopted for improving conditions on the border. A series of such proposals was submitted by Israel to Jordan in March 1953, but met with categorical rejection. The most important measure to prevent trouble in the border region would be the demarcation of the present lines by clearly visible signs on the ground. A further preventive measure would be the partitioning of the "no man's land" areas on the border which considerably hamper the effective policing of the frontier region. To remove the incentive of booty, searches should be carried out to discover goods stolen by marauders in Israel. At the same time, the responsibility of the local authorities to prevent the infiltration of marauders into Israel territory should be enforced by disciplinary measures. Firearms should be carefully registered and licensed and all unauthorized explosives and their detonating agents should be confiscated by the competent authorities in Jordan.

Another measure intended to stop infiltration was the agreement reached on March 5, 1951, between Israel and Jordan for the holding of regular meetings of local commanders for setting border problems, exchanging information on marauders, arranging for the return of stolen property and providing for the return of persons who had inadvertently strayed across the unmarked line. After a year's trial it became clear, however, that the Jordanian authorities had no intention of cooperating effectively in the prevention of marauding. Stolen property was for the most part sold openly in Jordan market places and was returned only in very exceptional cases.

On January 8, 1953, Israel informed the Jordanians that it saw no purpose in continuing this agreement. In June 1953 Israel took the initiative in proposing a new local commanders' agreement, following a suggestion made by Secretary of State Dulles. The Jordanians were reluctant, but in the

end grudgingly signed it. The new agreement, too, remained a dead letter. Very little was done by the Jordan police to return stolen property and apprehend marauders even when their names were officially communicated to them by the Israel authorities. Israel also proposed the setting up of telephone lines in exposed districts, such as the area of Al-Kubelbelatrun, to facilitate a speedy exchange of information. This proposal, too, was first held up and then rejected. The Israel authorities also suggested that in certain areas the armistice line be redrawn, so as to enable villagers to work on their fields without crossing the border. In this matter, too, the Jordanians have maintained their negative attitude.

Israel would welcome any measure, however temporary and palliative, that might help in some measure to reduce tension. In recent weeks, especially since the appointment of General Burns to lead the U. N. Truce Supervision Organization, there has been a promising reduction of tension. Israel has no aggressive designs against her neighbors. If she had, she could have had many opportunities in recent years, when Arab States were weakened by internal disturbances and coups d'etat. There has been a scrupulous abstention by Israel from exploiting these instabilities. Nor would an aggressive Israel support American and British proposals for reinforcing the armistice demarcation line as a tangible barrier to movement from either side. Israel urgently needs peace for economic development and for accomplishing the great task of absorbing the 700,000 Jewish refugees who have come from all parts of the world—including 350,000 immigrants driven by intolerance from Arab lands. Some Arab leaders must be aware that peace with Israel would benefit the Middle East and open out a new horizon of regional progress; but such moderation, if it exists, has not yet found tangible expression in official policy, the Arab leaders having become slaves of their own bellicose slogans which they cannot now recant.

Despite this negative attitude Israel has from time to time outlined concrete peace proposals. In the Seventh General Assembly of the United Nations in 1952 the Israel Government submitted an elaborate blueprint for a peace settlement and regional cooperation between Israel and the Arab states. These proposals were categorically rejected by the Arab spokesmen. In November 1953 the Government of Israel made another effort to seek an agreed settlement of outstanding issues with Jordan by requesting the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in conformity with article XII of the armistice agreement, to convoke a conference of both parties for the purpose of revising and improving the armistice agreement in the light of past experience. Although the terms of the armistice agreement make attendance at such a conference obligatory, the request of the Secretary General, supported by the Western Powers, was rejected by the Government of Jordan. In October 1954, the Israel Government released the blocked accounts of Arab refugees and proposed the conclusion of nonaggression pacts as an intermediate stage between the armistice and a peace settlement.

At the time of writing, despite a comparative lull on the Jordan border, no long-term solution is in sight. It does not appear likely that local border incidents will develop into a general collapse of the armistice frontier; but the air is heavy on both sides of the frontier, and peace hangs on a tenuous thread.

No international question has been so much discussed and so little solved. The discussions have at least defined the three

avenues of progress. The first and best alternative would be a negotiation between Israel and each Arab state with the object of making a transition from the armistice to permanent peace. There is nothing revolutionary or unreasonable in this suggestion. It expresses the duty of all civilized states to live together in neighborliness and tranquillity. It does not involve the Arabs in any new commitments; for the armistice agreements are defined in their own terms as acts of transition to permanent peace. There is an impressive volume of world opinion in favor of the doctrine that the armistice system, with its many improvised and impermanent features, has lasted too long and should be succeeded by a more stable system of international relationships. The Great Powers and the United Nations would do well continually to articulate this as the determined will of the international community. Six years ago Mr. John Foster Dulles, addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations, clearly expressed the view that it would be perilous to allow a provisional military relationship to endure too long. He said: "Fighting must give way to truce, truce to armistice, and armistice to final peace." There can be no assurance that negotiations between Israel and her neighbors would lead to swift agreement; but a stubborn refusal even to negotiate is surely out of accord with any doctrine of international duty.

A second alternative, which might bring relief until a peace negotiation takes place, would be to utilize the opportunities of review and revision inherent in the armistice agreements themselves. Article VIII of the armistice agreement with Jordan provides for a special committee for settling many dangerous problems, especially in the Jerusalem area. In 1952 the United Nations chief of staff reported that Jordan refused to meet Israel in that committee. This refusal still persists. There are articles in each armistice agreement which oblige either party to accept the U. N. Secretary-General's invitation to attend a conference, convoked at the request of the other party, for the purpose of reviewing, modifying, or suspending any or each article of the armistice agreement. Here, too, Jordan has refused to honor its signature obliging her to meet Israel under the procedures laid down in the armistice agreement. It is extraordinary for a government to proclaim fidelity to an international agreement while declining to meet the central provision of that very agreement for revision or review. Recently, the policy of ostracism has been carried to even more extreme lengths by Jordan's refusal to attend meetings of the United Nations Security Council because the charter makes such attendance conditional upon the acceptance of an obligation of pacific settlement.

A third and more modest line of possible improvement has recently been tried in the form of proposals for marking the border and erecting obstacles at suitable points. This too has been rejected on the Arab side.

The Israel Government and its defense forces will not neglect any idea or opportunity which seems likely to offer hope of a remedy. In these circumstances the basic question is clearly not one of procedure but of policy. Does there exist any international influence which can overcome the comprehensive negation which the Arab Governments have chosen to adopt? Refusal to discuss peace; refusal to develop the armistice agreement into more lasting accords; refusal to review the armistice agreement under article XII; refusal to confer with Israel under article VIII of the armistice; refusal by Jordan to attend the Security Council's meetings under article 35 of the charter; refusal to mark the frontier; refusal to erect barriers to infiltration; refusal

to restrain the eruption of marauding bands across the frontier; refusal to desist from inflammatory propaganda and incitement; refusal by Egypt to abandon an illicit blockade—all this together adds up to a political attitude which will surely have to be modified if the tension in the Middle East is to be relieved. Until then the Israel defense forces will face a heavy task, and face it virtually alone as the solitary effective means for safeguarding Israel's physical integrity.

¹ Security Council official records, 3d year, No. 72, 301st and 302d meetings.

² Al-Misri, August 24, 1953.

³ Al-Ahram, January 10, 1954.

⁴ Al-Ahram, July 2, 1954.

⁵ Al-Misri, April 12, 1954.

⁶ Radio Damascus, November 3, 1954 (from a verbatim recording).

⁷ Filastin, June 24, 1951.

⁸ Gen. J. B. Glubb in Foreign Affairs, July 1954, and in an interview in the New York Times, July 17, 1954.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Alken, George D., *Vt.*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*.....
Anderson, Clinton F., 6 Wesley Circle,
N. Me.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky.*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, N. H.
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., N. J.
Case, Francis, S. Dak.4545 Conn. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, N. Me.3327 Cleveland
Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky.*.....2800 Woodley Rd.
Cotton, Norris, N. H.
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex.*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa.*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., N. C.
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga.*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, University Club,
R. I.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr.,
Mo.
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., 5511 Cedar Park-
way, Chevy Chase,
Iowa, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H.,
Minn.
Ives, Irving M., N. Y.
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*.....
Johnston, Olin D., S. C.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okl.*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., W. Va.3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F.,
Calif.
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*.....
Langer, William, N. Dak.The Roosevelt.
Lehman, Herbert H., N. Y.Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La.*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis.*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., The Shoreham,
Wash.
Malone, George W., *Nev.*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo.*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike,
Okl.
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., S. Dak.The Capitol
Towers.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., W. Va.
Neuberger, Richard L.,
Oreg.
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., Sheraton-Park
Wyo.

Pastore, John O., R. I.
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, Mass. 2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F.,
Kans.
Scott, W. Kerr, N. C.
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, N. J.Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase,
(Mrs.), *Maine*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*.....4920 Upton St.
Stennis, John, *Miss.*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*.....
Thurmond, Strom, S. C.
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*.....
Young, Milton R., N. Dak.Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry
Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of
South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland,
Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young,
Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and
Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations
Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell,
Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan,
Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis,
Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Know-
land, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of
Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services
Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson
of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington,
Jackson, Ervin, Bridges, Saltonstall, Flanders,
Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South
Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency
Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson,
Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Mon-
roney, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush,
Beall, Payne, and Morse.

Committee on the District of Columbia
Messrs. Neely (chairman), Gore, Bible, Mc-
Namara, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey,
Allott, and Morse.

Committee on Finance
Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr,
Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas,
Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania,
Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and
Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations
Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Ful-
bright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield,
Barkley, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hicken-
looper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, Capehart,
and Morse.

Committee on Government Operations
Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson,
Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey,
Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of
Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin
of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson,
Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neu-
berger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak,
Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

*Committee on Interstate and Foreign
Commerce*
Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore,
Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible,

Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter,
Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Ke-
fauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hen-
nings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley,
Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker,
and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely,
Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara,
Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Gold-
water, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chair-
man), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings,
Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer,
Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New
Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore,
Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neu-
berger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of
South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and
Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hen-
nings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, Mc-
Carthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel
Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts,
3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701
Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut
Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist
Building.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield
St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hem-
lock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecti-
cut Ave.
Marshall—T. Perry Lipplitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren, District of Columbia.
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frank-
furter, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachu-
setts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frank-
furter (temporary appointment), Vermont,
Connecticut, New York.
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton,
Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin
Islands.
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice
Warren, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia,
North Carolina, South Carolina.
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black,
Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Loui-
siana, Texas, Canal Zone.
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed,
Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Min-
ton, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark,
Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota,
Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas,
Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, Cali-
fornia, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark,
Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma,
New Mexico.

Appendix

"He Is One of the Finest Institutions of Washington"—A Personal Portrait of Speaker Rayburn by a Correspondent of the British Broadcasting Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House will be interested, I believe, in a word portrait of the great American who presides over the House of Representatives as carried in a broadcast recently in the General Overseas Service of the British Broadcasting Corp., and which has just been brought to my attention by a constituent from St. Louis who sent me a reprint of it in the BBC's publication *London Calling*.

This personal portrait of SAM RAYBURN, written by BBC correspondent Robert Waithman, formerly assigned, I believe, to Washington, accurately describes our Speaker as "the most beloved figure in the House." It discusses his role in accomplishing the reconciliation of views and of sectional interests here in the House in order to make democracy function for the whole Nation.

The Members will also be interested in the BBC correspondent's description of the legislative processes of the House and of the Speaker's role.

I think that without exception all of us will agree with Mr. Waithman of the BBC that our great Speaker is one of the finest institutions of Washington.

The article follows:

SAM RAYBURN

(By Robert Waithman)

In the small hours of the morning of November 3, 1954, some scores of newspapermen were frowning over tape machines and radio and television sets in Washington trying to make sense of the election results that were coming in spasmodically from all over America: I was one of this uncertain crew. One of the brethren of the typewriter rose, picked up the wad of copy paper he had been using to work out his calculations and said: "Well, SAM RAYBURN's back, anyhow."

SAM RAYBURN has been elected 21 times without a break by his constituents in north Texas. He is the 8th son of a family of 11: his father was a cotton farmer. He worked his way through college, became a school teacher, then a lawyer, went into politics and got himself elected to the State legislature. At the age of 29 he was Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives—the youngest man ever to hold that post. Then he stood as candidate for Congress and was elected. So he came to Washington—in 1912.

He sought and obtained, and for 42 years he has been well satisfied with, membership of the Lower House. He has never wanted

to move up into the Senate. He has developed a fierce and abiding love of the noisier, faster-moving House of Representatives.

A RECONCILER OF INTERESTS

There are 435 Members of the House, elected according to the voting strength of the population from districts all over America—a pretty accurate cross section of the Nation. They often have the difficult job of reconciling national interests with the local interests they are expected to promote when they get to Washington. If they want to be re-elected, as all but a fraction of them do, they must keep themselves in the headlines of their local papers at home. The Speaker knows that. But he also knows that there is considerable national business to be done, and only a limited time to do it in. So he allows the Members to make use of a little device that often fascinates legislators from other parliaments in other countries. It is the practice of obtaining the House's permission, as the phrase has it, "to extend my remarks." This means a speech, which is never in fact delivered, nevertheless appears next day in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, the Hansard of Washington.

When, in 1940, Mr. RAYBURN succeeded Speaker Bankhead—Tallulah Bankhead's father—he permitted another agreeable practice. He allowed Members to talk for 1 minute only on any subject under the sun for a short, introductory period each day while the House was settling down to business. That released a lot of inhibitions, and, as he had rightly calculated, made it possible to get along faster with the important work. And there is a lot of important work. The authority of the House of Representatives is greatly enhanced by a provision of the Constitution that all revenue bills—every sort of legislation touching the public purse—must originate there, and not in the Senate. One of the Speaker's first jobs is to see that this business is attended to, first in the relevant House committee and then on the floor of the House, with all possible speed and efficiency. And with this duty goes considerable power.

In the first 10 years of this century the House found itself with a Speaker who used his powers so ruthlessly that he turned his office into a little dictatorship—and brought retribution on his head. This was Speaker Joseph Gurney Cannon, who put the committees into the pockets of his own political clique and crushed all minority groups until a coalition of Republicans and Democrats passed new legislation which broke his power and reduced the power of all subsequent Speakers. But since then the United States has moved into a new place among the world's nations—as leader of a great alliance. Today the Speaker of the House has responsibilities and opportunities such as the dictatorial Joe Cannon never imagined at the height of his authority.

It is doubtful whether anyone could have exercised them more carefully or more successfully than has the gentleman from Texas. The office is one that could be exploited by anyone who wanted to talk his way into the public consciousness. But Mr. RAYBURN is one of the most taciturn men in Washington. One consequence is that what he does say is listened to with respect. Another is that the office of Speaker of the House is invested, while he occupies it, with a dignity which a garrulous man could not give it.

He is patient and restrained, both on and off the floor of the House. There are days when as many as 100 visitors, mostly Congressmen in search of guidance or counsel, seek and obtain appointments to see him, singly or in small groups. Plainly he cannot spend much time with any of them, but almost nobody comes away from SAM RAYBURN's office with the feeling that he has been slighted or rebuffed. And for a new Congressman, uncertain of the ropes and unsure when to speak or act, it is of vast comfort to have seen the Speaker and to have got his advice.

This is not to say that Mr. RAYBURN is not capable of being both outspoken and tough when he thinks the need arises. At election times he reveals himself to be a Democrat of the deepest dye, pouring scorn and fury upon the Republicans. As to his toughness there probably is no better illustration than the story of what happened in the House on the afternoon of August 12, 1941—a day when America came terribly close to inviting disaster.

It was less than 4 months before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. President Roosevelt had called upon the Congress to extend the Selective Service Act—which enforced conscription in what was peacetime for America. The isolationists were fiercely fighting this bill. They were intent upon bringing about an immediate demobilization of the American forces. And when in the House the vote came out at 203 to 202 in favor of passage of the bill there was furious noise and excitement on the floor. Speaker RAYBURN accepted a motion for a recount. When it was over the vote stood as before. Scores of Members leaped to their feet, and there is little doubt that many of them were looking for a chance to change their vote. But Mr. RAYBURN banged the gavel and froze this vote, making another count impossible, and though there were angry challenges thereafter it was seen that in the 15 seconds when he had used the Speaker's power SAM RAYBURN had almost certainly saved the Nation from weakening itself at the crucial hour.

MOST BELOVED FIGURE IN THE HOUSE

But these exhibitions of the iron hand are the exception, not the rule. Mr. RAYBURN has attained his influence far more by gentler means, and those same means have made him the most beloved figure in the House. There is, and there long has been, no doubt about the affection that is felt for him in the Congress—and there is certainly a wealth of evidence to prove it.

For instance, when the Democrats lost control of the 1947-48 Congress, and SAM RAYBURN had to step down from the Speaker's chair, he relinquished the right to use the official limousine attached to the job. So a fund was started to buy a car "so that SAM won't have to walk," it was explained at the time. A number of Republicans sought to contribute to the fund, but their checks were all politely returned. This was a Democratic gesture. The big new car for SAM was bought, and in it there was affixed a small plate which reads, "To our beloved SAM RAYBURN—who would have been President if he had come from any place but the South."

There may be a tinge of southern bitterness, a reflection of unforgotten history, in that sentiment. A lot of Americans would say, though, that there is a touch of truth in

it, too. Certainly there cannot be many people in America, in or out of the Democratic Party, who do not admire the firm, knowledgeable, upright, self-disciplined gentleman from Texas, or who have any doubt that the high office of Speaker of the House, will be discharged in the present Congress.

It was on January 6, 1955—RAYBURN's 73d birthday—that President Eisenhower drove up Capitol Hill to deliver his state of the Union message to the Senate and House assembled in joint session. The President began by acknowledging the RAYBURN anniversary in an interpolated sentence which did not appear in the official text of the message. The Congress, to a man, rose to hail this graceful bow by a Republican President to a leader in the opposite camp. But SAM RAYBURN is more than that. Full of years and honor, he is one of the finest institutions of Washington.

Accounting Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the course of its extensive overhaul of our tax system during the last Congress, one of the most widespread complaints received by the Committee on Ways and Means was that artificial divergences had developed between the computation of income for tax purposes and the computation of income for business purposes as determined under generally accepted accounting provisions. These differences were confined almost entirely to questions of when certain types of income and expenses should be taken into account in arriving at net income.

As a result, the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954 sought to bring the income tax provisions of the law into harmony with generally accepted accounting provisions and, as stated in the report of our committee, "to assure that all items of income and deductions are taken into account once, but only once in the computation of taxable income." Sections 452 and 462 of the new code were designed to meet these objectives.

Under the prior law, payments received in advance for the use of property in future years or for services to be rendered in future years were includible in the income of the recipient in the year they were received. This was true regardless of the taxpayer's method of accounting. However, well established accounting procedures provide that, in the case of taxpayers on an accrual accounting system, payments for rentals, club dues, warehouse fees, and the like should be included in income in the year in which income is earned and in the year in which the related expenses are incurred. Obviously, this is not necessarily in the year of receipt.

As a consequence, section 452, in general, permits accrual basis taxpayers to defer the reporting of advance payments as income until the year, or years, in

which, under the taxpayer's regular method of accounting, the income is earned.

With respect to deductions for expenses and losses incurred by a taxpayer, prior law provided that these deductions could be taken only when all events had occurred which fixed the fact and the amount of the taxpayer's liability. This rule, in many cases, was at variance with generally accepted accounting principles which require all determinable liabilities relating to reported income to be taken into account.

As a result, section 462 of the new code conformed the tax treatment of expenses more closely to general business treatment by permitting an accrual basis taxpayer to deduct reasonable additions to reserves for estimated expenses.

These two provisions, sections 452 and 462, were strongly advocated by the accounting profession of the United States. Each section was approved by the unanimous vote of both the Republican and Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

It has developed recently that there is a sharp difference of opinion between taxpayers and the Government as to the scope of these sections. The tentative regulations issued by the Treasury on January 22 in order to carry out the provisions of the law have come under strong attack as being too restrictive. For example, the tentative regulations would not permit a deduction for additions to reserves for estimated repair and maintenance expenses. Taxpayers have already served notice that they intend to litigate this restriction. Should they be successful in the courts, the revenue loss under the law would be far in excess of anything contemplated by the Congress.

In addition, the tentative regulations also require that the reserves which these sections permit for tax purposes must be shown on the regular books of the company which are used for statements of financial condition to stockholders. This requirement is also under attack although it would seem to be in line with the objective of the law to bring tax accounting into harmony with business accounting.

Therefore, it seems clear that many groups will seek an opportunity under these sections to receive tax benefits substantially in excess of anything anticipated by the Congress. If the present provisions remain in effect, extended litigation appears inevitable. As a result, I believe that the two sections in question should be repealed in order to prevent this type of uncertainty and to avoid possible taxpayer abuse. The Secretary of the Treasury has recommended this action. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4726, to carry out this objective.

There is absolutely no question in my mind but that the objective which Congress sought to achieve by these provisions was and still remains highly desirable. Tax accounting should not depart in an artificial manner from generally accepted principles of business accounting. Therefore, it is my earnest hope that this matter will receive further study with a view to solving the

transitional problems which have occurred. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that effective and practical legislation along these lines can and should be developed.

Resolution Dealing With the American Legion Position Opposing the Federal Medical Services Report of the Second Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the American Legion adopted at the 32d annual national rehabilitation conference of the American Legion on March 3, 1955:

Whereas the Second Hoover Commission has filed with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate its report and recommendations in the field of Federal medical services; and

Whereas said report contains many vicious, unwarranted and unjustified attacks on the sick and disabled veterans of America; and

Whereas, in addition to the official report, the accompanying task force report contains misinformed discussions and presentations critical of the existing structure of veterans benefits and services; and

Whereas the report would form a Federal advisory council on health, another super-agency which, among its other duties, would exercise indirect control over the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the report would transfer the cost of disability compensation, pensions, and military retirement from their proper place as a delayed cost of war and make this an added charge to the Nation's health program; and

Whereas the report contains direct attacks on disability compensation of those who received their disability in service and are entitled to the greatest consideration which the American public can offer; and

Whereas the Commission recommends the closing of 20 hospitals when at this time there are thousands of eligible veterans certified for hospitalization unable to secure proper medical care and treatment because of the lack of beds; and

Whereas the Commission believes that authority to evaluate the extent of disability should be vested in the Department of Medicine and Surgery when the complicated laws, rules, and regulations governing rating are a joint legal, occupational, and medical matter now exercised by the VA Department of Veterans Benefits; and

Whereas the Commission has disregarded the health needs of our disabled veterans as established by the Congress and the people of the United States and recommends that authorizations to construct and money which is already appropriated for the construction of badly needed beds be rescinded; and

Whereas this Commission has branded the Nation's veterans as goldbrickers and implies that our sick and disabled veterans are a group of perjurers to our country which they defended and which they patriotically uphold and support; and

Whereas they have recommended that a system of socialized medicine be instituted in the United States by permitting veterans

to use the VA hospitals and outpatient medical services and pay at a later date when, and if able, and this program is an expanded, uneconomic, and costly program to the American taxpayer and unworthy of serious consideration by informed people; and

Whereas the Commission's proposal to require our service-connected disabled veterans to file an economic statement in order to secure hospitalization for disabilities other than their service-connected disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, for the above-mentioned reasons, the American Legion expresses its great shock, disappointment, and disapproval of these unfounded, uneconomic, and heartless recommendations and deplores the direct attack on our disabled veterans who have so courageously served to protect our freedoms; and be it further

Resolved, That we call these matters to the attention of the President of the United States and request his sympathetic understanding in the solution of the problems of the disabled veterans whom he committed to war service; and be it further

Resolved, That the case of America's disabled be placed before the Members of the 84th Congress, with full confidence that the Members of that body will continue to reflect the generous attitude of the American people in connection with the care of our disabled.

Tuition Expenses Should Be Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide an income tax deduction for amounts paid as tuition or fees to public and private institutions of higher education for the education of any dependent of such individuals.

This is a matter of tax justice which should be carried through by this Congress at the earliest practicable time. The average taxpayer can generally provide for his family until he faces the high and ever-increasing costs of higher education for his dependents, over and above the normal expenses of support. While higher education and training for dependents may be a matter of personal pride for the taxpayer—it is also a matter of investment in human life which pays fruitful dividends to the whole economy.

Higher education and training makes for a more useful citizen—in every respect. Not only is the educated or trained dependent more productive—but through such increased productivity he earns more income and pays more income taxes. Therefore, the entire national economy is benefited by the development of its most important resource—its young people. Taxpayers who contribute and help in this important way are certainly entitled to a tax deduction for the costs of education and training for their dependents. We should give the taxpayer credit for his contribution to the national wealth. When a taxpayer educates his dependent, he does so for the benefit of the entire American economy.

Family life is the very bulwark of our democracy—a fact which should be recognized in our tax structure. The family as our most cherished institution must not be allowed to suffer through present tax inequities.

We must recognize that the wealth of the Nation is more in its people than in its atoms. We must help the family develop the latent I. Q.'s buried under N. S. F.—not sufficient funds.

What Price Automation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the following article by Mr. Benjamin F. Fairless, which appeared in the newsletter, Human Events, of March 5, the bogymen of automation is laid quietly and efficiently to rest.

We humans are always fearful of what we do not understand, whether it be the U. S. S. R. or automation.

Mr. Fairless shows clearly that our way of life is basically geared to the use of better, bigger, and more effective machines; that, far from creating fewer jobs, they have created better and more jobs.

Finally, in the words of the late Philip Murray, president of the CIO: "I do not know of a single, solitary instance where a great technological gain has taken place in the United States of America that it has actually thrown people out of work."

Mr. Speaker, automation is just one more great technological gain.

WHAT PRICE AUTOMATION?

(By Benjamin F. Fairless)

There is nothing new, of course, about man's fear of machines. Nearly three centuries ago, an inventor in Danzig built a loom that could weave six webs at once. The workers seized the hapless inventor and drowned him in a nearby creek.

At the outset of the so-called Industrial revolution in England, mobs of angry workers broke into the mills and tried to destroy the new automatic machinery which they feared would leave them jobless.

Today we know that it was the machine alone which enabled England to support her rapidly growing population and provide it with a rising standard of living. In countries like India and China, where mechanization did not occur, the standard of living fell far below subsistence levels and the population was decimated by starvation and disease.

Twenty-five years ago, similar fears of the machine were widely prevalent here in the United States. A popular Broadway play of that period, R. U. R., brought the word "robot" into our language.

Today, the same old blind, unreasoning fear of machines is reappearing among us; but we are being frightened—not by the advance of technology itself—but by a strange new word: "automation."

The Public Opinion Index took a poll among more than a thousand factory workers, and asked them two questions: First, did they favor the use of more new and improved machines? They did, by about 3 to 1. Then they were asked how they felt about

more automation. But they opposed that, 3 to 2.

Yet the two things, of course, are really identical. There is nothing new about automation. The mechanics of it are older than our own American Republic.

Back in 1784—before our constitutional Government was established—a man named Oliver Evans, living near Philadelphia, built a flour mill about as automatic as any mill can be. A system of conveyors, run by waterpower, picked up the grain, carried it through all the grinding operations, and delivered the finished flour. But when an auto manufacturer in Detroit builds a plant which handles engine blocks in exactly the same manner, we think it's something new, and it worries us.

Nowadays, too, we marvel at the modern business machine which writes checks and keeps records through the use of punch-cards. And on our production lines are other wonderful machines which are automatically controlled by a punched paper tape. But is this really new? Not at all.

More than 150 years ago, a Frenchman named Jacquard built an automatic loom which wove all kinds of complicated patterns in accordance with instruction that were also punched in paper.

So let's face it. This thing called automation is simply evolution—not revolution. It is only another little step in the slow and plodding progress of man toward a richer, fuller life and a better, freer world.

Suppose we think for a moment of the three outstanding examples of automation that we have seen in our lifetime:

The first one that comes to mind, probably, is the dial telephone. We would naturally assume that it must have thrown thousands of telephone operators out of work; and some of the current propaganda on the subject would seem to confirm that assumption completely. But what are the facts?

Between 1940 and 1950, the number of telephone operators in this country increased by 159,000—or 79 percent.

Next we come to business machines and these fabulous new electronic brains that we've seen on television. Surely we don't need accountants any more. But still the census shows that the number of accountants and auditors increased 71 percent in this same 10-year period.

And how about these so-called automatic factories in Detroit, where the word "automation" was thought up? Are the automobile workers losing out? Not by a long shot. Their number doubled in 14 years. Automobile mechanics and repairmen have increased 75 percent. And for every new job in the auto industry, five new jobs are created in allied fields which supply the raw materials and components that go into the manufacture and equipment of new cars.

But this, of course, is not always the case in every industry and every occupation. Dislocations do occur in some instances, and men do have to change from one job to another. That has been true in farming for nearly 40 years. Moreover with the falling demand for coal, employment in the mines has also dropped off substantially, and there is recent evidence of a mild decline in oil refining.

Where are these men to go? Has automation made it tougher for them? Look at the picture as a whole. Just what really has happened in the last 15 years or so—say from 1939 through 1953?

During this period the population of the United States has increased 22 percent. But the total number of jobs has grown by 35 percent—or more than half again as much. In the field of manufacturing itself—where automation has advanced most rapidly—employment has gone up 73 percent, or more than three times as fast as the population.

This rapid increase in employment has occurred because of mechanization—not in spite of it. The building of machines them-

selves—plus their installation, maintenance, and the construction of new factories to house them—has opened up thousands of job opportunities that never existed before.

Employment in the field of electrical machinery, for example, has more than trebled during this period. In other machinery it has increased by 150 percent.

In the specialized field of automation itself, the mere manufacture of the necessary instruments of measurement and control has mushroomed into a \$3 billion business which already employs as many men as the auto industry did in the middle 1930's.

But that is only the beginning. As mechanization has enlarged the output and the purchasing power of our people, it has also multiplied enormously their demand for services. So they, in their turn, employ more doctors and dentists, more engineers and scientists, and more teachers and clergymen. They send out more of their laundry, and they eat more often in restaurants. Even the fact that they have more leisure time has created more jobs for others. Employment in tourist courts and camps has more than tripled. Theaters, movies, amusement parks, and similar establishments provide 75 percent more jobs than formerly. The purchase of books has doubled, and expenditures for home music have trebled. And so it goes. Employment in the service industries alone has risen by more than 2 million during these 14 years. That is a jump of 65 percent.

The same thing has happened, too, in the general field of trade. As the volume of production has increased, it has taken more workers to sell and to handle these goods. Thus 6 million new jobs have been opened up by the growing employment demands of department stores, shops, offices, builders, bankers, utilities, bus lines, trucking companies, and others in this category.

Finally, of course, our advance in technology has created whole new industries and vast new fields of opportunity. In television, antibiotics, airconditioning, many new branches of electronics, and now, in atomic energy—just to mention a few. So with each passing year, and with every new invention, our people have a wider choice of jobs; and today it is reported that there are more than 40,000 different ways whereby Americans can earn a living.

But suppose, for example, that all technological progress in the auto industry had stopped back in 1908, and that we were to try to build a 1955 car, at today's wages, with the tools and machines we used then. Such a car, if it could be produced at all, would cost well in excess of \$65,000.

How many cars would there be on the road? And how many roads would we have? How many jobs would there be in Detroit, and in the oil fields, and the tire-making industry—or even in our steel mills for that matter? Why, millions of our workers would be idle, and America would rank among the so-called backward nations of the world.

The time has come to nail this propaganda for the fraud that it is. The facts show that only through the widest possible use of new and better machines can we hope to achieve the fullest measure of employment and a higher standard of living.

While we are at this business of nailing, let's tackle another dangerous deception that the busy propagandists are perpetrating these days: That is the charge that the greedy owners of industry have grabbed the lion's share of the fruits of technology, while the workers have been robbed of the rightful rewards of their mounting mechanized production.

Fortunately, the facts are readily available in a study made by Allen W. Rucker, published by the Eddy-Rucker-Nichols Co., Cambridge, Mass. This study covers the 33-year period from 1914 to 1947 and is based entirely on the United States Census of Manufacturers and other official Government reports.

I do not suppose that anyone will challenge the authenticity of the facts which he presents. This is what they show:

On a man-hour basis, over this entire period, the output of the workers and machines, in American manufacturing as a whole, increased by 161 percent; the real wages of the men, measured in terms of purchasing power, increased 157 percent; the relative prices of manufactured products, measured in terms of hourly wages, declined 61 percent.

The real wages of the worker have advanced "at almost exactly the same rate as the improvement in productivity." Under the American system of manufacturing, the advance in such wages "depends wholly upon advances in productivity." The report concludes that the manufacturing industry on the whole has passed on to its customers and employees "virtually all the 'savings' from increased productivity"—that rarely, and only temporarily, have the owners retained any gains whatever from this source.

To support Mr. Rucker's statements, I call attention to one additional fact which is not contained in his report: Back in 1914, the share of the national income which went to the owners of business in the form of dividends was about 6 percent; but in 1947, their share amounted only to about 3 percent. So over this 33-year period the owners who put up the money for all the machines that made increased production possible found that their slice of our total economic pie had been cut approximately in half.

It may well be asked, of course, why industry continues to spend billions of dollars upon the development and purchase of improved machines if its owners receive no direct gains from these expenditures. And the answer to that, as we know, is all bound up in one simple and compelling word: competition.

When a business in America fails to keep its plants modern, and thus allows its more efficient competitors to undersell its products in the marketplace, that business is on the way out. Unless it can recover its lost ground quickly, it is through. The money that its owners have invested in it will be largely wiped out—and so, of course, will the jobs of all its employees. Thereafter, in a very important sense, technological improvement is simply the process by which we protect, not only the investment of the owners, but also the job security of every industrial worker.

I conclude my argument with a quotation from Philip Murray, president of the CIO. Standing before a convention of the CIO, not long before his unfortunate death, he said:

"I do not know of a single, solitary instance where a great technological gain has taken place in the United States of America that it has actually thrown people out of work. I do not know of it—I am not aware of it—because the industrial revolution that has taken place in the United States in the past 25 years has brought into the employment field an additional 20 million people."

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of legislation to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to \$1.25 per hour, I include in my remarks certain

information prepared for me by a reliable source.

The information follows:

Number and classes of employees covered under Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949 and number and classes not covered or are exempted

	Covered and not exempted	Not covered or are exempted	Total
Manufacturing.....	15,448,000	683,000	16,131,000
Mining.....	747,000	21,000	768,000
Construction.....	614,000	1,951,000	2,565,000
Wholesaling.....	1,933,000	846,000	2,779,000
Retailing.....	230,000	6,698,000	6,928,000
Finance, insurance, real estate.....	1,048,000	744,000	1,792,000
Transportation, communication, and utilities.....	3,441,000	515,000	3,956,000
Miscellaneous.....	741,000	3,447,000	4,188,000
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries.....	14,000	3,052,000	3,066,000
Domestic service.....		2,021,000	2,021,000
Total.....	23,976,000	19,978,000	43,954,000

Source: Department of Labor.

The Fair Labor Standards Act applies, with certain sizable exceptions, to all employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce, with out regard to size of firm or whether the employee works in factory, office, or at home.

Coverage under the wage-hour provisions deals with the worker individually, rather than with the employing establishment; if the individual's work is in interstate commerce and his job is not exempt, he is covered regardless of the basic nature of the business. Many firms employ both covered and noncovered workers on the same premises.

Exemptions in the act exclude about half of the workers in interstate commerce who would otherwise be eligible. White-collar jobs—executive, administrative, professional, and outside selling jobs—are specifically excluded. Employees in retail or service establishments where more than 50 percent of the annual dollar volume of sales is made within the State are exempted. Also exempt are certain cannery workers and food processors, workers in logging if the total number of employees does not exceed 12, certain agricultural workers and handlers of agricultural products within the area of production, certain employees of the fishing and maritime industries, workers on small county newspapers, and switchboard operators at exchanges with fewer than 750 stations.

The law permits payment of subminimum rates to learners, apprentices, messengers, and handicapped persons in protected employment. It sets no monetary rates for these categories but authorizes the Wage-Hour Administrator to approve pay scales lower than 75 cents an hour through certification of a limited number of subminimum workers to the extent necessary in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment.

HOW IS ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT SUPERVISED?

Enforcement is in charge of an administrator who has a staff of employees in Washington. The continental United States is divided into 10 regions, each under the supervision of a regional director. The territories embraced by the regional offices are as follows:

Boston: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

New York: New Jersey and New York.

Philadelphia: Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

Birmingham: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

Cleveland: Michigan and Ohio.

Chicago: Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Kansas City: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Dallas: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

San Francisco: Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

Nashville: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In North Carolina enforcement is under the supervision of the State Labor Department under a cooperative agreement. The same arrangement is true with respect to approximately one-half of the counties in Minnesota.

In addition to the continental regional offices there are Territorial offices in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Field offices under the jurisdiction of the regional offices are located in almost every State.

The actual number of investigators throughout the States and Territories at present fluctuates between 480 and 500. The investigators have authority under the statute to enter places of business, examine books and records and to interview employers and employees to determine whether the statute is being violated.

The remedies available where violations are found are:

1. Suits for injunctions to prevent future violations.
2. Criminal prosecution.
3. Suits by the Secretary of Labor to recover unpaid wages when such suits are requested by employees.
4. Suits by employees themselves to recover double the amount of unpaid wages.

Number of employees and number of violations for each of the last 8 fiscal years

Fiscal year	Employees	Violations
1947	1,509	20,570
1948	1,131	15,799
1949	1,110	18,180
1950	1,253	13,446
1951	1,821	18,908
1952	1,618	24,321
1953	1,375	22,136
1954	1,046	20,694

Source: Department of Labor.

GAAT Renews United States Curbs on Food Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to a news dispatch from Geneva, Switzerland, under date of March 7, and appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 8.

The article has to do with the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—and brings forcibly to mind the recent battle on the House floor over the renewal and extension of our Trade Agreements Act.

Our farm groups should be on guard, since already our unknown members of this outlaw group at Geneva have prom-

ised other nations that restrictions set up under the general agriculture act are soon to be set aside.

Some of the outstanding proponents of our trade policies are in for a surprise. I refer to the steel and automobile groups. The latest move by GATT is to admit the six-nation European steel and coal group to membership. It is just possible some of our big domestic mass-production industries will join the great bulk of our domestic producers at the tariff "wailing wall."

The article follows:

GATT RENEWS UNITED STATES CURBS ON FOOD IMPORTS

GENEVA, March 7.—The 34 member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade have granted permission for the United States to continue to impose quantitative restrictions on certain agricultural imports, it was learned here today.

But the members also gave other countries permission to retaliate and seek compensation if affected by the restrictions, which are contained in section 22 of the United States Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This section mainly concerns imports of dairy produce and has led to clashes with several nations in the past. Holland once retaliated by slashing imports of wheat from the United States.

The United States is understood to have assured GATT that it will end any restrictions under the act as soon as they are no longer needed, and consult with interested countries before taking further action.

It also was learned that Switzerland will seriously study this year the possibility of joining GATT. It is thought that Switzerland would try to join it if it can obtain protection for home agriculture similar to that granted to the United States.

A statement published here today revealed that the six nations of the European coal-steel community intended to seek permanent recognition of organizations such as theirs in the revised GATT agreement.

The Mather Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a news story which well illustrates the happy results which can be achieved when labor and management join forces to solve a mutual problem.

The labor history of Toledo, Ohio, a great industrial center, is not unmarred by strikes and discord. In fact, there was a time when the city bore the stigma of poor labor-management relations and new industries were reluctant to locate there.

Today the situation is quite different—different because the labor unions and management leaders found that they had a common stake in better labor-management relationships and went to work to do something about it. Much of the credit goes to the Labor-Management Citizens Committee of Toledo, to the Toledo Industrial Development

Council, and to the individual leaders of labor and industry whose foresight, wisdom, and sense of community responsibility have made labor-management co-operation possible. Above all, tribute must be paid to the workers for their unselfishness, courage, and faith in the future of their city.

That is why I am proud, today, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Mather Story as told in the Toledo Blade of February 6, 1955. It is the latest example of how labor and management are working together for their mutual benefit which will be reflected in the welfare of the community as a whole.

THE MATHER STORY—UNION AND COMPANY COOPERATED—SUCCESS ACHIEVED BY JOINING HANDS IN FACE OF ADVERSITY

(By Frank R. Kane)

Henry T. Mather, president of Mather Spring Co., and other officials of his company had a date last night with their employees in UAW-CIO Local 12's headquarters.

Behind that meeting lies a remarkable story of union-management cooperation in a Toledo plant. It is the story of how a company and a union that had fought each other for years suddenly joined hands in the face of adversity and found that they could work together in solving common problems.

Three years ago Henry Mather would never have even contemplated meeting his employees at a union hall. To understand why not, you have to go back as far as 1911, when his father, Gordon M. Mather, founded Mather Spring in Toledo.

Gordon Mather was one of the pioneers of the auto industry. He developed the use of strong, flexible alloy steel for automotive springs and became the sole supplier of springs for Henry Ford's Model T. He also became friend and associate of such rugged early automotive giants as Ford and William C. Durant, founder of General Motors. And he ran Mather Spring much as Henry Ford operated the Ford Motor Co., as almost a one man show.

Mr. Mather was fiercely proud of maintaining an intimate relationship with his workers. He felt he had a personal responsibility for their welfare and he took pride in the fact that he had kept the firm operating in the depression and paid relatively high wages. But he also was convinced that so-called "outsiders" could never represent the interests of the employees effectively.

Naturally, when the UAW-CIO later organized Mather Spring, there was little love lost between Gordon Mather, with his strong personality and convictions, and a union that appeared to be challenging his single-handed control of the destinies of the company. Mr. Mather and the union respected each other as tough adversaries, but they also eyed each other with mutual suspicion and they fought hard and frequently.

Six years ago, Gordon Mather withdrew from active participation in the business because of advancing age and his son Henry took over. Henry Mather admired and respected his father and saw no reason to change his policies, particularly his fighting attitude toward the union.

Then 3 years ago, Mather Spring's management could see trouble coming. Throughout the years it had maintained a high level of quality in its product, but it had not kept pace with its competitors in improving plant efficiency and worker productivity. As a result, the company's production costs and prices were drastically out of line with the rest of the automotive-spring industry.

As Henry Mather later explained it, "The only reason that we were still in business in late 1952 was because the Government had imposed controls on alloy steel. Because of our high volume of production in

previous years, we had large allocations of this alloy steel and many auto firms found that if they wanted alloy steel springs, they had to buy from us."

Mr. Mather and other company officials were not kidding themselves. They knew that when the Government lifted controls on alloy steel, many of their customers would shift to lower-cost spring suppliers.

Drastic action was needed to reduce operating costs and make Mather Spring competitive. So Mr. Mather arranged for an impartial, objective survey of the business by an organization of management consulting engineers.

Together Mather officials and the consultants studied every phase of the company, figuring where they could reduce costs. Among other things, they reduced the number of different types of steel being stocked, so they could cut handling costs. They streamlined accounting procedures and they developed new production methods such as a \$150,000 assembly line which would combine operations then being done at 14 different centers in the Toledo plant.

During the discussions, the management consultants also pointed out that individual worker productivity would have to be considerably increased and this could only be done with the wholehearted cooperation of the employees and the union. So Mather officials arranged a meeting with the plant committee and international representatives of the UAW. They also conferred with Richard T. Gosser, UAW vice president.

Clarence "Buck" Tucker, chairman of the Mather unit of UAW Local 12, later said, "We went to that first meeting determined that we would be nothing more than good listeners. We thought the company was just going to wave a crying towel at us."

"But the management went into every detail of the company's competitive situation and their proposed program. They told us how they needed our help, that they wanted to install a new assembly line which would mean retiming practically every job in the plant."

"They convinced us that they were sincerely asking our cooperation. We decided to go along."

Both union and company officials later agreed that if the union had continued to maintain its attitude of suspicion and mistrust and fought the proposed changes, the cost-cutting program would have been a failure.

Both sides, however, settled down to cooperation. The union aided in the installation of the new assembly line and other improvements and did not oppose the introduction of new job standards as it could have done. The company agreed that in any case where there was a dispute over a time study of a job, a joint time study would be conducted by the management and the union. Actually the program worked so smoothly that the joint time-study provision was invoked by the union only a few times.

The company also conducted a training program for supervisors, on every subject from labor relations to departmental budgeting. It increased the supervisors' responsibilities and successfully encouraged early settlement of problems at the foremen-steward level.

A real test of the program at Mather Spring came early last year when the company had opportunity to bid on a big spring contract being let by one of the largest automobile manufacturers. At that time a number of Mather employees from the finishing department were laid off. If Mather got the business, seniority provisions in the union contract would require that these workers be called back before any new employees were hired.

But as William B. Barney, plant manager, pointed out: "This meant that the company

would be recalling the finishing department workers and placing them in other departments where they would have to be trained to do that work."

"Then when production in those other departments got underway more jobs would open up in the finishing department and those former finishing workers would go back to their department. Then we would have to hire new workers for the other departments and do the training job all over again. If we did it that way, it might take 6 months to get the new production underway."

Union officials explained the situation to the laid-off finishing department workers, who agreed to allow new workers to take the jobs in the other departments and to remain on layoff for another few weeks until work expanded in the finishing department.

"Because the union and the workers cooperated, we were able to meet our planned schedules on that very important contract," Mr. Barney said.

Company officials, however, reserved their highest praise for the continuing vigorous campaign for higher productivity that union officials themselves conducted at union meetings.

Mather Spring also improved its engineering, research, and sales departments. Within a few months the program was definitely on the way to success. Costs were reduced to competitive levels and the company was beginning to reestablish its former strong position in the industry.

Last night Henry Mather and other company officials reported on progress of the program to members of the Mather Spring unit of local 12 and their wives at a social get-together in the union hall. They had a good story to tell.

In the last 2 years employment has just about doubled at Mather Spring's 2 Toledo plants to 500. Last year the company had its biggest sales in history and employer-employee relationships have improved greatly. There has been only 1 written grievance filed by the union in 2 years.

At the same time the company is working to increase job security for the workers by developing new products in an attempt to lessen the firm's dependence on the auto industry.

In his letters to employees during this period, Henry Mather has always concluded with the phrase: "We are going places together." Today Mr. Mather, union officials, and rank-and-file workers at Mather Spring are looking forward to the future with confidence that by working together they can make their company successful from every standpoint.

Civil, Military Leaders Battle Over Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I want at this time to draw the attention of my colleagues to an article published in the Detroit News of February 27, 1955, which deals with a subject vital to the defense and commerce of our Nation.

In this article the writer, Mr. Robert S. Ball, gives an accurate picture of the behind-the-scenes struggle between civilian and military interests over what kind of common air-navigation system we should have.

The facts in this controversy are not all in but the background which this article supplies is important. I commend it for the attention of my colleagues:

CIVIL, MILITARY LEADERS BATTLE OVER AIRWAYS

(By Robert S. Ball)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—A bitter battle for control of the Federal airways system finds the might of the military establishment arrayed against embattled components of civil aviation.

The battle already has cost the public a reported \$500 million, and many additional millions are yet to be spent before it is resolved, whichever way it goes.

When the controversy erupts in a public inquiry, as now appears certain, these charges will be aired:

1. That the Pentagon has, under a veil of secrecy, spent more than \$350 million on an electronic short-range navigation system that still does not work satisfactorily, and will not for another 3 years.

IGNORED CONGRESS

2. That the Department of Defense violated the will of Congress in developing a system competitive with one agreed upon by all components of aviation and ordered into operation by congressional act.

3. That after the military air navigation system was once rejected by an interdepartmental committee evaluating competitive proposals, the Navy quietly pushed ahead with the competitive development which has led to the present controversy.

4. That the Defense Department has usurped the prerogatives of the State Department by seeking to impose its system as the universal air navigation system, for both military and commercial operations, in all North American Treaty Organization (NATO) countries.

SEEK TO JUNK SYSTEM

Immediately at issue is a decision to junk, starting June 30, a substantial portion of the existing civil airways system on which \$92 million already has been spent and an additional \$15 million is committed.

While the controversy is basically a split between military and civilian aviation, it has resulted in sharp disaffection between the Civil Aeronautics Administration (CAA) and its parent Department of Commerce, has State Department aviation chiefs seething, and has split the Air Transport Association (ATA) down the middle.

Here is the story as pieced together from official documents and the statements of informed persons who only recently were partially released from a pledge of secrecy:

Back in 1947 Congress directed the civil and military agencies to cooperate in the development of a common navigating system. A special committee of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics recommended a general system.

APPROVED PROJECT

Congress approved the recommendation and the project was launched with firm military support.

A new interdepartmental agency, the Air Navigation Development Board (ANDB) was established to amalgamate military and civilian technical knowledge, and finally there was evolved, what is known as VOR-DME (very high frequency omniranges and distance-measuring equipment).

This was adopted as the common system, to be used by both military and civilian aircraft, for cross-country navigation.

Pilots using this equipment are constantly informed as to their heading on the transmitter to which they are tuned as well as to the exact distance from the homing point.

NINETY PERCENT COMPLETE

In effect, the control tower operator can keep precise tabs on all approaching and departing aircraft.

Installation was begun in 1950. Today, the Federal common system is nearly 90 percent completed.

In addition to these CAA-operated ground stations, there are nearly 54,000 sets operating in aircraft, representing a total investment of approximately \$50 million.

It is now disclosed that almost immediately after the joint military-civilian agreement to proceed exclusively with the VOR-DME common system, the military started developing a rival system called TACAN (tactical air navigation).

What makes this duplicate expenditure of public funds even more grievous, in the eyes of Pentagon critics, is that the TACAN system is incompatible with the present system—in other words, it is on an overlapping wave band and both cannot be used.

Anniversary of the Independence of Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1918, Estonia proudly proclaimed her independence. For two centuries Estonia had suffered under Russian domination, beginning with the period when Peter I conquered the territory in 1710. Independence came only after many uprisings and bloody reprisals, of which the most notable was the revolution of 1905. In November of 1918 Estonia declared herself a democratic republic and repulsed an invading Red army. But in 1940 the Soviets seized the country.

It is important for us to remember that the spirit of freedom that lived in the hearts of Estonians in the past is no less alive today. We in the United States should keep faith with the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Ours is a nation forged out of the strength and convictions of people from many countries. Ours is a nation that has the capacity to aid in the rehabilitation of displaced persons. We should not be blinded by our fortunate position so that we cannot appreciate the hardships of others less fortunate. Nor should we forget that a concrete basis of hope is sustained by a generous policy of immigration and by a continued and more revealing congressional investigation of the Soviet crimes against the Baltic peoples. It is desirable that we correct any shortcomings in this respect.

One closing thought that I wish to call to the attention of the House is this: We in the United States are fundamentally one people. We are one people in the support of the Constitution of the United States. We believe in the freedom and dignity of man. We have faith in the ability of man to learn and grow and to overcome the obstacles in the path of his development. It seems to me that there might be more time spent toward

establishing a more certain and a more effective long-run policy of carrying the message of the American people to the world, and this applies to those locked behind the Iron Curtain.

Remarks of Mr. Paul M. Butler, Chairman, Democratic National Committee, Before the Kiwanis Club, Tallahassee, Fla., March 1, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the text of a splendid address delivered by the Honorable Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, before the Kiwanis Club of Tallahassee, the capital city of Florida, on March 1. Paul Butler has assumed executive leadership of the Democratic Party with a firm and capable hand, and his philosophy on politics and government is particularly refreshing. I recommend the reading of his address to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, honored guests, and members of the Kiwanis Club, I deeply appreciate the graciousness extended to me since I arrived in your Sunshine State. I feel even more honored by the fact that my visit to Florida coincides with the 110th anniversary of Florida's admission to the Union. Although this is not my first visit to Florida, it is by all odds the most pleasant. So much so, in fact, that I would like to remain much longer than the few short days my schedule permits.

How easy it must have been for the one who coined the phrase—"Any place in Florida is better than anywhere else"—though I suppose a minority of people elsewhere is still hard to convince.

I am especially pleased to accept the hospitality of your invitation and to have this opportunity to meet with you on the 40th anniversary of the founding of the first Kiwanis Club. It was in 1915 that an exciting new idea entered the lives of a few business and professional men in Detroit, Mich., and in Cleveland, Ohio. Allen S. Browne, a professional organizer, set about to form a mutual-interest club for Detroit businessmen. So 5 men, together with 100 other pioneers, organized the first Kiwanis Club. The idea expanded beyond the limits of the community where it was born. Later in the same eventful year, Cleveland businessmen found the Kiwanis idea had magic appeal. They, too, set up a club and there established the universality of what was soon to become an international movement.

The very next year saw Kiwanis grow from 2 to 32 clubs. Today, after 40 years of unselfish service which has made life better for everyone it has touched, we have seen the Kiwanis international membership move steadily toward the quarter-million mark.

The whole concept of Kiwanis has been one of ever-expanding service and understanding. It found expression in its broad policies of rural-urban cooperation, public affairs and working with underprivileged children. It has emphasized the need for international understanding.

During World War II, Kiwanis pledged itself to morale building for the war effort. But you did more than just that. You started collecting scrap rubber and metal, sponsoring victory gardens, marshalling blood donations, entertaining troops, and watching over the dependents of men who were fighting overseas. Your motto was: "Victory by united effort—by individual service." In 1945, Kiwanis was keyed to victory with the theme, "Win the war—build the peace."

In 1948, the Kiwanis awareness of the realities of world leadership was reflected in the growing number of public affairs activities. Much interest was shown in the United Nations, housing, universal military training, and other vital matters.

In evaluating the 40 years since the first Kiwanis Club was formed, Mr. Dan E. Engdahl, president of the Kiwanis International had this to say:

"As 1954 drew to a close, there was a growing awareness that the year ahead, while marking 40 years of growth, would also mark 40 years of preparation for tomorrow.

"We have moved from one milestone to the next until today we find ourselves at No. 40. Here the road forks. One branch is straight and level. It goes on and on until the road is lost in the mist.

"The other fork winds upward over narrow ridges and chasms. The grade is steep. The way is sometimes clogged with boulders. But leads to the summit of the towering mountain—this we can see.

"The easy road, the way of least resistance, is not worth taking. By following the rugged path of challenge we continue to be worthy of those many men whose pioneering efforts have built our Nation and our beloved Kiwanis.

"The rugged road means ever-expanding service . . . and more dynamic leadership for the free world."

It is about our preparation for tomorrow and the road we choose that I would like to talk with you today. We will be able to follow the rugged road of ever-expanding service; we will be able to give dynamic leadership for the free world only if we understand what living in a free democracy means, only if we have greater tolerance and understanding of one another here at home and of our allies abroad.

Your invitation to me as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, a political partisan, is a fine example of what living in a democracy means—of what tolerance and understanding of one another means. If the time should come in America when a gathering of this sort becomes impossible, then we are in trouble.

Now politicians have always been looked upon with a certain suspicion in our country. You may remember what Artemus Ward, the American humorist of the last century, once said in recommending himself: "I am not a politician and my habits are good."

This attitude of apprehension and caution which many of us hold toward politicians is strongly rooted in America. The ever-present raised eyebrow and tongue in cheek of the man in the street when he talks about the professional politician is in part healthy.

For all of us, as citizens in a democracy, should keep constant check upon those men and women who, from every level of public office, from township advisory board to the White House, govern us.

It is our task as citizens to see that they use the power which we have entrusted to them in a responsible way. We need constantly to keep looking over their shoulders to see what they are doing in the public trust.

What disturbs me, however, is the attitude of almost complete cynicism with which too many of us look upon politics. How many of you have not heard someone say, or perhaps yourselves have said, with ill-disguised contempt, "I want no son or daughter of mine in politics."

To serve one's country in the armed services is considered an honor but to serve one's country by taking part in the process of government and the selection of our officers of government, which is politics, is too often considered not quite respectable.

Perhaps this is because in the past few years officeholders, from both parties, have betrayed their public trust. And because they were in public service, their betrayals received widespread attention. But we can no more generalize about politicians than we can about any other group. I think it well to recall the wise words of Thomas Jefferson: "The want or imperfection of the moral sense in some men, like the want or imperfection of the sense of sight and hearing in others, is no proof that it is a general characteristic of the species."

What I am concerned about is that we recognize in America the importance and, indeed, the necessity of politicians if democratic government is to be more than just a high-sounding phrase.

In a country as large as the United States, with so many sectional and economic and social differences, we must have persons skilled in the art of resolving conflict, persons able to bring out the seemingly irreconcilable variety that is America, national policies which will keep our country from falling either into revolution or reaction, but rather moving steadily ahead.

Such artists are all too infrequently described as what they are: Politicians.

Therefore, we must seek in America to recruit the best talent that we have for political leadership, in both our major parties.

A good way to begin this task is to remove some of the stigma we commonly attach to the word "politician," while keeping an ever-vigilant eye on our public officeholders. And those of us who have some responsibility of political leadership can do much in this respect by seeing to it that men and women of integrity and capacity are encouraged to seek public office.

It is, or least has been with few exceptions, the hallmark of the American system of government that our political parties freely and enthusiastically compete at the polls and then graciously, though often reluctantly, accept the people's verdict.

The victory does not as a rule try to exterminate the loser. Our democratic form of government has grown strong on the basis of our two-party political system.

The annihilation of one party by labeling it the party of treason would, indeed, be fatal to that most successful political system in the history of the world.

I wish that all of you might have heard the fine tribute that was paid by the Democratic Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, to the outgoing Republican Speaker, JOE MARTIN, on the opening day of the new 84th Congress a few weeks ago. Mr. RAYBURN pointed out that he treasured the personal friendship that had existed between Mr. MARTIN and himself for a number of years. And then Speaker RAYBURN said: "There are no degrees in truthfulness. There are no degrees in honesty. You are 100 percent, or you are not. I have found you, JOE MARTIN, 100 percent in both."

This is not to say that the two great parties do not have genuine and profoundly different convictions about the important political issues of the day. But because the Republicans believe sincerely in one issue, and we Democrats believe with equal sincerity the opposite, it does not make one or the other lacking in honesty, integrity, or more important, in patriotism.

Character assassination has become a comparatively recent but nonetheless vicious part of our political campaigns. It is a political role unbecoming to the American scene, a campaign technique that places the desire for political office above the interests of our country. And it has been

known to reach beyond political campaigns into the personal lives of the American people wherein neighbor is turned against neighbor, and even family ties are threatened by accusations, many times unfounded, and more often unproved.

Let us remember the Ten Commandments in our daily lives and in our political campaigns. Let us disagree honestly and vigorously on public issues but without stooping to impugn the personal character of the men and women who disagree with our own point of view.

It is in great part the genius of America that we are all free to be different. The maintenance of that freedom is surely one common goal on which all of us can and should unite in the best interests of our common country.

Hon. Arthur G. Klein, of New York, Receives Community Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY A. FINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 27, one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Representative of the 19th Congressional District of New York, was awarded a plaque by the East End Temple of New York. This was in recognition of his exceptional services to the community and took the form of a citation, hailing him as the Man of the Year. Mr. Samuel Nichols, president of the Men's Club of the East Side Temple, presented the award with an introductory statement that I will include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He said:

We are presenting Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN with our first community service award today. We all feel deeply indebted to him for his immeasurable services to the East Side. His help to people, institutions, and organizations has been outstanding. There is not a philanthropic or communal enterprise in this part of the city, Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, or nonsectarian, that has not known the benevolent influence of his assistance, and often his direct participation. There is not an institution with a public service objective that has not known the warmth of his encouragement.

But while we are here to pay recognition to these community services of his, I must not forego the opportunity to remind all of us of Congressman KLEIN's exceptional services to the maintenance of the noblest traditions of our country. Whatever our political views, we must acknowledge with respect that in him we have a tireless champion of the freedoms and rights of every American, that have been granted to us by the work of the Founding Fathers of this country. I recall in particular his forthright challenge to the iniquities of the McCarran Immigration and Naturalization Law. I recall his courageous stand, in and out of Congress, that this country must not put up with the concept of second-class citizenship. I recall his almost solitary voice against the invasion of our privacy by the condonement of wire-tapping practice. I recall his humane understanding of the needs of the latest of our large immigrant groups when he designated for a West Point appointment a young man

of Puerto Rican origin. I recall, too, his forthright challenge to the late Mr. Rankin.

Congressman KLEIN is a son of the East Side. As its Representative in Congress he has been responsive to the needs and wishes of his constituents; but he is remarkable in another and broader aspect. He has been responsive, in and out of Congress, to the heartbeat of all Americans.

We are proud of you, Congressman KLEIN; and I am proud to be able to give you the citation in behalf of our temple.

Memorandum Prepared by the Massachusetts Maritime Academy for the Consideration of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an informative memorandum prepared by Arthur C. Sullivan, chairman of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, showing why necessary appropriations should be made for the fiscal year of 1956 to keep in existence the present State maritime academies.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE MASSACHUSETTS MARITIME ACADEMY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

It is reported that no money is to be appropriated to carry out the aims and purposes of a law enacted under which the various States have assumed obligations in the way of establishing colleges in the furtherance of the merchant marine.

The law to which reference is made is "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," enacted on June 20, 1874, and later, the purposes of the 1874 act were reaffirmed by H. R. 24145, approved March 4, 1911.

This law is now included in the United States Code, title 34, chapter 19, starting with paragraph 1121, and has as its purposes:

I

"To promote nautical education, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and empowered to furnish . . . a suitable vessel of the Navy . . . to be used for the benefit of any nautical school or school or college having a nautical branch established at each of the following parts of the United States: Boston, Philadelphia, New York . . . upon the condition that there shall be maintained at such port a school or branch of a school for the instruction of youths in navigation, steamship marine engineering, and all matters pertaining to the proper construction, equipment, and sailing of vessels or any particular branch thereof."

This law has been amended as it applies to specific locations, but otherwise it is in force and effect.

II

This law also provided:

"That a sum not exceeding the amount annually appropriated by any State or municipality for the purpose of maintaining such a marine school . . . is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of aiding in the maintenance and support of such school or schools, provided, however, that

the sum for any one school would not exceed \$25,000."

The Massachusetts Legislature has appropriated the following amounts for each of the last 5 fiscal years:

1950.....	\$211,416
1951.....	200,704
1952.....	236,159
1953.....	261,700
1954.....	279,231

It is to be noted that the annual grant of \$25,000 has not been increased since 1874.

III

The law also provided that "The President of the United States is authorized . . . to detail proper officers of the Navy as superintendents of or instructors in such school."

At the present time the superintendents at all the State academies are former naval officers; 1 is a vice admiral, 2 are rear admirals, and the other is a commodore.

There are officers and enlisted personnel assigned by the Navy Department to conduct a course in naval science corresponding with similar courses at other colleges, to which reference is herein made to Brown University at Providence, R. I., Dartmouth College in Hanover, N. H.; Harvard College at Cambridge, Mass.; Holy Cross College at Worcester, Mass.; Tufts College, Medford, Mass.; Yale College at New Haven, Conn.

In compliance with the 1874 law, academies were established in four States, and these academies were later authorized to grant bachelor degrees.

New York was the first to comply with the law by establishing a maritime academy in 1874. Later there were academies established:

Massachusetts, 1891.

California, 1929.

Maine, 1941.

For a period supervisory control of the State academies was under the Navy Department and later for a short period the supervision was taken over by the Coast Guard, but the general supervision of the State academies and other colleges comes under the Maritime Administration.

After the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and in accordance with the amendment thereof, the Maritime Administration took over the supervising control of the State maritime academies and adopted rules and regulations for the administration of the State maritime academies.

In 1938 there was established by the Maritime Administration the United States Marine Cadet Corps and for a period to 1942 the members of this corps were all trained in State maritime academies, and it was provided that it was a requirement for Federal aid that the State academies agree to admit out-of-State residents as students in the State academies in a number not to exceed one-third of the academy capacity.

It was determined in 1942 that the requirements of the Maritime Service exceeded the capacity of the State academies, so a Federal Academy was established at Kings Point to supplement the available opportunities for the training of officers.

It is to be noted that when the war requirements for officers were met and the normal needs did not require the full capacity of the State and Federal Academies, the contest started as to whether the United States Government should recognize its obligation under the 1874 law or should such money as is available for maritime training be used exclusively for the maintenance of the Federal Maritime Academy. The authorized enrollment at the 4 State academies is approximately 710 students, which is approximately the same number as those under training at Kings Point. The Federal subsidy to the State academies is re-

ported to be about 20 percent of the cost of operating and maintaining the Federal Academy.

The decision to discontinue the Federal subsidy under the 1874 law is not based upon the economy of the situation for the training at the State academies is at substantially less cost than the training at the Federal Academy. At the Federal Academy the Federal Government provides the premises, as well as all of the instructors for the academic subjects whereas in the State academies, the Federal Government merely makes a contribution to partially reimburse the State academies.

It appears to be the present opinion of some that the 1874 law which has been in effect over 80 years does not reflect our national tradition so that Federal aid to State colleges should be discontinued on the 81st year.

In addition to the grants and allowances under the 1874 act, there have been other funds made available, but these funds are in the manner of assistance to the students in attendance at the State and Federal Academies as indicated below.

Starting in 1942 the Federal aid was increased so that the students in attendance at the Federal and State Maritime Academies were granted aid in two ways:

1. There was a subsistence allowance of approximately 75 cents a day.
2. There was an allowance to each cadet of \$65 per month. In 1950 this was changed to \$200 a year.

For the fiscal period ending June 30, 1955, the Federal aid to the students was \$200 for books, uniforms, etc., plus \$275 for subsistence, on the basis of 710 students at the State academies and the same number at the Federal academy.

During the last session of Congress the House of Representatives acted favorably upon House bill 9434 which established that the need for officers for the maritime service was so demanding as to require the establishment and continuance of a Federal Maritime Academy with the students to have the same financial allowance as granted the cadets at the United States Academies for the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

It is reported that the President has recommended that the appropriations to the various States in compliance with the 1874 law be discontinued, as well as the subsistence and other allowances to the students in an amount on a parity with the students in attendance at Kings Point.

If the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is required to provide the training ship at the academy the cost would be prohibitive, as it would be for all the other State academies.

It appears to be a determined fact that the need for maritime training is an essential today as in the past, or there would be no need for the continuance of a Federal academy at Kings Point on the basis suggested by House bill 9434.

At the present time the applications are being considered by the commissioners of the Massachusetts Maritime Academy for the class to be admitted in August 1955, and the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, is being considered by the Massachusetts Legislature, so some present policy determination must be made in connection with the Federal subsidy.

The above is not intended to be all inclusive, but is merely a summary of the situation.

It would be appreciated if each member of the Massachusetts congressional delegation would advise as to what further details are desired.

ARTHUR C. SULLIVAN,
Chairman, Board of Commissioners,
Massachusetts Maritime Academy.
FEBRUARY 1, 1955.

Good Evening

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the Good Evening column by Clifford B. Ward, of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel. The views expressed by this article, in my opinion, are both important and timely.

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

Most human beings have a tough time of it. There may be a few favored individuals who go through life without ever encountering any bad bumps in the road, but I doubt it.

Living is a battle and only a few take part in a battle without getting hurt.

I think that a lot of death certificates are improperly made out.

Most people die, not of the things that doctors write on death certificates, but as a result of having lived. An auto ends up on the junk pile, not because its fuel pump failed, but because of the long service which caused not only the fuel pump but a lot of other things to fail. But human beings, of course, are differently constituted. One person gets bumped and becomes embittered, another one gets bumped and becomes a more mellow, kinder person as a result of it. The one person feels sorry for himself, the other has a better appreciation of what the other fellow's sorrow is.

MARKED DIFFERENCES

Now and then I run into people with a grudge against the American system of private enterprise because of what happened to them back in the depression days in the early thirties. Most people who went through that period were hurt badly. Some of them took it in stride, others made it an excuse for espousing causes aimed at destroying our country. But there again we run into the differences between people. Some people can take a lot of pain, others can't take any. One person's first inclination is to feel sorry for himself, another would rather die than yell "ouch."

At any given time in any community, there are hundreds and hundreds of cases of human beings in serious trouble of one sort or another. Every once in a while some particular case is dramatized for public attention making it seem that the case is unique, but actually for every one case dramatized there are many just like it that never get attention, simply because many people do not want to bring attention to their troubles.

DEPRESSING ITEMS GALORE

Actually, on any day any newspaper could be filled from front page to last page with news stories of human beings in trouble. Almost any large hospital has scores of cases that would rate commanding the attention of the public, but normal human beings couldn't take living constantly in an abnormally stressed atmosphere of suffering and death. Oddly enough those who probably have the greatest claims on the pity of other human beings object to having their troubles publicized.

This is not an age in which much attention is paid to any virtues. Virtues are moral things and moral things are ignored. Most people have never heard of the word "fortitude," do not know it is such a thing

as a virtue and know even less about its moral necessity. If life is a battle, it is fought with weapons and the weapons are virtues. All of the good things derive from virtues. Loyalty, courage, patriotism, honesty, manliness, generosity, kindness, and the like are all moral things. The word "virtue" itself derives from the Latin for "manliness." What a ghastly thing it is to send a soldier onto a battlefield without having taught him anything about how to fight in defense of himself. It is even more ghastly to send people onto a battlefield of life without any training in the use of the moral weapons they must have if they are to survive the fight.

Kalewala Day of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1835, the Finnish national epic, the Kalewala, first appeared in book form. The 120th anniversary of this great epic was celebrated on the 28th of February of this year. Composed of folk verses about the deeds of three semidivine brothers of gigantic stature who lived in Kalewala, the epic has had a great effect on all Finnish art.

The Kalewala is a mythical land of happiness and abundance. This epic of rich mythology is composed in the eight-syllable trochaic line that was imitated by Longfellow in *Hiawatha*. Scholars had known of the Kalewala since 1733, but the verses had to wait until the following century to appear in print.

The verses were first collected by two Finnish physicians, Dr. Zakarias Topelius, who published fragments of the epic in 1822, and Dr. Elias Lönnrot, who was responsible for the 1835 edition and the Kalewala as it appears today.

Appropriately close to Kalewala Day is the date of March 5, the anniversary of the birth of John Ludvig Runeberg, 1804-77. This great national poet of Finland, like all Finnish authors of his day, wrote in Swedish. From 1837 until the end of his life, he served as professor of Latin at Provoo, near Helsinki. The Finnish national anthem was taken from Runeberg's *The Tales of Ensign Stal*, 1844. Among his other best known works are the peasant epic *The Elk-hunters*, 1832, a cycle of romances, *King Fjalmar*, 1844, and *Nadeschda*, 1841. Runeberg's works have been, in part, translated into English.

The country of Finland, through its struggle to remain free and independent, has endeared itself in the hearts of all Americans. The relations of the United States with Finland have been noteworthy for the respect each holds for the other. It would be a sad day for the world if Soviet imperialism ever endangered Finnish independence. And I know that I speak for all Americans in saying that we intend that a free Finland shall continue the fine contributions that distinguishes her history and traditions.

National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include herein a communication from J. Wellington Hall, national secretary of the American Material Handling Society, Inc., commenting in House Joint Resolution 231 designating a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week:

AMERICAN MATERIAL HANDLING SOCIETY, INC.,
Toledo, Ohio, March 4, 1955.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,

Member of Congress, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RODINO: That you are thoroughly cognizant of the varied activities of the material handling industry and profession is evidenced in the extension of remarks you prepared in regard to a National Material Handling Week. I will, therefore, not take your time in a long discourse on material handling functions, as the contents of your speech is indicative of your familiarity with the subject.

I would, however, like to again state that there can be no industrial activity in which material handling does not occupy a most important niche. Consider the United States Postal Department as a governmental function.

The conveyor industry has in operation some moving sidewalks. R. C. Sollenberger, in an article from the Conveyor Equipment Manufacturers Association Bulletin, states, and I quote:

"On May 24, 1954, the country's first public passenger conveyor went into service at the Erie terminal of the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad, Jersey City, N. J. Length of the conveyor 227 feet, more than half of it up a 10-percent grade, with an approximate speed of 1½ miles per hour and a capacity of 10,800 people per hour."

In planning, may be the replacement of the 42d Street subway shuttle trains by passenger conveyors, as announced by Col. Sydney H. Bingham, manager of New York's Transit Authority. Other projects in planning are: In Cincinnati, an 80 block long system for keeping buses out of the downtown area, a 14-block long system for Cleveland, and many others, all intended to reduce the traffic and congestion in the downtown areas of great cities. Quotes Mr. Sollenberger, "It took the unholy traffic congestion in our cities to make them (passenger conveyors) economically feasible and probably downright necessary."

To cite another example of the material handling engineer's use of all available means to reduce the cost of transportation, the communications industry has increased the efficiency of material handling equipment tremendously. By use of two-way radio communication, it is now possible to have the apparatus do the work for which it is intended, eliminating the time formerly lost waiting for assignments, by having a piece of material handling equipment formerly assigned to a small area, because of lack of communications, now able to cover tremendously large areas, because of the central control. Today, no piece of mobile equipment, be it a bulldozer, crane, overhead or crawler, yard locomotive, lift truck, highway

truck, steamship, airplane, or freight train is further away than the microphone.

In my original letter to you, requesting a National Material Handling Week, the intent was to project the material handling industry and profession into the niche in the industrial organizational structure of this Nation which it is, and by right should be, entitled to occupy.

The designation, in itself, poses a particular problem. The organizations participating, in the strictest sense of the word, make and use as many types of equipment and materials as can be found in an analysis of American industry.

The one common interest is material handling. And material handling is composed of many things. The railroad, the highway truck, the airplane, the conveyor, the pipeline, the fork lift truck, the industrial tractor-trailer train, the lowly, but so important hand truck, ad infinitum.

But, basic to all of these is the package. How shall it be handled? How can it be handled? How best can we transport or warehouse bulk commodities in steel, brass, bar, coil or strip stock or chemicals, liquids and powders? How best can we load and fully load, ships, planes, trucks or freight cars.

Then, too, the manufacturers of pallets for transportation and warehousing are an integral part of the tremendous material handling machine.

Therefore, the communications industry, the packaging industry, the pallet industry are basic to the concept of good material handling.

It is with extreme pleasure that I note your resolution House Joint Resolution 231, a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week.

This designation acknowledges the various organizations which are vital cogs in the immense machine known as material handling, whose various contributions to the function have contributed so much to the Nation's economy.

I would request of you, in the furtherance of this effort, that this letter be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of value to the program to establish a National Better Material Handling and Packaging Week.

Very truly yours,

J. W. HALL,
National Secretary.

Thomas G. Masaryk—World Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1850, Thomas G. Masaryk was born.

The world was busy that year. Jenny Lind, the Swedish Nightingale, was giving her first American concert. California was admitted as a State. Senator Henry Clay was striving to bring together the rapidly dividing interests of the North and the South.

But, to the world, nothing that happened in 1850 was more important than the birth of this one child.

Thomas Masaryk might have gone down in history as a great organizer. It was through his dedicated efforts that the diverse peoples of Czechoslovakia were welded into one.

Thomas Masaryk might have had his name graven among the great as a scholar. The brilliance of his pen produced books which will, long after his death, be praised as outstanding contributions to the science of politics.

Thomas Masaryk might have been forever known as a prophet. It was he who said, "A Communist is only a Czarist with his uniform on wrong side out."

But, to me, Thomas Masaryk was more than an organizer, more than a scholar; even more than a prophet.

He was a patriot who lived with his people; for his people. He was a lover of liberty who extended the hand of enduring friendship to all men who loved freedom, irrespective of their breed or their birth.

Thomas G. Masaryk was—and is—a hero of the world.

Prime Minister Churchill's Address on Deterrent Defense and the Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEWART L. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today the full text of the address delivered to the House of Commons last week by Prime Minister Churchill. This is certainly the most thorough and perceptive analysis of defense in the age of the hydrogen bomb which we have yet had. Those interested in this paramount problem will, I am sure, want to read, and reread, this statement. The address follows:

We live in a period happily unique in human history, when the whole world is divided intellectually and to a large extent geographically between the creeds of Communist discipline and individual freedom, and when at the same time this mental and psychological division is accompanied by the possession by both sides of the obliterating weapons of the nuclear age.

We have antagonisms now as deep as those of the Reformation and its reactions, which led to the Thirty Years' War. But now they are spread over the whole world instead of only over a small part of Europe. We have to some extent the geographical division of the Mongol invasion in the 13th century. We only more ruthless and more thorough. We have force and science, hitherto the servants of man, now threatening to become his master.

I am not pretending to have a solution for a permanent peace between the nations which could be unfolded this afternoon. We pray for it. Nor shall I try to discuss the cold war which we all detest but have to endure. I shall only venture to offer to the House some observations, mainly of a general character, on which I have pondered long and which I hope may be tolerantly received as they are intended by me.

NEW SOURCES OF POWER

And here may I venture to make a personal digression? I do not pretend to be an expert or to have technical knowledge of this prodigious sphere of science. But in my long friendship with Lord Cherwell I have

tried to follow and even predict the evolution of events. I hope that the house will not reprove me for vanity or conceit if I repeat what I wrote a quarter of a century ago:

"We know enough," I said, "to be sure that the scientific achievements of the next 50 years will be far greater, more rapid and more surprising than those we have already experienced. High authorities tell us that new sources of power vastly more important than any we yet know will surely be discovered."

"Nuclear energy is incomparably greater than the molecular energy which we use today. The coal a man can get in a day can easily do 500 times as much work as the man himself. Nuclear energy is at least 1 million times more powerful still. If the hydrogen atoms in a pound of water could be prevailed upon to combine together and form helium, they would suffice to drive a 1,000-horsepower engine for a whole year. If the electrons—those tiny planets of the atomic systems—were induced to combine with the nuclei in the hydrogen, the horsepower liberated would be 120 times greater still."

"There is no question among scientists that this gigantic source of energy exists. What is lacking is the match to set the bonfire alight, or, it may be, the detonator to cause the dynamite to explode."

This is no doubt not quite an accurate description of what has been discovered, but as it was published in the Strand magazine of December 1931—24 years ago—I hope that my plea to have long taken an interest in the subject may be indulgently accepted by the house.

What is the present position? Only three countries possess, in varying degrees, the knowledge and the power to make nuclear weapons. Of these, the United States is overwhelmingly the chief.

Owing to the breakdown in the exchange of information between us and the United States since 1946, we have had to start again independently on our own. Fortunately executive action was taken promptly by the Right Honorable Gentleman, the leader of the opposition, to reduce as far as possible the delay in our nuclear development and production. By his initiative we have made our own atomic bombs. Confronted with the hydrogen bomb I have tried to live up to the Right Honorable Gentleman's standard. We have started to make that one too.

GRAVE DECISION

It is this grave decision which forms the core of the defense paper which we are discussing this afternoon. Although the Soviet stockpile of atomic bombs may be greater than that of Britain, British discoveries may well place us above them in fundamental science.

May I say that for the sake of simplicity and to avoid verbal confusion, I use the expression "atomic bombs" and also "hydrogen bombs" instead of "thermonuclear," and I keep "nuclear" for the whole lot.

There is an immense gulf between the atomic and the hydrogen bomb. The atomic bomb, with all its terror, did not carry us outside the scope of human control or man-made events in thought or action, in peace or war. But when Mr. STERLING COLE, the chairman of the United States Congressional [Atomic] Committee, gave out a year ago—February 17, 1954—the first comprehensive review of the hydrogen bomb, the entire foundation of human affairs was revolutionized and mankind placed in a situation both measureless and laden with doom.

It is now the fact that a quantity of plutonium—probably less than would fill this box on the table, and quite a safe thing to store—would suffice to produce weapons which would give indisputable world domination to any great power which was the only one to have it. There is no absolute

defense against the hydrogen bomb, nor is any method in sight by which any nation or any country can be completely guaranteed against the devastating injury which even a score of them might inflict on wide regions.

What ought we to do? Which way shall we turn to save our lives and the future of the world? It does not matter so much to old people. They are going soon anyway. But I find it poignant to look at youth in all its activities and ardor, and most of all to watch little children playing their merry games, and wonder what would lie before them if God wearied of mankind.

The best defense would, of course, be bona-fide disarmament all around. This is in all our hearts, but sentiment must not cloud our vision. It is often said that facts are stubborn things. A renewed session of a subcommittee of the Disarmament Commission is now sitting in London and is rightly attempting to conduct its debates in private. We must not conceal from ourselves the gulf between the Soviet Government and the NATO powers, which has hitherto, for so long, prevented an agreement. The long history and tradition of Russia makes it repugnant to the Soviet Government to accept any practical system of international inspection.

A second difficulty lies in the circumstances that, just as the United States, on the one hand, has, we believe, the overwhelming mastery in nuclear weapons, so the Soviets and their Communist satellites have immense superiority in what are called "conventional" forces—the sort of arms and forces with which we fought the last war, but much improved.

The problem is therefore to devise a balance and phased system of disarmament which at no period enables any one of the participants to enjoy an advantage which might endanger the security of the others. A scheme on these lines was submitted last year by Her Majesty's Government and the French Government, and was accepted by the late Mr. [Andrei Y.] Vishinsky as a basis of discussion. It is now being examined in London.

UP-TO-DATE ARMS NEEDED

If the Soviet Government has not at any time since the war shown much nervousness about the American possession of nuclear superiority, that is because they are quite sure that it will not be used against them aggressively, even in spite of many forms of provocation.

On the other hand, the NATO powers have been combined together by the continued aggression and advance of communism in Asia and in Europe. That this should have eclipsed in a few years and largely effaced the fearful antagonism and memories that Hitlerism created for the German people is an event without parallel but it has to a large extent, happened. There is widespread belief throughout the free world that, but for American nuclear superiority, Europe would already have been reduced to satellite status and the Iron Curtain would have reached the Atlantic and the Channel.

Unless a trustworthy and universal agreement upon disarmament, conventional and nuclear alike, can be reached and an effective system of inspection is established and is actually working, there is only one sane policy for the free world in the next few years. That is what we call defense through deterrents. This we have already adopted and proclaimed.

These deterrents may at any time become the parents of disarmament, provided that they deter. To make our contribution to the deterrent we must ourselves possess the most up-to-date nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them. That is the position which the Government occupy. We are to discuss this not only as a matter of prin-

ciple: There are many practical reasons which should be given.

Should war come, which God forbid, there are a large number of targets that we and the Americans must be able to strike at once. There are scores of airfields from which the Soviets could launch attacks with hydrogen bombs as soon as they have the bombers to carry them. It is essential to our deterrent policy and to our survival to have, with our American allies, the strength and numbers to be able to paralyze these potential Communist assaults in the first few hours of the war, should it come.

The House will perhaps note that I avoid using the word Russia as much as possible in this discussion. I have a strong admiration for the Russian people—for their bravery, their many gifts, and their kindly nature. It is the Communist dictatorship and the declared ambition of the Communist Party and their proselytizing activities which we are bound to resist, and that is what makes this great world cleavage which I mentioned when opening my remarks.

There are also big administrative and industrial targets behind the Iron Curtain, and any effective deterrent policy must have the power to paralyze them all at the outset, or shortly after. There are also the Soviet submarine bases and other naval targets which will need early attention. Unless we make a contribution of our own—that is the point which I am pressing—we cannot be sure that in an emergency the resources of other powers would be planned exactly as we would wish or that the targets which would threaten us most would be given what we consider the necessary priority, or the deserved priority, in the first few hours.

These targets might be of such cardinal importance that it would really be a matter of life and death for us.

All this, I think, must be borne in mind in deciding our policy about the conventional forces, to which I will come later, the existing services.

Meanwhile, the United States has many times the nuclear power of Soviet Russia. I avoid any attempt to give exact figures, and they have, of course, far more effective means of delivery. Our moral and military support of the United States and our possession of nuclear weapons of the highest quality and on an appreciable scale, together with their means of delivery, will greatly reinforce the deterrent power of the free world, and will strengthen our influence within the free world. That, at any rate, is the policy which we have decided to pursue.

That is what we are now doing, and I am thankful that it is endorsed by a mass of responsible opinion on both sides of the House, and, I believe, by the great majority of the Nation.

A vast quantity of information—some true, some exaggerated, much out of proportion—has been published about the hydrogen bomb. The truth has inevitably been mingled with fiction, and I am glad to say that panic has not occurred. Panic would not necessarily make for peace. That is one reason why I have been most anxious that responsible discussions on this matter should not take place on the BBC or upon television, and I thought that I was justified in submitting that view of Her Majesty's Government to the authorities, which they at once accepted—very willingly accepted.

APPALLING PROSPECT SEEN

Panic would not necessarily make for peace even in this country. There are many countries where a certain wave of opinion may arise and swing so furiously into action that decisive steps may be taken from which there is no recall. As it is, the world population goes on its daily journey despite its somber expression and earnest longing for relief. That is the way we are going on now.

I shall content myself with saying about the power of this weapon—the hydrogen

bomb—that, apart from all the statements about blast and heat effects over increasingly wide areas, there are now to be considered the consequences of "fallout," as it is called, of windborne radioactive particles. There is both an immediate direct effect on human beings who are in the path of such a cloud and an indirect effect through animals, grass, and vegetables, which pass on these contagions to human beings through food.

This would confront many who escaped the direct effects of the explosion with poisoning or starvation, or both. Imagination stands appalled. There are, of course, the palliatives and precautions of a courageous civil defense, and about that the Home Secretary will be speaking later on tonight. But our best protection lies, as I am sure the House will be convinced, in successful deterrents operating from a foundation of sober, calm, and tireless vigilance.

However, a curious paradox has emerged. Let me put it simply. After a certain point has been passed, it may be said, the worse things get, the better. The broad effect of the latest developments is to spread almost indefinitely and at least to a vast extent the area of mortal danger. This should certainly increase the deterrent upon Soviet Russia by putting her enormous spaces and scattered population on an equality, or near equality, of vulnerability with our small, densely populated island and with Western Europe.

I cannot regard this development as adding to our dangers. We have reached the maximum already. On the contrary, to this form of attack continents are vulnerable as well as islands. Hitherto crowded countries, as I have said, like the United Kingdom and Western Europe, have had this outstanding vulnerability to carry. But the hydrogen bomb, with its vast range of destruction and the even wider area of contamination, would be effective also against nations whose population hitherto has been so widely dispersed over large land areas as to make them feel that they were not in any danger at all.

PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE

They too become highly vulnerable; not yet equally perhaps, but still highly and increasingly vulnerable. Here again we see the value of deterrents, immune against surprise and well understood by all persons on both sides—repeat, on both sides—who have the power to control events. That is why I have hoped for a long time for a top-level conference where these matters could be put plainly and bluntly from one friendly visitor to the conference to another.

Then it may well be that we shall, by a process of sublime irony, have reached a stage in this story where safety will be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation. Although the Americans have developed weapons capable of producing all the effects I have mentioned, we believe that the Soviets so far have tested by explosion only a type of bomb of intermediate power.

There is no reason why, however, they should not develop sometime within the next 4, 3, or even 2 years more advanced weapons and full means to deliver them on North American targets. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that within that period they will. In trying to look ahead like this, we must be careful ourselves to avoid the error of comparing the present state of our preparations with the stage which the Soviets may reach in 3 or 4 years time. It is a major error of thought to contrast the Soviet position 3 or 4 years hence with our own position today. It is a mistake to do this either in the comparatively precise details of aircraft development or in the measureless sphere of nuclear weapons.

The threat of hydrogen attack on these islands lies in the future. It is not with us now.

According to the information that I have been able to obtain—I have taken every opportunity to consult all the highest authorities at our disposal—the only country which is able to deliver today a full-scale nuclear attack with hydrogen bombs at a few hours' notice is the United States. That surely is an important fact, and from some points of view and to some of us it is not entirely without comfort.

It is conceivable that Soviet Russia, fearing a nuclear attack before she has caught up with the United States and created deterrents of her own, as she might argue that they are, might attempt to bridge the gulf by a surprise attack with such nuclear weapons as she has already. American superiority in nuclear weapons, reinforced by Britain, must therefore be so organized as to make it clear that no such surprise attack would prevent immediate retaliation on a far larger scale. This is an essential of the deterrent policy.

For this purpose, not only must the nuclear superiority of the Western powers be stimulated in every possible way, but their means of delivery of bombs must be expanded, improved, and varied. It is even probable, though we have not been told about it outside the NATO sphere, that a great deal of this has been already done by the United States. We should aid them in every possible way.

I will not attempt to go into details, but it is known that bases have been and are being established in as many parts of the world as possible and that over all rests the United States Strategic Air Force, which is in itself a deterrent of the highest order and is in ceaseless readiness. The Soviet Government probably knows in general terms of the policy that is being pursued, and of the present United States strength and our own growing addition to it.

Thus, they should be convinced that a surprise attack could not exclude immediate retaliation. As one might say to them: Although you might kill millions of our people, and cause widespread havoc by a surprise attack, we could, within a few hours of this outrage, certainly deliver several, indeed many times, the weight of nuclear material which you have used, and continue retaliation on that same scale. We have, we could say, already hundreds of bases for attack from all angles and have made an intricate study of suitable targets.

GUIDE OF SOVIET INTERESTS

Thus, it seems to me, with some experience of wartime talks, you might go to dinner and have a friendly evening. I should not be afraid to talk things over as far as they can be. This, and the hard facts, would make the deterrent effective.

I must make one admission, and any admission is formidable. The deterrent does not cover the case of lunatics or dictators in the mood of Hitler when he found himself in his final dugout. That is a blank. Happily, we may find methods of protecting ourselves, if we were all agreed, against that.

All these considerations lead me to believe that, on a broad view, the Soviets would be ill-advised to embark on major aggression within the next 3 or 4 years. One must always consider the interests of other people when you are facing a particular situation. The Russian interests may be the only guide that is available. We may calculate, therefore, that world war will not break out within that time. If, at the end of that time, there should be a supreme conflict, the weapons which I have described this afternoon would be available to both sides, and it would be folly to suppose that they would not be used. Our precautionary dispositions and preparations must therefore be based on the assumption that, if war should come, those weapons would be used.

I repeat, therefore, that during the next 3 or 4 years the free world should and will

retain an overwhelming superiority in hydrogen weapons. During that period it is most unlikely that the Russians would deliberately embark on major war or attempt a surprise attack either of which would bring down upon them at once a crushing weight of nuclear retaliation. In 3 or 4 years' time—it may be even less—the scene will be changed. The Soviets will probably stand possessed of hydrogen bombs and the means of delivering them not only on the United Kingdom but also on North American targets. They may then have reached a stage not indeed of parity with the United States and Britain but of what is called saturation.

MEANING OF SATURATION

I must explain this term of art. "Saturation," in this connection, means the point where although one power is stronger than the other—perhaps much stronger—both are capable of inflicting crippling or quasi-mortal injury on the other with what they have got. It does not follow, however, that the risk of war will then be greater. Indeed, it is arguable that it will be less, for both sides will then realize that global war would result in mutual annihilation.

Major war of the future will differ therefore from anything we have known in the past, in this one significant respect that each side at the outset will suffer what it dreads the most—the loss of everything that it has ever known. The deterrents will grow continually in value. In the past an aggressor has been tempted by the hope of snatching an early advantage. In future, he may be deterred by the knowledge that the other side has the certain power to inflict swift, inescapable and crushing retaliation.

Of course, we should all agree that a worldwide international agreement on disarmament is the goal at which we should aim. The western democracies disarmed themselves at the end of the war. The Soviet Government did not disarm, and the western nations were forced to rearm, though only partially, after the Soviets and Communists had dominated all China and half Europe. That is the present position. It is easy, of course, for the Communists to say now, "Let us ban all nuclear weapons." Communist ascendancy in conventional weapons would then become overwhelming. That might bring peace but only peace in the form of the subjugation of the free world to the Communist system.

I shall not detain the House very much longer and I am sorry to be so long. The topic is very intricate. I am anxious to repeat and to emphasize the one word which is the theme of my remarks, namely, "deterrent." That is the main theme.

The hydrogen bomb has made an astounding incursion into the structure of our lives and thoughts. Its impact is prodigious and profound, but I do not agree with those who say, "Let us sweep away forthwith all our existing defense services and concentrate our energy and resources on nuclear weapons and their immediate ancillaries." The policy of the deterrent cannot rest on nuclear weapons alone. We must, together with our NATO allies, maintain the defensive shield in Western Europe.

Unless the NATO powers had effective forces there on the ground and could make a front, there would be nothing to prevent piecemeal advance and encroachment by the Communists in this time of so-called peace. By successive infiltrations the Communists could progressively undermine the security of Europe. Unless we were prepared to unleash a full-scale nuclear war as soon as some local incident occurs in some distant country, we must have conventional forces in readiness to deal with such situations as they arise.

CONTRIBUTION TO NATO

We must, therefore, honor our undertaking to maintain our contribution to the

NATO forces in Europe in time of peace. In war, this defensive shield would be of vital importance, for we must do our utmost to hold the Soviet and satellite forces at arms' length in order to prevent short-range air and rocket attack on these islands. Thus, substantial strength in conventional forces has still a vital part to play in the policy of the deterrent. It is perhaps of even greater importance in the cold war.

Though world war may be prevented by the deterrent power of nuclear weapons, the Communists may well resort to military action in furtherance of their policy of infiltration and encroachment in many parts of the world. There may well be limited wars on the Korean model, with limited objectives. We must be able to play our part in these, if called upon by the United Nations Organization. In the conditions of today, this is also an aspect of our commonwealth responsibility. We shall need substantial strength in conventional forces to fulfill our worldwide obligations in these days of uneasy peace and extreme bad temper.

To sum up this part of the argument, of course, the development of nuclear weapons will affect the shape and organization of the Armed Forces and also of civil defense. We have entered a period of transition in which the past and the future will overlap. But it is an error to suppose that, because of these changes, our traditional forces can be cast away or superseded.

The tasks of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in this transition period are set forth with clarity in the defense white paper. The means by which these duties will be met are explained in more detail in the departmental papers which have been laid before the House by the three service ministers. No doubt, nothing is perfect; certainly nothing is complete, but, considering that these arrangements have been made in the first year after the apparition of the hydrogen bomb, the far-seeing and progressive adaptability which is being displayed by all three services is remarkable.

I understand that there is to be a vote of censure. Well, certainly, nothing could be more worthy of censure than to try to use the inevitable administrative difficulties of the transitional stage as a utensil of party politics and would-be electioneering. I am not saying that anyone is doing it; we shall see when it comes to the vote. The future shape of civil defense is also indicated in broad outline in the defense white paper. This outline will be filled in as the preparation of the new plans proceeds, but the need for an effective system of civil defense is surely beyond dispute.

It presents itself today in its noblest aspect; namely, the Christian duty of helping fellow mortals in distress. Rescue, salvage, and ambulance work have always been the core of civil defense, and no city, no family, nor any honorable man or woman can repudiate this duty and accept from others help which they are not prepared to fit themselves to render in return.

If war comes great numbers may be relieved of their duty by death. But none must deny it as long as they live. If they do, they might perhaps be put in what is called coventry. I am speaking of the tradition, and not of any particular locality.

The argument which I have been endeavoring to unfold and consolidate gives us in this island an interlude. Let us not waste it. Let us hope we shall use it to augment or at least to prolong our security and that of mankind.

But how?

There are those who believe, or at any rate say: If we have the protection of the overwhelming powerful United States, we need not make the hydrogen bomb for ourselves or build a fleet of bombers for its delivery. We can leave that to our friends across the

ocean. Our contribution should be criticism of any unwise policy into which they may drift or plunge. We should throw our hearts and consciences into that.

OWN NEEDS STRESSED

Personally, I cannot feel that we should have much influence over their policy or actions, wise or unwise, while we are largely dependent, as we are today, upon their protection. We too must possess substantial deterrent power of our own. We must also never allow, above all, I hold, the growing sense of unity and brotherhood between the United Kingdom and the United States and throughout the English-speaking world to be injured or retarded. Its maintenance, its stimulation, and its fortifying is one of the first duties of every person who wishes to see peace in the world and wishes to see the survival of this country.

To conclude, mercifully, there is time and hope if we combine patience and courage. All deterrents will improve and gain authority during the next 10 years. By that time, the deterrent may well reach its acme and reap its final reward. The day may dawn when fair play, love for one's fellow men, respect for justice and freedom, will enable tormented generations to march forth serene and triumphant from the hideous epoch in which we have to dwell. Meanwhile, never flinch, never weary, never despair.

The 105th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to a great and worthy man, whose very life exemplified the highest ideals and traditions, I call attention to the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the father of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is only fitting that we here in America should note this anniversary because the Communist masters of Masaryk's homeland have banned any celebration, as did the Nazis before them. And why? Simply because they know that as long as the name of Masaryk lives in Czechoslovakia their rule is insecure. The spirit of Masaryk is the spirit of belief in the individual, of tolerance, of respect for truth and hatred of insincerity, and of belief in one's Creator. No dictatorship in the world can permit these truths to flourish and itself long endure.

Even in his personal life Masaryk can serve as an inspiration. He was born to a low station in life, but raised himself to a position of eminence by hard work and perseverance. Yet he never hesitated to jeopardize that hard-won standing by embracing causes that he believed to be right, regardless of popular or official opposition. He was undismayed in defeat, and magnanimous in victory.

A true friend of the United States, he created a Czechoslovakia that was an embodiment of the democratic ideal. We regret profoundly that this anniversary cannot be honored in his own land. The world needs more men like Thomas G. Masaryk.

Death Takes Jim Thomas, Director of District 15

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. VERA BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of James J. "Jim" Thomas, director of district 15, United Steelworkers, came as a deep shock to his many friends, among whom I had the privilege to count myself.

Jim Thomas was a close friend of mine and of my late husband Congressman Frank Buchanan, for many years. His efforts and his accomplishments on behalf of the Steelworkers were tremendous. He earned and enjoyed the respect and affection of his fellow workers and of his community, to which on many occasions, he devoted his great diligence and his many talents. His death is a tragic loss to the United Steelworkers and a truly personal loss to me. To his devoted wife and family I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the March 1955 issue of Steel Labor:

DEATH TAKES JIM THOMAS, DIRECTOR OF DISTRICT 15—"OLD FAITHFUL" IN STEEL UNION MOURNED BY MEN OF THE MILLS

Death has struck down one of the mainstays of the United Steelworkers of America.

James J. "Jim" Thomas, director of one of the largest districts in the steel union, died unexpectedly, February 22, of a heart ailment while he was confined to Homestead, Pa., hospital for a series of tests and treatment. He had been in the hospital for about 2 weeks. He was 55.

The news stunned his thousands of friends, both inside and outside the labor movement. It was a particularly heavy blow to the 50,000 members of the union in district 15, where Jim had labored so faithfully for 15 years in building the United Steelworkers into a solid, closely knit organization.

President David J. McDonald, who was in Washington for the CIO executive board meeting, expressed the grief felt throughout the union:

Jim Thomas was one of the old faithfuls who devoted all of his life and the vast store of ability and energy to the people he loved best—the men of the mills and their families.

"The services he rendered to this union simply cannot be measured. He was a man who could be depended on no matter how rough the going might be. We will miss him in countless ways, and the imprint he leaves on the United Steelworkers of America will be felt as we move down through the years."

Mr. Thomas was a steelworker all of his working life. He was a union man in the truest sense of the phrase. He went into the mills of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. at a very early age and was active in union affairs while still in his teens. Born in Uniontown, Pa., in 1900, Jim moved to Hazelwood, in Pittsburgh, with his family and went to work in Jones & Laughlin's Hazelwood mills. He learned the machinist trade, advanced to first-class machinist, and worked in that plant until 1940.

As far back as 1919, when an attempt was made to organize basic steel by the old Amal-

gamated, Jim poured all his youthful drive into the campaign. When the attempt failed he bided his time until the steelworkers organizing committee was formed in 1936 and became one of the very first volunteer organizers while continuing his regular job in the mill.

When local 1843 was formed Jim became a key officer, holding most of the posts in the local. The union called him to take on the job of director of district 15 in 1940, a position he filled until his death. He was reelected without opposition in every referendum.

Jim Thomas was a man who was easy to know and easy to love. He was a kindly man, always ready to sit down and reminisce or worry about someone else's problems. A perpetual smile creased his face, regardless of the tenseness that surrounded many union problems he bucked day in and day out. He experienced great joy in mingling with his people—the steelworkers—in their homes, their local unions, their clubs.

His genial personality sometimes hid an uncanny shrewdness that enabled him to cut through to the heart of a problem. That, plus the fact that he knew the steel industry from stem to stern, made him a top-notch negotiator. And his honesty at all times commanded the respect of management people, as well as his fellow unionists.

Those who really knew Jim Thomas marveled at the deep reservoir of strength within him and at the hidden drive that led him to take part in scores of outside activities aimed at helping people. He devoted many evening hours to such activities as the Community Fund, which he served as a board member in western Pennsylvania. He served on the Blue Cross Blue Shield Board upon which thousands of union members depend for protection under union insurance programs. He was active in dozens of fraternal organizations that hold an interest for steelworkers. He served for several years on the Pittsburgh Housing Authority.

All of this Jim managed to crowd into a busy life within the union itself, as he headed the most highly concentrated basic steel area in the world. District 15 stretches for 18 miles up the Monongahela River from Pittsburgh, boasting some 46 locals. It comprises such mill towns as Homestead, McKeesport, Braddock, Clairton, Irvin Works, Duquesne, and Rankin, where big basic United States Steel plants operate.

Jim was one of the top negotiators in contracts negotiated with Big Steel for many years. He served on most of the important committees within the union, including the pension and insurance committees.

Since the early 1940's he was a vice president of the Pennsylvania CIO Industrial Union Council. As such, he became involved in the problems of other unions and could always be counted upon to fulfill a duty as he saw it. He was one of the prime movers in the early, hectic days of the formation of the Steel City Industrial Union Council in Pittsburgh and one of his last appearances was on the platform, with President McDonald, at a special meeting called by that body to mark its anniversary.

Through international conventions and his many assignments to serve on special commissions in other districts, Jim became known and loved by steelworkers across the country.

Friends were received at the O'Toole & O'Connor Funeral Home, around the corner from his early home in Hazelwood and within the shadow of the J and L smokestacks. Solemn requiem high mass was offered in St. Teresa Church, Homestead, and burial was at Calvary Cemetery, Pittsburgh.

Mr. Thomas was survived by his widow, Mrs. Claudia Hetrick Thomas; a son, James R. Thomas, of Pittsburgh; a daughter, Mrs. Jo Ann Marino, of McCallen, Texas; 3 broth-

ers, Frank, Joseph and Howard; 3 sisters, Mrs. Kathryn Pearson, Mrs. Rose Shirey and Mrs. Virginia Fisher, and 2 grandchildren.

Instead of flowers, Mrs. Thomas had requested that donations be made to the Heart Fund. Members of the United Steelworkers international executive board were honorary pall bearers.

European Credit Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the February 1955 issue of the Texas Credit Union League Bulletin carried an article by Mr. H. B. Yates, president of the Credit Union National Association, of Dallas, Tex., entitled "European Credit Unions," which I am inserting herewith.

Mr. Yates' comprehensive report of the tour of 8 European countries by himself and 11 other cooperative leaders is so interesting, it will be found worthwhile reading. It is as follows:

EUROPEAN CREDIT UNIONS

(By H. B. Yates, president, Credit Union National Association)

The tour of 12 cooperative leaders visited 8 countries in 3 weeks, spending from 2 to 3 days in each country. The time was spent principally in conferences with the leaders of the different countries and conducted tours to cooperative stores, farms, and factories. We did spend a small part of our time in sightseeing.

The credit union movement and the cooperative movement have separate origins and today are still separate movements in most of the countries visited. Only in Finland, and to some extent in Holland, did we find what might be called an integrated movement. As practically all of our time was spent with the cooperative leaders, I found it somewhat difficult to get complete information on credit unions in all of the countries visited.

One characteristic of all European credit unions is that they require security or co-makers. This general attitude is not different from that found in some American institutions; that one should be able to prove that he does not need a loan in order to secure one. Raiffeisen insisted that only members of good character be accepted in the credit union and that character loans be made. The only character loans that I heard of being used in Europe were in the credit unions in Finland, Holland, and Germany organized among people working for the same industry or on the same payroll and then loans were small. The development and extension of character credit is a contribution of American credit union to the movement.

The principle of a person borrowing money to improve his position in the world is not so prevalent in Europe as in America. European borrowing seems to be more for necessity. Europeans are naturally more conservative than Americans. In Europe, due to the crowded conditions in all countries and the relic of the class system found in some, the social and economic status of an individual is much more fixed than it is in America. One Englishman said to me: "We do not believe in encouraging our poor people to go into debt." Most European governments do more for the lower

classes than does the Government of the United States.

Raiffeisen's credit unions were organized primarily for farmers and the European credit union today is still primarily for farmers. The widespread organization of credit unions in the cities is another American contribution to the movement. In countries where the credit needs of the farmers have been provided for by the Government as in England and France, there is no credit-union movement. The credit unions in all countries visited, regardless of the name they operate under, are based on the Raiffeisen system except they have discarded the character-loan idea. Various names are used for credit unions in different countries as Raiffeisen bank, rural bank, village bank, credit cooperative or credit society. The best development of credit unions is probably found in Finland, Germany, and Holland. In all countries, they primarily serve the farmers, but in Germany, Finland, and Holland, the middle and working classes in the towns and cities are included to some extent. In all countries, these organizations have their own central banks, which have charge of the supervision and examination. This seems to be more effective than our supervision and examination by Government agencies as embezzlements are unheard of. The central bank is much closer to the credit union and more interested in the success of the credit union than a government agency would be as the central bank is dependent on a healthy credit union movement. As a rule, these credit unions are small, usually located in villages where everyone knows everyone else's business.

Finland, at the close of 1952, had 650 credit societies with 354 branch offices and 970,000 members. One person in four in Finland belongs to a credit society. These organizations had \$250 million in working capital, \$78 million of it borrowed. Fifty-four percent of all agricultural loans are made by the cooperative credit societies. Nineteen percent of all the deposits in Finnish financial institutions were made in the credit societies in 1953. The Finnish cooperatives, due to heavy agricultural loans, had the same difficulties during the depression that the country banks had in the United States, so the central bank reduced the number of organizations from 1414 in 1930 to 623 in 1952. The membership in the Finnish credit societies is divided as follows: 64 percent farmers, 20 percent city workers, 7 percent skilled workers and professional people. The Finnish movement has had much support from the Government. The funds for settling the displaced persons and for the reconstruction of north Finland at the close of the Second World War were handled by the credit societies. In Germany, there are 11,157 Raiffeisen banks with 3,317,000 members and \$354 million at the close of 1953. The German credit unions usually carry the accounts of the other cooperatives in the village. One person out of 14 in Germany belongs to a credit union. In Holland, there are 1,320 credit cooperatives with 300,000 members and \$500 million in assets at the close of 1952. One person in every 33 in Holland belongs to a credit cooperative. In Sweden, there are 631 credit societies with 142,000 members; in Denmark, there are 53 village banks with approximately 30,000 members; in Italy, there are 900 rural banks with approximately 200,000 members. According to recent issues of Cuna Briefs, there are 950 Raiffeisen banks in Switzerland with 100,000 members and 15 credit societies in Norway.

The work of Mr. Filene, Mr. Bergengren, and Mr. Dolg, can best be appreciated by studying the credit-union movement in Europe. There are more than 19,000 credit unions in North America with 9 million members and \$2½ billion in assets. Com-

pared to an outside number of 17,000 in Europe, with approximately 6 million members with possibly \$1½ billions in assets. Free western Europe has a population of about 200 million people.

Cooperatives are best developed in Britain and the Scandinavian countries. One person in four in Britain belongs to a cooperative. In the well-organized countries, the cooperatives usually control about 20 to 30 percent of the business, enough to set the prices. Some products, such as dairy products, in Denmark, are all controlled by the cooperatives. Consumer cooperatives have their own wholesale houses and factories. The consumer cooperatives have established their own banks in Britain, Denmark, and Germany. These banks handle the surplus of the cooperative societies as well as the savings of cooperative members. Savings banks are found in practically all countries which accept savings and make loans on security to the general public in the cities. Building societies comparable to our savings and loan institutions are found in most countries.

The last week of the 4-week trip was spent in Paris—most of it at the 19th Triennial Congress of the International Cooperative Alliance. The International Alliance is 59 years old and has 117 million members. Russia attempted to secure memberships for the co-ops of Poland, Hungary, Albania, and East Germany. This motion was voted down 671 to 366 on the grounds that a cooperative cannot determine its own policies in a dictator state. The theme of ICA Director, W. P. Watkins' paper was "Cooperative Development in Underdeveloped Countries." Several favorable speakers from different countries were heard on this paper, even a Russian delegate. I was glad to report that the Credit Union National Association had set aside \$50,000 to be spent in underdeveloped countries in 1954.

Red-Ink Post Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 18, 1955, entitled "Red-Ink Post Office":

RED-INK POST OFFICE

Postmaster General Summerfield thinks he can hold the post-office deficit to about \$315 million this year.

That's about half the size of the postal deficit in 1952, the year before Mr. Summerfield took over.

The Postmaster General says most of this improvement has resulted from economies in the operations of the Department.

But you can go only so far in economies before you start impairing the service. Mr. Summerfield thinks he has gone almost that far.

To get the post office on a black-ink basis, then, he needs to raise his prices—4 cents for first-class mail and increases for other classes.

If the post office is to meet its purpose, the service should be A-1. But it ought to pay its way.

This estimated deficit of \$315 million for this year will come out of the pockets of the taxpayers. We think the people would prefer to pay directly for their postal service,

as they use it, instead of indirectly through taxation.

And since the whole Government keeps running up deficits, the people who are going to pay off most of this debt haven't even had a chance to use the postal service. They haven't been born.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak republic. He lived an extraordinarily productive life—1850-1937. He is acknowledged as one of the great democratic philosopher-statesmen of this century. A friend of Woodrow Wilson, and married to an American, Charlotte Garrigue, whose surname he adopted as his middle name, he was always an admirer of the United States. Thomas G. Masaryk was born in Moravia, the son of a Slovakian coachman. His unusual ability enabled him to study at the University of Vienna, where he became professor of philosophy. From 1882 to 1911, he taught at the University of Prague. From his youth, he was active in the political education of his people and took a leading part in the movement to liberate his country from Austrian rule. He was elected to the Austrian Parliament, but was forced to flee to Paris at the outbreak of World War I. There, he formed the Czechoslovak National Council, which was recognized by the Allies as the Government of Czechoslovak Republic, and was re-elected to the office in 1920, 1927, and 1934. In 1935, he resigned as President because of his advanced age.

It is very befitting that Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan, issued the following proclamation on behalf of this great statesman:

PROCLAMATION—THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK DAY

This year on March 7 American citizens of Czechoslovakian descent, along with all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world, are celebrating the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

On October 28, 1918, Thomas Masaryk proclaimed from Washington the independence of the Czechoslovak Republic. Mr. Masaryk's great patriotism was equalled only by his belief in liberty and his magnificent intelligence. He contributed much to western culture and our peoples honor him equally for each of these contributions.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim March 7, 1955, as Thomas Garrigue Masaryk Day in Michigan, and urge all our people to join their fellow citizens of Czechoslovakian descent in paying homage and tribute to the memory of this great statesman of peace and independence.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this second day of

March in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, Governor.

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARR,
Secretary of State.

No Giveaway Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., which appeared in the Sunday issue of the New York Herald Tribune, on March 6, will, I hope, counteract some of the many factless statements about the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954:

MILLIONAIRE SAVES \$600—DIVIDEND-TAX CUT PROVES NO GIVEAWAY BY UNITED STATES

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—If a Democratic Congressman wants to risk his health, he need only go up to a holder of stock who has just gone through the agonizing process of filling out his tax return and tell him that the dividend relief in last year's big tax bill was a "steal," a "giveaway," and a "bonanza for the rich."

The stockholder, if he has any energy left after making out the return, will undoubtedly seriously consider pounding the Congressman with the nearest blunt instrument.

For he will have just discovered that some of the most intricate calculating he has ever been required to perform has saved him in taxes approximately enough money to spend one night with his wife at a medium-priced restaurant.

That is, unless he is so rich and has so much stock that he isn't worried about money anyway.

Take, for example, the fellow who has the substantial sum of \$10,000 invested in stocks. Let's suppose they are high-yielding stocks paying 6 percent dividends. And let's also suppose that half of those dividends were paid after August 1, 1954 (see col. B in special schedule I on p. 4 of form 1040)—both of them favorable assumptions to the taxpayer.

First, he pays no tax on the first \$50 of dividends. If he's in, say, a 25-percent bracket, that saves him the solid sum of \$12.50. Then he gets a 4-percent credit—subtraction from his tax—on the \$300 of dividends paid after August 1 (though he can't prove it until he has worked out first 2 percent of his taxable income and the amount of his total tax to see if they are bigger than the credit, which they invariably are). That's another \$12.

So the big steal has netted him the staggering sum of \$24.50—no doubt approximately equal to his hourly earnings for the time he spent figuring out the \$24.50.

According to Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, in his testimony Thursday before the Senate Banking Committee, the average stockholder holds \$4,000 worth of stock. The great bonanza will yield this average individual about \$17.

And even the fellow who has the large nestegg of \$25,000 worth of stock would save only about \$42 in his taxes because of dividend relief.

Of course, the J. P. Morgan who has \$1 million worth of stock may find the whole thing worthwhile. If all his stocks yielded 6 percent, he would have \$30,000 worth of

dividends and his tax savings would be more than \$600. But one cannot escape the feeling that \$600 would hardly be visible to the fellow with that much stock salted away in his portfolio.

If you haven't worked out your taxes yet, in other words, don't lick your chops too eagerly when you start bravely through that haze on page 4. You'll be disappointed.

Remarks by William B. Murphy, President, Campbell's Soup Co., Before the Washington Board of Trade's General Membership Luncheon, Concurrent With the Business Outlook Conference, Shoreham Hotel, January 25, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVINGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a speech of great significance to a great farming area and the effort over the years to get away from one- or two-crop farming. My district was blessed by nature, surely, with deep, strong soil that grows almost any crop well, but most of all it is blessed with thousands of growers who have conserved the soil, diversified the crops, and farmed with intelligence that has attracted the largest food packers in the Nation.

This great company is starting an addition to their plants at Napoleon, Ohio, costing millions of dollars. One main building covers 23 acres of floor space. To create this new Campbell soup plant—giving year round employment to thousands of local people—good shipping by great railroads, truck facilities, and Great Lakes shipping will make this a great outlet for farm products and poultry and add to the greatness of the area.

The above-mentioned speech follows:

Gentlemen, it is generous of you to let me be your guest today and to take a look at what the year 1955 may have in store for all of us. I should like to divide what I have to say into two parts.

The first part has to do with major economic questions, about which I know no more than the average businessman and certainly no more than you.

The second part has to do with questions with which I am more directly familiar—the outlook for tomatoes, for example.

Now, in regard to part 1.

It seems clear that for the long pull the general economic outlook for this country is most promising. When we get down to something specific, like tomatoes, it's not so easy. Anyone who can tell us in April what the tomato crop will be in August can count on a cordial welcome from us and no questions asked.

I would like to make a few observations on the prospects for 1955 as we see them, and then talk more about the long-term outlook.

The best phrase I have heard to describe 1955 is that it will be a year of competitive prosperity; in other words, a good year for those who recognize the need to compete for

business with all the ability at their command.

It seems likely that the year 1955 will nudge out 1954 from its position as our second best year and may turn out to be our No. 1 peacetime year.

The newspaper columns, the newscasters, and the trade papers have been full of prognostications as to 1955. I suppose everyone of you has read and reread the predictions.

We have all been informed that steel production is likely to be up this year.

It is predicted that retail sales will increase about 5 percent.

Automobile manufacturers expect to sell nearly 6 million cars.

The fairly heavy liquidation of inventories that took place in 1954 is not likely to be repeated in 1955.

Street and road construction will be at a high level.

There will be a record number of school-rooms, new water systems and sewerage facilities under construction.

These and other factors have led many leading economists to the opinion that 1955 will be a good year—moderately better than 1954.

Now, if I may, I would like to talk about a couple of major developments that seem to be behind today's healthy economic state. These are: (1) A high rate of technical development in our industry that is producing a kind of a revolution of products and processes, and (2) important shifts in home life, affecting particularly our urban areas, which we might call a kind of revolution in living.

Our technical development as it affects industrial products and processes stems from the research work which has gone on in the past and which is now going on at a higher rate than ever. This technical development has many effects:

It has increased industrial spending.

It has produced new products—products of better value.

It has helped to lower costs of production and permitted higher wages and salaries. Naturally enough it has opened up wholly new fields for future development.

This kind of a revolution in products and processes has been aided by new concepts of automatic controls and mechanized processes; new electrical, chemical, and atomic discoveries; and new concepts of management.

Not the least of all of these favorable developments is a growing understanding by all concerned that wage and salary increases must be hinged to productivity increases, if those wage and salary gains are to be real in terms of standard of living.

Another major factor that is prevalent this year has to do with development of the home—changes in our way of living. This is reflected in the fact that 1.2 million new homes were constructed in 1954. One of our best and most conservative exports in the field of home construction predicts a slightly higher number in 1955, possibly 1.25 million. He also predicts in excess of 1.1 million new homes per year through 1960.

Those of us who travel about the country see with our own eyes a tremendous movement to single-family units, each with a plot of ground.

About one-half of the new homes are for new families, and about one-half are accounted for by the movement from multi-family structures.

It is estimated that the cost to repair and fix up homes will be about equal to the cost of new home construction. In addition, there is a strong trend which has been labeled "do it yourself" and means much to the makers of tools and appliances and building materials.

Another trend affecting the homelife which has been going on for some time and which continues unabated, is the trend toward the use of more prepared foods. This

trend has the effect of enabling the housewife to have more time to spend on her home and with her family.

Tied in with the home development is a rising population. Last year there were approximately 4 million babies born (the greatest number in 1 year in our history). In this respect we seem to be going back to the old days when families were larger. It is reliably estimated that the population in the United States in 1970 will be 200 million. Whatever problems may be created by our rapidly accelerating population curve, we in the food business simply accept the fact that there are going to be many new mouths to feed.

So much for the general economic outlook. Now let me talk about that part of the economy I know a little more about, food, which happens to be one of the largest, if not the largest single industry in the United States, and an important one to each of us at least three times a day. Although Campbell's is a small part of the food industry, we have a fairly wide knowledge of foods, if only because we buy 130 different food ingredients and market 44 different food products. We are also, by the way, a fairly large producer of metal cans.

If I presume to mention my company occasionally, I hope you will understand that my purpose is to use its experience and status as typical of many companies in the very large food industry, an industry which is tied closely to the economy of the Nation and to the general conditions that will affect all of us in 1955.

Campbell Soup Co. today does over half of the soup business in this country. We have one competitor, however, who is very big—about as big as we are—a noncorporate competitor who is making us hustle. This competitor is the American housewife, who in her own kitchen makes approximately 40 percent of the soup consumed in this country today. We think that we can persuade a great many of these competitors of ours to save themselves time, trouble, and money by switching to our products. But this is very stiff competition and we have no reason, therefore, to feel complacent.

Furthermore, we are conscious that there are 21 meals in every week, and that our soup is served at the present time at only 1 or 2.

In quite a few homes soup is served once a day, but just think what it would mean to us if all homes served our product once a day instead of once or twice a week. Our business would be more than quadrupled. Now don't laugh over this. There are people, you know, who like soup for breakfast, and that is a trend we propose to encourage.

Our company had net sales of \$338 million in the fiscal year ending July 31, 1954, the highest to date. Our goal is \$500 million by 1960. Accordingly we are not looking to 1955 as a period in which we can doze comfortably by the fireside. Our competition would not let us and we would not want to anyway.

In the move toward our goal we are in the process of expanding our plant capacity—new buildings and new machinery—expected to cost us over \$60 million by 1960. Here, again, may I say that we are only typical of aggressive food manufacturers.

We Americans, naturally enough, talk with satisfaction and pride about the high standard of living we enjoy, about the many automobiles, the variety and quality of the many household appliances that have been produced by our industries. We look at our friends overseas and realize how well off we are by comparison. But isn't it a healthier outlook when someone—in General Electric, for example—observes that there are 54 varieties of standard electric appliances, but the average American household has only 9 of them, or notes that in this great electrified Nation of ours there is something like \$15 billion worth of work that needs to be

done simply to replace deficient electrical wiring.

The potentialities for progress in America seem greater than at any time in our history. As we learn more we also learn that the scope for future development is broader than we imagined.

Nowhere in the American economy is this observation more true than in agriculture and in farm yields. Consider that jewel of rural America, the Campbell tomato, for example. The average grower 15 years ago obtained 6 tons of tomatoes to the acre. In 1954 he was up to 10 tons per acre. Furthermore, future potentialities are reflected in the achievements of the most successful growers who last year produced over 20 tons per acre.

In the 1930's and 1940's we all thought that 10 tons of tomatoes per acre was a fine achievement and there were 10-ton clubs—with not very many members. Today 10 tons is only a fair crop. Actually, with what has been learned, and what we know can be learned, about new plant varieties, new soil treatments, new sprays, and new growing methods, it is not at all unrealistic to foresee an average of 20 tons per acre, and maybe more, of redder, more perfect tomatoes that taste better and have superior food values. When we reach the 20-ton average you can be sure ways will be found to push the yield even higher. Think what this will mean to the grower, the processor, the distributor, and the consumer. The changes taking place in tomato growing parallel those for other agricultural products.

What has happened in the past as to farm yields and what we believe is in store for us in the future tells something of the capability of the agricultural industry. I doubt that there is any cause to worry about feeding the population as far ahead as you and I can see, and a lot further.

Now, I would like to touch on another subject that will have a lot to do with the future welfare of the food industry. There is an accelerated development of better equipment for processing foods and making containers. This is certainly true for us and other food companies must be having similar experiences.

For many good reasons, there will always be a considerable amount of handwork in the food industry. We know that certain operations probably can never be done by machinery, but, as the ingenuity of machine designers has developed, we have found more ways to eliminate tedious handwork. Where this mechanization is possible, costs are usually lowered and quality improved. At least to us, this has not meant less employment. Because of the upward trend of our business, our employment actually has been growing.

It is our feeling that, for us, the chief opportunities for increased productivity come from improvements in machinery and plant methods and equally important from a better understanding and cooperativeness between our workers and our supervision.

I have spoken as if our business were exclusively soups. Of course this is not true. We make Franco-American prepared foods and V-8, and we recently expanded into the field of frozen soups. We are now experimenting with a number of other high quality prepared food specialties.

There is a strong trend today toward prepared foods which are designed to ease the work of the housewife and our business is being built on this trend. We hope to accelerate this trend by the good old American system of preparing such tantalizing products, advertised in such a tantalizing manner and offered at such tantalizing price that we will prove irresistible.

No one in the food business can be successful and ignore what is going on in the field of distribution and marketing. Food retailing—in fact, all retailing—is undergoing a kind of continuous evolution.

We feel that we have thus far only scratched the surface in our marketing research. There is a wide field for psychological and motivation studies having to do with consumer habits.

For example, we just don't know why one family has a food freezer and uses a great quantity of the new frozen foods, whereas another family of similar kind and circumstances ignores these conveniences. We feel sure this isn't caused by sunspots or the signs of the Zodiac, but a great deal of probing needs to be done to find the correct answers.

Technical improvements are constantly being made in the field of advertising media. Foods can be pictured more attractively today in magazines than ever before. Coverage of local markets by newspapers and radio is probably more widespread today than any time in our history. Meanwhile, television has added a whole new dimension to the selling equation, and color TV is obviously on its way.

Nutritional research and flavor research offer us some of the most fascinating possibilities for the years ahead of us. The Nutrition Foundation, an organization for research financed by many of the food manufacturers, is today studying a wide range of subjects of nutritional importance. The same is true of a good many of our colleges and universities and government agencies. And, of course, companies like ours are continually studying nutritional needs and the effect of foods in meeting these needs.

We can assume that most everyone enjoys food that is delicious, so it's a real consolation to know that enjoyment of food is important nutritionally. It is interesting that a good deal of attention is being given today to the basic nature of flavors and how to improve them.

As we look into the future we see exciting potentialities for growth in the food-processing industry—in the interests not only of the consumer but of the farmer. If Campbell's business expands as we expect it to, we will need new full-line production units at the rate of about 1 every 5 years—units similar to the one recently completed at Sacramento and the one now being built at Napoleon, Ohio. We expect that these new plants will be located adjacent to favorable agriculture sections in various parts of the country. Such a policy establishes plants close to the farm areas from which we draw many ingredients and provides the farmer a nearby stable market.

There are many advantages to this close relationship. Obviously, it is desirable to process fruits and vegetables as soon after they are picked as possible, but there is more to it than this. By decentralization we can encourage cooperation between the food processor and the producer and stimulate improvements in farm production methods as well as in food processing.

Now if I may summarize briefly the thoughts I have tried to express:

(1) For the economy as a whole, we are told that 1955 will be a good year—possibly our best peacetime year.

(2) So far as Campbell Soup Co. is concerned, we believe 1955 will be the biggest and best year in the history of our company.

(3) In spite of the tremendous technological progress which has occurred already in this country, it is possibly only a beginning. We have barely scratched the surface of progress. Certainly, this is true of the food-processing industry, despite the great gains that have been made since World War II.

(4) There are two ways of looking at our situation in this country. One is to recognize the strength of our position and the progress that we have been able to achieve in the development of a high standard of living. The other point of view is more interesting and certainly more constructive—

It is to recognize how much there is ahead of us—how much unfinished business there is to do. We at Campbell's are delighted at how much Campbell soup Americans consume today but perfectly appalled at how much they do not consume. They are missing so many opportunities—and so are we—it must be our fault.

I want to thank you again for inviting me to this luncheon and for the privilege of speaking to so distinguished an audience. No subject seems more important to us today than trade—the vigorous production, development, improvement, and marketing of food products and services that contribute to the health, comfort, and wealth of all of us.

Thank you.

**A Tribute to John T. Jones, by His Pastor,
Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Foundry
Methodist Church, Chaplain, United
States Senate**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following tribute to John T. Jones by his pastor, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, United States Senate:

The brief working day of a valiant servant of God and of humanity, on this mortal stage, is ended. His sun has gone down down while it is yet day. Our eyes are staring, stunned, bewildered, and strangely moved at a vacant place against the sky of our choicest friendship, our church and our Nation.

By dint of his own energy and effort, John T. Jones, climbing from the penury and darkness of his childhood and youth, never forget the pit from which he was digged. The ruling passion of his life became to light that darkness for others who kept their backs to its heavy tasks.

His own spirit was as the candle of the Lord—not just to shine in places of plenty and comfort, to which his indefatigable toil, his devotion, and his ability lifted him, but to bring justice and safety and more abundant homelife to those hardy servants of the public good, his brother miners, whose contribution to the gadgets and glitter of an industrial day sentenced them to arduous labors, with light of day denied.

We are vividly conscious in this hour, now that his lips are silent, that with righteous indignation against selfish powers which sought to exploit those whom he always regarded as his comrades in toil he cried out again and again to exploiters in high places of privilege, "Let my people go."

We remember today the wistful appreciation with which in memory he turned often to that long-suffering, Christian mother, whose face and form were ever with him and who, amid conditions which might have stifled spiritual aspirations, lighted the candles of faith and reverence on the altar of his boyish heart, a flame that no winds of adversity could ever blow out.

As we survey the record of this useful life we are thankful, as was his own grateful heart, that when as a young man his face turned from across the sea to this land of hope and glory, our America, this "blessed

land of room enough" gave him his chance to unlock native talents for leadership and for wide service which struggled for expression in the heart of this Welsh lad whose life, until that emancipating day, had been so cabined and confined. In these latter years, as with disciplined powers he moved on levels of great influence, all his days were as a paean of devotion to the great Republic which had become so truly his as it molded life to ampler patterns of service to man and his Maker.

We think of the great causes which claimed his loyalty and the full measure of his devotion. We bear witness to his love for the church of the living God and his belief in her mission. John T. Jones was not just a hearer, but a doer of the Word. The message of the church and the kingdom to him was literally expressed in the program as announced by the Great Head of the Church: "I am come to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and to set at liberty them that are bruised." In this triumphal hour we testify that here was a Christian, indeed, in whom there was no guile. In a time of sophisticated artificiality he loved and clung to the genuine and true. He hated sham and cant, and knew both when his honest eyes looked upon them with scorn in high places and low.

We rejoice in the heritage of the moving words he recently wrote, blazing with holy wrath against the sophistries of those who, in the titanic global struggle now raging, blaspheme the paramount dignity of the individual and the rights of the common man.

Our hearts are warmed as we remember his genius for friendship and how his life was bound as with bands of steel to the very souls of those he loved and trusted. As we think of his devotion to the Master of all good workmen, it will be to us evermore who ministered to him in holy things a blessed memory that on his last earthly Sabbath, listening, by his own earnest request, to the ancient words of contrition and consecration, his hands, so still now, reached out reverently for the bread and the wine in remembrance of the Lord and Master who was the strength of his life.

Ring in our ears will ever be his clear witness, just before the human skill of surgeons did their best, his confident words will light us to the end of our own way as we count the rosary of his assurance: "I am not afraid, if this is the end of this life for me, for I know that the next room is a place of beauty and brightness beyond compare." Inspired by his undimmed trust as he walked through the valley of the shadow and feared no evil, now that he has gone into the bliss of that larger room, our hearts cry out:

"Servant of God, well done.

Thy glorious warfare past;

The battle's fought, the race is won,
And thou art crowned at last."

And so we give thanks that there was a man sent from God whose name was John, and we give him back, with clean hands and pure heart, knowing where we shall find him again and in what company we shall see him when the long night is past and the eternal morning breaks.

"A friend has passed
Across the bay
So wide and vast
And put away
The mortal form
That held his breath;

But through the storm
That men call death,
Erect and straight,
Unstained by years,
At heaven's gate
A man appears."

The Government Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 7, 1955, and brings into proper focus the whole employee security problem of the United States:

**PERSONAL RIGHTS AND UNITED STATES JOBS—
SUPREME COURT RULING DUE SOON ON
WHETHER ONE PERSON CAN FORCE A LEGAL
PROCEEDING ON REJECTION FOR POST**

(By David Lawrence)

Some press dispatches within the last few days, in reporting the news about a new brief filed in the Supreme Court by the Attorney General, have given a misleading impression to the American people by implying that President Eisenhower has been or is now at odds with the Department of Justice in the handling of security cases.

What has been quoted to support such an alleged divergence of view was a speech made by the President on November 23, 1953, in which he said something about "the right to meet your accuser face to face." While this comment—which obviously referred to court proceedings and not to the discretionary powers exercised by the Government in hiring and firing employees—was resurrected by some of the press associations, they neglected to point to the President's comments of a few days later explaining the real meaning of his speech.

At the press conference which occurred on December 2, 1953, Mr. Eisenhower, replying to a direct question about this same speech said there was one point which he must make clear, namely, that employment in the Federal Government is not a right of citizenship, but a privilege. He added that if there is real justifiable belief and conviction that a person is a security risk, you cannot keep him in a delicate position and in certain instances probably couldn't keep such persons at all. The President emphasized that there is a difference between determining whether or not a man should work for the Federal Government and charging anyone with a heinous crime of any kind.

It was clear that Mr. Eisenhower was differentiating in the traditional way between a criminal court proceeding and a personnel inquiry in which the Government decides whether to hire or fire an employee. The applicant or the employee does not have to be proved a security risk. It is necessary only for the Government to be convinced of his unreliability or unsuitability by reason of his background.

The issue as to the rights of the individual employee to convert a personnel inquiry into a court proceeding is coming up for a decision soon in the Supreme Court of the United States. Already extensive briefs have been filed by both sides in a test case involving a college professor who was not cleared for service as a consultant to the Government on account of alleged connections with Communists and was declared ineligible on security grounds. The case originated under the Truman loyalty program.

The Department of Justice has just filed a brief with the Supreme Court which points out that to grant to an individual a hearing within the Government is a privilege bestowed by the Government itself, that it really is under no legal obligation to furnish

any reason if it wants to fire an employee, and that the executive branch must determine for itself the scope of its personnel restrictions.

The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in the famous Myers case, involving a postmaster dismissed obviously for political reasons, that the Chief Executive could remove any employee at will in the executive departments unless Congress by law had enumerated specific causes for removal. The late President Franklin Roosevelt removed a member of the Federal Trade Commission because "your mind doesn't go along with mine," but the Supreme Court held that Congress, in creating the Commission, had specified grounds for removal and political incompatibility wasn't one of them.

So the absolute right of removal resides in the executive branch until and unless Congress qualifies it in some way by law.

An attempt has been made to argue that the Constitution requires that a person shall not be deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process, namely a trial. Is he guaranteed by the Constitution, however, the liberty to undermine his own Government from within? If so, it would mean that the Government departments would have to submit to a court trial if they wanted to get rid of an incompetent employee or an indiscreet employee or if they just wanted to give the job to somebody else.

The issue basically turns on whether the FBI should be required to bring into the hearings as witnesses for cross-examination the persons from whom it got its information originally about a suspected employee. The President has approved slight amendments in existing regulations so that the FBI will furnish to the accused a complete statement of the charges and as comprehensively as possible the nature of the information. But the new program does not provide that the identity of all informants be disclosed.

The FBI says the whole system of protecting national security would breakdown if the Communists were to be able to learn by one means or another who the informants are, so that they could either intimidate or liquidate them.

So again the Supreme Court is asked to decide an issue it has had up before in the so-called clear and present danger cases, whether or not to tell the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission, in effect, that they must wait until a conspiracy is actually fulfilled and the damage done before firing a suspected employee. In other words, must the Federal departments here get an affidavit from Moscow and corroborative testimony from the Russian secret service itself before anybody in America can be fired as a security risk?

Incorporation of Veterans of World War I of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would grant a Federal charter to a new national organization known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. This organization meets a need which has become more and more apparent in recent years—a need for separate recognition of the common in-

terests of those who served in our first great world conflict. It is not, of course, that these older veterans want in any sense to dissociate themselves from all the brave young men who carried on so splendidly in World War II and in Korea. But some of their memories and traditions are distinctive, and I can fully understand how there is a growing desire to band together for the purpose of keeping them alive.

Actually, this new group has been operating since 1949, when it was first established by a group of veterans who met in Cleveland, Ohio. In 1953 it held its first national convention, in Baltimore, which was attended by representatives from all over the country, and in 1954 it met again, in Buffalo, with a much larger attendance. It is now formally organized in 31 States and several Territories, including even a post in the Philippine Islands. It has a total of 186 units, some with as many as 400 individual members. There is also a ladies auxiliary which has organized 84 units to this date.

The organization is, of course, non-profit, and it has not aspirations which would bring it in conflict with the other large veterans groups. I hope it will be accorded the honor and privilege of a Federal charter.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith the proclamation issued by Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan, on the occasion of the anniversary of the birth of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko:

PROCLAMATION: GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO DAY

STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Lansing.

February 12 is of special significance to Americans of Polish descent. To all Americans it, of course, symbolizes the birthday of the great Abraham Lincoln. In addition, however, it also marks the birth date of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

This great general came to America in 1777 to fight in the American Revolutionary War. He built the fortifications at West Point and played a tremendous role in the Saratoga and Carolina campaigns. Upon his return to Poland, he became a champion of Polish independence, and led his countrymen in their uprisings against the Russian and Prussian monarchisms. Exiled by the Czar, he died in Switzerland. It is more than fitting that we remember the great contribution this man made to our American liberty.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim February 12, 1955, as Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko Day in Michigan, and urge all our citizens to join with the citizens of Polish descent in paying homage to the memory of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this 10th day of February 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Net Incomes of Farmers in Certain States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, Col. Paul J. McGahan, who has been a writer for the Philadelphia Inquirer for more than 40 years, had a most interesting article in that newspaper of last Sunday on agriculture as it relates to the States of New Jersey, Delaware, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Believing that it will be of great interest to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ON THE FARM FRONT—NET INCOME DIPS 10 PERCENT IN 1954

(By Paul J. McGahan)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Nationally the farmers' net income totaled \$12 billion in 1954, 10 percent less than in 1953, the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture disclosed today.

Cash receipts were below those of 1953 in 44 States. These included Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, a fact well realized by the agriculturists of Delaware Valley, United States of America.

In 1954 cash receipts from farm marketings in Pennsylvania were 7 percent lower than the 1953 figures; in New Jersey they were 8 percent lower, and in Delaware they were 9 percent lower. The largest percentage decline was 21 percent in Mississippi, and the largest gain was 3 percent in Florida.

Cash receipts for the Nation's farmers from marketings in 1954 totaled \$30 billion, 5 percent less than in 1953.

Delaware Valley, U. S. A., farmers shared in the drop which was general over the North Atlantic region, which was the hardest hit over the Nation. Total receipts were 7 percent below 1953, with livestock and products down 8 percent and crops down 6 percent.

Receipts from dairy products and poultry were lower by reason of lower prices. In Delaware the livestock prices were 12 percent below 1953, and in that State there were also lower receipts from broilers.

The statistics just released are as of February 15 and the estimates are preliminary. It will be another 6 months before sufficient new information is available to justify revision of the estimates.

With farm production costs remaining high as gross income declined, farmers retained as net income in 1954 only 35 percent of their realized gross farm income, the smallest percentage in 22 years. Expenses for purchased feed and livestock were up slightly, and farm-property taxes and farm-mortgage interest charges continued upward.

It is interesting to note that the number of persons living on farms declined 3.5 percent to 21,900,000 in 1954, compared with

the decline of 3 percent in the total income of the farm population. As a result the per capita farm income increased slightly to \$918. On the other hand, the nonfarm population continued its upward trend, while the total income of nonfarm population remained almost the same, so per capita nonfarm income dropped 3 percent to \$1,836.

Compared with the post-Korea high in 1951, farmers' total realized net income was down 18 percent, but with 3 percent fewer farms the realized net income per farm was down 15 percent. On a per-farm basis, realized net income in 1954 remained slightly higher than in 1950, the low point of the postwar period.

Statistics on the cash receipts from farm marketings by States disclosed that Pennsylvania farmers received \$748,860,000 in the year. In New Jersey, farm marketings amounted to \$336,826,000. In Delaware the cash receipts were \$93,708,000.

July was the high month for receipts in two of the States, New Jersey farmers getting \$39,772,000, and those in Delaware \$12,923,000. The high month for Pennsylvania was August, with cash receipts of \$72,583,000. Low month for Pennsylvania receipts was June, for Delaware it was December, and for New Jersey it was February.

Livestock and livestock products proved to be the principal source of cash receipts for farmers in the tri-State area, Pennsylvania farmers received \$73,445,000 from this field in 1954; those in New Jersey got \$216,726,000, and those in Delaware \$70,179,000. High month in Pennsylvania was October, with receipts of \$50,915; in New Jersey, March with \$19,619,000; and in Delaware, July with \$6,912,000.

In Pennsylvania last year farmers received cash receipts of \$175,365,000 from crops. In New Jersey the figure was \$120,100,000, and for Delaware, \$23,529,000. August receipts in Pennsylvania were highest and those of December the lowest. In New Jersey the high receipt month was July, with the low ebb in February. In Delaware the high month was July and the low month was February, with only \$802,000 accruing from crop cash receipts.

Government payments under various programs brought Pennsylvania farmers \$4,002,000, those in New Jersey \$872,000, and in Delaware a total of \$390,000.

The House this week by voice vote passed H. R. 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, effective with respect to 1955 and subsequent crops, relating to restrictions on agricultural conservation payments. The bill is now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and hearings are scheduled. This bill would eliminate the provision of law that farmers who plant in excess of farm-acreage allotment in certain commodities shall not be eligible for conservation benefits. It is aimed to help the small farmer.

The House Agricultural Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, on Friday concluded hearings on bills proposing a return to rigid price supports for certain basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. The committee is scheduled to hold an executive session on Tuesday. It's anticipated that, by a lopsided vote, the committee will order the measure favorably reported to the House for action there.

This will be a field day for the farm bloc Members of the House, who last year opposed the Eisenhower-Benson plan for flexible price supports which carried Congress. Because of recent rifts between Democrats and Republicans over administration domestic policies, the debate is expected to be quite vigorous. The measure may pass the House, but is expected to become stymied for the remainder of this session in the Senate.

Politics and Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Politics and Taxes," published in the New York Times of March 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND TAXES

When the Senate begins debate this week on the Democratic proposal to cut income taxes by \$20 a person next year's Presidential campaign will loom in the background perhaps even more importantly than this year's state of the budget. For the handout thought up at the last minute by the Democratic leaders of the House, and pushed through by a five-vote margin, is political in conception and political in purpose. It is thought to be a good issue on which to garner votes in 1956, irrespective of how much it will increase the existing Federal deficit.

An example of this kind of political thinking is implicit in recent statements of Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. On the one hand, Mr. Butler claims—presumably with a straight face—that this tax reduction was soundly conceived so far as the fiscal policy of the Government goes, which is about as broad a stretch of the political imagination as we have seen in many moons. On the other hand, and much more to the point, is his further statement that the Democrats will fasten on the President personally the responsibility for its defeat, if it is defeated. This is the real key to the proposal.

If it goes through, the Democratic Party hopes to take whatever political credit there may be in removing 5 million persons, including many voters, from the Federal tax rolls. If it doesn't go through, the Democratic Party will attempt to picture the President as interested only in the welfare of big corporations and not at all in the welfare of the little individual. This fiction will be maintained despite the fact that the present bill continues the existing high level of corporation taxes, despite the fact that in 1953 the President had fought for and obtained a 6-month extension of the excess-profits tax, despite the fact that a 10-percent personal income-tax reduction took effect a year ago, despite the fact that last year's monumental tax revision bill included many features aimed directly at helping the individual, and despite the fact that is most important of all to the small taxpayer: The price level has been stabilized, inflation ended and savings once again have some meaning.

Senator CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, acting majority leader, has said that the Democratic Senate leadership would make a party fight for the \$20 reduction. But fortunately there are Democrats in the Senate who refuse to be maneuvered into pushing the Government into a ruinous financial position just to make some political hay. It appears at this writing that there will be enough such Democrats to prevent passage of the \$20 handout. The more there are, the less this can be made the party matter that the Democratic leadership—or most of the leadership—is trying to make it. And the more

there are, the better the chances of defeating the proposal in conference.

We have never said that the Republicans are above playing politics in this crucial game of national financial stability; but in the present case the onus does lie with the Democrats. They have asked for the responsibility and they must have it. But the hope is that they may yet be saved from themselves and the National Treasury saved from a politically inspired annual loss of over \$2 billion.

A New Look at Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the press has recently told of this year's A-bomb tests at the Nevada proving grounds of the Atomic Energy Commission. I was privileged to witness one of the previous tests. It is an awesome and unforgettable experience. I dread the day that we are faced with atomic warfare. Though we will be prepared due to the work of the AEC and the Department of Defense, nevertheless it is a terrible thing to contemplate. Worse still is radioactive fallout which according to the AEC report of February 15 had added a new dimension to atomic warfare.

What is radioactive fallout—and how is it brought about? Here is what happens: When an H-bomb goes off, the explosive force is so great and the fireball so huge—sometimes 4 miles in diameter—that great quantities of pulverized material are scooped up in the tremendous blast. They become impregnated with deadly radioactivity. This dust then is carried downwind from the explosion and is deposited over a cigar-shaped area which in last year's Pacific test extended 220 miles and was 40 miles wide.

As my constituents know, Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated that the radioactive fallout of bombs such as were used in the Pacific tests last year will extend over an area as large as New Jersey—more than 7,000 square miles. If no preventive measures are taken or if the people do not know what to do to protect themselves, casualties would be inflicted upon more than 90 percent of the population and some 45 percent of these casualties would probably be fatal. The situation is not hopeless because there is much that we can do. If we take cover either in a building or in a shelter, preferably covered by 3 feet of earth, we have a good chance of surviving. Radioactive substance also can be washed off. The difficult task is to determine where the radioactivity is because it is invisible and odorless. To meet this problem the Federal Government and our States and cities will have to provide monitoring instruments—Geiger counters—to civil-defense workers, fire and police stations, and probably to high-school science instructors. On the encouraging side, New

Jersey has been in the forefront of the States that have had a good civil-defense organization. Gov. Robert B. Meyner has been briefed by the top people in the Government including the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the FCDA Administrator on the importance of the civil-defense program. Newark has budgeted \$157,409 for civil defense, including approximately \$84,000 which is matched by Federal funds for the purchase of equipment for warning systems and for stockpiling emergency supplies. By July 1 of this year over \$130 million worth of medical supplies and other equipment will be stockpiled for civil defense use. Some of these medical supplies and other equipment is available for use in case of attack in the FCDA warehouse at Somerville, N. J.

In concluding these remarks I call your attention to the following words of Gov. Val Peterson, FCDA Administrator, before the Kefauver Subcommittee on Civil Defense during its present hearings:

As I see it, the need for civil defense will continue until one of these two conditions prevails: until we are satisfied that man has been able to develop a permanent, secure peace; or until our Military Establishment is able to guarantee that no enemy can make an attack on this country. I am afraid that neither of these two conditions will be fulfilled for many, many years to come. Consequently, as long as there are weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them—in other words, as long as we need a military defense—we will need a civil defense.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, I should like to make it clear that the military efforts to build strength to deter attack, or if it comes to defend our homeland, are most important contributions to civil defense. The successful military defense of a city is the best type of civil defense—and I am convinced that our military leaders are doing everything humanly possible to build the required strength. But since we are assured that no defense can be perfect that enough bombers may be expected to penetrate our defenses to pose staggering problems of destruction, we in turn must spare no effort to build a strong civil defense.

They Are Building a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include some pertinent facts about an outstanding American girl: 16-year-old Janet Hammer, of Scales Mound, Ill., of the 16th Illinois Congressional District. The following statement appeared in This Week magazine, under date of February 27, 1955, on the subject of We're Raising a Great Crop of Kids, and reads as follows:

Look at Janet Hammer, 16, of Scales Mound, Ill. She gets up before sunrise to tend her own herd of cattle. After breakfast, she is off to school, 6 miles away, driving

the family car. She can't come home on the school bus; she's too busy with after-school activities. She comes home in time to help cook dinner and wash up. After dinner she studies—she is a good student. Then she sits down at her sewing machine (which the cattle paid for) and really goes to work. She will tackle anything from an evening gown to a bathing suit. She sews all her own clothes and takes in plenty of orders from schoolmates. She has just finished her biggest job to date—costumes for the school's cheerleaders.

Inadequacy of Program for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon Education, which is the official periodical of our Oregon State Education Association, published a very effective editorial in its recent March issue showing the inadequacy of the recent administration plan for our schools. It is important to note that this editorial points out that "for Oregon schools, we doubt that the \$1 billion program would have any appreciable significance."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT FIRST GLANCE ONLY

Take a look at \$1 billion and what it might do for the Nation's hard-pressed schools. Take a second look at the conditions appended; then reconsider the known facts and authoritative estimates.

President Eisenhower recommended, in a special education message to Congress last week, that the Congress allocate \$1,120,000,000 to help alleviate the Nation's desperate school-building needs. He noted that the Nation was short some 300,000 classrooms now, and, of course, we in education know that additional thousands of classrooms will have to be built in the next few years to accommodate pupil upsurge.

The President's \$1 billion-plus recommendation sounds like a lot of money, but it isn't in light of current school needs. And by comparison with the President's proposed \$100 billion highway-building program, it dwindles to relative insignificance.

At a very conservative cost of \$10,000 per classroom, just to catch up with present shortages would cost \$3 billion. And additional classrooms are needed every day—and will be needed daily until well into the 1960's. The National Citizens' Commission for the Public Schools, in 2 recent reports (Financing Public Education in the Decade Ahead and How Do We Pay for Our Schools) estimates that all the schools needed by 1965 could be built at a budget of \$2 billion a year if State authorities financed them, amortizing over 30 to 50 years. That's \$20 billion over the next 10 years for construction alone and does not take into consideration rapidly mounting operational costs as enrollments expand.

Of the President's recommended allocations, \$900 million would be in loans, repayable with interest to the Federal Treasury. Only \$220 million would be in grants, and not all of this directly applicable to school construction.

For Oregon schools, we doubt that the \$1 billion program would have any appreciable significance. We know of no schools in the

State which have been unable to negotiate satisfactory loans for building purposes. Yet high interest rates are one of the requirements anticipated for receiving Federal loans. And our school districts currently have bonded debt limits beyond which they legally may not go, despite need and the availability of Federal loan funds.

But if circumstances were different, if all of the \$1,120 million were directly available for school construction, and if Oregon as a State received one forty-eighth part of the contemplated funds, the amount so allocated would come to only \$23 million. That would be roughly enough to take care of our current school building needs for 1 year's time. Between now and 1960, it is authoritatively estimated that Oregon will have to spend over \$100 million for school capital outlay.

The President's proposal is no panacea for the Nation's school ills. At best it can bring substantial aid only to a relatively few districts. It should not divert our efforts to find effective solution to our school finance problems.

A billion dollars seems like a lot of money, but at first glance only.

The American Red Cross and Dr. Schweitzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "American Red Cross Campaign," published in the New Beacon, of Provincetown, Mass., of March 2, 1955. It eulogizes Dr. Albert Schweitzer and his work in relation to the Red Cross.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN RED CROSS CAMPAIGN

During the month of March the American Red Cross will conduct its annual campaign for members and funds in our town and throughout the country. At the same time, in an African jungle, one of the great men of our time will begin his 42d year in a project of selfless devotion to mankind. Between these two seemingly unrelated events there is a connection, a strong one.

The man is Dr. Albert Schweitzer, physician, philosopher, writer, and Nobel Prize winner, who has devoted most of his 80 years to running a hospital for the inhabitants of a remote jungle community.

Doctor Schweitzer has developed a principle called Reverence for Life, a subject on which he was interviewed recently.

It is not enough, he said, to do one's daily job, support one's family, abide by the laws. "That's all very well," he said, "but you must do something more."

"You must give some time to your fellow man. Even if it's a little thing, do something for those who have need of help, something for which you get no pay but the privilege of doing it."

So great was Doctor Schweitzer's belief in this principle that he left his native Alsace to live out his life in a jungle. That principle brings us back to the Red Cross.

The Red Cross, in its essence, is merely the means by which we all can give some help to those of our fellow men who need it, who

must have it. Through the Red Cross we can lighten the load of a tornado victim, help brighten the hours of a hospital patient, even save a life. In helping them, our own lives become more meaningful.

The Red Cross has long realized that fact and on it has been built the enduring, world-wide organization which serves us in so many ways. We can serve it, in turn, by joining during its March campaign for members and funds.

Capitol Cloakroom Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] appeared on the CBS radio program Capitol Cloakroom on March 6, discussing various issues before the Congress and the Nation at this time. Inasmuch as the Senator's statements shed considerable light upon several of these issues, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program Capitol Cloakroom be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITOL CLOAKROOM

Guest: The Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, Democratic Senator from Louisiana.

CBS correspondents: Griffing Bancroft, Wells Church, Paul Niven.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, will this Congress reduce income taxes?

Mr. CHURCH. Can tariffs be lowered any more without hurting American industry?

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, will the South go Democratic in 1956?

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, welcome to Capitol Cloakroom. A lawyer, and youngest man in the United States Senate, you have been here now for 5 years, where you are a member of the Senate Finance Committee which this week has been busy with taxes and tariffs.

Let's start with the first: Will this Congress reduce personal income taxes?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, it is impossible to give you an answer for that. All I can tell you is that we will make a very strong effort to do it on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Right now I suspect we are a few votes shy of what we need in the United States Senate to put through the kind of amendment that the House adopted. I hope that we can gain more votes there, as the fight develops. I believe we have a good case to make for income-tax relief for the average individual. And, of course, I am going to support the kind of relief that the House voted for that the average man would have \$20 tax relief, \$20 more for his wife and \$20 more for each child. For example, a family of 5 would have tax relief of \$100 on their income tax.

Mr. BANCROFT. I know, Senator LONG, you were one of those who supported that in the Finance Committee, and were outvoted. Do you think there is a possibility that you can get it through the Senate when it comes up on the floor?

Senator LONG. I do not believe in giving up a fight before you have tried. I believe that we have a good case to make.

This type of tax relief would help to relieve unemployment. At the present time we have 3,350,000 people unemployed, and, incidentally, the press has not noticed particularly that unemployment increased 500,000 from December until January of this year. Those figures are too high in terms of unemployment, and I believe we are losing a tremendous amount of wealth in terms of national production by failure to give some tax relief in the ways of increasing purchasing power among the great masses of our people.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I would like to ask this:

In view of the fact that there are stories and reports going along that you supporters of this \$20 tax cut are engaged in stalling the bill—we do not know for sure, it is apparently not coming up on the floor of the Senate until late next week at the earliest; when will that bill come up on the floor, and is there any deliberate stalling on the part of you supporters of it?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, there is no deliberate stalling as far as those of us supporting the tax cut are concerned. But we do want some time to get together the facts and figures upon which we buttress our case.

Now, I have been just today consulting with other minority members on that committee. I say minority, we are part of the majority, we are a majority of the Democratic majority, but the two Democrats voting with the Republicans give them a majority on that committee because Republicans vote solidly against this tax cut. We want that bill to come up. We want to make our fight just as we did last year to see to it that the average individual gets some tax relief because we believe it is in the overall interest of this Nation.

I would like to point this out in connection with this tax relief. We supported last year efforts to reduce taxes in the low-income bracket, and we were defeated by the Republican majority at that time both in the House and in the United States Senate. Now there was some income tax relief. However, it did not reflect itself where it was needed the most, because the increase in social security tax was even greater than the reduction in personal income tax as far as anybody making \$3,500 or less was concerned. That meant that more than 50 percent of the people of this Nation really had no tax relief at all because the increase in social security more than offset what the reduction was in their personal income tax.

Mr. CHURCH. But, Senator, what about the Republican charge, as I understand it, that this tax cut will be just enough to cause sufficient inflation to more than wipe it out in some instances, the value of the dollar?

Senator LONG. Mr. Church, a man ought to be ashamed to make argument if he knows what the real facts are.

Last year against a previous budget deficit of \$9 billion and a budget deficit of last year that turned out to be \$4.5 billion, the administration was willing to go along with \$7 billion of tax relief.

Now, for this coming year, we are told that the budget deficit would be only half much, about \$2.5 billion. So, without as much budget deficit, we are now told that it would be inflation to give just \$2 billion of tax relief, or one-third as much.

Mr. CHURCH. But the Republicans say that is predicated on the Congress cutting expenditures in this next year.

Senator LONG. The point was that we had a deficit last year twice as big as we will have for this coming year and in spite of that \$7 billion of tax relief did not produce any inflation at all.

The \$7 billion, however, for the most part, went to the corporations and those who were better fixed financially. Now we want to give about one-third that much tax relief to the people, and there is no reason to think

that would be any more inflationary than it was when the \$7 billion was given to those who are better fixed economically.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, I presume you have been getting some mail on those proposals. Do your constituents seem interested in this \$20? Do they regard it as a political maneuver or are they just bored by it?

Senator LONG. Mr. Niven, the press has made great effort to convince the people that the Democrats are just playing politics by trying to give the average individual \$20 tax relief, per person. However, the average person feels that both Democrats and Republicans play politics, and I believe that if you want to be fair and you ask the man on the street—I do not mean the businessman, I mean the average little fellow who is working for a living by the sweat of his brow—he will probably tell you it was Republican politics when the Republicans gave tax relief to the corporations, and perhaps Democratic politics, when the Democrats tried to give tax relief to the average man.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, you mentioned having gotten licked last year, and last year you had, I think we will all concede, a pretty big asset on tax matters over here in the Senate on your side, in the person of Senator GEORGE, and Senator GEORGE is against you this year. Do you still think with that opposition that you are going to get this bill through the Senate?

Senator LONG. Fortunately, after the people got through hearing the argument about the taxes last year, they elected more Democrats and, therefore, our hand is somewhat strengthened in that regard.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator GEORGE—to come back to him for a moment—while he said he opposed this, has talked about the possibility of a compromise if the House stands firm in its insistence on the \$20 cut. Do you look for some possible compromise to come out of this thing, assuming you may get licked on the floor of the Senate?

Senator LONG. It is certainly my hope that the House conferees will stand their ground to the very last. If they will, I believe that there should be some sort of compromise.

For my part, I am ready to agree with the President, or anyone else, that there is no reason why we should reduce the corporation tax at this time. The corporations got relief last year on their dividends from taxation, and they got all sorts of handouts that are too complicated and too lengthy to explain here. But, if you read that 875-page bill, it was almost like an Easter egg hunt for golden nuggets, as far as a corporation executive was concerned.

Now, looking into this next year, it is only fair to say that their corporation stock is now at an all-time high. It has never been that high, even in 1929. Particularly, large corporations are concerned. They are not entitled at this time to expect any further tax relief, and we should extend that corporation tax for a while longer.

The Democrats will go along with the Republicans on that part of it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, suppose it comes to a question of choosing one or the other, and I have in mind there the possibility of the President vetoing a bill which might combine the two of them. Would you then go along for an extension of the corporation and the excise taxes alone, as he has asked?

Senator LONG. I suppose if we are successful in getting a bill to the President that would reduce taxes for the average individual, that we would stand our ground if the President vetoed the bill. I do not think he would veto it. I do not think he could afford to do it, for many reasons: politically, morally, and many others.

Mr. NIVEN. But you surely could not get two-thirds of the votes to override the veto, could you?

Senator LONG. No; we could not get two-thirds of the votes to override the veto; that would be correct.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I know in your Finance Committee you are involved in another problem now, this week, and this was the question that Mr. Church has asked you about the tariff bill:

What do you think is going to happen to that over here in the Senate?

Senator LONG. I believe we will report out substantially the bill that was sent to us by the House of Representatives. I suspect that there will be some amendments adopted in the Senate committee. I cannot predict just what those amendments will be, but I see that there are quite a few Senators who are receptive to one suggestion or another on that committee, and I would expect that there would be a few amendments drafted over in the Senate committee, in addition to those that were adopted in the House.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think those amendments would take the form of broadening the so-called escape clause, to make it easier for certain industries to get out of tax reductions or tariff reductions?

Senator LONG. I would not be surprised to see an amendment offered that would gain substantial support, along the line of saying that the President could not reverse the judgment of the Tariff Commission if the Tariff Commission recommended protection for domestic industry.

As you know, the President has reversed the Tariff Commission more often than he has upheld the Tariff Commission, when the Tariff Commission has recommended that the escape clause be invoked to protect some domestic industry.

I see substantial support for that, and I just cannot predict what the result will be when that amendment comes to a vote.

Mr. CHURCH. If I follow you correctly, Senator LONG, it sounds to me as though there might be an equally close shave in the Senate as in the House.

Senator LONG. It might very well be that way. As a matter of fact, on the floor of the House of Representatives the rule was that Members could not offer amendments. They could only offer one proposal to recommit the bill to consider one particular amendment.

Now in the United States Senate no one would ever agree to such a thing. As you know, we have this rule of unlimited debate. As long as someone wants to continue to fight, he has the right to stand there and be heard.

We have some Senators, I won't call any names right here, but I have some in mind, who very well might stand and talk at great length about that bill and offer an untold number of amendments. Some of those amendments may be adopted.

Mr. CHURCH. Is there chance for enough amendments to ruin the bill, that is, ruin it in the eyes of the President in what appears to be a Democratic majority in favor of the bill?

Senator LONG. I think that as far as the administration is concerned, they will have a good chance to regain whatever ground they lost in the Senate in conference because the conferees, for the most part, are either Republicans who have pretty well stayed with the President on most issues, or Democrats who believe in expanding trade. If you look at the senior Democrats and senior Republicans on the Finance Committee, so it is possible that the President may gain coming back from conference what he might lose on the Senate floor if a substantial number of amendments were agreed to there.

It is sort of like the man being chased by the bear. He jumps for a limb on a tree. A friend said, "Did you catch the limb?" He said, "I missed it on the way up, but I caught it on the way down."

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, once you start accepting amendments, surely the meat would be knocked out of it completely in a very short time, would it not?

Senator LONG. I do not believe that the committee will recommend accepting any amendments. I think the committee, for the most part, will stay together in trying to beat off amendments that are offered on the floor. Usually the Finance Committee has done that in the past. As a matter of fact, the Senate Finance Committee has a rather good record under Democratic leadership of defeating amendments. I recall on more than one occasion when Senator George was the chairman of the Finance Committee in which he was successful in getting the committee to stick together and beat off as many as 200 amendments without a single one being adopted. I would not be surprised to see that sort of thing work out again if the committee sticks together.

Mr. NIVEN. Will the committee stick together even in the case of amendments designed to help industries in their home States?

Senator LONG. There will be more difficulty in that case.

Mr. CHURCH. There were some 75 Members of the House, as I recall it, who had industries in their own State which caused them to go against the bill. How about your own State. Do you have anything down there that would make you worry about this bill?

Senator LONG. I have some individuals in my State who are interested in amendments to the bill. I do not expect to support many such amendments because I believe that most of those industries are getting along reasonably well and, after all, although this bill gives the President the authority to reduce tariff 5 percent each year or to reduce tariff on items where there is only a negligible amount being imported at the present time by as much as 50 percent, that is not mandatory upon the President. It is only anticipated that he would reduce the tariffs in the cases where he finds that American industries would not be too adversely affected.

Many of the industries that complain the most bitterly about this matter really cannot show that they are badly hurt or that they would be badly hurt by expanding foreign trade and permitting a few more imports to come into this Nation.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I would like to ask this if it has any bearing on the support of you southerners for this tariff-reduction bill, and that is the matter of the textile industry. As you know, the New England textile Senators are mostly lining up in opposition to this on the ground that it will definitely hurt their textile industry. But I have heard some of you southerners say that a little reduction in tariff might encourage even more movement of the textile industry from New England down South and, therefore, might help your industry. Is there anything to that?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, looking at the whole picture, we cannot expect everything to be in our favor in this foreign trade picture. You cannot expect to get everything from others without giving something in return.

Now in good years we can sell as much as 50 percent of our cotton to other countries, and they consume that cotton within those countries and I suppose they process most of it there.

We do have some textile imports coming back into this country, but the last figure that I saw on it indicated that we are actually shipping out more manufactured textile products than we are importing. So, what are we complaining about? I cannot see that there is any great reason to feel that the textile industry is being very badly injured.

Now, there has been some reduction in employment in textile industries but, for the most part, that has been because of the improvement in their machinery and increased productivity of their working people.

I think I receive about as much mail from textile workers in my State as almost any other one thing. But I believe that if we are efficient, as you suggest, and we continue to improve our ways of doing business, that we should be able to meet a slightly stiffened competition from abroad, and we should try to expand our textile market just as others try to expand their export to us.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, is anyone in your party contemplating plans for Federal aid to communities which might face severe distress because of foreign competition, conceivably, for instance, a one-industry town which was going to be injured by foreign competition to take a loan from the Government in order to retool its factories, switch to another field?

Senator LONG. I do not know of any such proposal as that that is being advanced with much support at the present time, Mr. NIVEN. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any proposal of that sort pending at the moment. There might be.

I have, myself, thought that we should try to work out some way to compensate some of those who are genuinely injured as a result of tariff reductions. I particularly have that in mind when the President reverses the recommendation of the Tariff Commission for relief. Nevertheless, it is so difficult to work out a practicable plan to protect all those who are injured or to help those who are injured in so many different connections. For example, you might help the man who owns the plant, but then the laborers lose their jobs, and how are you going to compensate them? The best thing you can do for them is to help them find a job somewhere else. The result is that no one really has anything worked out, that I know of, to help those who might be injured as a result of increased foreign competition.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, there are some other points in the President's overall program, as I understand it, to increase world trade. One of them is stepping up the so-called point 4 program, and another to grant some sort of tax relief for American business investments overseas. Are you in favor of those things in addition to the tariff relief?

Senator LONG. For the most part, Congress is getting rather weary of these foreign give-away programs. I believe the tendency will be to reduce them, rather than give more in the future.

This economic aid has been going on for so long now that a lot of people would like to get out of the business. Congress, for the most part, will vote to reduce those things.

Insofar as the tax reductions for those doing business overseas are concerned, I would prefer to be selective and try to determine where we want to encourage additional investments or who we want to help and perhaps write into trade agreements if those people have a general increase in their living standards, that we would be willing to reduce our own tariff to help them to continue to sell on the American market. I have that in mind, especially in Central American countries, where many people are only making about 5 cents an hour for their labor. I think that just tends to encourage communism and things of that sort. However, I do not know whether you can attract much support for that sort of proposal.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, you supported the Stevenson ticket in 1952, but the South was anything but solid. Is it going to go Democratic again in 1956?

Senator LONG. Yes; I believe the prospects are very good for the South going solidly Democratic the next time. I would not be

surprised to see every Southern State go Democratic. I said that some time ago, and I see nothing in what has happened during the past 2 years to change my mind about it. I would be inclined to think that you will see the South go together. We have been able to resolve many of these party fights during the last 2 years. We have had very good leadership; we have not fought nearly as bitterly. We have divided on some issues, but it has not been nearly as pronounced or bitter as it has been in years gone by. For that reason, I think the South will be inclined to go back solidly for the Democratic ticket next time.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, is this prediction of the South going Democratic based on the assumption that President Eisenhower will be the candidate for the Republicans in 1956?

Senator LONG. Yes; that is based on that assumption. As a matter of fact, I have seen various polls that have been made in my own State that would indicate that there is far stronger sentiment today for the Democrats than there was at the last election, even assuming that Eisenhower would be the candidate.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, of course, your State of Louisiana went against Eisenhower in 1952.

Senator LONG. We carried it, with difficulty. We carried it by about 40,000 votes, which is not a safe majority when you are polling about 750,000.

Mr. BANCROFT. In other words, you think President Eisenhower is less popular in the South now than he was in 1952?

Senator LONG. That is correct. It is not so much a matter of Eisenhower being less popular; it is a matter of the Democrats as a party, being more popular.

We had many burdens to carry at that time. It was difficult to explain a lot of things that were complicated. A lot of people tried to blame the Democrats for the various burdens that we had to carry during the Korean war, and things of that sort. I think that the next go-around, not having been in power for 4 years, we will be in better shape than we were, having been in power for 20 years.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, you said a moment ago that your party has avoided a fight in the last couple of years. Perhaps you made a distinction as to other parties. But, do you have reason to believe that the Northern liberals are going to let the race issue and the civil-rights issue lie dormant between now and the election?

Senator LONG. I do not know precisely what moves may be made by our Northern liberal friends, but I believe, on the whole, that they have been willing to join with us on those things that Democrats can unitedly support. And as long as we continue that trend, I believe there is every reason to believe why the South should be more happy with the Democratic Party and more anxious to support it.

Mr. NIVEN. Then you do not expect a strong civil rights plan in the 1956 platform in your party?

Senator LONG. I expect a civil rights platform similar to the one we had last time. I do think the Southern Democrats will be somewhat helped in keeping their States in the Democratic column, however, because of the fact it is now clear that the Republican Party is not for the Southern position on civil rights. They are just as much opposed to our position, perhaps, as the Northern Democrats. But that always took a lot of explaining down South and kept some of us very much on the defensive when we were urging some of the people to vote Democratic before.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, this prediction of yours about the South was based on the assumption that President Eisenhower would be the Republican candidate. I would

like to ask you if we could take the other assumption that Adlai Stevenson will be the Democratic candidate?

Senator LONG. It is possible that Adlai Stevenson would be, and he would be a good candidate. But at this time I would not be at all prepared to concede Adlai Stevenson would be the Democratic candidate. I think he would run a very good race and stand a very good chance of winning if he were the candidate. However, I think there are other possibilities who might run just as strongly and perhaps a stronger race.

Mr. CHURCH. Could you name some of them?

Senator LONG. I would rather not do it. I have some in mind, but I do not want to suggest any of them. I would rather let them put themselves forth rather than me advance their candidacies.

Mr. CHURCH. You do agree that the President will run again?

Senator LONG. I do not agree he will run again. I do not know. I cannot speak for him.

Mr. CHURCH. That is what I understood you to say a moment ago.

Senator LONG. Well, I believe if he runs the South will go solidly Democratic, and I believe the Democrats will have a—

Mr. NIVEN. Is there likely to be a southerner in the race for the Democratic nomination?

Senator LONG. I would certainly hope so, being a southerner myself. I am rather proud of our representation from the South. I would certainly hope that we would have some good southerners offer themselves.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think Senator Russell would run again?

Senator LONG. He said he would not. He is a man of his word, and if he said it, he means it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Let me ask you this about yourself: Your term is coming up in 1956. Are you a candidate for the United States Senate next year?

Senator LONG. Well, there is quite a bit of local politics in Louisiana at the present time. I have indicated that I might be a candidate for governor. I have not at all decided that. I think we had better let first things be decided first, and I cannot tell you whether or not I will run for Governor of Louisiana at the present time. Therefore, I could not tell you whether I would be a candidate for the Senate as yet.

Mr. BANCROFT. Could you say that you would be a candidate for one or the other?

Senator LONG. I would rather not answer that question quite that way. I would prefer to decide a little bit later on what my position will be, as far as offering myself for office is concerned.

Mr. NIVEN. Would you exclude retirement from your plan?

Senator LONG. I do not necessarily exclude it, but I would rather leave that to the public to decide.

Mr. CHURCH. You do enjoy being in the United States Senate?

Senator LONG. I have enjoyed it very much, Mr. Church.

Mr. BANCROFT. Coming back to some of the problems in the United States Senate, we have mentioned some of your problems on the Finance Committee. You are also a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which has this problem of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

What is going to happen to that in this session of Congress?

Senator LONG. I wish I could predict. I was one of those who supported the President's position that Hawaii should become a State because it had been ready for some time, and Alaska was not ready for statehood. Last year the Democrats were successful in adding an amendment that would put the Alaskan statehood bill in with the Hawaiian statehood bill. You had to vote

for both of them or none. Therefore, I voted for statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

It looks as though there is not much chance for separating those bills, and so I suppose we will pass such a bill through the Senate again, if we get a chance to consider it.

Mr. CHURCH. Both of them?

Senator LONG. There are some machinations about this legislative bill. For example, there is the Rules Committee over there on the House side. If there are any differences of opinion between the leaders on the House side, sometimes they won't let the House vote on it. That is what happened to the statehood bill last time. It might be the fate this time.

Mr. NIVEN. Why are most southerners opposed to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska?

Senator LONG. They can make many arguments, and I would prefer to believe that they are 100 percent sincere in saying that they believe that we shouldn't broaden the representation of this Nation, and that we would be a stronger Nation if we limited ourselves to the continental United States and did not take in outlying areas.

Personally, I believe that we would be a greater country if we did take those areas in.

Mr. NIVEN. Other motives are sometimes ascribed to them, aren't they?

Senator LONG. Oh, yes; there are some that say southerners feel it would be two more votes for FEPC or two more votes to make southerners quit talking when you try to reduce States rights.

I do not think that necessarily would be the case. I am inclined to think that the new States would be even more jealous of their States' rights than existing States.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I know one matter you have taken considerable interest around here in is the matter of civil defense. What do you think Congress ought to do about civil defense?

Senator LONG. About 10 times what we have done. A tremendous number of lives could be saved if we would make some plans to alert the people to the kind of measures that could be taken to save their lives in the event of an atomic attack. Just to give you an example, if you had an atom bomb, let's take a hydrogen bomb, the huge kind that could explode on one of our cities, while that might kill everyone within 5 or 6 miles of the explosion, most people beyond that point would live if they had just a good, deep basement to go into and stay there until the radioactivity of the so-called fallout, the dust that is created by these explosions, had settled and dissipated itself into the atmosphere. But most people would not know that unless you do a better job of educating them. The result is most of them would leave their homes to try to get away, and many of them would be killed as a result of the radioactivity.

Then, too, when those type bombs explode, these clouds of radioactive dust might go as much as three or four hundred miles, dropping the cinders all along the way. A person could be safe from that if he had himself a small cellar, or if he had prepared a little bomb shelter with as much as two feet of dirt over the top of it to protect himself against the radioactivity that would be involved there.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think the Federal Government should put up some money to help him do that construction?

Senator LONG. The first thing we ought to do is to tell him what sort of shelter he ought to build. Then I believe it would be good to pass some sort of legislation to make a housing loan to a person, just as you have a title I, FHA, where a person can borrow money to put venetian blinds or a thing of that sort in his home. Perhaps we ought to make them a longer term loan to install a properly speci-

fled bomb shelter in their own homes that might save their lives in the event of an atomic disaster. I believe you might save as many as 40 million lives that way if you had the proper type protection from just the radioactivity.

Mr. BANCROFT. I am afraid that is all the time we have. Thank you very much, Senator LONG.

Senator LONG. You are very welcome.

Vice President Nixon's Caribbean Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Robert C. Hill, the distinguished American Ambassador to El Salvador, relative to the tremendously beneficial effect to the United States of Vice President Nixon's recent trip through the Caribbean area.

There being no objection, the latter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN EMBASSY,
San Salvador, El Salvador,
February 21, 1955.

To the EDITOR.

Because of your constructive policy in conveying news to the people of the United States, I am sure you will be interested in comments regarding the current trip of Vice President Nixon and his wife through Central America.

This trip is exerting a tremendous influence toward achieving the hemispheric solidarity which is vital to the future of the United States and Latin America.

In the 48 hours that the Vice President and his party were in El Salvador, the growth of warm friendship for the United States and its citizens was a tangible, active experience.

Perhaps the original announcement of the proposed visit by Mr. Nixon to Central America was received by the public with an understandable lack of enthusiasm. The people of Central America are our friends, but they are also our neighbors. Here, as at home, neighbors have a way of being critical, of developing a dislike for mischievous children and of being annoyed when the other fellow's radio is too loud. Central America also has memories of times gone by when, rightly or wrongly, they considered Uncle Sam the neighborhood bully. It has been a long time since there was a basis for such recollections, but neighbors have long memories.

These are the agricultural countries with great masses of workers that the Communists cultivate. And they succeeded, for a time, in Guatemala until the people rose up against them and reestablished democracy.

These are the countries which depend for their livelihood on the purchase by the people of the United States of their agricultural products—mainly coffee and bananas. These are the countries which buy more than 80 percent of their manufactured articles from the United States.

And these are the countries which—just because they are considered to be our solid friends—we have largely ignored in our international efforts to win friends and influence people on the side of democracy.

Now, in a matter of days, public opinion here has changed. I have talked with Government officials, with newspapermen, and with men on the street. They say: "Mr. Nixon's visit proves you really are interested in us—it is not just words."

Mrs. Nixon, too, is showing the same sympathetic understanding of Latin Americans. Here she visited hospitals, the nurses' home, and the wonderful orphanage called Ciudad de los Niños which is modeled on Boys Town, Nebr.

The effect of the trip on El Salvador is best summed up in the editorial which appeared today in La Prensa Grafica, the newspaper of widest circulation in this country. Its concluding paragraphs state:

"Bolívar wanted Latin America united. He fought until he died to achieve that union. Today, Bolívar's ideal is enlarged to include the union of all America as the only means of survival.

"The significance of Mr. NIXON's visit—which makes us very grateful—is that the great nation to the north has understood also that its destiny is the same as that of Latin America."

The Vice President and his party deserve our gratitude for the contribution they are making to the free world.

ROBERT C. HILL,
Ambassador of the United States
of America to El Salvador.

Century of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Century of Progress," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 7, 1955. I am particularly pleased to call attention to the editorial because St. Elizabeths Hospital was created through the unceasing work of a Massachusetts lady 100 years ago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTURY OF PROGRESS

The centennial of St. Elizabeths Hospital, which was observed last week, is significant for something more than 100 years of growth in an institution. It brings to the fore a totally different concept of mental and emotional illness. The story of St. Elizabeths is the story of 100 years of evolution in the practice of psychiatry. It is a matter of good fortune for the people of Washington and many others who make use of this institution that Dr. Winfred Overholser and the other four eminent superintendents who have served it have kept abreast of modern methods of treatment as well as the heavy demands upon its facilities.

Some concept of the progress that has been made in this century may be had by remembering that it was the spectacle of mentally ill persons incarcerated in a Massachusetts jail which drove Dorothea Lynde Dix to work unceasingly for the creation of a special hospital for mental patients in the Nation's Capital. Over the years the inhuman practice of treating these unfortunate as criminals was changed. Special institutions were built for them, but in some

instances these became worse than jails, and the prevailing use of mental hospitals was for segregating the insane from the sane. For many long decades these hospitals were little more than prisons for mentally disturbed persons.

Today all the leading mental hospitals have become in fact scientific treatment centers. Of course, they care for many patients who are not curable by any methods now known to medical science. But the great majority of patients go to a mental hospital for treatment and return to society in precisely the same way that they enter and are discharged from other hospitals. The emphasis is in finding the cause of a patient's disturbance and supplying a remedy through psychotherapy or other means.

St. Elizabeths has contributed much to this evolution. In addition it has trained a great number of psychiatrists, psychologists and others engaged in the care and treatment of the mentally ill and is the only public mental hospital which has been approved by the American Medical Association for general internship. It is everywhere recognized, however, that this century of progress is only a beginning in the development of this highly specialized branch of medicine. Many types of emotional and mental illness are still not adequately understood and the techniques of treatment can be vastly improved. Indeed, the gulf between the treatment applied in the best of the mental hospitals and in the poorest is still discouragingly wide. We must recognize also that the strains and tensions of life today are causing an appalling volume of emotional and mental disturbance. It is a challenge to society in general as well as to the medical profession—a challenge which calls for more of the foresight, courage and spirit of experimentation that led to the creation of St. Elizabeths.

Irrigation in Northwestern Lake County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John L. Denny in the Portland Oregonian of February 28, 1955, describing the irrigation of 30,000 once arid acres on the upland desert of south-central Oregon.

Cheap electricity provided by the Midstate rural-electric cooperative, with headquarters at Lapine, Oreg., is making possible the pumping of water to create a new agricultural civilization amidst Oregon's high desert. This is a tangible demonstration of what low-cost water power means in terms of development and economic progress in the Pacific Northwest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRRIGATION PUMPS BRING NEW LAND RUSH TO NORTHWESTERN LAKE COUNTY

(By John L. Denny)

A new land boom is in the making in the Fort Rock area, a high-desert basin in northwestern Lake County ringed by the shattered remnants of long-dead volcanoes.

This is a new boom, because the first land rush was in the 1890's, when homesteaders

by the hundreds settled the country, and towns sprang up, flourished and died.

The homesteaders went broke, and only their abandoned buildings remain to remind of the first boom. Their exodus was aptly described by E. R. Jackman, range crops specialist at Oregon State College, in a recent issue of the Oregon Farmer:

"The homesteaders left without benefit of FHA, PMA, SCS, REA, or crop-disaster loans. When their cash ran out, so goods no longer came COD, they left PDQ. Their deserted homestead buildings still dot the landscape, though some were torn down for some vague reason when the Government decided the land thereabouts was pretty marginal and bought it up in the heyday of the New Deal.

This time irrigation is the magic word triggering the new land rush. It might better be called a pump rush, because pump companies are getting set for an Eldorado, selling pumps to the settlers. One company is talking of sending salesmen with sleeping bags and order books, to be in on the ground floor.

The water to irrigate this thirsty hunk of desert will come from a vast underground lake, and the juice to pump it will come from a new 191-mile line the Lapine Rural Electric cooperative is building into the basin with a \$1 million loan from Uncle Sam.

Enthusiastic boosters of the project say irrigation will convert the basin into a garden spot, growing grain, potatoes, and sugar beets.

Skeptics assert that settlers who hope to get rich growing with irrigated cash-crop farming are going to wake up some frosty morning singing "Yes, we have no bonanza."

George Larimer, manager of the Lapine REA, is one of the backers of the project who believes it has a rosy future in row crop and grain farming. He says the 100-day growing season gives plenty of time for crops that grow in the ground, such as sugar beets and potatoes, and cites sagebrush 6 to 8 feet tall as proof of the deep and fertile soil, just waiting for the water.

LIVESTOCK SEEN ANSWER

Larimer said contracts for construction of 43 miles of transmission line and 148 miles of distribution line will be awarded by the REA co-op Monday night. He said 80 customers on the line have signed up to put in pumps the first year.

Larimer said some 30,000 acres will be developed in the first phase of the project. Shallow wells will provide low-cost water, he believes, because the water level averages only 29 feet down.

A different view of the prospects for farming in the project is taken by most farm authorities and some of the livestock ranchers now in the basin.

Jackman, for example, believes the short and undependable growing season will rule out cash crops. The growing season might be 100 days one year, all right, but the next year it might be only 30 days.

Jackman believes prospects are good in the area for livestock farming. Irrigated pastures and alfalfa will produce about 400 pounds of beef to the acre a year. At present cattle prices, ranchers would do all right. With cattle at 15 cents a pound, roughly, this would yield \$60 an acre a year, or \$10,000 on a quarter section, with production costs of around \$5,000.

Only trouble with this picture is that no one knows how long cattle prices will stay where they are.

It will cost about \$100 an acre to convert the sagebrush into irrigated farms, and financing may be a stumbling block that will hold back the boom. As Jackman put it:

"A lot of folks with small holdings can't get a well drilled until they get the money, and they can't get the money until they get the well drilled. It's like the Irishman who couldn't get his new shoes on until he had worn them a couple of days."

The United States Geological Survey report says the water supply in the basin is adequate for irrigating 30,000 acres of land. Others say 100,000 acres is the limit.

Part of the land is in private ownership, some of it in livestock ranches which owners will subdivide. And Larimer reports that heirs of some of those 1890 homesteaders are showing up to claim their property.

Approximately 100,000 acres of the basin is land acquired by the Government under the resettlement project in the 1930's. Unlike other regular public domain lands, this land utilization project is not under the Homestead Act. It cannot be transferred to private ownership unless Congress passes special legislation.

SOILS FIT FOR WATER

Soil Conservation Service technicians who have been doing some soils surveying in the basin say they have delineated five broad areas suitable for irrigation. But unfortunately about half of the suitable land is in the Government land utilization project, closed to homesteaders. This area is being used as grazing land, under supervision of the Bureau of Land Management.

All of these and other pros and cons of the incipient boom are due for an airing Tuesday at Fort Rock Grange Hall, at the annual meeting of the Fort Rock soil conservation district. Promoters of the project, pump company representatives, and a panel of State and Federal soils and irrigation experts will be on hand. The meeting starts at 10 a. m.

The Robinson-Patman Act and Food Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers, at the annual convention of National Food Brokers Association in Chicago, on February 19, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT AND FOOD DISTRIBUTION

(Address by Mrs. Marie Kiefer)

It is a pleasure, indeed, to be here today and have the opportunity of discussing with you the Robinson-Patman Act, and more pointedly the evil of price discrimination which it was intended to prevent.

Insofar as the basic issues of the evils of price discrimination, and the need for strong enforcement of the statute are concerned, there is no difference in our respective positions.

But before getting to the heart of that matter, I want you to know that we recognize how important brokers are in the pattern of food distribution today. Please don't misinterpret this, my purpose is not to flatter you by making a pretty speech complimenting you in a dozen different ways, but actually I have a far different purpose in calling attention to your importance.

All of us know that the food distribution industry has experienced sweeping changes in its method of operation in recent years. The self-service market, modern packaging,

and new methods of processing are frequently cited and discussed as an index to the progress made in bringing better foods to the American consumer at lower costs. But the food broker needs recognition in this picture, too, for he plays a very vital part.

I know, without the use of statistics, that more and more food processors and manufacturers are turning to brokers to help sell their products. Everyone in the industry is aware of the fact that the growth of sales through food brokers has been substantial, and is continuing to climb. Why is it? What is responsible for this growth? In my judgment, the answer can be stated in one word—competition. The food industry, from manufacturer and processor right through to the retailer, is one of the most fiercely competitive in the entire country. This also means that a high degree of efficiency prevails in the industry, and the overall result is that within the last 20 or 30 years the cost of food distribution has been cut in half.

Food brokers have succeeded because they offer to both small and large manufacturers and processors an economical method of promoting and selling their products. That is not all—for food brokers also stimulate competition by providing an outlet for small sellers and those just getting started who cannot afford to hire a salaried sales force. Food brokers also reduce the cost of merchandise by expanding the market for products they handle through personal visits with distributors. This extra service of brokers calling on retailers has resulted in a much closer relationship between retailers and brokers than ever before.

Mentioning this close relationship brings to my mind a suggestion we would like to offer for the interchange of views to strengthen the relationship. For some years, NARGUS has had a very active merchandising committee, made up of successful, enterprising, and progressive retailers. We are proud of the work the committee has done in solving some common problems with similar groups in other segments in the industry. The same beneficial accomplishments can be attained if our committee could meet together with representatives of your group and lay a foundation for working together in selected areas of mutual interest. We would like very much to become better acquainted with your views, and to let you know those of the retailers, not only for ourselves but for the welfare of the industry and consumers generally. I surely hope you will give this suggestion serious consideration, and that before too long your representatives and ours can sit down around the table to discuss mutual interests and problems.

As I mentioned earlier, we believe food brokers serve a most useful and necessary purpose. It will not come as any surprise to you, I am sure, that not everyone in the industry feels this way about brokers. You will recall the recent effort to destroy the section of the Robinson-Patman Act dealing with brokerage payments. "Please note I said 'destroy,'" because that is the ultimate effect the proposed legislation would have.

NARGUS opposed this legislation vigorously, after careful consideration of the entire problem by our executive officers. For example, supporters of that proposed legislation requested our officers to review the measure with them. This was done, not once but several times. The secretaries of our affiliated associations reviewed the proposed measure, too, at their meeting in Kansas City last year. All of them, unanimously, determined to oppose the measure aimed at amending the brokerage section of the Robinson-Patman Act. After the bill was introduced, a congressional hearing was held during which we were subjected to a flagrantly abusive attack, simply because we did not go along with the bill. Had it not been for our long and impartial consideration of the measure before it was intro-

duced, we might not have been in a position to meet and disprove the vituperative and defamatory things said against us before a committee of Congress. This is the last time I shall refer to this unhappy experience for, as they say, to err is human, to forgive divine.

NARGUS opposed the bill to amend the brokerage section for one reason, namely, it was adverse to the best interests of the independent retail grocers, regardless of what buying practices or arrangements they may follow. It was this reason, and this reason alone, that led us to the position we took. There were two parts to our reasoning on why we felt the proposal to open up the brokerage section was one we could not support. First, brokerage payments from sellers to buyers were, prior to the Robinson-Patman Act, the chief and most disastrous form of price discrimination against independent retail grocers. The Federal Trade Commission, in the investigation that started in 1928 found, after 6 years of study, that phony brokerage payments was the rotten thread which ran completely through the fabric woven for the purpose of hiding special preferences to mass buyers. Listen to what the House Judiciary Committee had to say in its report on the Robinson-Patman bill:

"Among the prevalent modes of discrimination at which this bill is directed is the practice of certain large buyers to demand the allowance of brokerage direct to them upon their purchases, or its payment to an employee, agent, or corporate subsidiary whom they set up in the guise of a broker, and through whom they demanded that sales to them be made."

The practice of buyers setting up dummy brokerage houses was so thoroughly corrupt that one very large retail distributor not only received phony brokerage payments on its own purchases, but also shared in those paid on products sold by its competitors. I could stand here for hours and cite to you case after case from the public record showing how brokerage payments paid to huge buyers and their intermediaries became a monopolistic endeavor at work in the food distribution industry. A few of you in this audience managed to live through those days. Those of us who saw the destruction, dishonesty, and discrimination that prevailed will never forget it.

The second reason that we, in the retail field, vigorously opposed efforts to open up the brokerage section of the act was because we believe the proposed bill violated the antidiscrimination policy of the act itself, as well as the principles of our Constitution. The bill was framed in such a way as to purport to allow a few specially defined wholesale headquarters houses to collect brokerage. It was deceptively designed to create the impression that only independent distributors would share in the benefits derived from payments received. Actually, what this bill proposed was to write a special discriminatory preference into an act which condemns discrimination on principle. In other words, the bill would encourage the very practice the act was intended to prevent. As our spokesman said to the Senate Judiciary Committee at the time: "We view this with alarm, because we see the act doomed if it is to become a vehicle for granting special privilege to any class of buyers. 'Equal justice under the law' is an essential part of the Robinson-Patman Act, without which it loses both its meaning and its purpose."

Now let me pass to the broader subject of injurious price discriminations. Senator KEFAUVER has discussed the public interest that is served by the Robinson-Patman Act. He has also described the urgent necessity for legislation closing the loophole now in the act. I shall not attempt to elaborate on what he has said, but I do want to tell you that the rank and file of NARGUS members across this country are alert to the

fact that price discriminations in the food distribution industry are on the march again. Hardly a week goes by that we do not hear reports of some special concessions or arrangements that favor a select group of retailers over their competitors. I feel sure that most of you, too, are aware of this kind of vicious price discrimination now going on.

There is a case now pending before the Federal Trade Commission charging a canning company on the west coast with selling fruit cocktail to a large buyer at \$1.75 per dozen while charging smaller competing purchasers \$1.80 per dozen. The Commission also charges that this canner sells its commodities through brokers and sales agents to some of its buyers at approximately 2½ percent to 7½ percent higher than it sells the same commodities of like grade and quality to some of its direct buyers.

If this canner, is, in fact, giving discriminations as charged—it's a safe bet his competitors are now or will likely follow this same practice.

Many discriminations today are not direct price preferences. There is the frozen-food manufacturer who pays the salary of the frozen-food buyer for a local chain in the east, the dairy which pays cash to get exclusive distribution in a food store, the individual arrangements which permit large numbers of representatives of a supplier to work on a full-time basis throughout some special featured event in one or several large retail establishments. There are all types of promotion schemes which give one group of stores preference in both allowances and facilities over competing retailers. Free goods for store openings, manpower for stocking shelves, consignment sales, and so on, are very frequently offered on a preferential basis to buyers who have no scruples about making illegal demands on suppliers.

Sometimes these discriminations are carried on by representatives of a firm which has a headquarters policy against the practice. The trouble is that the sales staff disregard the policy or perhaps do not even know it, but we believe it is up to the manufacturer to see that their representatives observe a law as important to the entire industry as the Robinson-Patman Act.

I am sure you know that the act prohibits discriminations in allowances and facilities, as well as in price. You know that a seller cannot evade the terms of the act simply by giving these indirect forms of price discrimination, but it is quite evident there are a number of people in the industry who either do not know this or else they choose to ignore it. Let's not underestimate the amount of money involved in discriminations of all kinds. The public record shows that in 1 year a large buyer received, in what the court termed "headquarters allowances," \$6.4 million—which constituted 24.59 percent of their total profits from all operations in that year. These headquarters allowances were the largest single source of profit for that organization.

Of course, it isn't always the largest buyer who gets the most, but legitimate operators today in the retail field have good reason to wonder why some suppliers seem to feel the Robinson-Patman Act is dead, and that no one need pay attention to it any more. Let's not kid ourselves into believing that some of the evil practices condemned in the early thirties which gave birth to the Robinson-Patman Act don't exist or will pass away of themselves. They won't, and if something isn't done to correct the situation, it will get worse.

The overwhelming majority of business people do not desire to stoop to injurious discriminatory and unfair practices, but if the willful few, who choose this way of doing business, are allowed to pursue their evil conduct then many will feel they must adopt similar tactics to meet unfair and unethical competition. If this is permitted, the ethi-

cal standards of the industry will sink to the lowest level followed by the most unscrupulous. Two decades of effort to wipe out discriminations and to preserve equality of opportunity for all are now threatened by a resurgence of this old enemy.

We recognize the difficulty in overcoming this dangerous situation. In the first place, the Robinson-Patman Act is structurally weaker now than ever before in its history. This is why we join with you and other groups in supporting efforts to strengthen the act. This effort must go forward with all the vigor and determination at our command. Happily, our two organizations are joined together in this great crusade to save equality of opportunity in America. On behalf of our entire organization I want to commend your association and its officers and members for the spirit and zeal you have always shown in fighting to preserve the act and the principles it stands for. No organization has given greater and more unselfish service to this important cause than yours, and I am thankful for the opportunity to state this fact publicly for the record.

At this point I cannot overcome the irresistible impulse to pay tribute to your president, Watson Rogers. I have known Watson a long time, probably longer than most of you, and it may be for that reason I feel a little embarrassed in acclaiming him because I am just as sure as anything I won't do justice to the man. In all sincerity you have as your president one who combines all the rare qualities of mind, character, and personality that make him an exceptional, outstanding leader. He is a fighter and by that I mean he has the courage to fight for what he believes. Such men have made this industry a great productive force. I shall not say more for surely neither he nor you need my voice to add to his laurels.

Both your organization and ours have a unity of purpose in preserving equality of opportunity in America. But I wonder sometimes if either of us realize how desperate is the need to make more effective the rules against systematic and injurious price discrimination. Oh, sure, most of us know how seriously the Robinson-Patman Act has been weakened. We know that in many instances it is not being enforced and that in some instances the act has been weakened by judicial and administrative opinions. But do we know how far this dryrot has progressed?

The most recent example was given at the trade practice conference for the frozen food industry recently held by the Federal Trade Commission. Representatives of the Commission inserted into a draft of these rules the following as their explanation of the provision allowing discriminations given to meet competition:

"This," it said, "is to be understood as permitting an industry member to meet in good faith a lower price at which like goods are being sold or offered for sale to the same customer by a competitor, though such price be lower than the industry member's price to other buyers competing with such customer, when the industry member is able to show that his lower price was granted under circumstances which would lead a reasonable and prudent person to believe that it would in fact meet the equally low price of a competitor, unless the industry member knew or should have known that the competitor's offer of price was unlawful."

This is the law as presently seen through the eyes of the Commission. I do not pretend to know all it means, but one would have to be totally blind not to see how this new interpretation weakens the original intent of Congress and leaves a loophole which any coercive buyer can take full advantage of. This is the main reason why the equality-of-opportunity bill, which Senator KEFAUVER discussed is so necessary to effectual prevention of harmful price discriminations.

And there is another side to this problem that needs to be stressed. It is the individual responsibility each of us has to foster fair competitive opportunities by refusing to countenance harmful practices we know are taking place. And here I am talking to each one of you as an individual and not just to food brokers as a group.

Each of you is in a unique position in this respect. As sales agents of manufacturers, dealing with buyers of every size and description, you are in a strategic position to learn of violations almost from the moment of their inception.

As an example, one of your principals might send you a notice not to bother contacting a particular buyer because this account is to be handled directly. The principal offers no explanation, but you don't need one. The probabilities are this buyer has succeeded in arranging a special deal where he buys at a discount in lieu of brokerage. Not only you, but this favored buyer's competitors, are the victims of this practice. They cannot compete with such a disadvantage. The trouble is that other buyers do not know the supplier is cutting their throat.

Though you may be willing to accept this loss of brokerage philosophically, you must also consider each one of the nonfavored buyers who is being hurt.

Take even a worse example. You may be told by a principal that a certain large buyer is to get a preferential price not known or available to competing buyers. Perhaps the special preference may not be so blatant, for it may take the form of selling at a discount kept secret from others. There are all kinds of possibilities, and I dare say many in the audience here today could expand tenfold these few examples through your alert observations of daily events.

Now, I would like to get personal. I want to ask you as a legitimate and honest food broker what you do when you find unfair or illegal practices being used? You disapprove of them, of course, but that is not enough. Your duty doesn't stop there.

Suppose you are in your office some day and witness a bank being held up across the street. You stand there observing the event and notice the robbers are getting away in a car. You jot down the license number and make a note of the description of the car and the robbers. Now what do you do about it? Do you shrug your shoulders, comment on how terrible it is, and go back to work? Is that what you do, or do you immediately call the police and tell them all you know, offering your services in apprehending the criminals?

The analogy fits well because discriminations of the kind we are talking about are robbery and are more serious than a bank holdup. The bank is covered by insurance, but the food retailer has no insurance to compensate him for being denied the right of equality of opportunity to succeed in his business.

Can you, in good conscience, become a party to a discriminatory practice that leaves so much harm and destruction in its path? You may not be asked to become a participant in the perpetration of the wrong doing, but in many cases your acquiescence will be necessary to its success. In some instances all that is required of you is to look the other way, to remain silent and unconcerned. But is this all you would be doing? Obviously not. For each violation you overlook is another nail in the coffin of the Robinson-Patman Act. Have not the enemies of that act done enough damage without getting indirect support from its friends? Abraham Lincoln once said: "To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men."

If you are interested in this law—and I know you are—you will do your part in seeing that it is properly and fairly enforced. You will see to it that all violations familiar to you are reported to the Federal Trade Com-

mission regardless of who is involved. As a citizen whose duty it is to uphold the law you have the right to do this without discussing it with anyone. A letter, signed by you, containing a short and simple statement of the facts, with the name and address of the violator, is all that is needed. Send it direct to the Federal Trade Commission in Washington. Correspondence of this nature coming to the Commission is classed as confidential, and the law provides that unauthorized divulgence of information by an employee of the Commission is punishable by a fine, imprisonment, or both.

Even if passive acceptance is all you, as a broker, may be properly charged with, I cannot find anything that relieves you of your duty as a citizen to report the facts to the proper authorities. If you will do at least this much, you, as a part of the fraternity of food brokers, will be a part of a great moral force for good in the industry. Not only that, you will be admired and respected by the great majority.

All this requires is living up to the principles of fairness to all, privilege for none. On this basis the greatness of America is built. Let all of us, therefore, think and act in terms of our individual responsibility to preserve freedom of opportunity so all will have a fair and equal chance.

I do not wish to imply that most of the discriminations are carried on in lines handled by food brokers, for such is not the case. Generally, there is less discrimination in sales handled through brokers. In fact, without brokers and the great advances they have made in expanding their sales volume, the situation in the industry today would be much worse. Credit for this goes to you and your association, but I know and you know that the chiselers in this industry fear the brokerage section of the Robinson-Patman Act more than any other part of it. It is not conditioned by a lot of "ifs," "ands," and "buts" like some other sections.

If you will help lead a crusade to recapture the lost territory, your supporters and followers will be legion. The issue is yours to face because of the position of trust you hold. Food brokers can become the greatest constructive force for fair play there is in the industry.

And right here and now—during this convention—is a wonderful opportunity for you to begin the campaign. Following this session you will meet with principles in many conferences. The Robinson-Patman Act affects the sales policies of each of them, and every manufacturer and processor should be just as interested in strengthening and enforcing the Robinson-Patman Act as "we" are.

You have an obligation to tell your principals how necessary it is that they vigorously and religiously observe the law and not look for loopholes by which to grant price discriminations. If they do not yet realize how important this act is to them, show them what it means to their own survival. You and I know that if they grant unfair discriminations it will boomerang, in time, and they will destroy themselves.

I cannot believe manufacturers and processors are completely unaware of the grave dangers to themselves from such discriminations. Surely they do not have to be told that it is the same large distributors who are granted discriminations that are putting in their own processing plants, and developing their own brands of merchandise. It is no secret that many of these large distributors are using the money they get from these illegal kickbacks to promote and advertise their own brands, which they pack in competition with the manufacturers and processors who are stupidly granting the discriminations. For these suppliers there is more at stake than saving equality of opportunity. Their own future is at stake. Unfortunately some of them do not see this

clearly, and here is where you can render them a great service.

Have you pointed this out to your principals recently? It is your job to get over to them that at best price discriminations provide them with only temporary gains. Before the manufacturer knows it he is being sucked in deeper and deeper until there is no escape. No matter how large a manufacturer or processor may be, he cannot afford to disregard this dangerous threat—the food industry cannot afford it—the Nation cannot afford it. You can—and must—help prevent this growing cancer from destroying the food industry.

Thank you most sincerely for giving me this opportunity to speak to you.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, February 24 was celebrated in the United States as Estonian Independence Day. Those valiant people have suffered under the yoke of the Communist tyranny since 1940, but the hope for their eventual liberation has been kept alive both in their homeland and throughout the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Estonian National Committee in the United States at a patriotic meeting held on the occasion of Estonian Independence Day be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW YORK,
February 27, 1955.

We, Americans of Estonian descent and Estonian refugees, assembled on occasion of the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Republic of Estonia, are deeply concerned about the growing attitudes of complacency in the free world against the menace of Communist aggression.

Most of us have directly experienced the naked face of the Soviet quest for world domination which actually involves not only grasping rule over free nations, but is bound to result in the extinction of substantial parts of the subjugated populations. Therefore, it is not only our wish, but our duty, to point out the true extent of the ruthlessness of the Communist conquistadores, if they would succeed in their world domination, after having lulled the free nations, the American Nation among them, by their peace and coexistence propaganda or paralyzed them into concessions by threats about their alleged hydrogenic superiority.

The Special Report No. 3 by the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives, titled "Communist Takeover and Occupation of Estonia," describes succinctly what went on in Estonia after the seizure of power by the Soviets.

"About 10,000 men, women, and children were arrested during one night (June 14, 1941) and sent in cattle cars to Siberia and northern Russia. This was to be only the beginning. . . . The biggest roundup of the population, however, occurred in March 1949. At least 30,000 to 40,000 persons were sent to slave-labor camps in remote regions. . . . It has been estimated by witnesses before the committee that during the 2 occupations

up to date, about 120,000 to 150,000 Estonians have been deported to the Soviet Union. . . . Thousands of people were plainly murdered and thrown into mass graves, often after tortures."

The population of Estonia before the Soviet conquest was roughly 1.2 million, and the first years of Soviet domination in other conquered countries have resulted in about the same percentage of victims (10-12.5 percent of population). In terms of the total population of the United States, it means that no less than 16 to 20 million persons would be practically annihilated here during the respective period of time.

These simple facts and figures are a grave warning. The question arises: Which requires more victims: the red terror or nuclear warfare?

In 1940 the Estonian Government and Parliament decided to meet the Soviet ultimatum demanding occupation of Estonian territory by the Red army in order to avoid war and unnecessary bloodshed. The result was worse than anticipated: More people were killed or deported by the Communists than the whole armed forces of Estonia taken together, and most of the statesmen themselves who made this decision were among the victims.

The forces of the Communist empire are growing daily, the development of heavy industry and war potential is going on at a much faster pace than in the free West, and is being accelerated. In order to align their forces, the Soviet grip over satellized nations is being consolidated through continuing extinction of population and through indoctrination of youth. The day may come, when our nation who now is longing for liberation will be turned against the West as a part of the "monolithic" Soviet structure. Our experience tells us that as soon as the balance of power will become favorable to the Soviets, they will not hesitate to apply military forces against the West, if necessary.

Therefore we regard as our duty to recall, again and again, that a mere containment of Communist expansionism will not avert a final disaster for the free world, and that a more active policy against them should be pursued. Liberation of the Estonian as well as other Baltic and satellized peoples, which they are unable to achieve by themselves without outside help, is just one, but an integral part of such a more forceful policy against the successful buildup of Communist power in general, an integral part of a policy which we regard to be also of vital interest to this country.

COMMITTEES CAN CHANGE THEIR RULES, BUT RED WITNESSES ARE ALWAYS THE SAME

Sometimes it is said that we ought to create some tribunal as lofty and unassailable as a British Royal Commission to replace congressional committees as probers of Red infiltration. The comrades show less enthusiasm for this idea than they once did, since the Canadian Royal Commission rooted out the Dominion's Reds with no more compunction than a gardener trapping moles.

Australia now has a Royal Commission investigating Soviet espionage and its connection with domestic Communists as an aftermath of the Petrov case. The distinguished commissioners are making a noble effort to carry on in the Liberal tradition, with public hearings. How are they making out? The London Times reported this passage from the testimony of W. H. Bird, Victoria, secretary of a seamen's union:

"Mr. BRD. I have come here to tell you what I know, without this boy (indicating Mr. Pape, junior counsel to the Royal Commission) interrupting me all the time. . . .

"Mr. Pape. You are here to answer questions, not to talk.

"Mr. BRD. Dry up. I know what I have to say without you telling me.

"Seamen in the gallery began to applaud, calling out, 'Good on you, Bill.' The commissioners retired to allow the gallery to be cleared, amid calls of 'This is a free country.' 'You can't take it,' 'You're a lot of cowards.'"

If it all sounds familiar, it is because the method used by the party to disrupt social institutions is the same in every case and every country.

They've been doing it for years. In November 1928, at Zagreb, Yugoslavia, one Josip Broz went on trial for Communist agitation and propaganda, contrary to the law of the realm. The defendant told the presiding judge arrogantly: "I do not recognize the bourgeois court of justice, because I consider myself responsible only to my Communist Party."

When he was sentenced to 5 years and led away by the guards, there was the standard shouting match, joined by supporters in the packed audience. Broz, of course, is now better known as Marshal Tito, and the interesting fact is that his official biography cites this as one of the glorious episodes in his career.

There isn't much you can do with Communists except let them yell. But it would be a mistake to amend our procedures to make their obstructive tactics easier.

be of interest to all persons concerned in that type of a national defense designed to meet any type of aggression that may concern our national security. Secretary Thomas' statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES S. THOMAS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, REGARDING H. R. 4393

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Admiral Duncan, Admiral Leggett, and I are here today to outline the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program and to give your committee reasons and justifications for it.

At the outset, I wish to note, as indicated in section 2 of H. R. 4393, that the proposed legislation does not grant increased shipbuilding or ship conversion authority to the Navy beyond that already authorized by law. This bill would simply indicate the approval of the committee and the Congress for this specific program. In this bill, the committee would give us a bill of particulars.

On the occasion of my recent appearance before your committee, I stated that President Eisenhower had indicated that the fundamental policy of the Department of Defense (which Admiral Carney, General Shepherd, and I fully and unequivocally support) is to prepare a military program which is adequate, balanced, and long ranged. A program which will prevent war if possible, which will meet a variety of military contingencies and, at the same time, a program which our national economy can support indefinitely.

The naval part of this 1956 program, I feel, meets these demanding requirements, and provides for a strong and balanced Navy and Marine Corps that will have the highest degree of combat readiness and flexibility for discharging our peacetime missions and worldwide commitments, and for carrying out our important tasks if war should occur.

In any size or type of war which can now be foreseen, the need of a strong and adequate United States Navy is more essential than it has ever been before. We must have command of the seas so that we can consolidate our strengths with those of our friends and allies. We must always be able to cross the seas to supply our industrial machine—still the free world's arsenal—with the many critical raw materials we need. We must have a Navy for transporting our armies overseas and for keeping them supplied. We must control the oceans in order to operate and supply our worldwide network of bases. And most important, we must be able to exploit the seas to keep the conflict away from our shores, and to carry the fight into the enemy's own territory.

One of the major and vital parts of that naval program is the procurement and conversion of combat ships. In these days of rapid progress in fields such as atomic propulsion, guided missiles, metallurgy, plastics, and shipbuilding techniques, ordering a combat ship demands much foresight on the part of the planners to insure that the vessels which they design are superior and advanced in the technical, naval, and engineering fields. To provide this superiority, our planners must not only anticipate the period of the ship's construction, as much as 3 or 4 years, but must also calculate the adaptability and potential of each type vessel during its life span of about 20 years.

Moreover, the naval needs of a quarter century in advance must also be foreseen with as much vision and wisdom as we can command. For this difficult task, the best—perhaps the only—parameters are experience, logic, and ingenuity. Careful weighing of the many diverse factors of national strategy,

Congressional Committee Rules and Red Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Committees Can Change Their Rules, but Red Witnesses Are Always the Same," published in the Saturday Evening Post of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Why the Navy Needs the "Forrestal" Type Aircraft Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Navy Charles E. Thomas when appearing before the House Armed Services Committee March 7, made the following statement concerning the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program.

While his statement covers the shipbuilding program in general, his reasons as to why the Navy needs additional Forrestal type aircraft carriers should

probable naval requirements, technical advancements, budgetary limitations, relationship to other military programs must be taken into account in arriving at a decision.

I assure you that all such factors have been most thoroughly and carefully reviewed by Admiral Carney, Admiral Duncan, and myself, and others in authority, in the presentation of this shipbuilding and conversion program for your consideration. I consider it a vital, sound, and well conceived one. This program also carries the President's approval.

The shipbuilding program for fiscal 1956 can be summarized by reference to four types of ships—the carrier, the cruiser, the destroyer, and the submarine. I will take each one of these in turn.

The Navy is requesting a fifth aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* type; we are also requesting authority to improve six of our older carriers by conversion.

This carrier program is essential for several reasons. First of all, new carriers are needed as replacements for World War II carriers which are now 13 and 14 years old. A ship has a life of about 20 years, so beginning in 1960 until 1965, we will be reaching the economical limit of their service. This carrier-construction program is a plan to gradually replace our older ships over an extended period.

Secondly, the fleets are now beginning to receive several types of new and larger jet aircraft whose full performance and potential can only be achieved from these modern carrier bases. The new *Forrestals* will have the stronger and larger landing areas, including the angled deck, increased hangar-deck heights, improved steam catapults and faster elevators, stronger arresting gear, and many other new features such as better fire-fighting and damage-control ability. The new families of jet aircraft, such as the A3D, a very advanced attack aircraft weighing 70,000 pounds, the A4D, an equally advanced but light attack aircraft, and several excellent fighter aircraft, such as the F4D and the F9F9, go hand in glove with our newest model carriers which have been specifically designed to operate and accommodate such modern, high performance planes. We are reaching the point, so to speak, where the suit of clothes we bought some 12-15 years ago is getting to be a tight fit for the growing young man of jet naval aviation.

But the most important reason is that our aircraft carriers—which are the key units of our naval task forces—are absolutely essential to the successful execution of our naval missions, and to the security of the country, either in cold war, fringe war, or nuclear war.

In this present period of prolonged tension, the value of having a potent offensive navy, built around our carrier forces, was recently seen in the Tachens operation. In the troubled waters around Formosa—far removed from our normal naval bases, in an area where our fixed air bases are also limited, and 7,000 miles from our homeland—the importance of having our mobile carrier forces move into the threatened area to reinforce our national policy and to prevent trouble was, I am sure, readily apparent to all. I am confident that the continued presence of our naval task forces in the Formosa area is an effective brake and a great deterrent to the outbreak of general war, giving us time to work diligently for a real peace in the Far East.

The importance of carrier forces during a fringe or local war is best illustrated by the recent Korean war. I will not dwell on this, for I am sure the gentlemen of this committee are very familiar with the 3 years of unremitting and invaluable work which our naval task forces accomplished there. The Navy and Marine Corps flew approximately 183,000 sorties in Korea, totaling 412,000 flying hours from carrier decks.

As for having carriers during an all-out nuclear war, their value and capabilities are even greater. As a matter of fact, I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would make our carrier forces even more indispensable than they have ever been before.

In a nuclear war, the first task of any air force will be to destroy the opponent's air power at its sources. It is logical to assume that our retaliation system—our planes, our weapon sites, and our bases—would receive the enemy's initial onslaught.

Therefore the integrity and security of our airbase system, from whence our reprisal originates, assume the very highest priority in our defense planning. Ideally our base system should be a combination of both fixed air bases, continental and overseas, and moving air bases. The fixed air bases of the Air Force are designed, and properly so, to carry out the primary mission of strategic air warfare. The moving air bases of the Navy, which are the modern aircraft carriers, serve to carry out the Navy's vital tasks and to complement the fixed bases in order to make our reprisal system varied, versatile, and invulnerable.

Our moving carrier bases make it impossible for any enemy to completely destroy or neutralize our reprisal system in a sneak attack because he can never be sure of their locations. A balanced system of our primary fixed bases, complemented by our moving carrier bases, makes an aggressor uncertain that a blitz attack would succeed. No matter how powerful or pervasive his attack upon it, there will still be a sufficient punch left to devastate him. A partially successful enemy blitz of our retaliation system is tantamount to his suicide.

I am sometimes asked, usually by members of the press, 3 questions about the *Forrestal* carriers concerning their (1) vulnerability, their (2) state of development, and their (3) ultimate use which I think are fair ones, which are pertinent to this shipbuilding program, and which may be in the minds of some of the members of this committee.

Are not the *Forrestals* so vulnerable, I am asked, as to make it infeasible to build them? My answer is "no," because they are extremely difficult to destroy, even with an atomic bomb. Yes, a *Forrestal* can be hit. Any target can be hit under the right conditions. But it is patently obvious that a target moving at speeds up to 40 miles per hour, which can change its location 500 miles in a day, is a harder one to find, to hit, and to destroy than one which cannot move. Finding a carrier task force in the great wastes of an ocean is not an easy task even in these days of electronic magic. Even when it is found, attacking it would be very hazardous. Enemy planes would have to penetrate concentric circles of electronic warning curtains, overcome formidable jet fighter protection, and survive a guided missile and antiaircraft barrage before reaching their release point.

Moreover, the fast moving task force would be operating under dispersal conditions so that even a mass destruction weapon could neutralize but a small part of the force. Individual ships of the fleet might be neutralized, but it is highly unlikely that the task force could be kept from doing its job. Furthermore, the presence of our carriers in proximity to an aggressor's land will force him to divert his own offensive strength to defend against their power (which might otherwise be used against our homeland or fixed bases) and will also dilute his defenses; for he must anticipate attack from every direction from the seas which surround him.

The next question raised regarding the *Forrestals* concerns their state of development. Shouldn't a moratorium be called while these new ships are tested and evaluated? This question presumes that the carrier is an untested vessel, a new type which

should be evaluated. My reply is that the aircraft carrier weapons system is a fully tested, repeatedly evaluated, and an oft-proven weapons system, that the new *Forrestals* are simply a logical and progressive step in the Navy's art of building aircraft carriers. We firmly know what they are capable of doing, and we must have them if we are to keep our fleets modern and capable of handling advanced aircraft essential to the fulfillment of the Navy's mission.

And finally, the question is asked, How does the Navy plan to use these ships which will be able to carry large attack and fighter planes capable of transporting nuclear weapons to targets more than 1,000 miles from their flight deck? The answer to that is that the Navy has many legitimate naval targets for which we need such a weapons system—such targets as submarine pens, shipping concentrations, shipbuilding activities, airfield bases, and other targets which jeopardize our command of the seas. Moreover, in the NATO theater, the Navy has been given certain collateral tasks to further prosecute the air battle and assigned certain specific tasks to support the land battle. In no sense does the Navy compete or infringe upon the field of strategic air warfare which is properly the primary responsibility of the United States Air Force.

In summary, then, a fifth *Forrestal* will add to our potent carrier weapons system which is the very foundation of our naval striking power. Without this carrier weapons system, it would be impossible to carry out the Navy's last mission to control the seas. The best military and civilian talent in the Department of Defense, and the President, have approved the building of a carrier this fiscal year as a proper requirement, and I strongly urge your approval.

Turning briefly now to the other types of ships, we are requesting the conversion of one light cruiser and one destroyer to equip them with guided missile capabilities in order to make effective our guided missile progress. We are also requesting one non-atomic submarine with a guided missile capability. As you know, two guided missile cruisers—the *Boston* and *Canberra*—are virtually complete and will be joining the fleets this year. All of these ships, which are fundamentally prototypes, are indicative of the Navy of tomorrow. In the guided missile field, the Navy is just now crossing the threshold into a field which promises to revolutionize navies as much as did the discovery of gunpowder.

We are also requesting 13 destroyer types—7 destroyers and 6 frigates. The frigate is a destroyer type, somewhat larger, with better sea-keeping qualities, and with heavier antisubmarine and antiaircraft defenses. These 13 destroyer types being requested are replacements for the hardworking, versatile, and indispensable workhorses of our Navy.

And finally, the submarines. As you know, the modern submarine is a very potent offensive weapon as well as an effective defensive weapon. We foresee that as a guided missile platform, the nuclear submarine with its almost unlimited range, can appear over the horizon or emerge from the depths of the ocean, and send missiles of great destruction great distances with deadly accuracy. Eight submarines are included in the program, 3 nuclear powered ones, 4 conventional ones, and the one I mentioned earlier which will have a guided missile capability. We have been encouraged by the excellent progress of the atomic-powered *Nautilus*, and we are progressing as rapidly as is practicable in this very promising field. However, we do not feel justified in waiting for final completion of this development to request these submarine replacements. The requested four conventional submarines, we feel, with their improved power plants, armament and hull structures, will not become obsolescent during their normal life span.

In summary, I believe the naval program for fiscal 1956 is sound. Throughout our country's history, naval power has always been an indispensable factor in carrying out United States policy in peacetime and in achieving victory in wartime. It is no less important and vital today. In the nuclear era now upon us, I am convinced that the talents of a Navy are even more necessary than ever before.

Scott McLeod Replies to AVC Refugees Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the February issue of the American Veterans Committee bulletin carried an article under the heading "Scott McLeod Replies to AVC Refugees Resolution." This seems to be the other side of the story previously inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. In order that the RECORD may be complete, I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTT McLEOD REPLIES TO AVC REFUGEES RESOLUTION

(NOTE.—On February 9, Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution adopted by AVC's 8th national convention condemning the State Department for its failure to effectively implement the Refugee Act of 1953. In immediate response, AVC received a letter from Scott McLeod, the act's administrator, excerpts from which appear below.)

When the resolution was adopted the Refugee Relief Act had been passed some 15 to 16 months, yet the reference in the resolution was to the "first 10 months." The first 10 months of the program were admittedly difficult. We took off from a standing start, since this Bureau had no previous experience in such work. The act is very involved legislation. It required international agreement before we could start in any of the countries. There were problems of staffing and of working accommodations overseas. In providing for safeguards in the national interest, the Congress wrote into the act requirements that resulted in administrative hurdles. These could be reduced only after a period of operating experience.

The tooling-up process was not an easy one. But experience was a good teacher, as usual, and we have now put behind us the major difficulties. . . .

I have been well aware that a speed-up has been needed in issuance of visas under the act, and I can assure you it is now being attained.

INCREASE IN VISAS

Illustrating this is the fact that of the more than 25,000-visa cases that have been processed, 20,000 visas have been issued in the program to date, and 38 percent of these have been issued in the last 90 days. In addition, 51,000 applications are now in some stage of processing, which is an increase of 10,000 within a 30-day period.

This is not exactly a minute total, the word used in the committee statement. Nor does the current tempo of the program indicate failure in attaining the objectives of the law if United States citizen assurances for refugees are forthcoming. We are not yet at the halfway point in the 40-month life of the program. There are still 22 months ahead of us within the statutory limits of the program.

So, you see, with some 75,000 persons having entered the "pipeline"—applicants notified of documents required—there is marked progress toward the numerical halfway mark in the program, considering the 209,000 total admissions set by the act. . . .

ADMINISTRATOR'S JOB

As Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act I consider my job, and the job of my staff, to be that of assisting intelligent, hard-working, healthy aliens, who are free of criminal and subversive taints, to migrate to this country. All of us in the program, as citizens and taxpayers, have the common duty to make certain that the best interests of the United States are safeguarded. Within the limits of administrative discretion we are bound to act not upon personal inclination but upon the broader concepts of humanitarianism and patriotism.

This operating policy of mine, I trust, will ease the concern of those, who, in the language of your resolution, have felt there is a disregard for the expressed will of the Congress and the President of the United States.

Resolution of Lithuanian-Americans of the City of Kenosha, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Kenosha, Wis., commemorating the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

These following resolutions are for adoption at a mass meeting of the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Kenosha, Wis., gathered for the purpose of commemorating the 37th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas Lithuania with her 700-year-old history, tradition, language, and religious customs; and

"Whereas the people of Lithuania during these 700 historical years, have time and again fought aggressors to defend her freedom, have shed their blood to prove to the world that Lithuania as a nation is worthy of self-government; and

"Whereas Lithuania, together with her neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, make up a population of 6 million people, have wholeheartedly and sincerely defended the principles of western democracy; and

"Whereas the Baltic Democratic Republics, these past 15 years, enslaved by Hitler and Stalin, have been subjected to torture and death; and

"Whereas the citizens of Lithuania, placing their faith in the Atlantic Charter and in world peace, today face tragedy, and wholesale massacre by the thousands, and also deportation to the slave camps of Siberia; and

"Whereas Lithuanian freedom being dissolved by the Communists, her religious beliefs persecuted, and tens of thousands of her loyal subjects scattered throughout the world, homeless; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of Kenosha, Wis., having carefully reviewed the events and being well aware of the graveness of the present international situation and concerned over the fate of the Lithuanian nation, pledge all possible support to the Government of these United States in its effort to achieve the principles of justice and freedom for all the nations, great or small; be it further

"Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of Kenosha, Wis., pledge the Government of the United States:

"1. That the servitude of the Baltic States be further held as an act of aggression, and to accept and recognize only the democratic diplomats in this country.

"2. To support this country's resistance movement by information and organization.

"3. To help carry on and conclude the testimonies of the Committee on Communist Aggression.

"4. To make known to the United States the Baltic States Aggression Act.

"5. To recognize the Genocide Convention, thereby concluding defenseless people wholesale massacres.

"6. To accept Kersten's committee findings as a sharp weapon against Communistic propaganda; to propagate the enslaved people's plea through the press, so that political leaders throughout the world would awaken and realize the dangers of communism, and act by liberating these people from their aggressors. Silence only urges Communists on to more barbarous acts by subjugating other nations and by tearing down democratic principles.

"Resolved, That this meeting of the Lithuanian Americans of Kenosha, Wis., express their deepest gratitude to the Federal Government and both Houses of Congress of the United States for their support constantly extended to the cause of independence of Lithuania."

California Fights Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some recent correspondence I have had with the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, attorney general of California, whose continuous efforts to combat crime, especially as it exists in California, are highly commendable. His proposed legislation, as detailed in the following correspondence, if adopted, will provide, I believe, thorough and effective weapons against organized crime, and should make the State of California one of the progressive leaders in our war against crime.

Without hesitation, I would commend to law-enforcement agencies in other States all of Attorney General Brown's

proposed legislation, particularly that portion which recommends the coordination of State crime activities with local law-enforcement agencies, crime commissions, State and Federal officials, and agencies, as well as the proposed mutual exchange of information concerning activities of reported criminals, racketeers, and their associates.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
San Francisco, February 21, 1955.
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Your recent letter addressed to H. G. Robinson has been called to my attention.

I appreciate receiving your comments on the legislation which has been proposed to amend the California Penal Code to provide for surveys of local enforcement and for the establishment and operation of intelligence files.

After the lengthy and detailed studies which have been made of the matter by the United States Senate Crime Committee, the American Bar Association committee on organized crime and the California Crime Study Commission on Organized Crime and the unanimity of the recommendations made by these groups it is appropriate that those recommendations be implemented by appropriate legislation at State level. California, as you have found in investigations by the Senate Crime Committee, has been in the forefront in the matter of crime control and, as attorney general of this State, being charged with maintaining uniform law enforcement, it is requisite that everything be done to keep enforcement in this State at the highest attainable standard.

In further explanation it can be stated that during the past 3 years the work of our Bureau of Criminal Statistics has been strengthened and expanded. The results of this work have been published in two reports, Crime in California 1952 and Crime in California 1953, copies of which are being forwarded under separate cover. Further improvement in our statistical reporting has been programed during the coming year.

A good system of statistical reporting can measure and define the nature and scope of the crime problem but as worth while and necessary as this function is, it requires a further step to explore the factors giving rise to the statistics tabulated. Manpower, equipment, and training deficiencies resulting from unrealistic and budget conscious city administrators all have a material bearing on the general crime picture despite the common practice on the part of the public to relate crime trends to spiritual, moral, or economic factors. Until further survey functions make it possible to probe the underlying factors, there is no realistic way of completely interpreting or evaluating even the most accurate statistics on crime.

Your interest in this legislation and your valued comments are appreciated. Considering your leadership in the field of crime prevention and your continuing interest in this vitally important field, you will perhaps agree that the following acrostic suggests a more objective spelling out of the crime picture:

C-ongressional
R-ecommendations
I-mplemented by State legislation to
M-odernize and strengthen
E-nforcement efforts.

Sincerely yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Attorney General.

FEBRUARY 15, 1955.

Mr. H. G. ROBINSON, Esq.,
Deputy Director, Division of Criminal Law Enforcement, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR ROBBIE: I have read with great interest your letter of February 9, 1955, containing the proposed legislation to be introduced by Attorney General Brown, which I feel should make effective, the recommendations approved by the United States Senate Crime Committee, the American Bar Association Committee on Organized Crime, and the suggestions contained in the attorney general's two proposed amendments to the California Penal Code, appeal to me, particularly those that recommend the coordination of your State crime activities with local law enforcement agencies, crime commissions, State and Federal officials and agencies, as well as the proposed mutual exchange of information concerning activities of reported criminals, racketeers and their associates.

Your proposed legislation, if adopted without any crippling amendments, should very materially strengthen your law-enforcement machinery, and I am hopeful that other States may emulate the splendid steps that California is taking to combat crime.

With kindest personal regards to Attorney General Brown, yourself, and all other friends in California, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator.

The \$20 Handout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, recently an editorial appeared in the New York Times which clearly sets forth the issues of the proposed \$20 tax cut. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD:

THE \$20 HANDOUT

The refusal of the Senate Finance Committee to accept the \$20-a-person tax handout pushed through last week by the Democrats of the House is a victory for responsible fiscal policy; but it is a victory that is still a long way from being clinched. The administration, and those Democrats and Republicans who also believe in a realistic and equitable tax policy conforming to the actual financial position of the Government, will have to stand firm and fight hard on this dangerous political issue.

The \$20 tax handout is thoroughly bad for a number of reasons. It would result in a major loss of revenue at a time when the budget is still unbalanced. But, say its Democratic proponents, this is an unfair and partisan argument because the Republican administration itself takes credit for a reduction of \$7.4 billions in taxes last year, when the budget was also unbalanced. The answer is twofold: (1) Those cuts came at a time when the economy seemed to be faltering, and they were, except for the excise reductions, part of an orderly tax plan designed to stimulate business activity in conjunction with a shrinking Federal deficit; (2) the cuts in excise taxes, amounting to about \$1 billion, were not asked for and were in fact opposed, though ultimately accepted by the administration.

The tax handout is also bad because it is a blatant effort to purchase the political goodwill of the estimated 5 million persons

whom it would remove altogether from the Federal income-tax rolls. While obviously the rich can, should and do pay more income tax than the poor, it is still true that as broadly based an income tax as possible is sound public policy from the standpoint both of obtaining revenue and of reminding all of us that we have a direct financial as well as political stake in the economic stability of our Government. Furthermore, this particular handout is bad because it was not adequately considered by the House that approved it; it formed part of no coherent tax proposal; it was, on the contrary, thrown in by Speaker RAYBURN at almost the last minute as a transparent effort to anticipate a potential—though by no means assured—Republican-sponsored tax cut next year.

The tax handout is bad because it lends itself so easily to promoting the demagogic claim that last year's reductions were all for "the big fellow" while this one is for "the little fellow." The very first tax cut last year was the approximate 10 percent slash in income taxes of some 50 million individuals. It is perfectly true that the corporation excess profits tax also expired at the same time, but this law had been extended, and at the President's urgent request, 6 months beyond its original expiration date. Many features of the general tax revision of 1954 were directed toward improving the lot of the individual taxpayer. In addition, the present tax bill calls for a continuation of existing high corporate tax rates as well as some excise taxes; so that it is simply a distortion of the fact to say that in its tax philosophy the administration has looked out only for the "big fellow." Most important of all to the "little fellow," the price level is stable. Absence of inflation is infinitely more beneficial to the "little fellow's" pocketbook than absence of taxes.

We do not say that the administration's tax policy is perfect. Such matters, for example, as the very large depletion allowances so dear to the hearts of certain Texas Democrats bear much sharper examination. Nor do we say that politics has been absent from the Republican side of the fence, for it certainly has not. But the \$20 deduction is politics pure and simple, it has no place in the present revenue-raising (or any other) bill, and it happens to be a Democratic measure backed by the official Democratic leadership of both Houses. We do not see how anyone of either party who believes in fiscal responsibility can continue to support it.

Weekly Radio Program of Dean Clarence E. Manion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the weekly radio program of Dean Clarence E. Manion, broadcast No. 21, of February 20, 1955.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: A PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION TO THE RUSSIAN PEOPLE

Behind the Iron Curtain the Communist world is in convulsions. Mao Tse-tung is dying of cancer. A struggle is on for his job as No. 1 man of the Chinese Communist

Party. Chou En-lai, the odds-on favorite to succeed to the top spot, has formidable and ruthless opposition. Thus Chou has much more important work on his hands these days than that which shapes up for him in the Formosa Straits. Chinese Red Army generals, sensing a shift in the direction of the political wind, are showing warlord symptoms. This is the old Chinese military ambition to boss and squeeze tribute from their own local provinces and let it go at that. Once this symptom becomes a contagious disease, the Chinese Communist conspiracy is finished.

Basic in this political turmoil is the Chinese food situation. Rice rations in Communist China were recently cut one-third. As the food supply diminishes, Communist brutality is proportionately increased. The one old-fashioned way to weld all this interior disintegration into disciplined unity is to incite fear of destruction from without. To this end Chinese Communist propagandists are busy reviving memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, where uncounted thousands of brown men were cooked to a crisp by two small bombs dropped on them by white men from the United States. Such disturbance as Chou En-lai can create and exploit over Formosa and the fear of American hydrogen bombs will be used to restore disciplined unity to his wavering generals and force fearful docility upon the starving, terrorized Chinese people. Across Manchuria and on into Communist Russia it is the same critical story, but with much more open evidence to support it.

In Moscow, a Foreign Minister is not now recalled nor is a mere chief of police arrested for subsequent trial and liquidation. For this sort of thing there is a long list of Communist precedents. For what has actually happened in Moscow there is no precedent. Like a bolt out of the blue, the King himself announces that "the King is dead," and by his own hand. King Malenkov says he is unworthy to reign any longer because he has miserably failed. In what field? Foreign relations? Military management? No. He has failed to properly organize Russian agricultural production. Failure of agricultural production means food shortage. There is hunger in Russia and it is going to get worse.

Could that ominous fact have been more graphically demonstrated than it was in Malenkov's resignation? The commissars can successfully deceive the Russian people on the subject of Communist foreign policy, or about the strength of the Red army, or the quality and quantity of their hydrogen bomb, but on the subject of available food, no deception is possible. When food rations are cut, every Russian learns about it the hard way. When the people's stomachs are empty they can't be filled by Communist propaganda in the United Nations, or by Red parades around the Kremlin. Many times during the past 35 years the Russian people have been hungry, very hungry. But never before has the famine been serious enough to make the commissars cook up and serve their Premier to the people. This has happened now.

Malenkov is a fat goat certainly for the fires of popular discontent, but he is an extremely dangerous sacrifice for the commissars to offer. Remember that the hard core of world-wide Communist discipline is the fixation that the king can do no wrong; that the dictator cannot make a mistake; that the Communist Party line as it flows out of his dictatorial power and wisdom is supreme over the order of reason, experience, or the plain evidence supplied by the physical senses. This hypnotic spell of blind Communist obedience is brilliantly portrayed in Arthur Koestler's book *Darkness at Noon*. (Random House, 1951.) Malenkov's sensational announcement has shattered this thesis for all time.

Some years ago, under orders from Moscow, Earl Browder publicly confessed error and expelled himself as the commander of the Communist Party in the United States. Even that tiny piece of revelation was hard for some American fellow-travelers to swallow. Beria's liquidation was released to the public 1 inch at a time, and thus, however hypocritical, was nevertheless capable of containment within the iron mould of Communist discipline. Malenkov's suicidal announcement has cracked this iron mould to its very center. Communist discipline, inside and outside of Russia, will never be the same again.

Like Chou En-lai, first Molotov, then Konev promptly screamed about impending American aggression upon the Russian Motherland. Said these commissars in substance: "We may have failed to produce food but we are your only hope against otherwise certain destruction by American bombs. Better to starve slowly than to be blown to bits any minute. Forget your bourgeois appetites. Tighten your belts with Russian patriotism." Then concludes Konev: "Our army represents a mighty force. If the Imperialists dare to attack our Motherland, the Soviet armed forces have at their disposal all kinds of weapons for the complete defeat of the aggressors."

To whom is Konev speaking? Is any outside listener so naive as to believe that this balderdash was spoken to deter a military attack upon Russia by the United States? Soviet agriculture may have broken down, but the Soviet American-based spy system is as good as ever. From it Konev knows as well as we do that the United States will never attack Russia until Russia has attacked us. But the Russian people do not know that, and Konev and Molotov were talking to the same Russian people to whom Malenkov made his suicidal confession. Malenkov, Molotov, and Konev were all speaking to the same audience and for exactly the same purpose. The one purpose of all three speeches was to quiet the hungry, rebellious Russian people, and control them with deliberately manufactured fear—fear of the United States. For this purpose Konev accused what he called American imperialists of surrounding Russia with bases for atomic warfare.

This latest Moscow show is the most transparent exhibition that the Soviet gangsters have ever staged. Through this hypocritical bombast the truth is clearly and officially revealed to the world. The truth is this: The Soviet governors are literally scared to death of the Russian people. In his time, that flint-hearted old bandit, Joe Stalin, took care of similar situations with mass murder and systematic starvation. His uncertain successors lack the nerve and perhaps the facilities to follow his example. In the current Communist command nobody can trust anybody any more—even to carry out an order of execution.

The Soviet gangsters are panic stricken. Make no mistake about it, if they decide that war is the only way to whip their rebellious subjects into line, behind the faltering Communist command, they will provoke war. Meanwhile, they will continue to wash the brains of their hungry, bedeviled slaves with the repeated assertion that American bombs and worldwide military bases are designed to destroy the Russian people, and that the hour of their planned destruction is close at hand.

What have we done to counteract the effect of this propaganda? Precisely nothing. Officially, we ignore the conflict between the Soviet Government and the Russian people; a conflict that is now openly disclosed by the Soviet Government itself. Unfortunately, our professed hope now seems to be that President Eisenhower's one-time friendship for General Zhukov will give us a few more years of unheated cold war.

This is the hypocritical nonsense of co-existence magnified a thousand times. Through 10 years of cold—and sometimes not so cold—war with the Soviet Government, we have refused to express one official word of sympathy for the more than 15 million Russians who are continuously subjected to slow and painful death in Soviet slave-labor camps. Officially, we have not deplored the fact that the Russians, throughout their history a devoutly religious people, are now deprived of the right to worship God by their viciously materialistic Communist masters. The natural rights which dignify all mankind and which American government recognizes as unalienable and God-given, have been torn from the Russian people by a ruthless dictatorship forced upon them against their will.

This is the same Soviet Government which for 15 years the United States refused to recognize as lawful and respectable. Then, just when it was ready to collapse, we took this gangster apparatus to our bosom and hold it there even now, while it tries in every way to stab us in the back. We have outlawed communism in the United States and we have spent billions in relatively fruitless efforts to prevent the spread of its contagion around the world, but we have not expressed one official word of concern for the 800 million human victims of communism, in spite of our serious official responsibility for their plight.

Let us not forget that it was our recognition of the Soviet Government and our subsequent concessions to that monstrous clique of cutthroats at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, that sold most of these same people into this diabolical system of slavery. To date, we have never had the decency to ask their forgiveness nor have we repudiated the agreements that sealed their doom. At this point it is no longer a mere matter of human decency; it is a matter of American self-preservation. Unless we get the truth to the Iron Curtain people immediately, their panic-stricken, power-mad dictators may soon pull the trigger that will end our world. The time has come to prove our good intentions, not to the criminal Communist governments, but to the millions of bruised and bleeding human beings now held in unlawful bondage by Chou En-lai, Khrushchev, and company.

We have heard from Messrs. Molotov, Konev, and Malenkov. Now let us hear again from Nikolai Kokhlov, for years a captain of the Russian secret police. Kokhlov, you will remember, was sent from Russia by the Soviet Government to supervise the killing of Georgel Okolovich, the leader of the anti-Communist Russian underground in West Germany. Instead of carrying out his mission, Kokhlov exposed the plot, deserted the Communists, joined the revolutionary forces, and is now working for them in the United States. Interviewed by the Brooklyn Tablet last February 5, Kokhlov said: "It is my firm belief that if the Christian world would strongly and openly support the fight for freedom of the Russian people, a war could be prevented. Let the Russian people know that the free world does not hate them. Let them know that the free world is aware of and sympathizes with their sufferings and that it would welcome their becoming free from their tyrannical regime."

It is just as serious and yet just as simple as that. The ice was broken a few weeks ago, when the Texas House and Senate passed a stirring resolution of sympathy and hope for the suffering Russian people. Hurrah for Texas. Every State legislature now in session should do the same, but the die will not be definitely cast until Congress calls upon the President to set aside an official day of prayer and sympathetic sacrifice dedicated to all the hungry people behind the Iron Curtain whom we have so grievously offended. Let us offer—not to their gangster

governments—but to these hungry, suffering people directly the surplus grains with which our Federal granaries are now bulging. Only such a congressional resolution and a subsequent Presidential proclamation can break the curtain of silence that the Communists have thrown about their now rebellious slaves.

This is that precise "tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads to fortune," but which, if ignored, will drown civilization in war and endless misery. We have made every mistake in the book. Let us now do right for a change.

The Historical Development of the Conference Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, conference committees of the two branches of Congress have often been referred to as the "Third House" of Congress. This designation arises from the fact that when the House and Senate have worked their will on a legislative proposal, particularly of a controversial nature, conference committees have often reshaped such legislation and thereby developed a very substantial influence on the whole course of legislation.

It has often occurred to me that the historical development of the conference committee and its powers would be of special interest to all members of the House and Senate, and accordingly some time ago I requested the Library of Congress to make a documented study of this matter. This deserves consideration not only in government but by students of political science throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD because I am confident it will be useful to students of political science, useful in science courses, and useful to Members of Congress and others.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THIRD HOUSE OF CONGRESS

Now that the Federal Government has come to have an intimate impact upon the life and work of all of us, it is important for us to understand how the laws are made which influence our daily lives. Books have been written to describe the process of lawmaking. All I can do here is to hit the high spots of the legislative process as I have observed it work in Congress.

STAGES IN LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

From the introduction of a bill in the Senate or House of Representatives to its proclamation as the law of the land, there are 28 stages in the process of lawmaking. These steps are described in detail by Congressman CLARENCE CANNON in his authoritative manual of parliamentary procedure. The process begins when a Member drops a bill in a basket or "hopper" on the Clerk's desk on the floor of the House. Senate bills may be jointly sponsored by several Senators, but House bills may not be introduced jointly.

After its introduction, the bill is referred by the Parliamentarian to the committee which has jurisdiction over its major subject matter. There are 15 standing committees in the Senate and 19 in the House, set up along roughly parallel lines. The jurisdiction of these committees is defined in the rules to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. The clerk of the committee receiving the bill enters it on his committee calendar which is a schedule or docket showing the number of the bill, by whom presented, date of reference, title, subcommittee to which referred, and any action thereon.

The first major stage in the legislative process is the committee stage. Some committees have regular meeting days; others meet only at the call of the chairman. When the committee meets, the calendar is called by the clerk and a particular bill taken up for consideration. If the bill is important, it may be referred to a subcommittee, appointed by the chairman, for study. Where a matter is deemed to be of sufficient importance, and the committee or subcommittee desires information on the subject, hearings are held and witnesses are called, or may ask to be heard, to give testimony. A day is fixed for the hearings and interested persons are notified. The hearings may last for 1 day or several weeks, depending upon the importance of the bill under consideration. After the hearings, the committee meets in executive session and votes either to report the bill favorably to the Senate (or House) or to lay the bill on the table. This is commonly known as pigeon-holing a bill. If the bill is reported favorably, with or without amendment, the committee staff prepare a report explaining the bill which is then referred to the Senate (or House) Calendar. The House has 5 different calendars, whereas the Senate has but 1.

Subject to various limitations, the committees of Congress have come to play a dominant role in lawmaking. Each composed of a few members, each acting independently of the others, they now determine the agenda of both Houses, which have surrendered to their standing committees the power to determine what matters shall be considered on the floor and to control the proceedings there, subject in the lower Chamber to the terms of its Rules Committee. Committees can amend or rewrite bills to suit themselves. They can report bills or pigeonhole them. They can initiate measures they desire and bury or emasculate those they dislike. They can proceed with dispatch or stall indefinitely. In short, congressional government is still government by the standing committees of Congress, as Woodrow Wilson wrote in 1885.

The second major stage in the legislative process is the floor stage. Numerous ways are provided by the House and Senate rules for taking up a bill once it is on a calendar. In the Senate a bill is taken up either by unanimous consent or on the call of the calendar. In the House there are five routes by which a bill may reach the floor. Admission to the House floor of important, controversial bills usually depends upon getting a special order or green light from its Committee on Rules which has acquired power to prescribe the terms of admission, including a time limit on debate, the conditions of amendment, etc.

When a bill has finally reached the floor, it may be debated, amended, passed, or rejected. Debate is strictly limited in the House under various rules and rarely lasts more than 1 or 2 days per bill. In the Senate debate is unlimited, except by unanimous consent, and may continue for several weeks. Bills strongly opposed by a few Senators may be filibustered indefinitely, i. e., talked to death. The Senate adopted a cloture rule in 1917, but it has been successfully invoked only four times in 35 years, and never since

1927. A majority vote of those present and voting is required to pass an ordinary bill. A two-thirds vote is needed to suspend the rules and for certain measures specified in the Constitution, such as a resolution to amend that document.

After a bill has gone through its several stages in the House where introduced, it is engrossed and transmitted to the other house where the same steps are repeated. If the bill finally survives all the possible pitfalls in its path—pigeon-hole, filibuster, Rules Committee blockade, irrelevant debate, dilatory tactics, a single objection on the call of the Senate Calendar—and passes both Houses in other than identical form, it is referred to a conference committee. This is the final major stage in the legislative process. A conference committee is a joint committee composed of Representatives and Senators, appointed by the Speaker and the Vice President, respectively, which is charged with the duty of compromising the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The conference committee which has been called a third house of Congress, nearly always reaches an agreement, and then resubmits the revised bill to each House for a majority vote. The report of the conference committee is almost invariably approved by the vote of both Houses, although the House surprised the country in October 1951 by rejecting the first report of a conference committee on a tax bill.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Ada McCown, historian of the origin and evolution of the conference committee, traces its origin back to 14th century England.¹ In that century the English Parliament became a bicameral body, with the lords and prelates sitting in one house and the knights and burgesses in the other. Contemporaneously the custom arose for members of both houses to confer together on the answer to be given to the king's request for funds. According to the historian, William Stubbs, a real conference committee system existed in England before 1378.² The first conference recorded in the Journals of the House of Commons was held in 1554. We learn from these early Journals that parliamentary conferences were usually held in the Painted Chamber, that twice as many Commoners as Lords attended them, that the upper chamber fixed the time and place of meeting, and that "the Lords came in a body, expecting the Commoners to await them. They sat with their hats on while the Commoners stood with their hats off. While a conference was in session all other proceedings in both houses were suspended."³

Conferences became especially significant during the 17th century in England when they were used in a series of parliamentary crises. But with the development of the cabinet system in the 18th century they declined in importance; and by the middle of the 19th century they had disappeared. The conference device has been obsolete in England for a hundred years.

While the conference committee was dying out in the mother country with the rise of the cabinet system, colonial records indicate that it was widely used in the American Colonies as a means of reconciling differences between the two houses of the Colonial legislatures, and it continued to be used in the State legislatures after the Revolution. In New York State the Constitution of 1777 provided for conferences between the Assembly and the Senate which were held in public and sometimes excited great public interest, as in the differences between the two houses over the State's support of the Federal Government in the War of 1812.

McCown reports that "from the very beginning of our congressional history, the

Footnotes at end of speech.

conference committee was the accepted method of adjusting differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate. At the beginning of the 1st session of the 1st Congress, on April 7, 1789 . . . the Senate charged a committee with the duty of preparing rules for the government of the two houses in the case of conference."⁴ The House chose a similar committee of 5 members and the result of their report was a joint rule which read as follows: "

"Resolved, That in every case of an amendment to a bill agreed to in one House and dissented to in the other, if either House shall request a conference, and appoint a committee for that purpose, and the other House shall also appoint a committee to confer, such committees shall, at a convenient time, to be agreed on by their chairmen, meet in the conference chamber, and state to each other verbally, or in writing, as either shall choose, the reasons of their respective Houses for and against the amendment and confer freely thereon."

According to McCown, several conferences were held during the 1st Congress on such subjects as the impost bill, Members' salaries, the amendments to the Constitution, judicial procedure, the Treasury and Post Office bills, trade with the Indians, and other matters.

Inherited from England, the conference committee system is an evolutionary product whose principal threads were woven on the loom of congressional practice into a unified pattern by the middle of the 19th century. "By 1852," writes Ada McCown, "the customs of presenting identical reports from the committees of conference in both Houses, of granting high privilege to these conference reports, of voting upon the conference report as a whole and permitting no amendment of it, of keeping secret the discussions carried on in the meetings of the conference committee, had become established in American parliamentary practice."⁵

CONFERENCE PROCEDURE

A large body of law and practice has developed over the years governing conference procedure and reports. They operate under the limitations of a code of rules which occupy 16 pages of the Senate Manual, 14 pages of the House Manual, and 22 pages of Cannon's Procedure. The essential features of conference procedure under the modern practice have been succinctly described by Gilbert Steiner as follows: "

"The conference stage is reached in congressional action when disagreement is formally stated by one House or the other. Usually, this will occur when the second House has amended a bill and returned it to the House of origin which refuses to accept the amendment(s). Not infrequently, however, the second House assumes that the House of origin will refuse to accept a change, and consequently votes to insist, and requests a conference without returning the bill to the House of origin. In either case, the Presiding Officer does not dispose of the conference request on his own initiative, some Member will address the Chair; he may ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the table with the amendments of the second Chamber, that the amendments be disagreed with (or insisted on), and that a conference be agreed to (or requested). When unanimous consent is not obtained in the House, a special rule may be brought in by the Rules Committee providing for a conference. In the Senate it is, of course, always theoretically possible to filibuster against the appointment of a conference committee. Actually, no cases of real opposition to agreeing to a conference have been found. The reason for this is obvious—the bill has already been passed by the Chamber involved, and presumably sufficient votes to agree to a conference should there-

fore be garnered. In addition, opponents of a measure may well prefer to wait for the conference report, before taking obstructive action; since the report may result in a modified bill more to the liking of disaffected elements.

"Under House rule X, clause 2, dating back to 1890, the Speaker appoints House managers. By tradition, Senate managers are named by the Vice President or President pro tempore of the Senate. The range of free choice is strictly limited, however, in that the customary practice in both Chambers is for the chairman of the committee having charge of a bill to send to the desk a "little pink slip" bearing the names of his nominees for appointment. The chairman and ranking majority and minority members of the committee are usually named conferees, although as is noted subsequently, there has been something of a problem in determining the membership of conference committees with the growth of the subcommittee device. A tradition has not yet developed as to whether subcommittee members deserve a preferred place on the conference committee over ranking members of the full committee originally involved. Indeed, the seniority principle itself has sometimes been ignored, and this has led to charges of "packing" the conference with proponents of a point of view supported by the standing committee chairman and the presiding officer of the House involved. The number of managers appointed is also determined by the standing committee chairman with the approval of the Presiding Officer, but by precedent it is three, five, seven, or nine. There does not seem to be any correlation between the number of managers and the importance of the legislation. Nor does the number of managers appointed by one House determine the number appointed by the second Chamber.

"A fairly elaborate process governs the possession of conference papers; the original engrossed copy of the bill attested by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate; the engrossed amendments; any special acts concurring in amendments with amendments, and the messages transmitting them between the two Houses, all similarly attested; and later, the conference report signed by the managers. The House agreeing to the conference sends the papers to the House asking for a conference. The managers on the part of the House asking the conference bring the papers to the conference room. At the close of a successful conference, the papers change hands; the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference receive them and take them to their House, which is first to consider the conference report. If the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference fail to take possession of the papers, by agreement or otherwise, from the managers on the part of the House asking conference, the report may be received first by that House. A conference report may not be considered when the original papers are not before the House considering the report. If the conference is not successful in reaching agreement, the papers are not surrendered, but remain with the managers of the requesting House, and that Chamber first receives the report of disagreement and takes action. If a conference report is recommended to the conference committee, the papers are no longer before the House ordering recommitment, and no motion regarding the amendments in disagreement is in order.

"Instructions to conference managers must be given before managers are named, but after the House has agreed to a conference. Once instructions are given, no further motions to that effect are in order. Whether instructed or not, managers may disregard all instructions, and the conference report is not subject to the point of order that it is in violation of instructions. Insertion of

new matter, and alteration of agreed matter, is cause for a point of order since the rules of both Houses have presumably outlawed these practices. However, a technique which Miss McCown dates back to the 1860's and 1870's has developed whereby one House may strike out all after the enacting clause of a bill passed in the other Chamber. The second House then substitutes its own bill as a single overall amendment, retaining only the number and the enacting clause of the bill passed by the first House. Under such conditions, it has been successfully argued that everything in the legislation was in technical disagreement, and that the conferees were legally empowered to write a completely new bill eliminating matters agreed on by both Houses or inserting legislation never approved by either Chamber. Section 135 of the Reorganization Act was designed specifically to eliminate this practice. An evaluation of its efficacy is made in this study.

"The operation of the conference itself is very informal. Meetings are usually held on the Senate side of the Capitol, and by tradition, the first named Senate manager is nominal chairman of the committee. Voting is by the unit rule, and a majority of the managers of each Chamber sign the conference report. The minority has no authority to file a separate report, but may do so under unanimous consent.

"A conference committee may secure whatever expert opinion it thinks desirable. Members may bring aides to conference with them so long as no objection is raised by managers of the second House. In at least one instance, the managers on the part of the House of Representatives prevailed upon the House to pass a resolution requesting that Senate aides be asked to depart from a conference. Invariably, House and Senate legislative counsel will be present at a conference to aid in the actual drafting of the report. This is particularly necessary when the conference committee recommends a third bill as a substitute for two bills committed to it. A conference report may not be called up for consideration until the conferees have formally reported the matter back to their respective Houses.

"Under the rules of the House of Representatives, if a conference fails to yield a report within 20 calendar days, it is a matter of high privilege for any Member of the House to move to discharge its conferees from further consideration of the measure assigned to them and appoint new managers. During the last 6 days of a session, the limitation is reduced from 20 days to 36 hours. A conference report may not be called up in the House until 1 day after it is filed, except by unanimous consent or during the final week of the session.

"It should be noted that the motion to send to conference is certainly not the only possible disposition of a bill amended in the second Chamber. Indeed, six other motions are possible, each of which takes precedence over a motion to disagree and ask for a conference. These are a motion to lay on the table, a motion to postpone indefinitely, a motion to postpone to a certain date, a motion to refer to a standing or special committee, a motion to amend, and a motion to agree. As has been stated, however, in the case of important legislation, the motion to disagree and ask for a conference is nearly always made.

"There are no minutes or formal records kept of the sessions of conference committees. On the contrary, members seem to feel that the conference is a confidential matter, and explanations of conference activity made on the floor of House or Senate are sometimes preceded by the comment that the speaker does not wish to violate the confidence of the conference. Usually, influential members of the conference will make a statement to the press on the day-to-

⁴Footnotes at end of speech.

day progress at a conference, but only the formal conference report embodying the recommendations of the committee becomes a part of the official record. The rationale for this practice is that publication of debates and votes would subject the managers to external pressure and would hamper the give and take necessary for a successful conference. The process may be compared to international diplomacy; great powers deem it unwise to make public detailed progress reports, out of fear of giving a strategic advantage to the other powers. The process may also be analogous to collective bargaining in labor agreements, since detailed interim statements may adversely affect the results for one group or the other.

"Because the formal conference report is often very little more than a recommendation that each Chamber recede on certain numbered amendments, the House of Representatives has adopted a rule requiring that every report be accompanied by a statement. This statement must be sufficiently detailed and explicit to inform the House what effect suggested amendments or propositions will have on the measure to which they relate. In practice, this statement has been used to make clear to the Members of the House the differences between a bill as originally passed by the House and as it would be if the recommendations of the conference were approved. The statement must be in writing and must be signed by a majority of the House managers. A conference report may not be received in the House without the accompanying statement. There is no requirement in the Senate of any comparable nature.

"Conference reports are considered matters of high privilege in both House and Senate. In general, they are in order except when the body is dividing or when the Journal is being read. The Senate rules specify that when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of a conference report, if raised, shall be put immediately, and shall be determined without debate. In the House, the previous question may be ordered to decide the question of proceeding to consider a conference report if a challenge is raised.

"A conference report may not be referred to a standing committee, and, in the House, may not be referred to the Committee of the Whole. A conference report may be withdrawn in the Senate by leave of the Senate, and in the House by unanimous consent. It is not in order to amend a conference report, and it must be accepted or rejected as an entirety. This last requirement, of course, greatly enhances the potential power of conferees. This is particularly true near the close of a session when rejection of a conference report, because of dissatisfaction with a single portion of it, may well cause the loss of the entire bill, time being too short to permit a new report to be drawn. Rejection of a report is usually followed by the ordering of another conference, if there is adequate time, and in accordance with custom, the same conferees are appointed to the second committee as served on the first. The only method whereby conference reports may be amended is by concurrent resolution or order, and this is usually reserved for technical corrections.

"Finally, partial reports from a committee of conference will be accepted in both Chambers. In such a case, approval is given to that portion of the report on which agreement has been reached in conference, and the respective Houses indicate whether they desire their managers to insist further, whether they are willing to recede, or whether they wish to propose a further compromise."

EXTENT OF PRACTICE

The conference committee has been a medium of continuous struggle for legisla-

tive supremacy between the Senate and House of Representatives. Here behind the legislative scenes many decisive battles of congressional history have been waged. For 2 weeks during the 79th Congress, for example, the conferees on the full-employment bill locked horns.⁸ In the 81st Congress the civil-functions appropriations bill was tied up in conference for 4 months—a period longer than any within the memory of living Members. According to Representative CANNON: "The delay was due to the unanimous objection of the managers on the part of the House to agreeing to exorbitant and unwarranted expenditure of public funds proposed by the other body."⁹ In the first session of the 82d Congress the House, in a surprise move, rejected a conference report on a tax bill by the combined action of Republicans and Democrats who voted against it for different reasons.

This device has been used extensively by every Congress since 1789. Of the 217 public laws enacted by the 2d session of the 82d Congress, 90, or 41 percent, went through conference and, of these, 13 were appropriation bills. Most important legislation goes through the conference closet and is there revised, sometimes beyond recognition, by the all-powerful conferees or managers.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

During the 1945 hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, considerable testimony was presented regarding the introduction by conferees of new material into conference reports, and the elimination or substantial change of legislation agreed to by both Houses. While the standing rules are clear regarding the limitation of conferees to the disagreements between the two Houses, parliamentary procedures make it possible for conferees completely to rewrite legislation substantially agreed upon in both Chambers. This is done by one House striking everything after the enacting clause, substituting one overall amendment, and thus technically placing everything in the bill in disagreement and making it subject to complete revision by the conferees.

To meet this situation, the La Follette-Monroney committee recommended in its final report "that conferees of the two Houses be limited to adjustment only of actual differences in fact between the two Houses and that matters on which both Houses are in agreement be not subject to change in conference."¹⁰ This recommendation was followed by the inclusion in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 of the following section:

"Sec. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

"(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order."

Thus, the act restated the old rule that the authority of conference committees is limited to matters which are in disagreement between the two Houses, while recognizing their right to report a substitute on the same subject matter.

Few points of order against conference reports under this rule have been made or sustained in recent years. On June 4, 1947, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan made a point of order against the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations

with one another which affect commerce, etc., on the ground (1) that the conferees had changed the text theretofore agreed to by both Houses, and (2) had inserted additional matter which, even though germane, they had no authority to insert. "The House is considering an entirely new bill," said Mr. HOFFMAN, "that was written in conference by seven men * * *." After discussion, the Speaker was "convinced that the conferees had followed well-established precedents" and overruled the point of order.¹¹

On October 5, 1951, Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, made a point of order against the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951 on the ground that it contained matter not committed to the conferees by either House in a section providing for making the Mutual Security Director a member of the board of the Export-Import Bank. After discussion, the Speaker sustained the point of order.¹²

On October 1, 1951, Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho, made a point of order against the same conference report on the ground that the conferees had changed identical sections in both the House and Senate bills by changing the percentage of funds which the President could transfer between military and economic aid. After spirited debate, the Chair overruled the point of order and held that the change was a germane modification of the original language. Upon appeal, the Senate sustained the decision of the Chair by a vote of 41 to 38, with 19 absentees. This vote seemed to strengthen the powers of the conferees and to weaken control of legislative action by the Senate.¹³

The ensuing Senate debate on the powers of conferees revealed a loophole in the conference rules which Senator Ferguson, of Michigan, sought to plug by offering a resolution (S. Res. 221, 82d Cong., 1st sess.) to amend paragraph 3 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate by prohibiting conferees from striking out matter passed in identical form by both Houses or from modifying any such matter. The Ferguson resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which took no action upon it. The effect of the Ferguson amendment would be to restore language in the rule which was approved by the Senate when it passed the legislative reorganization bill in June 1946, but which was deleted from that bill after it had passed the Senate and while it was on the Speaker's table.

On September 15, 1950, and again on April 11, 1951, the Senate agreed to a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) providing that every conference report shall be accompanied by a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee. Seventy years earlier the House of Representatives had adopted a similar rule on February 27, 1880 (rule XXVIII-1b). Compared with the strict code of the House, the rules of the Senate have advanced at a snail's pace.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that in the House the chairman of the House conferees usually asks and obtains unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the conference report. Then, after the statement explaining the conference report has been partially read, the chairman usually requests that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with. Since neither the conference report nor the explanatory statement has yet been printed in the Record during the last 6 days of a session, Members have little knowledge of the contents of conference reports, of the changes that have been made by the conferees, or of whether or not the rules regulating confer-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ences have been compiled with. In the absence of such knowledge, they can hardly make points of order against conference reports.¹⁴

EVALUATION OF DEVICE

Comparatively unknown except to the few who are familiar with the mysteries of the legislative process, the conference committee is today perhaps the most unique and powerful legislative institution in America, the least dramatic, and one that has received all too little attention.¹⁵ It is a notable fact that American legislatures stand alone among modern bicameral legislative bodies in providing a formal method for adjusting differences between them. Since few, if any, important bills ever pass both Houses of Congress in precisely identical form, and since the final shape of differing measures must be determined in conference, the strategic role and importance of the ad hoc conference committees will readily be appreciated.

Commenting upon the powers of conferees, Willoughby writes:¹⁶

"In cases such as these [substitute bill situations] the committee has before it the whole subject and has practically full discretion with respect to the drafting of a new measure for submission to the two Houses. Even where resort has not been had to this form of amendment, conditions are often such as to permit of a wide range of action by the committee in seeking to formulate provisions that will be mutually acceptable. Except, therefore, where the matters in dispute are very specific, these committees have large powers in the determination of the provisions of many important bills that will come before the two Houses for final action. To such an extent is this true that the statement is often made that the real character of the legislation actually had it determined by these bodies . . ."

In general, writers on Congress regard the conference committee as an admirable device for achieving its purpose. The advantages claimed for the system are that it settles differences between the two Houses in most cases, that it serves to expedite legislative business and prevent deadlocks, and that it facilitates majority party control of legislation. Some mechanism for reconciling differences under a bicameral system is obviously essential.

Yet the disadvantages of the system have also been recognized. In her authoritative history of the subject, Ada McCown writes:¹⁷

"The evils and dangers of this conference committee system are perhaps apparent. It gives too much power into the hands of a few men who are not really held to answer for what they do. In the privacy of the conference mutual concessions may be made which involve provisions which would never pass if considered openly in the House or the Senate. The conference committee has much power of independent action, but it is not held responsible in any such manner as is a ministry under a cabinet system. No conference committee of either House is forced to resign because it has gone counter to the wishes of the House which it represents. Its Members still retain their positions on the regular standing committees and they will be members of the next conference committee which is chosen to settle differences on a bill coming within their province."

Writing in 1946, George B. Galloway remarked that serious evils have attended the development of the conference committee system.¹⁸

"Suffice it to say here that serious evils have marked the development of the conference committee system. In the first place, it is highly prodigal of members' time. McCona-chie calculated that the average time consumed in conference was 33 days per bill. (He made this estimate by comparing the dates upon which the appropriation bills

passed the Senate in the 54th Cong., 1st sess., with the dates when they became laws.) Bills are sent to conference without reading the amendments of the other Chamber. Despite rules to the contrary, conferees do not confine themselves to matters in dispute, but often initiate entirely new legislation and even strike out identical provisions previously approved by both Houses. This happened during the 78th Congress, for instance, when an important amendment to the surplus property bill, which had been approved by both Houses, was deleted in conference.

"Conference committees, moreover, suffer like other committees from the seniority rule. The senior members of the committees concerned, who are customarily appointed as managers on the part of the House and Senate, are not always the best informed on the questions at issue, nor do they always reflect the majority sentiment of their Houses. Furthermore, conference reports must be accepted or rejected in toto without amendment and they are often so complex and obscure that they are voted upon without knowledge of their contents. What happens in practice is that Congress surrenders its legislative function to irresponsible committees of conference. The standing rules against including new and extraneous matter in conference reports have been gradually whittled away in recent years by the decisions of presiding officers. Senate riders attached to appropriation bills enable conference committees to legislate and the House usually accepts them rather than withhold supply, thus putting it, as Senator Hoar once declared, under a degrading duress.

"It is also alleged that under this secret system lobbyists are able to kill legislation they dislike and that 'jokers' designed to defeat the will of Congress can be inserted without detection. Senator George W. Norris once characterized the conference committee as a third house of Congress. 'The members of this house,' he said, 'are not elected by the people. The people have no voice as to who these members shall be. . . . This conference committee is many times, in very important matters of legislation, the most important branch of our legislature. There is no record kept of the workings of the conference committee. Its work is performed, in the main, in secret. No constituent has any definite knowledge as to how members of this conference committee vote, and there is no record to prove the attitude of any member of the conference committee. . . . As a practical proposition we have legislation, then, not by the voice of the Members of the Senate, not by the Members of the House of Representatives, but we have legislation by the voice of 5 or 6 men. And for practical purposes, in most cases, it is impossible to defeat the legislation proposed by this conference committee. Every experienced legislator knows that it is the hardest thing in the world to defeat a conference report.'"¹⁹

One Senator's opinion of the power of conferees was reflected in a satirical speech a few years ago by Senator FULBRIGHT, who congratulated the conferees on a national defense appropriation bill "for so forthrightly disregarding the wishes of the common lay Members of the Senate and the House." Said he:²⁰

"I submit, Mr. President, in all sincerity that there is no need whatever for the ordinary lay Member of Congress to come back to Washington for a special session. It is clearly evident, Mr. President, that to save the world and the people of this country from disaster, all that is needed is to reconvene, preferably in secret, only those incomparable sages, the conferees of the Appropriations Committee. From their deliberations the same results would be achieved and without the expense and trouble to everyone

that is involved in going through the archaic ritual of pretended legislation. It is quite clear that regardless of what the common Members of this body may wish, the conferees make the decisions."

The chief criticisms made of this device over the years have been that: (1) bills are sent to conference without reading the amendments of the other house; (2) much legislation has been forced through Congress in the form of Senate riders on House appropriation bills late in the session; (3) conference reports are voted upon blindly without knowledge of their contents, especially during the end-of-the-session log jams; and (4) Congress has docilely surrendered its legislative powers to irresponsible committees of conference.

PROBLEM OF CONTROL

The central problem connected with the conference committee system is that of controlling it. Various rules and rulings of the Chair have been made to this end during the past century. In 1918 the Senate adopted the Curtis rule which makes it possible to challenge a conference report on the point of order that it contains new matter not committed to the conference committee, whether germane or not, even under a substitute bill situation. This appears in clause 2 of rule XXVII of the standing rules of the Senate which has been strictly construed and which reads as follows:

"2. Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference."

In the House a rule of 1920 (rule XX, clause 2) forbids House managers to agree in conference to a large class of Senate amendments to appropriation bills without a separate vote on each amendment by the House. This rule has been generally observed and is regarded by McCown as "probably the most effective means yet devised of controlling the evils of the conference committee system."²¹

In 1946, as noted above, the Legislative Reorganization Act, in section 135 applicable to both Houses, authorized conferees to report a new bill where one house strikes out all after the enacting clause of the bill of the other House and inserts new language. The defect of this amendment, as noted above, is that it does not forbid conferees to delete or modify matter passed in identical form by both houses.

In the House of Representatives the Speaker may rule out a conference report if it be shown that the managers have exceeded their authority; and points of order may be made against conference reports in the House before the reading of the explanatory statement. The House adopted a rule (rule XXVIII, clause 2) in 1902 which provides that "it shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the Record, except on either of the 6 days preceding the end of a session."

This rule may be evaded, however, by the granting of unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a conference report; and by its own terms it is inoperative during the last 6 days of a session when many conference reports are made.

In practice, the rules governing conferees, like all rules, depend for their effectiveness upon their enforcement. Writing in 1927, McCown reports that the rule forbidding the insertion of new matter in conference re-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ports has been "flagrantly violated in recent times."²² Points of order against infraction of the conference rules are, in fact, seldom made. Committees of conference enjoy largely uncontrolled powers to write new legislation in substitute bill situations where the rules allow them to report any bill germane to the bills under consideration. Sometimes conference reports are brought up in the House of Representatives under a special rule granted by the Committee on Rules waiving points of order against them. Under all these circumstances, it is obviously difficult to control committees of conference, which have long exercised a determining influence upon the shape of much important congressional legislation.

CONCLUSIONS

However, it would appear that effective control of conference committees is possible under existing rules, if they are enforced. McCown concluded "that under the House and Senate rules of the present time a fair degree of control is maintained over the managers * * * since the additions of the Senate rule of 1918 and the House rule of 1920, control of the managers has been increased so that there is much less conference committee legislation than there was at one time. Certainly there is now [1927] more control over the conference committee by the two Houses than there ever has been in the past. It would seem, then, that conference committee legislation is bad," concludes McCown, "but that there is not enough of it that eludes the rules and practice of the two Houses to cause despair."²³

"The truth is that the conference committee system is a necessary part of the congressional government system. It must, however, be kept under the control of the two Houses. The managers must not be allowed to include in their report any matter not committed to them by either House nor must they be allowed to eliminate items which have been agreed upon by both Houses. On the other hand, the peculiar composition of a conference committee makes it particularly fitted to offer constructive suggestions in regard to a bill that may have been altered several times in the course of its progress through the two Houses * * *"

Similar conclusions were reached by Dr. Gilbert Steiner, of the University of Illinois, in his 1951 study. Steiner made an intensive analysis of 56 pieces of the most significant legislation enacted between the 70th and 80th Congresses, inclusive, which went through conference. He concludes that "the conference committee has not been a consistently irresponsible 'third house' of Congress. Conference committees have sometimes been reckless, and sometimes have flouted the will of a congressional majority, but the number of such instances is small, too small to justify a damning generalization. Conference committees may be and have been controlled by effective rules and precedents. It would not appear, however, that the institution of the conference committee is such as to require closer oversight than is given any other congressional committee."²⁴ Steiner concludes that "the conference committee is both a practical and satisfactory device" of accommodation and that no new method of adjustment is needed.

In the 56 cases studied by Dr. Steiner in the period 1928-48, he found only 3 outstanding instances in which conference committees had deleted matter agreed to by both Houses or had included new matter. These involved the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the Transportation Act of 1940, and the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Of special interest is Dr. Steiner's conclusion that the House has been more influential in conference than the Senate. For the period and cases studied, he reports that

"the House achieved 57 percent of the victories, the Senate 27 percent, and 16 percent of the cases showed joint influence." House influence was predominant in all cases of revenue and appropriation acts studied, while the Senate dominated in broad fiscal policy legislation.

PROPOSED REFORMS

Thus, we see that the conference committee is a little known institution which operates secretly behind the legislative scenes and exercises large influence over the final form of much important legislation. It takes the handiwork of the two Houses and, in the interests of compromise, can modify the actions of either branch no matter how preponderant the vote therein may have been on the original bills, and submit a conference report which almost always becomes law.

Several suggestions have been made from time to time for changes in the congressional conference committee system. Mention has already been made of Senator Ferguson's resolution to amend paragraph 3 of Senate rule XXVII so as to plug an apparent loophole in it, making it crystal clear that it is the intent of Congress to limit the power of conferees in dealing with a substitute bill. To the same end, Senator Vandenberg sought in 1938 to add the following sentence to the rule:

"It is hereby expressly provided that this paragraph shall be deemed to include reports on measures where one House has struck out all after the enacting or resolving clause and inserted a substitute."

Adoption of this proposal by both Houses would eliminate the loophole still provided by permission to "include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement." The problem in the substitute bill situation has been less that of inclusion of new matter than that of deletion of matter agreed to by both Houses, and section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act does not meet this squarely.

Another recurring suggestion is to permit conferees to report new matter separately for separate consideration in each House. This requires unanimous consent and has occasionally been done. It has been the practice in the House under the 1920 rule in the case of certain Senate amendments to appropriation bills.²⁵

As a remedy for secrecy it has been suggested that conference meetings be open to Members of either House. Open conferences were prescribed by the New York State Constitution of 1777 and the first congressional conference ever held over a legislative disagreement—the conference on the impost and tonnage bills on June 26, 1789—was an open one attended by several Members of both Houses. The annals of Congress record no other such open conference from 1789 until 1911 when a tariff conference opened its meetings to representatives of the press under the influence of Senator La Follette who was strongly in favor of publicity.²⁶

In order to avoid inadequate consideration of conference reports during the crowded closing days of a session, the elder La Follette also suggested that a deadline be fixed by rule upon the receipt of bills from the other House. No action was ever taken on this proposal which is probably impractical.²⁷

Another abortive suggestion was that made by Representative McRae in 1902 that conference reports be printed in bill form, with changes in italics so that they can be readily recognized and any "jokers" discovered. But Congress has been content to rely upon the explanatory statements for

knowledge of the changes made in conference.

Others argue that the real remedy for the defects of the device is to keep it under congressional control by enforcing the conference rules so as to make theory and practice coincide. Congress makes its own rules and only Congress can compel compliance with them.

Several alternatives to the conference device are conceivable. Conference committees are not used in the Legislature of New York State. Amendments made to a bill in one chamber at Albany are returned to the house of origin for acceptance or rejection. And agreement is apparently achieved under the leadership of the Governor.

Under the parliamentary form of government used in England and many other countries, deadlocks between the houses are avoided by the cabinet which originates all important legislation, keeps harmony between the two chambers, and replaces the conference committee as the instrument for adjusting interchameral differences. Under the Cabinet system disputes between the chambers are conciliated by the Government whose ministers move freely between the two Houses, consult with their committees, and defend Government measures on both floors. But adoption of the Cabinet system in the United States would be a herculean remedy for the evils of the conference committee system.

Within the bicameral framework perhaps the most promising remedy is to make more use of joint standing committees in the formulation of important bills. It is easier through such committees to prevent differences from arising in the initial stages of the legislative process than it is to compose them after measures have passed both Houses. Persuasive testimony on this point was presented to the La Follette-McRoney committee by Representative Hale, of Maine. "A committee of conference," he said, "is not nearly as well adapted to framing legislation as a joint standing committee. A joint standing committee having agreed upon a bill can generally procure its passage with minor amendments through both bodies. But a committee of conference finds it much harder to get the coordinate branches of the legislature to recede from a position previously taken and concur with the other branch. All sorts of factors of pride and prestige are involved on the presentation of conference reports which are not involved in the report of a joint standing committee."²⁸

Increased executive influence, perhaps in the form of a joint executive-legislative cabinet, has also been suggested as a potential method of minimizing House and Senate differences. This suggestion was made by Thomas K. Finletter in 1945 in chapter XI of his well-known little book *Can Representative Government Do the Job?* It was also proposed by the La Follette-McRoney committee in its final report which recommended "that the majority policy committees of the Senate and House serve as a formal council to meet regularly with the Executive, to facilitate the formulation and carrying out of national policy, and to improve relationships between the executive and legislative branches of the Government."²⁹

The taking of steps to strengthen party government in Congress might be expected to reduce the need of conference committees, except when opposing political parties control the two houses. Several proposals to this end have been made in recent years. Most noteworthy among them are the suggestions to revive the party caucus as an instrument of policymaking, to create single responsible leadership committees for each party in each house, and to abandon the seniority custom in committee appointments and the selection of chairman.³⁰

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

A drastic remedy for the alleged shortcomings of the congressional conference committee would be to allow the example of Nebraska and adopt a unicameral legislature, thus eliminating the need of conferences. There are those who believe that the United States Senate no longer performs any unique or indispensable functions in the American system of government.¹ Its tolerance of unlimited and irrelevant debate and its frequent absenteeism have been severely criticized by its own members.² The decay of second chambers and the trend toward unicameralism in the democratic constitutions of the postwar world are widespread phenomena.³ Twenty-nine nations have unicameral national legislatures today. And in several others the role of the second chamber has been reduced to a mere suspensive veto. The British House of Lords was finally emasculated by the Parliament Act of 1949. Some students of representative government believe that under the new order of affairs there is less justification for the bicameral system than it has had in the past. As Walter Shepard wrote in 1935, "The Senate . . . may lose its *raison d'être*. A single chamber . . . might constitute a better instrument to do the work which seems to lie ahead of Congress."⁴ But unicameralism is probably merely an academic suggestion, for neither House of Congress would sign its own death warrant by submitting such a constitutional amendment to the States.

¹ Ada C. McCown, *The Congressional Conference Committee* (1927), ch. II.

² William Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England* (1860), vol. II, pp. 645-646.

³ McCown, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁵ *Annals*, 1st Cong., 1st sess., p. 20, April 15, 1789. Quoted by McCown.

⁶ McCown, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-255.

⁷ Gilbert Y. Steiner, *The Congressional Conference Committee: 70th to 80th Cong.* (1951), pp. 7-11.

⁸ See Stephen K. Bailey, *Congress Makes a Law: the Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946* (1950), ch. XI: Conference and Compromise.

⁹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 3, 1949, p. 13970.

¹⁰ S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 8.

¹¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 4, 1947, pp. 6537-6539.

¹² *Ibid.*, October 5, 1951, pp. 12962-12964.

¹³ *Ibid.*, October 1-2, 1951, pp. 12678-12681, 12718-12737.

¹⁴ For an example of this situation, see remarks of Representative COLMER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 7, 1952, p. A4742.

¹⁵ The books by Ada McCown (1927) and Gilbert Steiner (1951) are the only full-length studies of the American conference committee system. Brief descriptions of it are given in textbooks and treatises on American government. See, for example, W. F. Willoughby, *Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration* (1934), ch. XXVI.

¹⁶ Willoughby, *op. cit.*, p. 421.

¹⁷ McCown, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

¹⁸ George B. Galloway, *Congress at the Crossroads* (1946), pp. 98-99.

¹⁹ The Model Legislature, address at Lincoln, Neb., February 22, 1934. Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 27, 1934.

²⁰ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 2d sess., p. 9206 (June 19, 1948).

²¹ McCown, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 262.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 264, 266.

²⁴ Steiner, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

²⁵ McCown, *op. cit.*, pp. 267-268.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 36, 43, 177.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 268-69.

²⁸ Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 79th Cong., 1st sess., April 24, 1945, p. 342.

²⁹ S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 13.

³⁰ For a full discussion of these suggestions, see *Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System*, Report of the Committee on Political Parties, American Political Science Association, September 1950; and pertinent testimony on Party Government in Congress before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, hearings on the Organization and Operation of Congress, June 1951.

³¹ Cf. Arthur N. Holcombe, *Our More Perfect Union* (1950), p. 230.

³² Hubert H. Humphrey, *The Senate on Trial*, American Political Science Review, September 1950, pp. 650-660. See also Holcombe, *op. cit.*, pp. 231-34.

³³ Arnold J. Zurcher, ed. *Constitutions and Constitutional Trends Since World War II* (1951), ch. 4, *The Position of the Representative Legislature in the Postwar Constitutions*, by Edward G. Lewis.

³⁴ Walter J. Shepard, *Democracy in Transition*, American Political Science Review, February 1935, p. 16. Presidential address.

The Blessings of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, several days ago at the second century convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren, delivered a thought-provoking address entitled "The Blessings of Liberty."

I commend its reading to my brethren in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and I now ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY

(Address of Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at the second century convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1955)

It is a thrilling experience to participate in the opening session of this second century convocation of Washington University. The time, the place, and the cause to which the convocation is dedicated make it an occasion of major importance. The campus of Washington University enriched by a hundred years of devotion to the highest ideals of education and by the contribution of its thousands of alumni to the good life in America provides an ideal place to reflect upon "the blessings of liberty." To do so at a centennial celebration where the experience of the past, the events of the present and aims for the future can so appropriately be brought into balance adds greatly to the content of the occasion.

The times in which we are living are not normal times. Powerful forces are at work in the world—both to preserve liberty and to extinguish it. The interplay of hope and fear, belief and doubt, determination and frustration keeps the affairs of mankind and the minds of people in a state of turbulence—a turbulence that destroys perspective and clouds the vision. Such times call for constant reflection and reappraisal. In the atmosphere of these surroundings where

men and women have devoted their lives to the pursuit of truth throughout an entire century, we can more effectively detach ourselves for the moment from the complexities of everyday life in order to determine what our heritage of liberty is and what we are doing today to preserve it for our children and for those who come after them.

It is imperative that we do this. Notwithstanding the contributions of patriots through the centuries, the farsighted wisdom of the Founding Fathers or the written guarantees of the Constitution, liberty is not necessarily our permanent possession. Both external and internal pressures constantly assail it. It is axiomatic that every generation, to keep its freedom, must earn it through understanding of the past, vigilance in the present and determination for the future.

It is easier to know how to combat a foreign enemy who challenges our right to these freedoms and thus prevent a sudden collapse of the things we hold dear than it is to subject ourselves to daily analysis and discipline for the purpose of preventing the erosion that can with equal effectiveness destroy them. I say "easier" because Americans have never hesitated to make the choice between liberty and death. Normally we can rely upon our representatives in government to keep our defenses sufficiently strong to enable us to ward off outside attack, but we cannot delegate to any or all of our governmental representatives the full responsibility for protection of our freedoms from the processes of erosion. Such protection can be had only through an understanding on the part of individual citizens of what these freedoms are, how they came into being and whether their spirit dominates our institutions and the life of our country. The protection I speak of is that sense of strength and comradeship which flows from national unity, buttressed by freedom of thought, of expression, of mobility, and of participation by all in the life and Government of the Nation.

I have no doubt it seems strange to some people that we take time to discuss such things almost 2 centuries after the adoption of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. There are some who regard our freedoms merely as their birthright which they may simply take for granted. There are others who would never shrink from the loss of little freedoms—by the other fellow of course. And there are also those who would procrastinate until the deluge. The fact remains, however, we do have a battle today to keep our freedoms from eroding just as Americans in every past age were obliged to struggle for theirs. Many thoughtful people are of the opinion that the danger of erosion is greater than that of direct attack. I do not mean to suggest—nor do they, I am sure—that outside of the totalitarian menace any substantial group of our citizens would wilfully destroy our freedoms. But the emotional influences of the times coupled with the latent suspicion and prejudice, inherent in human nature, are capable of threatening the basic rights of everyone, unless those emotions are controlled by self-discipline, community spirit, and governmental action.

A few days ago I read in the newspaper that a group of State employees—not in Missouri—charged with responsibility for determining what announcements could be posted on the employees' bulletin board refused to permit the Bill of Rights to be posted on the ground that it was a controversial document. It was reported that the altercation became intense, and that only after the governor in writing vouched for its non-controversial character was the Bill of Rights permitted to occupy a place along with routine items of interest to the State employees. And this happened in the United States of America on the 15th day of December 1954, the 163d anniversary of our Bill of Rights, declared by proclamation of

President Eisenhower to be Bill of Rights Day.

It is straws in the wind like this which cause some thoughtful people to ask the question whether ratification of the Bill of Rights could be obtained today if we were faced squarely with the issue. They inquire whether we are as united today in defending our traditional freedoms as were the American people in asserting them during the first years of Constitutional government in the United States.

My faith in the sober second thought of the American people makes me confident that it would now be ratified. On the other hand I am not prepared to dispute with those who believe the issue would provoke great controversy.

Have we not had enough controversy over teaching in and the conduct of our colleges and schools, both public and private, to warrant the inference that an effort would be made to curb freedom of speech and thought in that important segment of American life?

Have not sufficient doubts been expressed concerning the rights of individuals to invoke their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination to justify the belief that the proposed adoption of this safeguard against tyranny might provoke heated discussion?

Does not the suspicion that has attached to lawyers who represent unpopular defendants indicate some departure from the constitutional principle that every person charged with crime is entitled to be effectively represented by counsel?

Are there not enough shortcuts advocated, and too often practiced, in our time-honored legal procedures resulting in what we called a denial of due process of law?

Have there not been enough invasions of the freedom of the press to justify a concern about the inviolability of that great right?

Departures from the letter and spirit of our constitutional principles are not the product of any one person or any one group of persons. They are more properly chargeable to the entire body politic; to the suspicion, hatred, intolerance, and irresponsibility that stalk the world today; and also to a lack of appreciation of the age-old struggle of mankind to achieve our present-day blessings of liberty. Government, whether national, state or local, is not the sole culprit in this matter. For it does not operate in a vacuum. In the last analysis it only reflects the mores, the attitudes, the state of mind of the dominant groups of society.

How do we come to have a Bill of Rights, and what is its significance in the history of this Nation?

The Bill of Rights, which became part of our fundamental law in December 1791 does not by any means define all our rights. Many of our rights are to be found in the original Constitution, and others are formulated in later amendments.

The Bill of Rights did not originate the rights which it guarantees; there was at the time of its adoption not a single novel idea in it. It did summarize in a striking and effective manner the personal and public liberties which Americans 164 years ago regarded as their due, and as being properly beyond the reach of any government, old or new.

The men of our First Congress knew, as we may be in danger of forgetting, that each element in the Bill of Rights was a painfully won acquisition. They knew that government must be neither too strong nor too weak; that whatever form it may assume, government is potentially as dangerous a thing as it is a necessary one. They knew that power must be lodged somewhere to prevent anarchy within and conquest from without, but that this power could be abused to the detriment of their liberties. Confronted by this paradox, they turned to the experience of their forebears for counsel.

The English people, in their long struggle to control the monarchy founded by William the Conqueror, hit upon a happy solution: government should remain strong for its proper ends, but its strength should be kept within clearly defined limits. It became the consensus of the English people that certain acts should be clearly understood by all to be beyond power of government, and illegal if committed by any of its agents. Here we have the basis of the Anglo-Saxon legal and constitutional tradition.

The first great document in this tradition was the Magna Carta of 1215. There was little new in Magna Carta. It merely recorded the rights which had been asserted, with varying success, against the Norman monarchy during the previous century and a half, and needless to say, there were reactions and backslidings in the five centuries that followed. But in the main the movement was forward, toward the accumulation of a body of well-established liberties and immunities enjoyed by the true-born Englishman.

The century or so during which the British colonized America was especially important in the development of British constitutional rights. A full century before Madison rose in the First Congress and proposed our American Bill of Rights, the British Bill of Rights had already come into being. It was the culmination of generations of struggle against the arbitrary government of the Stuart dynasty in England.

In the course of the 18th century, the question arose whether the residents of Thirteen American Colonies were true-born Englishmen, and as such entitled to the traditional liberties and immunities enjoyed in the homeland. Since the King and Parliament of Great Britain were resolved upon giving a negative answer to this question, the colonies decided, in the year 1776, that the time had come to make a fresh start, and to adopt a Declaration of Independence.

In one sense, the Declaration is a lineal descendant of Magna Carta. But in another sense, it is a very different sort of document, a characteristic product of the Age of Reason. Instead of appealing to royal concessions and traditional immunities, it takes its stand upon self-evident truths, the laws of nature, and unalienable rights. It was a new turn in human history. It was an experiment which had never been attempted. It is still on trial.

Our Revolutionary forefathers had had their fill of royal governors, and of George III and his ministers, and so they forgot for a time one of the great lessons of constitutional history: that government must be strong for its proper ends. Many of the new State constitutions set up a hobbled and ineffectual executive branch. Our first attempt to create a national Government, the Articles of Confederation, provided for no executive at all. Our attempt to operate under a weak government barely got us through the Revolutionary War. The return of peace began a drift which, all clear minds perceived, was toward anarchy. The inevitable and timely reaction brought about the Federal Convention of 1787, by which our present Constitution was submitted to the American people.

To the American people, the Constitution was a new and permanent legal basis for their Government. They wanted nothing left to conjecture. They insisted upon concrete rights being set down in black and white. If government was to be strengthened, the more apparent became the need to delimit its proper powers, and to itemize the immunities which its citizens ought to enjoy. And so, directly upon the establishment of Government under the Constitution, the first Congress submitted the Bill of Rights to the States.

Such, in the most general kind of way, is the process by which we acquired our Bill of

Rights. If you have not read its provisions recently, I urge that you read and reread them. They were never more important. The Bill of Rights contains only 462 words and can be read in only a few moments, but from the American viewpoint it embraces the wisdom of the ages as divined from man's struggle for freedom throughout civilization.

The liberties thus written into our fundamental law have not gone unassailed in the course of our national history, for men in office are still men. Whether men derive their authority from hereditary right or from popular election, they remain prone to overstep constitutional limitations and invade legal immunities. Periods of domestic dissension and of foreign war are especially liable to produce tendencies to disregard established rights in the name of national safety. Often the tendency persists after the danger which provoked it has passed away, and at such times Americans who cherish these rights have had to fight to vindicate them. The French Revolution, and the deep cleft of opinion which it brought about in our country, led to the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. When Thomas Jefferson succeeded to the Presidency 3 years later, he set free all those who had been imprisoned under what he regarded as an unconstitutional statute. Our Civil War saw the tendency to substitute military for civil tribunals which the Supreme Court rebuked in the famous case of *Ex parte Milligan* in 1866. World War I was followed by a wave of repressive measures, such as mass arrests without benefit of habeas corpus, which were strenuously opposed by the libertarians of that day. In our time, we have seen the greatest of wars give way to a decade of chronic tension and crisis, in which it is to be expected that new encroachments upon traditional liberties may have to be countered.

I have suggested that if there has been damage done to our traditional rights it has been accomplished by a process of erosion. Are the privileges and immunities summed up in our Bill of Rights in danger of loss through subtle changes in our climate of opinion? Is distrust of our fellow countrymen wearing away our traditional concept of the innate dignity of man?

These questions call for constant and intense exploration far beyond the limits of this discussion, but because we are here on the campus of a great university, I would remind myself and you that if our other rights are to be of value to us we must first have the untrammelled right to search for the truth in institutions such as this, and then to teach it in accordance with the dictates of conscience. If that right should ever fail, so will our other blessings of liberty. That is precisely what has happened to people in other parts of the world, and in our time.

But I do not wish to end on a mournful note. Nor do I wish to suggest that our liberties are about to be lost. Erosion may have begun in some respects but the fabric of our liberties is still far from undermined.

Surely the America that sent 12 million men into a world war to preserve freedom everywhere will not allow its own freedoms to be frittered away. Surely the America that has poured out its substance to rehabilitate the free world, and even our former enemies, so that they can resist tyranny, will not willingly pass on to its children less freedom than it has itself enjoyed.

It has been sagely remarked that men more frequently require to be reminded than informed, and I hope that we may all join in the good work of reminding each other of how much we have to lose, and how heedless we would be to lose it.

With a strong belief in the wholeness of our objectives and the courage to

defend our freedoms, I have no doubt we shall preserve our heritage.

Faith, the apostle tells us, is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Faith in America confirms the hope that we shall preserve for our children all that our fathers, by the way of clear thinking, firm resolution, patient endurance, and willing sacrifice secured for us; that our heritage of liberty will not dwindle but increase; and that we will prove worthy of what we have so abundantly received.

It is such faith, I believe, that brings all of us together today to consider the blessings of liberty.

Atomic Dawn or Twilight?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article entitled "Atomic Dawn or Twilight?", by Michael Amrine, appearing in the Progressive for March is worthy of our thoughtful attention. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we have come to one of the great crossroads in world history, one of the great hours of decision.

If we—and this means humanity—make the wrong decision, our civilization may well be doomed forever. It will matter very little, if we make the wrong decision and use the atom for our own destruction and that of the universe, whether we vote to put taxes up or down, or whether pay and fringe benefits are increased or curtailed. These things will be nothing but forgotten sound and fury if this planet joins those that go rolling on through space with no life upon them, giving out a cold silver light, or reduced to particles flying like meteors through space.

The article follows:

ATOMIC DAWN OR TWILIGHT?

(By Michael Amrine)

(This is the first of a series of articles exploring the peril and promise of atomic power. Other articles in the series will examine in detail the impact of atomic power in the fields of medicine, agriculture, public power, and foreign affairs. Michael Amrine, one of the Nation's foremost interpreters of modern science, has worked closely with Harold Urey and Albert Einstein. Formerly editor of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, he recently won Variety's award for the "best public-service program of the year" with his television series, Atomic Report.—THE EDITORS.)

When sunlight falls upon your hand, the warmth you feel is heat energy radiating from a hydrogen-helium reaction. The star we call our sun is really a kind of hydrogen bomb, slowly running through a complicated atomic-fusion process.

A sunrise is thus an atomic event, and atomic activity is part of our daily lives. All earthly life depends on the atomic energy of sunlight, which falls steadily upon the earth in enormous amounts—a quadrillion kilowatt hours of energy each day.

But the atom is closer to you than the sunlight through your window.

In the length of time it takes you to read this article, the chances are that 1 or

2 stray atomic missiles, traveling with an impetus gained in outer space, will pass through your body. The earth's surface is under constant bombardment from these "cosmic rays," and the odds are that every few minutes a "ray" will go through the average-sized human being. But the ray is so small and travels so fast that it is most unlikely to collide with any atoms of your body. When a cosmic ray does hit an atom, its energy of billions of electron volts may split an earthly atom into a score of separate fragments, themselves scattering at tremendous energies.

Atoms and particles fragmented by man may also be shooting through you.

This is the season for growing giant mushrooms at their testing grounds. If you are reading this in the long shadow of an atomic explosion in Nevada—that is, if you are reading this a few days after such an explosion, and if you are east of Nevada, even by hundreds of miles—this spring you will probably bump into a stray radioactive particle somewhere in the rounds of daily life.

The odds are overwhelming that this chance encounter will not do any harm to you or to your descendants. But what about the ultimate chances that the human race will kill itself through the accumulation of this radiation? The prospect is most real, as we shall examine in detail later. The hot cloud from the mushroom may go three times around the world and remain an entity detectable to our Geigers and those of the Russians. Its radiation will persist for centuries, long after it is too diffuse for measurement.

The most overwhelming questions of all asked by the atomic age are the basic ones of war and peace. What are the odds that you and millions of others will die from atomic blast, from heat, from shock, from fire, from radiation?

No statement on the atom is realistic if it does not make some assessment of the basic danger in which it places all of us.

Albert Einstein, with his customary lucidity, has put the central fact of atomic danger as simply as anyone: "Atomic bombs kill cities as bullets kill men."

This fact, however simple to say, however easy to demonstrate, has proved exceptionally difficult to communicate to peoples or to society or to the rulers of nations, including our own.

One could even say that the human mind and emotions are not organically capable of continuously living with this fact in our everyday world. There is no observable tendency for atomic scientists to live any further from the center of cities than their fellowmen live; interest in civil defense is as lacking at Los Alamos, N. Mex., the bomb-making center, as it is in less informed cities.

Truly understood, the fact that A-bombs can kill cities and H-bombs devastate whole regions, leads to some other basic conclusions.

One is that there will be no effective military defense against the atom. Bombs which can kill cities add up to total attacks which could virtually kill countries overnight (leaving aside the long-term menace of radiation). No amount of money—some want to spend \$20 billion on an antiaircraft net—can now make cities safe. We may disperse cities—we can never put walls around them.

Those who talk of defenses, like perfecting radar and fighter plane networks are deluded by the notion that our vulnerable neck can be protected by some superchromium collar. It can't be; militarily, the battleship *New York* is obsolete; militarily so is the city of New York.

II

We can build better Maginot lines; they will never be good enough. H-bombs may arrive by planes. They may come in merchant ships or in submarines. They may be

fired in guided missiles from ships offshore. The present range of guided missiles is 300 miles, but our planners now expect that both we and the Russians will have the 3,000-mile range missile within a few years. Traveling thousands of miles per hour, this missile could not be efficiently shot down by any device science can now imagine.

But a bomb to destroy New York can be brought in entire in a station wagon, or in pieces in suitcases carried by ordinary men.

Try to communicate this to yourself: Recently publicized scares about planted bombs had some foundation in conceivable fact; Soviet bombs may already be planted in our principal cities. And our bombs may be sleeping, awaiting a nightmare awakening in the shadow of the Kremlin. We or they can fire or hire a million Ladejinskys or Berias but we will not turn our times into an age of security. This is an age of total insecurity.

Congenital optimists that we Americans are, we forget this; when we forget it we become unafraid, so that the deaths of a few Japanese fishermen do not seem to us any great misadventure. Perhaps the fatal flaw in our foreign policy is that we thus seem heartless and heedless to those people outside our borders who can better appreciate war's destruction.

You should not be expected to keep this fact by your bedside any more than you should contemplate the fact that sooner or later, bomb or no bomb, you will one day die.

But whenever you undertake to think of foreign policy or military posture, of our educational programs abroad, or any basic national and international issue, you are playing Hamlet without Hamlet if you do not remember that H-bombs can kill cities as bullets kill men.

This is the real specter which truly haunts the world. It lies behind the fact that Coventry, England, and Chicago, Illinois, alike have no heart for civil defense. It sits at Adenauer's shoulder and it inspires and depresses Nehru. It redoubles the fanaticism of Red China and it disturbs the serenity of Schweitzer in Lambarene.

We can be tired of the bomb, frustrated by it, sick of it. But we cannot, like Pandora, seek to forget it by shutting it back in the box. Nor will science find a "miracle drug" to make this specter go away.

All this need not produce in rational men a depression or hysteria which says that there is no use, the game is over. In this atomic jungle, if we are accustomed to dressing for dinner, it would seem we should continue to dress. And if we have any ability to think, at dinner or at our jobs, we should by all means continue to think. This enormous danger gives all mankind a common fear and a common need. It is not fantasy to say this may well yet lead to common hope and community action.

Fortunately, the fantastic power of the atom also promises and has begun to deliver real benefits of value to all mankind.

The terror and the beauty of the physical world as now revealed lend support to the concept that mankind has not reached its maturity but its adolescence. Like a youth who has begun to discover the mystery of sex, mankind can be both frightened and ecstatically excited by this startling atomic force. Like the vital powers of the life-urge itself, our atomic powers can be directed to be playthings or to be instruments of domination; distorted, they can sharply limit our future and narrow our lives instead of broadening them. But if understood and respected, they can help illuminate the mystery and beauty of man's life.

When Enrico Fermi in 1942 led the first experiment which sustained a chain reaction in the atom, the code message flashed to Washington said, "Italian navigator has landed in a new world."

The atom could build a new world.

As Fermi was dying this winter, the first practical use of atomic power was being successfully tested. The first atomic ship, the submarine *Nautilus*, was starting what could be the longest voyage man has ever taken. The *Nautilus* could sail all of Columbus' seas, and in fact could go around the world like Magellan, without stopping once to refuel.

There are other far more useful and hopeful promises in atomic power than such dramatic endurance contests. In fact, even atomic power will probably not be the greatest benefit to flow from atomic energy. Six months after the first chain reaction Fermi argued that the great achievement would not be a new fuel but a new tool for learning more about the world.

The kinds of new atomic knowledge proving of benefit in agriculture, medicine, industry, and other fields will be discussed in detail later, but it might be useful here to list some examples in shorthand form:

The application of radiation is uncovering new information every day about the life processes of crops and animals. Radiation directed at the genes, the cells which carry hereditary characteristics, can cause variations of species. Within the last 2 years, for the first time, radiation has been used not just to cause harmful changes, but to point the way to better and stronger plants and animals.

Within the past 3 months reports have been received of the use of radiation to help understand the basic life process of photosynthesis. This may seem a forbidding word, but we should learn now to respect it, for it has enormous importance for the human race. "Photo" in this instance stands for light, and "synthesis" stands for the system by which plants take energy from units of light falling on them, and use that energy to process chemicals from the soil. Their chemical activity—their growth—far exceeds in measure and complexity all of man's works.

Man is completely dependent on this process, for we mainly eat plants or we eat the meat of animals that eat plants.

Moreover, coal is fossilized plant-stuff, and so are oil and gasoline. The log or the coal represent solar energy which plants have put through photo-synthesis and stored where we could use it. Thus the warmth of a fireplace, like the warmth of the sunlight in the yard, traces back to the hydrogen-helium reaction in the sun.

Should we solve the mystery of the process of photo-synthesis, we would solve the food problems of the world. The population growth today, matched against potential food shortages, will threaten the world within 50 to 75 years as ominously as the H-bomb does now.

Hundreds of medical scientists today are using radiation to study and treat disease. Fermi, like the late Senator Brien McMahon, who headed the first Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, died of cancer; the bitter irony of their untimely deaths underlines the great hope that through radiation man may abolish this scourge.

Scientists are uneasy about making promises, however vague and however tied to the future, which say that any amount of money or any of the revolutionary new knowledge is sure to place cancer, like typhoid and yellow fever, in the category of problems man has solved. But it can be stated definitely that knowledge based on radiation research is bound to extend and to save thousands and millions of human lives in the future. It is claimed today that radiation, including the long history of radium therapy, already has saved more lives than were wiped out in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This sort of simple balance is a little childish, but it may help us to get away from the kind of atomic age thinking which if applied to electricity would make us think of electric power only as the force which operates the electric chair.

Articles in this series will discuss these and other prospects in detail. This one attempts to introduce them by taking a look at the atom itself, to provide some simplified answers to these questions: What is an atom? What is radiation? Why do scientists believe our new knowledge can, if used properly, be more important to the human race than either atomic bombs or atomic power?

To begin with, one of the things we know about the atom which the Greeks did not know is how very small atoms are—so small that a teaspoonful of water contains a million billion billion atoms. The period at the end of this sentence contains perhaps a half dozen billion, give or take a billion. Combinations of atoms are called molecules and may include 2 to 2,000 atoms. Hydrogen and oxygen make a good combination adding up to molecules that form the common compound, water. Most atoms exist in compounds, and chemists constantly invent new ones. In the dot of ink at the end of a sentence would be many kinds of atoms in several compounds—hydrogen, oxygen as water, a lot of carbon, and intermixed with the dot of ink individual atoms and group-molecules from the cellulose of the wood-pulp which made the paper you now hold in your hand.

The very smallness of the atom has made it incredibly difficult to study. Much of the research, however fine the calculations, has been done simply by throwing atoms at each other—the so-called bombardment which is done by cyclotrons and other nuclear instruments. From the way in which atoms collide, or bounce off each other, or the way in which the atom-bullets slide through the atoms in their target, physicists have gradually been able to put together a picture which is useful, although at present so incomplete as to be basically unsatisfying.

III

But from the minute size of the atom flows the wonderful precision of measurement now applied by thousands of researchers to the physical world. You can do more precise work with bricks than with boulders.

Man has measured the diameter of the hydrogen atom's nucleus. It is 15/100,000,000,000,000 of a centimeter. Man now can use the hydrogen atom as a probe in the form of a bullet, to explore matter, leading to more precise knowledge than if he were poking into matter with a relatively rough scalpel, razor blade, or the finest point one could get on a needle.

Then we have learned that even the infinitesimally tiny atom is composed of still smaller parts, arranged in a very airy fashion, perhaps something like the solar system.

The outer shell of the atom is the electrons. Cartoonists always picture them somewhat like solid ping-pong balls and draw lines to indicate that they whirl in regular orbits. For many reasons the cartoonists' pictures inaccurately represent what physicists think the atom possibly looks like. Electrons actually have no mass or weight; they may be called particles for convenience, but are only particles of electric charge or energy.

Another major correction of the atom drawing which has become the atom's trademark is that in the heavier elements there are many rings of electrons. Hydrogen has one electron circling around, and one proton in the center. Uranium has 92 electrons, arranged as if in layers, around 92 protons and 146 neutrons.

The cartoonists' picture is off for still another reason—because small as the atom is, it is mostly empty. The cartoonist makes it cozy. It isn't. The electrons whirl so rapidly that they make the atom appear to be a solid sphere. This quality and the electrical forces operating which repel the "bullets" physicists shoot at them go a long way towards establishing atoms as the hard indivisible balls the Greeks dreamed about

as atoms. But they are not homogenous, nor tightly put together.

The nucleus, as the sun of this tiny solar system, is far from the outside rings of electrons. If a nucleus were enlarged to about the size of a baseball, the outermost electrons would be half a mile away. The nucleus of the next nearest atom would thus be a mile away from our first nucleus.

The mass of the atom—and the mass of all matter—is the center of these tiny whirligigs; the really solid stuff is a very small part indeed of what we call matter.

This vast emptiness of the atom gives rise to such dramatic illustrations as those written by George W. Gray, that if we could strip off all the weightless electrons, and concentrate nuclei together, the whole of Mount Everest might be packed into a cigarette case. The earth itself could shrink from its present diameter of 8,000 miles to about a thousand feet. Without the electrons, it would weigh the same. It would be an incredibly hard ball, though not indivisible.

The "vast spaces" between our constituent atoms explain why cosmic rays can pass through our subatomic latticework more easily than a boy can throw a baseball through a rose trellis on a summer's day.

But the key thing that we know which the Greeks did not know at all is the fundamental concept elaborated by Einstein: matter and energy are interchangeable. When the once invincible nucleus is penetrated, and is split into fragments, some of its elements may become parts of other atoms, or some of the nuclear stuff may do a quick change and come off as energy, or as particles traveling with enormous power.

Let's say that we have an atom composed of 100 protons and neutrons and electrons, as a dollar might be composed of pennies, dimes, and quarters. As such it exists and has its being as a dollar atom. Somehow we smash it and its elements reform themselves again into atoms which are harmonious, legitimate currency. However, there is always considerable loose change—charges which might be electrons but with no place to go, neutrons which escape at tremendous velocities—thousands of miles a second—and are not captured in another system. These homeless ones may do a lightning change to become pure energy, or may collide with and impart energy to other atoms.

Some elements—radium and uranium 235 are among them—are naturally unstable. They seem almost to be one of nature's mistakes. Their inner arrangement does not add up to a harmonious total—their particles are not at peace with themselves. Every so often one of their atoms disintegrates. That particular atom sends out some particles or energy and becomes stable. The atoms in a gram of radium will disintegrate at the rate of millions every second, but this is a small number compared with the sextillions of atoms in that gram.

Such unstable elements are called radioactive, and now we know that with modern instruments we can make an atom of almost any element radioactive. The carbon in a dot of ink, for example, can be made so radioactive that some of its atoms will still be disintegrating 20,000 years from now. This is done essentially by throwing into the normal harmonious atom a particle which it cannot digest, and which eventually it throws off.

If carbon atoms are radioactive, their presence anywhere can be detected by a Geiger counter. And it is from this fact that much research with radiation flows.

If we want to know just what a certain organ of the body is doing with the carbon it receives from the outside world, we could "tag" some of the incoming carbon by making it radioactive. Much work has been done in just this way with radioactive iodine, in study of the thyroid gland. There are literally thousands of research projects using this basic tool underway in the world today.

Wiretapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting yet terrifying article captioned "Rise in Wiretapping Brings State Inquiry," written by Charles Grutzner and published in the New York Times on Sunday, February 27, 1955. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RISE IN WIRETAPPING BRINGS STATE INQUIRY—
EAVESDROPPING, LEGAL AND ILLEGAL, IS NOW
A WIDESPREAD PRACTICE

(By Charles Grutzner)

One of the liveliest shows at the New York World's Fair of 1939-40 ran continuously at the telephone company exhibit, where visitors from all over the country could call the folks back home toll free. The only strings to the deal were the wires leading to 200 earphones to which other fairgoers glued themselves for blissful sanctioned eavesdropping. The operator who got the hinterlands numbers invariably greeted the person who answered with the warning: "People are listening in."

The way wiretapping has spread in the last few years the phone company could do its subscribers and dime-droppers a service by substituting for the dial tone a recording that would say: "Someone may be listening in."

No one has been able to measure accurately, or make even an informed guess at, the odds that the average telephone conversation will be eavesdropped or recorded. That is because so much tapping is done illegally and no public record is made of it.

MOST IN NEW YORK

In only about half a dozen States is it legal for law-enforcement officers to tap phones, and then under varying restrictions. New York, which permits such eavesdropping by law officers only under court order, has without doubt more of it than any other part of the Nation, although Washington, D. C., probably has more per capita.

In New York City, police have been cutting in on phone company wires since 1895. Many policemen, who have mastered the simpler techniques or who work with former phone-company employees, listen in on phones regularly without bothering to get a court order until they come upon a lead they may want to use in court.

Some Federal agencies engage in widespread wiretapping, although strictly speaking it is a Federal offense (section 605, Federal Communications Act), punishable by 2 years in prison, \$10,000 fine, or both.

District attorneys' men are frequent telephone eavesdroppers, usually with court orders.

PRIVATE DETECTIVES

Most of the illegal wiretapping is done by private investigators, hired by business concerns to steal trade secrets or to keep tabs on competitors by management to spy on employees; by some union leaders; by jealous husbands and wives; by persons fearing prosecution, and all sorts of other mortals who want either to eavesdrop or to protect themselves against it.

Many private eyes work it both ways. For a price they will tap someone's wire for you or try to find out if someone is tapping yours. The latter assignment is far more difficult to carry out successfully.

It is impossible to determine the full extent of wiretapping. Even sales records of special equipment, if available, would be meaningless because some technicians operate with little more than a \$1 set of war surplus earphones and 25 cents' worth of wire. Otherwise use induction devices requiring no physical contact with the telephone wires. Almost every month brings forth new gadgets, some quite Buck Rogers. Some wiretap technicians carry equipment valued at thousands of dollars.

LISTENING POST RAIDED

A clue to the mushrooming of the wiretap practice came within the last 2 weeks when the New York City Anticrime Committee, in asking for a legislative study of the whole situation, broke the news of a secret police raid on a wiretap listening post on midtown Manhattan's East Side.

Police who made the raid on February 11 kept it a secret even from District Attorney Frank S. Hogan. The first the district attorney, who is charged with enforcing the anti-wiretap law, knew of the raid was after John O'Mara, executive director of the Anticrime Committee, informed the legislature 6 days later. The police have never explained how it was that a large amount of electronic equipment in the apartment vanished between those dates. Mayor Wagner called in Police Commissioner Francis W. H. Adams, in an attempt to clear up the mystery.

The legislature has ordered an investigation of wiretapping in all its ramifications. A joint committee will hold public hearings and report by March 31 whether new legislation is needed. That is exactly what the Anticrime Committee wanted. The committee, privately financed, feels that there is too much ambiguity, too much hypocrisy, too much legal grayness, instead of clear-cut black-and-whiteness about the whole situation.

NEW LAWS NEEDED

The fast-spreading use of eavesdropping and recording devices that require no direct contact with the wires has raised some doubts as to the applicability of existing laws. Perhaps new definitions are in order, as well as straightforward Federal and State laws that will be enforced by the officials.

In the 21 years since Congress passed section 605 only one person has been convicted under the Federal wiretap ban. The lone luckless wight was Jacob Gruber, a lawyer, who went to jail for inducing a switchboard girl in the Securities and Exchange Commission to cut him in on phone conversations involving investigation of one of his clients. Ironically, Mr. Gruber was not even a wire-and-pier man. He was convicted under that part of the law which makes it a crime to intercept and divulge a telephone communication.

JUSTICE UNIT'S ATTITUDE

The Department of Justice position on wiretapping is one of the most interesting aspects of the overall problem. The Department has frankly declined to prosecute other wiretappers because its own men tap wires illegally. Former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson admitted as much publicly in 1940.

Federal law not only makes a crime of wiretapping but forbids use in court of evidence so obtained. The FBI and other agencies have resorted to wiretapping nonetheless, because this was the only way they could obtain leads in some investigations. After getting information from tapped wires, they then substantiated it by other means and went into court with evidence which, although stemming from an original illegal

practice, did not require the wiretap evidence in court.

It was this particular tactic by the Department of Justice that led to one of the reversals of the conviction of Judith Coplon, charged with giving Justice Department secrets to a Russian spy. The Coplon appeal was based, in part, on a 1939 precedent in which Justice Felix Frankfurter, writing the Supreme Court's majority opinion, referred to any evidence stemming from an original wiretap, no matter how well substantiated by other means, as "the fruit of the poisoned tree."

Wiretapping by Federal agencies won powerful support, although it was not legalized, when President Roosevelt in 1940 sent a secret memorandum to the Department of Justice approving of its use in certain specific cases of suspected espionage. Although not so intended, this was interpreted as a green light for much more wiretapping than the FBI had originally indulged in.

FEDERAL ACTION MINOR

But the Federal wiretapping is nothing compared to that of local police and private investigators across the country.

A former law-enforcement officer told this writer a few days ago:

"Detectives use wiretaps on maybe half of all the important police cases in New York, and many use wiretaps as a routine thing to pick up leads on bookmaking, prostitution, and other crimes without bothering to get court orders or even to let their captains know they're tapping."

One reason for shortcutting the legal order, which can be obtained in New York State from a Supreme Court, county court or general sessions judge, is the unwillingness some judges are showing now to sign such orders. Supreme Court Justice Samuel H. Hofstadter, in denying the applications for three policemen to tap wires in a bookmaking case only last month, said a tapped wire was "far more devastating—to civil rights—than a search warrant." His decision was hailed by the Civil Liberties Union as a "major victory to preserve the constitutional right of privacy."

INNOCENT PARTIES

It must be remembered that whenever a law enforcement officer—or anyone else—taps a wire he hears the conversations not only of the suspected parties but also of innocent persons who may use the tapped lines. In the case of taps on public telephones, which is widespread in bookmaking and some other cases, thousands of personal secrets, confidences and other conversations of innocent persons may be eavesdropped—and possibly played back in court on the same disk with a bookie's or prostitute's talk which preceded or followed it on the public phone.

Not all police, and certainly not all private investigators, limit their use of eavesdropped talks to those conversations they set out to hear. Blackmail and sale of business secrets, though incidental, have been found lucrative to crooked operators. A policeman who will share a prostitute's earnings or shake down bookmakers—neither of which is an unheard-of occurrence in police circles—will not hesitate to sell secret information he has stumbled upon.

FOR THE POLICE

Among the wiretap technicians a favorite story is that of the former signal corps GI, who tinkered with radios and electronics when he got out of the Army. The local police captain asked him one day if he could tap the wires of neighborhood bookmakers. The ex-soldier complied, glad to oblige the law, even if illegally. He was surprised when the captain later gave him a fat fee. After that he was less surprised to learn that the captain was using the taps to check on the bookies' business to make sure they gave him an honest deal in the protection payoff.

New York State law, while providing penalties of 2 years and \$1,000 for wiretapping, does not make it an offense for a man to put a device on his own phone to protect his business interests or the sanctity of his home.

Speech of Dr. Harold D. Fasnacht, President of La Verne College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, last January, President Fasnacht, of La Verne College, which is located in my district, visited Washington and conferred with a number of Government officials. When he returned to California he discussed some of his observations of Washington in a speech before the Kiwanis Club. Mr. Lee Aldrich, editor of the San Dimas Press, printed the entire text of Dr. Fasnacht's speech in his newspaper on March 3, 1955. The speech follows:

FASNACHT SEES NATIONAL OFFICIALS AS SINCERE, EARNEST, AND DEDICATED

(By Dr. Harold D. Fasnacht)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dr. Harold D. Fasnacht, president of La Verne College, made some remarks at a recent Kiwanis Club meeting about his impressions of our national officials in the Nation's Capital which the Press editor felt should have much wider circulation. Upon request he gladly consented to write those impressions for publication. He has done so and they follow:)

In January I had the privilege of attending the Association of American Colleges Convention in Washington, D. C. It was one of the greatest educational experiences of my life—not only because of the conference itself, but because of related opportunities in Washington and en route.

Each time I go to Washington, I return home with a new appreciation of our National Capital. My sensitivities to the work of our leaders in Washington are awakened and whetted. One cannot be long in Washington without being aware that the hub of the Nation, perhaps the world, revolves there. Indeed, people—important people—are there from all over the world. They have reason to be there, and that reason makes them busy and important people.

But, in spite of the fact that Washington is a busy place, and by its very nature a large and impersonal metropolis, I feel a sense of belonging while there. There are reasons for it.

I had the unique privilege, with several hundred other college presidents, of seeing and hearing President Eisenhower in person. He addressed the conference luncheon briefly, in person. Intensive preparation had been made. Each of us had to have our credentials approved to be admitted to the luncheon. The Secret Service and Washington police were in evidence literally everywhere. The President's personal flags and banners were draped along the platform. There was spontaneous applause and enthusiasm when he entered. I sat at a luncheon table not over 30 feet from where he stood to speak. I could study his features, the depth of his reflections, his sincerity.

He spoke without notes, but obviously from a well-thought-out sequence of ideas. He told us presidents that he had one thing

on his mind at this moment, above others. It was that he wanted us to challenge our faculties to find the answer to the greatest need of the day—that of how to get along with ourselves and with other nations. It is the problem of human relations, he insisted. He said that no one else had so vital a stake in it as the liberal arts colleges, and he said further that at center, it is a religious matter and based upon religious values. He was in dead earnest about the peace of the world. Everyone was easily aware of how it weighted on him—this problem of dealing with the other nations of the world.

Mrs. Peter Marshall and Dr. Edward L. R. Elson (the President's pastor) addressed our convention. The admonitions of the Sermon on the Mount and the imperative of Christianity were lifted. One could feel that the influence of such great souls was an outreach for good from the Nation's Capital.

I visited several Government offices. On the way eastward, I had business at the office of the Regional Housing Administrator in San Francisco. I spent an hour in Congressman PAT HILLING's office. I wanted to share viewpoints regarding United Nations, selective service, social security, and the postal rates. From his office I went to see Senator GORDON ALLOTT, newly-elected Senator from Colorado, whom I have known since boyhood, for we grew up in the same community. We talked of some of the same problems. Although both of them were extremely busy, for it was the week of the organization of congressional committees, they had time to listen to my viewpoints, and to express their concerns.

It was almost by chance that I heard that Col. Merlyn McLaughlin, a former teaching associate in Denver, was in the Pentagon as a high official in the Air Force. I phoned to say hello. He would have it no other way than for me to catch a taxi and come out. He met me at the entrance, showed me through a part of the labyrinth of winding corridors in the Pentagon and to his office. Long distance calls and personal interviews awaited but he had time to introduce me to his friendly associates.

My convictions about Washington were deepened as I left the city. Whatever one's political viewpoints, whatever your attitude toward particular personalities, theories, or policies, one must admit that the men and women who go there to direct and coordinate the affairs of our Government are trying to do a terrific job. They are busy and overburdened. They are human, and they do err; they have widely varying viewpoints toward the methods of achieving aims, but I believe that the overwhelming majority want to go the same direction. They are sincere, earnest, dedicated, and unselfish.

Postal Increase Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial written by Mr. Robert Ingalls and published in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times:

POSTAL INCREASE NEEDED

Almost all Congressmen are leary of doing anything about the constantly increasing deficit operation of the United States Post Office. They feel a boost in rates would make people unhappy—and we presume it would.

However, most people are reasonable and when the facts are explained to them they are usually willing to go along.

Here is the situation faced by the Post Office Department:

Right now this business-type enterprise within the Government is being operated on a prewar price level and a postwar cost level. Consequently, it is now losing money at the rate of at least a million dollars every working day. Since World War II, during a period of unprecedented national prosperity, the Post Office Department has operated at a total loss of more than \$4 billion. The interest alone on this portion of the national debt is costing American taxpayers more than \$100 million a year.

In spite of the fact the Department lost \$399.5 million in the fiscal year of 1954, pending wage increases and other employee benefits that will cost at least \$166 million more per year are being considered. Most of these benefits are deserved and necessary.

The question is, Should we go on deceiving ourselves by keeping postal rates artificially low and taxing ourselves additionally to pay the deficit and the interest thereon?

Somehow, this just doesn't make sense. In the first place it costs everyone more money and in the second place everyone pays proportionately regardless of how much they use the mails. It would seem more intelligent and fair for those who use the mails to pay the costs.

Watson Wooddy, Corvallis postmaster, has given us some interesting facts on the mail-rate situation and we pass them on to you.

The 3-cent first-class mail rate was established back in 1932. Since that time Post Office expenses have doubled and the mail user's ability to pay has increased doubly as well. The cost of almost everything else has also doubled (actually about 97 percent).

In 1954 the cost of handling the average first-class letter was 0.0312 cent and it will be higher in 1955. So it costs you in additional taxes a percentage of .0012 cent every time someone drops a letter in the box. The cost of handling the same letter in 1932 with the same postage rate was .0189. Quite a difference.

To make the recommended 1-cent increase on first-class mail easier to digest it should be pointed out that at least three-fourths of all letter mail originates with commercial users and that an increase of 1 cent on the first ounce of first-class family mail would cost the average United States family about 10 cents per month.

Additional rates in proportion have been recommended for all the other mail classifications. It is estimated that if all the increases were approved by Congress the Post Office Department would be able to operate on close to a pay-as-you-go basis. It would seem intelligent to have the actual users of the mails paying a larger share of the costs instead of ultimately transferring them to the shoulders of the American taxpayers.

Congress should muster up its courage and push the increases of postal rates.

Ethics in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very

thoughtful and provocative address by our former colleague, the Honorable William Benton. The address on Ethics and Politics was delivered before the Harvard Law School Forum on February 18, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ETHICS AND POLITICS

As a part-time politician, I thank Harvard for the chance to share this platform with two professionals. I also feel honored because politics is a noble calling—one of the noblest—and I am proud to be part of it, even part time.

Just 20 years ago I sold out my interest in my first creative business enterprise—the New York advertising agency of Benton & Bowles, which I founded. I dedicated 6½ years of my life to Benton & Bowles, big full-time years, when I thought only of business and of financial risks, uncertainties, and profits; but of the 20 years since I've devoted myself, in about equal parts, to 3 fields of action: first, to higher education, as an administrative officer of a university and as a college and university trustee; secondly, to the 3 businesses which I control and own—in publishing, motion pictures, and music; and, thirdly, to politics, including service as Assistant Secretary of State, and later as a United States Senator.

Thus, I've had an opportunity to compare the ethics of practitioners in three major fields. If we here tonight were to ask Dr. Gallup or Mr. Roper to get us a rating scale of public opinion on the relative virtue—or perhaps the word is respectability—of the three groups, I'm sure the professors would come in first—almost with haloes; the businessmen would rate second, because, as President Coolidge said, "the business of America is business"; and the politicians would come last, and many would label them as mendacious and corrupt.

My own rating scale, based on my observations of the 20 years, and taking into account the pressures to which each group is subjected, would reverse that order. I would put the politicians first—and remember, please, I am speaking of ethics—and the professors last.

I hasten to assure you that my veneration for scholarship and the life of learning is not diminished by my discovery of its ethical deficiencies as ethics are understood by practitioners of business and politics. The professor does not apply his high code of scholarship to one significant facet in any code of ethics, the realm of private and personal relationships.

Early in 1949, after I had served in the State Department as a high administrative officer working closely with the Congress, but before I had any notion I'd ever serve in the United States Senate, I gave a talk to the Sales Executive Club of New York. I may have startled some of the members with this paragraph:

"The truth is that the Members of Congress—the five-hundred-odd Members of Congress—are the finest group of men that I have ever met anywhere; and on integrity, intelligence, hard work, they rank above any group of men with whom I've ever worked and, believe me, I know the business community well. I know the board of trustees of the committee for economic development, and I am not without friends in the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. I would trust our United States destiny overwhelmingly to the Members of Congress, judged by intelligence, integrity, competence, and hard work, far ahead of trusting our country's future to the top business leaders as represented in these business associations. That is as great a tribute as I know how to pay to a group of men who are so frequently kicked around,

and abused, misunderstood, and unappreciated."

Today I still hold with that view—and with far greater emphasis after my 3 years in the United States Senate—I hold with it even after 3 years' exposure in the Senate to the condemned man from Wisconsin. The ethical practices of politicians are greatly underrated in contrast to other groups in our American community; and it is by such contrast that they must in part be judged.

The notion that all politics is dirty is one cause of the cynicism and apathy that keeps nearly half of all our eligible voters away from the polls, even in presidential years—a disgraceful record compared with the democracies of Europe. I pause here to pay high praise to my State of Connecticut where 93½ percent of the eligible voters went to the polls in 1952, the highest percentage ever achieved in any State in any election. I praise this percentage even though it was the Eisenhower vote which accounted for my own defeat.

This idea that politics is dirty is also one reason why otherwise estimable citizens avoid any personal involvement in politics. The truth is that only some politics is dirty.

We are not here to minimize the ethical problems of politics. Many of these problems are very old indeed. From the Old Testament on, a high proportion of the great books of our Western World have debated the virtues that are required of political leaders, and the vices associated with political power and with the struggle for power. Plato and Aristotle had much to say about this; Plutarch very much. So did Machiavelli and later the 18th century philosophers.

As my approach to the problem before us tonight, I shall seek to identify some major ethical problems of politics as they exhibit themselves in our day; and secondly I shall discuss some steps we might consider in our effort to resolve them, at least in part, for our generation—more precisely, how we might pursue those steps which may reduce the powerful pressures toward mendacity and corruption which our society inflicts on our politicians.

What are some of those pressures? And what are some of the easier things we can do to relieve them? In these two questions I pose a long series of discussions and debates before this forum. We cannot undertake tonight to develop a catalog. I shall only try to identify for you four major areas of acute ethical discomfort in politics, and briefly suggest approaches to relieving them.

I shall not invoke for you that great tried and true remedy of the orators and reformers, the only true, permanent, and sovereign cure, that of an ardent and informed citizenry. I shall not invoke it if only because from my efforts to sell encyclopedias and other books I know some of the difficulties in achieving this goal. This is a true goal, a great one, but it is very long range, indeed.

Two of my four areas concern election campaigns. The other two concern the conduct of an officeholder, specifically a Member of Congress, once he has achieved election.

There are really three kinds of politicians. There's the candidate who's running and any good candidate must run hard. Then there's the same man after he's been elected, the officeholder. Finally, there's the man in the back room, the professional, the manipulator and compromiser whose power is often absolute and whose word must be better than other men's bond.

My comments tonight deal with the first two species of homo political and ignore the third, who is often the most important of all.

As the first of my four areas, let's look at the financing of campaigns. This is the single most ticklish ethical question in the whole field of elective politics. Every candidate is now a panhandler, first among his

friends, and then among people he hopes to make his friends. (Of course, I'm talking about Democratic candidates—we Democrats realize that a bottomless cornucopia flows automatically into the Republican coffers.)

The school of thought which holds that all politics is dirty of course believes that candidates and their campaigns are bought and paid for by the so-called vested interests. The truth is at least cousinly to this belief: It is that nearly every candidate, at least for Federal office, must violate the spirit if not the letter of corrupt practices legislation. The limitations set forth in the corrupt practices legislation are unrealistic for our day. Since these acts were passed, campaign costs have increased 400 percent to 500 percent and they will increase further with the greater use of television. The Congressional Quarterly records that candidates for Congress are now reporting a national total of \$10 million in expenses per election, and the Congressional Quarterly adds: "The reported spending is actually far below what it cost to elect many candidates for contested seats." Ten million is by no means an excessive total. The truth far exceeds this. Ten million is far too small to underwrite and pay for the campaigns which must be waged. All the professionals know this. Ask Mr. DeSapio. If you don't believe him, ask Mr. Javits.

Further, in defense of these higher and ever higher expenditures, may I suggest that our political campaigns are our principal instrument for education in public issues, as our elections are our principal instrument for determining the public will. On that alleged \$10 million rides the decisions we shall make about many tens of billions and, potentially, hundreds of thousands of lives. The ten million by current standards is a pittance. It's the old nickel subway ride.

Unhappily for the morals of our generation, the present pattern of our corrupt practices laws, Federal and State, is such a sieve that any Harvard undergraduate can drive a bulldozer through the holes. What is now needed is a realistic revision of existing corrupt practices laws, and then rigid enforcement of the new legislation.

Among reforms required is new legislation to provide high penalties on corporation officials who reimburse themselves, in one way or another, from their companies, for their campaign gifts. Another urgently needed reform is a greatly improved system of reporting campaign contributions. A contribution made in the open loses much of the sinister character of a hidden gift. I would insist also that this reporting take place not only immediately after the election but shortly before it, and again at stated intervals following the election, to disclose how a campaign deficit, if there is one—and there frequently is—is met. I think all of us should know about the Nixon funds, even before the recipient becomes a candidate for Vice President.

Fifty years ago Theodore Roosevelt felt so strongly about the ethical hazards in campaign financing that he recommended that Congress provide "an appropriation for the proper and legitimate expenses of each of the great national parties." I'm not sure I'd go quite as far, but I'm not sure I wouldn't. Here's a good study for some willing doctor of philosophy candidate. But before I embrace President Theodore Roosevelt, I'd like to examine possible ways to broaden the base of political giving. As a people we haven't yet learned to give for politics. Our political fund raisers—and many of my best friends do it—are almost all of them part-time amateurs. Philanthropic money raising is developing as a science and an art. The political parties and partisans have yet to learn the techniques of the Red Cross, the Community Chest, the March of Dimes, the

Harvard Alumni Association, to which you are about to become subject subjects.

I'm merely opening the door into this first dark and murky area, that of the financing of political campaigns. I'm giving you a peek, but with little light. I haven't even touched the high spots.

I move hastily into my second area of danger—the character of the campaign itself.

I hasten to assure you I have no hope of overcoming the current excessive flamboyance of campaigns. I refer to the kind of exaggeration for which we Americans have developed a high tolerance.

But can we not concern ourselves with a moral peril point which is reached when a campaign becomes vilification and defamation—an attempt to political assassination? As a high example, I place in this category Governor Dewey's speech in Hartford, the capital of my State, when he told his audience that "Whenever anybody mentions the words 'Truman' and 'Democrat' to you, for the rest of your lives remember that these words are synonymous with Americans dying thousands of miles from home because they did not have the ammunition to defend themselves. Remember that the words 'Truman' and 'Democrat' mean bungling our country into war and the lack of courage or the capacity to win the war or to win a truce."

I take this as my example because this comes from no irresponsible political campaigner but from the 8-year titular head of one of our two great parties—a far more responsible role than that of any governor or United States Senator.

I take this as an example because I am here at the Harvard Law School talking to young men who could not be blamed if they wished to emulate Governor Dewey's present role, as a senior partner, in nomenclature at least, in a firm not unknown even in my community of Fairfield, Conn.

In this, my second area, I ask 2 questions, though I am not applying these 2 questions to my reference to Tom Dewey, who is perhaps an understandable idol for any young Harvard Law School student, even though a dubious one by the ethical standards which is our subject tonight. I ask these questions of those who seek to teach you. First, I ask whether our laws of libel and slander, applied to political campaigns, should be strengthened. In practice we have made it almost impossible for a complainant to recover damages for statements made about him in a political campaign. We have taken the position that "all's fair in love and politics." Perhaps a change is in the offing: A few weeks ago a New York court assessed \$25,000 damages against a candidate for Congress who described 2 of his opponent's workers as Communist fellow travelers. In my own second campaign advertisements were run all over Connecticut attacking me in eight points as a Communist.

Is there not a question here of legitimate interest to your forum and to the Harvard Law School?

Even more valuable than strengthened libel and slander laws could be the creation of a permanent Citizens Elections Practices Commission, a national body which could serve as a model for similar State commissions. I urged the creation of such a Commission when I served in the Senate. Such a nonpartisan Commission of distinguished private citizens could be called upon, among other responsibilities, to issue reports each 2 years after elections—a kind of referee to report on low blows delivered during the heat of campaigns and to admonish against them, and then to recommend criteria of responsibility. Such a Commission could sponsor an era of public enlightenment which our politics desperately needs.

My last two areas of moral hazard, for officeholders, are characteristically pitfalls of office as they are traps for campaigners.

The first of these involves the familiar old dilemma of compromise. George Bernard Shaw once described a political situation as "smirched with compromise, rotted with opportunism, mildewed by expedience, stretched out of shape with wirepulling, and putrified with permeation." But politics has also been defined as the art of the possible. It has been defined even more precisely for the politician by T. V. Smith as "the art of compromising an issue without compromising yourself."

Compromise is necessary and inevitable in politics. But exactly where, in the necessary and inevitable compromising, exactly where lies the question of ethics? A good compromise is the best practicable solution of a problem, possible at a given time, in the interest of one's constituency, and of one's nation.

A bad compromise is a politician's decision to support the proposals of a special interest group, even though they may conflict with the general interest. A classical example is pork-barrel legislation. Personal financial gain is rarely the consideration of the politician in such compromises. What is at stake is votes the politician seeks to own or control. Rarely is outright cynicism involved, but rather what might be called gymnastic rationalization. That is why I prefer to speak of relieving pressure on the politicians, rather than of redeeming sinners.

The root of the pork-barrel problem, and by any other name it smells the same, is that the special pleaders control a bloc of votes—or successfully create the illusion that they do—and the politician is not convinced that he opposes the bloc, no matter how small it may be, he will gain an off-setting support in the general citizenry, by virtue of his opposition.

Here is the great potential role for the voters' league, the citizens' council, the women who prefer politics to poetry. Here is the answer to the familiar question, "Does it do any good to write to your Congressman?"

Now let me move to my fourth area of acute ethical discomfort in the field of politics. This springs from the politician's need for publicity. Of all the crafts and professions, politics, and the theater are the two for which publicity seems indispensable. This is no mere matter of ego satisfaction for the performers. A good press translates into tickets at the box office, and into votes at the polls.

Applied to the politician, this urgent need for publicity is consistent with democratic theory. The ethical dilemma feeds upon the fact that what is interesting, what is newsworthy, has no necessary relation to what is important.

Congressman who knocks himself out trying to master tax measures, appropriations bills, tariff problems, water resource issues, or any key problem, may find his lazy colleague, or his opponent, grabbing the headlines with a quick denunciation of the latest shakeup in the Politbureau.

When I was a very junior Senator—in fact No. 96 in seniority—a batch of Hoover Commission proposals, for the improvement and reorganization of the Federal Government came before the Committee on Expenditures, of which I was the junior member. To my surprise, many of these worthy proposals had no Senate champion. Perhaps because of my business background these proposals to save money and achieve efficiency appealed to me powerfully. I leaped into the breach, not, I like to believe, without some success. One columnist said of me he couldn't decide whether I was a Sir Galahad or just naïve. I never was a Galahad; I happen to think my heart is reasonably pure, but it never gave me the strength of 10, or even one and a half in the Senate. But I was puzzled. The Senate has many able and dedicated men. Why had they not stepped forward?

Senator Wherry helped me gain understanding. After my speech in support of the Hoover Commission proposal to reorganize certain aspects of the Treasury Department's relationship to the banks, and I was the only Senator to speak for this proposal which was opposed by the banks and finally mustered only 7 votes, Senator Wherry left his front row seat as Republican leader and walked back to my back row No. 98. We were friends from my State Department days. He said, "Bill, your speech reminds me of my first as a Senator; I prepared it carefully; as I spoke I saw the old and distinguished heads nodding in approval; I thought I was doing fine; but when the vote came, I wasn't there; I didn't have them; and I remember that as I walked off the floor Senator Reynolds came up to me and put a consoling arm around my shoulder."

At this point, Senator Wherry put his arm around me.

"Kenny," Senator Reynolds said to me, "Kenny, we was with you as long as you was talkin'."

I learned that, older and wiser than I, the old hands of the Senate knew there was no political sex appeal in reorganization. There was little publicity, almost no incentive in terms of popular support, meaning votes in the next election, and there were some real and terrible penalties in terms of organized opposition of those who think they stand to lose, whether they be bankers or postoffice workers.

In this my fourth area there is a great opportunity for creative ideas and I have one suggestion I'll give you tonight. Can we develop a system of recognition which is independent of newsworthiness? A month or so ago, when Harold Lasswell of the Yale Law School was visiting me, I suggested an idea to him. He is to be president of the American Political Science Association next year. I suggested that the association each year designate the 10 Members of Congress who had done the most valuable unpublished work of the year. If no member could be named twice in 5 years, that would mean that every 5 years 50 members would receive such recognition. I do not believe it would be difficult to make the selections. Such matters are common knowledge to the staffs on Capitol Hill. And I would not underestimate the value of such recognition even in a campaign. I believe Senator DOUGLAS would acknowledge other value to him in last fall's election in Illinois of the fact he had been named the No. 1 Senator in a poll of Capital news correspondents.

My suggestion here is trivial, however, in contrast to the problem in this area. I give it to you because it's quick and easy. This problem well warrants a full evening by your forum.

Many of you young men here tonight in this historic hall will find yourselves within a few years deep in politics. I say, strength to your arms. The risks and hazards and pressures of politics are great. But the rewards outweigh them all. All your capabilities, all your experience will be called into play. And when other desires and ambitions have been satisfied, or blunted by the years, your desire to serve the public interest will sustain you.

I have outlined some of the pressure that operate against morality in politics. I have suggested a few possible ways of helping to relieve such pressures. But I have not mentioned the best solution of all. That solution is everywhere in this hall tonight. It is in yourselves, and in what you can and will and must do, for yourselves and for your country and for all of us, as you of the Harvard Law School move into politics. As your generation moves in and takes over American politics, in line with the great history of this hall and university, to which your presence here tonight shows you chose to con-

form, you will bring to politics all the truth and earnestness and honor that is in you. This is the best solution, the great solution, and to it I hope that some of you may dedicate yourselves here—in this hall—tonight.

Results of Russia's 5-Year Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by R. H. Shackford, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, which is entitled "Promises Galore—Five 5-Year Plans Net Nothing."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of March 4, 1955]

PROMISES GALORE—FIVE 5-YEAR PLANS NET NOTHING

(By R. H. Shackford)

Scene: Moscow hotel lobby.

Time: During 1947 Foreign Ministers Conference.

Characters: Old lady cloakroom attendant; stenographer for United States delegation.

Old lady (looking closely at girl's handsome hairdress, well-tailored dress, sheer nylons, and attractive shoes): Americanski? Stenographer: Yes.

Old lady: Ah, you have everything. We got nothing. They promise us everything. But we get nothing.

The Russian people still are getting nothing but promises.

The Soviet's own statistics prove how great is the Russian need for butter over guns.

Former Premier Malenkov produced some revealing facts about the Soviet planned economy during his brief stay at the top.

Stalin started his forced industrialization plan for Russia with the first 5-year plan in 1928.

Almost five 5-year plans later—in the 25 years between 1928 and Stalin's death in early 1953—the Soviet state invested more than 1 trillion rubles for industrialization. By the Soviet's official phony rate of exchange that is \$40 billion but actually closer to \$100 billion in terms of real purchasing power.

STILL NOTHING

But as the little old lady in the Moscow hotel cloakroom remarked, the average Russian got nothing from that huge investment.

Malenkov himself gave the breakdown of the 25-year expenditure of that 1 trillion rubles as follows:

Heavy industry: 683 billion rubles—65.5 percent.

Transportation: 193 billion rubles—18.5 percent.

Agriculture: 94 billion rubles—9 percent.

Light industry (consumers' goods): 72 billion rubles—7 percent.

Thus 84 percent of the 25-year investment went for heavy industry and transportation, while only about 16 percent was aimed at the Russian consumer. No other nation in the world has ever attained industrialization by so grinding its people. The United States, Britain, and Germany became industrial nations by parallel development of heavy and consumer industries.

Latest figures on Soviet industrial output and Kremlin plans for this year—the last

year of the fifth 5-year plan—show a decrease for consumer goods for both 1954 and 1955. Here are the figures based on official Soviet indexes showing the industrial trend toward less and less for the Russian people:

[In billions of rubles]

Year	Total output	Heavy industry	Consumer goods	Percent consumer goods
1940	139	85	54	38.8
1950	240	174	66	27.5
1952	309	223	86	27.8
1954	390	288	102	26.2
1955 (plan)	431	319	112	25.8

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I have today submitted to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture in opposition to the proposed cut in moneys for the school-lunch program. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to express my opposition to the proposed reduction in appropriations for the school-lunch program. Budget recommendations, if followed, would mean a reduction of approximately \$15 million worth of section 6 foods, and such action would seriously affect the school-lunch program in my State. With an increasing number of children participating, we need these section 6 foods along with the donated commodities received each year to keep our children's meals up to standard. If the \$15 million were cut off, it would mean less adequate meals, fewer free meals, and the closing of several schools.

Section 6 foods are of value to the school-lunch program because children throughout the country need more vitamin C than they receive at home. Canned fruits and vegetables are very necessary for an adequate and well-balanced diet, a diet that is delectable, interesting, and colorful. Peanut butter is accepted and enjoyed by practically all children, and this product supplies the additional proteins needed by youngsters.

An increasing number of meals are being served under this program in West Virginia, and this might be expected as a result of any normal population growth. Even though our Federal appropriations should continue at \$83,236,197, one can see how thinly it has to be distributed when figures from the biennial report of 1947-48 are compared with those of the 1953-54 report.

	1947-48	1953-54
Number of schools participating	1,278	1,478
Number of meals served	13,406,002	21,394,925
Number of free meals served	2,215,750	3,334,503
Average daily participation	86,828	123,862
Total expenditure	\$3,097,484.35	\$5,149,117.77
Amount paid by children	\$1,782,611.87	\$3,551,219.87

West Virginia's population, however, is not increasing. Rather, it has been decreasing over the past several months as a result of

conditions in the coal industry which have seriously and adversely affected the State's economy. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been a decrease in population, there is an accelerated increase in school lunches served. In December of 1954, we had an average daily participation of 143,474 children, or almost 20,000 more children per day than we had last year.

Gentlemen, these facts are enough to convince anyone that it would be a serious mistake to curtail this humanitarian program. Many children never receive a well-balanced and appetizing meal other than that which is provided under the school-lunch program. Over 225,000 people in West Virginia are dependent upon surplus food commodities at the present time. In such a distressed area, anyone who is willing to look a fact in the eye can see that children are being deprived of adequate diets in the home, and must depend upon meals such as those served at school for additional fruits and vegetables so necessary to proper health and growth.

Gentlemen, if this Government must retrench and curtail its spending, let it not be miserly in a program like this, a program which, in my opinion, is one of the best ever to be devised.

A nation's wealth is not to be found only in natural resources; its greatest wealth is in its human resources, its people, and these must be healthy in mind and in body if America is to be strong. Let us not be penny-wise and pound foolish in our attempts to economize. I am in favor of economizing wherever and whenever it is practicably possible to do so, but I submit that funds for the school-lunch program cannot be and should not be cut in the name of economy. I urge you, therefore, as members of this committee, not to sustain the reduction that has been recommended. I beseech and implore you to restore the amount to the extent that it will equal or surpass the figure within which the States are presently operating. The health and welfare of children cannot be measured in dollars and cents, and the strength of this Nation lies not in its gold and silver but in its boys and girls, the men and women of the future.

A Tribute to Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, next Monday, March 7, marks the 105th anniversary of the birth of the founder and liberator of the Czech Republic. I am extending my remarks to pay tribute to this great man.

America has always had a warm place in her heart for Thomas Masaryk. Many thousands of Americans either came themselves or are descendants of men and women who came to us from the land of Thomas Masaryk, Czechoslovakia.

Furthermore, Thomas Masaryk had spent some time in the United States, where he had worked toward the final achievement of his goal, the establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic. Here in Washington, he was a close friend of our great wartime President, Woodrow Wilson. And like Wilson, he

was a scholar, a statesman, and a great leader of democracy.

Most of all, however, it was in America that Thomas Masaryk saw embodied many of the ideals of democracy which inspired his drive toward the achievement of national independence for Czechoslovakia. It was, therefore, partly upon the same principles which motivate American democracy that Masaryk constructed the Czechoslovak Republic.

On the anniversary of the birthday of Thomas Masaryk, it is fitting that all Americans pause to pay tribute to the memory of this great Czech patriot. In our tributes let us not forget the homeland of Masaryk, a nation which now lies downtrodden beneath the yoke of the Communist aggressor. The Communists destroyed the Republic of Thomas Masaryk, but they can never destroy the ideals for which he dedicated his life. It is our prayer, as it once was Thomas Masaryk's, that Czechoslovakia will once again be free and independent.

The New Rules, The Old Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Post of March 7, 1955, is deserving of our attention:

THE NEW RULES, THE OLD GAME

Attorney General Brownell's heralded reorganization of the Federal security program is a hoax. It embodies no basic changes in the unjust, oppressive system which has brought demoralization to the Government service and dishonor to the country.

In four basic respects the allegedly revised setup bears deadly resemblance to the plan Herblock has called the United States internal insecurity program.

1. No attempt is made to reduce the scope of the screening process. Now, as before, all Federal employees will be subjected to investigation, reinvestigation, and re-reinvestigation, whether they hold strategic posts in sensitive agencies or they serve as minor flunkies to assistants to assistant bureaucrats in public relations.

2. No revision is proposed in the loose, sweeping definitions of "security risk" which have resulted in so many unwarranted dismissals. It was the fantastic vagueness of the criteria which enabled two different Government agencies to reach utterly divergent conclusions in the monstrous Ladejnsky affair.

3. No machinery is set up to allow dismissed employees to appeal to any agency outside the department from which they have been fired. Ezra Benson, for example, will remain the final arbiter of the fate of Agriculture employees despite the know-nothingism he exhibited in dealing with Ladejnsky; there is no court of appeal within the Government.

4. Finally, perhaps most serious, accused employees will still be denied the right to confront their accusers whenever the Justice Department and the FBI deem it in the in-

terest of national security to shield an informant. In a brief filed in the Supreme Court Friday in a loyalty case, Brownell made it plain that "undercover agents, paid informers, and casual informers" must be "guaranteed anonymity" in most instances. (It may be of major future significance that Simon Sobeloff, the Solicitor General, declined to sign it.)

In short, the dirty business of anonymous attack will go on as usual despite President Eisenhower's assertion that "the right to meet your accuser face to face" is a treasured American principle.

Undoubtedly there are exceptional cases in which the identity of a trained intelligence operative must be guarded. But the exception has become the rule; secrecy has become the refuge for a wide variety of professional character assassins, volunteer scoundrels, and irresponsible gossips.

What the Brownell formula amounts to is nothing more than a pious promise to behave better, to be more careful, to produce accusers once in a while, when it seems entirely convenient, and to avoid the embarrassing confusion created by the Benson-Stassen dispute over Ladejnsky.

No doubt Brownell hopes his rhetorical flourish will end the debate. But we believe the argument has just begun.

Americans have too long tacitly accepted abuses and wrongs and follies committed in the name of national security. Now, almost concurrent with the Ladejnsky debacle, other things have happened to force an agonizing reappraisal of the whole security panic. The recantations of Harvey Matusow, mingled with the revelations of false testimony by 2 witnesses in an FCC case, have thrown new and painful light on the business of accusation in America.

The disclosures have shaken many men and institutions. Currently the Senate Internal Security Committee is engaged in a frantic attempt to prove that Matusow is a low character in bad company. Such hearings are hardly necessary; Matusow boasts of his incorrigible unreliability. The question is why he was able to fool so many respectable men while he was playing the anti-Communist side of the street. Who protected him? How did so many super-sleuths in Government, on congressional committees and in McCarthyite journalism—fall for him?

Nothing in the new Brownell program offers any real assurance that another Matusow will not be permitted to destroy innocent men while their backs are turned. That is the issue Brownell—like so many of Matusow's old playmates—is trying to evade. But the issue haunts Washington.

John Marshall Harlan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "An Evasive Witness," which appeared in the Standard-Times, of New Bedford, Mass., on March 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EVASIVE WITNESS

John Marshall Harlan, the Federal judge from New York who has been nominated to

the United States Supreme Court, assumed a decidedly defensive attitude when questioned by the Senate Judiciary Committee which is now weighing his appointment. Although he was afforded several excellent opportunities to do so, Mr. Harlan did not state clearly and unequivocally his views on such vitally important topics as world government and the relationship between the United States Constitution and treaties.

Judge Harlan was nominated last November by President Eisenhower to be an Associate Justice of the Nation's highest Court, to succeed the late Justice Robert H. Jackson. The Senate Judiciary Committee has completed its hearings on the Harlan nomination but has not yet reported on it to the Senate.

At the hearings Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, a Judiciary Committee member, asked Harlan if he thought a treaty could override the Constitution. Harlan said he felt it would be inappropriate for him to comment, since the scope of the treaty-making power as set forth in the Constitution had been an issue before the courts many times in the past and would be again.

"Can a treaty take power from the States and give it to an international body?" Senator EASTLAND persisted. Harlan held it would be indiscreet and inappropriate for him to comment.

Senator EASTLAND then asked: "Would you approve a treaty that would deprive the people of rights guaranteed them by the Constitution?"

Replied Harlan: "That is a question that has not arisen for the last time. I should not be asked to forecast how I would decide cases."

Thus, a man who has been a judge of a United States circuit court of appeals for approximately a year and is a nominee for the highest court in the country, declined to tell a Senate committee whether he would uphold rights of the people guaranteed them by the Constitution.

Several members of the Judiciary Committee questioned Mr. Harlan about the proposed Bricker amendment, which would clarify the treaty-making provisions of the United States Constitution. Harlan said he knew nothing about the amendment, a startling admission since it was the subject of major debate in the United States Senate last year and failed to win approval of that chamber by a narrow margin.

Mr. Harlan told the committee he had joined the advisory committee of the Atlantic Union in 1952. When Senator Jenner of Indiana pointed out the Atlantic Union favors common citizenship and laws for North Atlantic nations and eventual world government, Harlan said he had not heard of those aims before and did not know the organization had any objectives which would threaten the sovereignty of the United States.

It is almost incredible that Mr. Harlan would join a committee fostering principles of which he remained unaware even after joining.

Judge Harlan told the Senate committee he would disassociate himself from the Atlantic Union committee if he is confirmed as a Supreme Court Justice, but apparently he sees no reason to separate himself from the Atlantic Union while he wears the mantle of a United States Court of Appeals judge. This is an amazing display of inconsistency, since some cases considered by the Supreme Court also are handled by Courts of Appeals.

Appearing before the Senate committee in his own behalf, Judge Harlan said little to enhance his prestige. In view of his reluctance to speak out on fundamental questions and his general evasiveness during the committee hearings, it is doubtful that Mr. Harlan possesses the qualifications of a Supreme Court justice.

Wiretapping**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record two editorials dealing with the problem of wiretapping. One is from the Washington Daily News of February 21, 1955. The other is from the New York Times of February 21, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of February 21, 1955]

THE WIRETAPPERS

In New York a raid a few days ago disclosed an array of equipment capable of tapping every telephone line on six East Side exchanges. And it is more than incidental, no doubt, that many of the prominent and successful people who live in Manhattan happen to reside in the areas involved.

There has been enormous growth in the private investigating profession, to whose members tapping a free citizen's telephone is as simple as picking a lock.

The fact that reputable private detectives have ethics is cold comfort in view of the ease with which any scoundrel can learn the rudiments of the business. What does it matter to a crook whether he has a license, if he doesn't get caught?

Wiretapping by law enforcement officers is a delicate business, which the public has tolerated largely because of its usefulness in catching subversives. Even where evidence so obtained is admissible in other types of cases, there are restrictions on wiretapping and public distaste for it.

Those who invade privacy by wiretapping, for any reason less than the Nation's security, deserve little consideration.

If we have not enough laws to punish them, let's pass them. If the telephone companies and the police have tolerated them or cooperated with them, let them too feel the effect of an honest public's righteous anger.

[From the New York Times of February 21, 1955]

THE WIRETAP MENACE

Current revelations in this city of what appears to have been wiretapping on a wholesale scale for private gain must disturb any thinking citizen. Such wiretapping is not only illegal under section 605 of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, but it violates every citizen's basic right of privacy. More than 2 years ago a pioneering survey by the Reporter magazine charged that wiretapping by governmental and private agencies was widespread. The latest revelations certainly support the latter half of this charge.

Wiretapping by police agencies goes back at least to 1895. The possibilities for private gain through such surreptitious acquisition of information are so obvious that it must be assumed that wiretapping by private persons has a long history. The basic equipment required is simple if one knows where the pair of wires required to tap a particular phone is located. To gain that knowledge, however, requires some specialized training or knowledge of telephone company procedure and practices. More re-

cently there have been hints of advanced electronic devices which do not have to be even connected to the wires that are tapped. One such device the Reporter has stated, is a recording machine capable of picking up audible speech at a distance of 40 feet and so small as to be easily hidden.

The rich rewards—from would-be blackmailers, from those seeking divorce evidence, from unscrupulous businessmen or labor leaders seeking economically useful information—available to expert wiretappers have apparently created a specialist group in this field. These rewards also make possible the corruption of telephone company employees.

There has been much controversy about the desirability of wiretapping by Government agencies. There can be no such controversy about the complete undesirability of private wiretapping, yet the record does not suggest that our law enforcement agencies have fought this evil as energetically as it needs to be fought. If the laws are inadequate to deal with this menace, then stronger laws should be passed. Certainly the citizen who picks up his phone is entitled to every protection in keeping his affairs private between himself and whom-ever he is addressing. The fact that many persons already make a practice of not discussing sensitive matters over the phone suggests the widespread fear of wiretappers that exists, and apparently not without justification.

Judge Weiss Sets Record on Murder Cases**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of the older Members of the House will remember the genial, energetic and likeable Samuel A. Weiss, of Glassport, Pa., who voluntarily retired from Congress in 1946 to become judge of the court of common pleas of Allegheny County, Pa.; a court with unlimited jurisdiction in every type of litigation—civil, equity, and criminal.

I am certain the Members will be pleased to know that Judge Weiss is making an extremely excellent reputation as a jurist. With his extraordinary sense of American fair play and his judicial temperament he is exercising the same sound judgment and dynamic energy he displayed to all of us here while serving as a Member of this body. In other words he is in every respect a most commendable jurist.

Recently he made an alltime record in western Pennsylvania in the hearing of successive trials of murder indictment which was noted in the Pittsburgh newspapers.

Under unanimous consent heretofore granted, I ask that the article appearing in the Pittsburgh Sun Telegraph of January 29, 1955, reporting this accomplishment, be inserted in the Appendix of the Record. The article follows:

JUDGE WEISS SETS RECORD ON MURDER CASES

Despite a serious throat ailment which necessitated the use of a microphone while on the bench, Judge Samuel A. Weiss has established an all-time record for hearing successive homicide cases in criminal court.

The murder marathon set by Judge Weiss started last December 6, when William Cole was found guilty of a homicide charge. Cole is in jail awaiting sentence. The hard-working jurist heard his last murder trial Thursday. William Mobley was the defendant. He has been sentenced to prison after being found guilty of a manslaughter charge.

Between December 6 and last Thursday, Judge Weiss was the trial judge in the trials of Eddie Foster, now serving life in Western Penitentiary; Albert W. Goff, in jail awaiting a court decision on whether he is to be given a new trial; James Parnell, sentenced to prison; Otera Holmes in prison, and Oscar Brewster, awaiting sentence.

SIX IN ONE MONTH

The remarkable thing about Judge Weiss' record fete is that six of the murder trials were held this month.

The nearest any judge has ever come to the new record was the late Jurist Joseph M. Swearingen, who in 1915 presided over four consecutive murder trials.

Although Judge Weiss was aware that he had presided over an unusual number of murder trials this month, he had no idea he had set a record until yesterday when Court Crier John (Jack) McIlvany, visited Judge Weiss' chambers and told him.

KEEPS OWN RECORDS

McIlvany keeps his own records, and for more than a quarter of a century he has recorded every homicide trial held in criminal court.

The court crier checking over his little black book realized the jurist had heard more successive murder cases than any other judge in the history of criminal court.

One of the first persons to congratulate Judge Weiss on his record was Assistant District Attorney William V. Swearingen, son of the late Judge Swearingen, whose record Judge Weiss had broken.

The Engineer's Role in America**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by William A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, before the Arizona Society of Professional Engineers at the Hotel Westward Ho, at Phoenix, Ariz., on February 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE ENGINEER'S ROLE IN AMERICA

(Address by Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer before the Arizona Society of Professional Engineers at the Hotel Westward Ho, Phoenix, Ariz., Thursday, February 24, 1955)

It is a particular honor and a pleasure to be invited to participate in your observance of National Engineer's Week.

It is a pleasure because it is always a delight for me to come back to Arizona. There is a lot of beautiful and spectacular scenery in the United States and elsewhere in the world, but I have never found anything to quite equal the thrill of sitting down in this Valley of the Sun on a warm winter day after a flight across the snowy and windswept miles between here and Washington.

It is an honor to be here because I am proud of the engineering profession and of my association with it. I am proud of our accomplishments—and when I say "our" I am not referring alone to my own sphere of operations in reclamation but to the whole broad field of engineering.

The contributions of the entire engineering profession to the advancement of civilization have been such that it is difficult to visualize progress in the world without a man with a slipstick in his pocket up somewhere near the front.

Mr. Raviola, in his letter of invitation, wrote that the primary purpose of National Engineer's Week is to convey to the American people an understanding of the function, the work, and the responsibility of the engineering profession and of its rapidly growing importance in our national life.

That shouldn't be too difficult to demonstrate. If anything, I would say the profession has already grown to major importance in our national life. Any kind of an analysis will show that engineers have been inextricably linked with the whole dynamic history of our country almost from its beginning.

As a matter of fact, the course of civilization has been pretty well charted by individuals who would be identified as engineers today. There is that unnamed genius of the stone age who chiseled out the first wheel from a block of stone to set us all in motion. Or the deep thinker, possibly from the era of the Neanderthal man, who discovered that by leverage he could move boulders twice as big as those his neighbor was pushing around by brute force.

These men were brothers under the skin with our profession today, just as were the great builders of Biblical and medieval times. Some of the great ruins of the past which have been found in various parts of the world are monuments to these early builders in our civilization. They all figured out how to do something and then went ahead and did it.

Nevertheless, engineering as a profession did not obtain real recognition until the middle of the 18th century, when civil engineering became clearly distinguished from military engineering. The earliest professional engineering society, the Institution of Civil Engineers of London, was not chartered until 1828, a half century after this Nation had launched itself as the free and independent United States. Thus, I believe we can safely associate the growth and stature the engineering profession has attained in the last two centuries with similar growth and world leadership of our Nation.

The United States has attained world leadership as a Nation on its reputation for freedom, vision, and the ability to do things. The American way is more than a political slogan. It is a beacon light offering to the world a future of peace, prosperity, and freedom. This American way we talk about has, as one of its foundation stones, progressive economy, an ability to get things done. And no one has been in the vanguard of this parade of progress more than the engineer.

To compare our lives in America today with those of a few generations back, even to the turn of the century, offers a startling contrast and story of progress in fields in which engineers are particularly involved.

One example might well be automobile transportation. It was hardly more than 50 years ago that the first few horseless carriages were chugging and sputtering along on city streets and country lanes that were either quagmires of mud or choked with dust. Constantly improved design and construction methods, which were worked out by research engineers, have transformed those rickety cars into the sleek vehicles we are now producing at the rate of 6 to 8 million per year. Some of you may remember the auto shows of 1910 or 1911 when the model T advertisement was a record repeating, "It gets you there and brings you back."

Production engineers designed the marvels of the assembly line and the latest production magic, automation, that have brought automobiles within the price range of millions. Then, don't forget the construction engineers who laid out the smooth ribbons of concrete and asphalt which compose our highway system for these millions of cars. Of course, any Sunday driver will tell you there aren't enough roads, but the engineers are doing something about that too, just as fast as they can get the necessary funds.

The same favorable comparison can be made in other fields of transportation. Who would have dared forecast, 50 years ago, that an individual would have been able to leave Washington in the morning to attend a dinner meeting out here at night? Or that there would be regularly scheduled nonstop commercial airline flights across the Nation, and across the oceans. I remember watching the altitude and speed records for airplanes being broken at Belmont Park, N. Y., in 1910. The speed record was 65 miles per hour on a closed course, and the altitude record was 9,700 feet. Engineers have brought us a long way since then.

The contrast is equally startling in the field of communications. In the last two decades, electronic engineers have transformed television from an impractical dream to a virtual household necessity. You can punch a teletype here to operate a linotype in a newspaper office two or three thousand miles away. It won't be long until you can dial not only your neighbor on the telephone but your former neighbor who now lives in another State or a continent away.

Another important aspect of our national progress, in which I am proud to say the engineers have had a major role, is the development of our natural resources. Our country is blessed with the richest supply of natural resources of any nation on earth.

Geologists have tracked down untold wealth in underground deposits of ore, oil, and water. It has remained for the engineers to devise ways and means of bringing that wealth to the surface and using it. Engineers also have designed marvels of machinery to improve the planting, cultivation, and harvesting of agricultural produce. Production engineers are constantly at work improving the processing machinery for foodstuffs, fibers, and hard goods. The result is a constantly improved product, a better diet and better standard of living for the consumer, and usually at a lower price.

No one needs to tell you here in Arizona that water is the most essential commodity in our life. You have a thriving economy here, but it is almost totally dependent upon your water resources. And once more, the engineer is right in the center of the picture.

The story of reclamation development in Arizona is almost the story of reclamation engineering. The Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River was considered one of the major structures of its day. It has set the pattern for the great multipurpose structures which have accomplished so much in harnessing our rivers and turning their waters to a beneficial use. It remains, today, one of reclamation's proudest structures. Subsequent construction additions to the Salt River project reflect the changing and improved methods engineers have devised for utilizing our water resources.

When the engineers moved into Black Canyon to initiate construction of Hoover Dam, a whole new horizon of possibilities for western expansion and development began to unfold. Oldtimers and some of you who are not so old will recall that there were many doubters about the construction of Hoover Dam. It was a bold undertaking which was even questioned by some engineers.

How in the world, they asked, could anyone build a dam that big? Besides, the Colorado will probably go on another rampage and rip it all out. But the engineers knew. They knew from past experience on similar

but smaller structures, and from their surveys on the river, that they could build a concrete dam in Black Canyon which would create the world's largest artificial lake and subdue the mighty Colorado forever.

The hardheaded businessmen in six big construction companies thought enough of the engineers' opinion to contract to build the job, and the rest is history. Hoover Dam stands today, still the world's highest, one of the engineering wonders of the world and a tribute to the profession.

The same might be said of Bartlett Dam on the Verde River, the world's highest multiple-arch dam, Grand Coulee Dam, up in Washington State, or Shasta, or the other great multiple-purpose structures which have been completed in recent decades.

Arizona has not only these monuments to the skill and importance of proper reclamation engineering in the control and development of its water resources. It also has evidences of what occurs when a Nation or a people do not or cannot take proper care of their water resources.

The first modern irrigation in the Western Hemisphere is popularly and correctly attributed to the Mormon pioneers who settled in the Salt Lake Valley in 1847. But there are remnants here in Arizona and other parts of the Southwest of crude irrigation canals which the primitive Indians scooped out in an effort to eke out a living.

These early peoples of the Pacific Southwest could not cope with the sharp fluctuations in annual rainfall and the long summers without precipitation which we, today, consider one of Arizona's great advantages. They had no conception of storing up water for a single season, let alone planning ahead to save the surplus water in years of plenty to use in years of drought. Thus, their primitive irrigation ditches ran dry and their civilization faded out.

There is no danger of that occurring today. Thanks to the skill of the reclamation engineer—and here I am not alluding only to Bureau of Reclamation engineers, for we have had plenty of outside help—the Salt and Gila Rivers and the Lower Colorado are among the most efficiently used of any in the country.

Five more storage reservoirs have been added to the original Roosevelt Dam. Diversion works and canal systems have also been improved. This work must continue until practically the last drop of water for consumptive use, hydroelectric power production, and the other multiple purposes has been squeezed from the Salt and Gila and their tributaries.

When water allocations in the lower basin are determined in the action now pending before the Supreme Court, some additional major facilities may be contemplated. Again, the engineers will be called on to determine how best to keep the water supply ahead of the demand in the Southwest. For here, probably more than in any section of the United States, there is an awareness of the need for proper conservation and use of water. That is probably why this has been the starting place for the concept of multiple-use reclamation facilities.

For example, I don't have to tell anyone in this audience that Hoover Dam was built not just because there was a good damsite in Black Canyon and a bunch of engineers saw an opportunity to build the highest dam in the world. You and I know that Hoover Dam was built to control and put to work a fluctuating and unruly river.

There is ample evidence of the success of this function in the current cycle of dry years which has brought Lake Mead to its lowest level since the reservoir was filled back in the thirties. Even though the runoff has been such that the normal flow of the river would have been little more than a soupy trickle by late summer, a steady and consistent year-round flow has been maintained downstream by operation of Hoover Dam and

its downstream partners, Davis and Parker. This year, we are reducing power output to further conserve the river for its primary consumptive purposes of irrigation, domestic, and industrial use.

But there are too many people who either do not know or else blindly ignore the reasons for construction of these reclamation facilities, and class them as a giant boondoggle or pork-barrel operation. Believe it or not, we are getting some of the same arguments against presently proposed reclamation work that were used 2 and 3 decades ago against projects that have since proved their worth many times over.

Just listen to what one columnist wrote about reclamation a few weeks ago: "If ever an object of Government expense needed an airing, it is what is loosely and inaccurately called reclamation."

The columnist goes on to mention the investigations by the Hoover Commission and the President's Cabinet Committees on Water Policy, and then asserts:

"It is to be hoped that one of the other of these reports will really tell the story, for there is a whole of a story to tell—a story of failure, of frustrated hopes, of political pork, of bureaucratic misrepresentation, and of widespread ignorance of what has been done with taxpayers' money over a period of more than half a century since T. R. pushed through his Reclamation Act of 1902."

Well, I join in hoping that the story of reclamation is fully aired. I hope that the successful operation of the Salt River project here in Arizona, the Boise and Minidoka projects in Idaho, the Yakima and Columbia Basin projects in Washington can be described. I hope the story may be told of how the Colorado-Big Thompson project in its first year of full operation this past summer prevented a drought disaster on 500,000 acres of land in north-central Colorado.

I hope the story may be told of the Central Valley project in California and how it has turned flood disaster on the Sacramento River, in the north part of the valley, into a combination rescue and agricultural expansion effort in the far southern end.

I hope, too, that the story may be told of the needs for the future. The West generally, and the Southwest in particular, are experiencing the most rapid population growth of any section of our country. These new frontiers of expansion and opportunity were, to a large degree, provided by reclamation projects. These areas are providing a tremendous market for American industrial products.

The future holds more opportunities for progress. Various Western-State groups have several new reclamation projects ready for Congress to consider for authorization and initiation of construction. They have been worked out by States and local groups in close collaboration with the planning engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation. None of them would have been feasible by the standards of 50 years ago.

But then there weren't 35 million people in the Western States in 1900 as there are today either. An acre-foot of water today is worth infinitely more than the farmer on the Salt River project could have paid 30 or 40 years ago. And conversely, the contribution that a farmer can make to the American economy by the successful operation of his farm is much greater today than it was a half century ago.

That is why I urge the engineering profession, particularly in these Western States, to keep in mind not the bigness of the reclamation structure, the number of yards of concrete that go into the dam, or the intricate design of the outlet works, but the end result. Keep in mind what these reclamation facilities are designed to accomplish, what they are accomplishing, and what those planned in the future can do to lift the ceiling of economic opportunity.

And be prepared to be vocal about it. We in the West, whether we be engineer, merchant, or farmer, are faced with a challenge to demonstrate the worth of reclamation to the Nation. We should do some talking about it. We should be fully armed to cite chapter and verse of the benefits Roosevelt Dam has contributed to the Salt River Valley—and by the same token, of the benefits the Salt River Valley has contributed to the economic stability and welfare of the Nation.

We should be able to tell, for instance, that retail sales in Maricopa County in a recent year, totaled \$168 million, that bank clearings were \$3,229,000,000 and that Federal taxes were estimated at \$69 million a year. All this from an area which has been built around a reclamation project in which the Federal Government invested the grand total of \$23 million. I suspect that in another half century, the projects now being completed at costs of several hundred million dollars will have the same outstanding ratio of returns to investment that the Salt River project boasts.

Our challenge to the future then, as I see it, is not alone to accept the engineering responsibility of designing and constructing the structures we need to put our remaining unused water resources to work. It is to join in the common cause of preserving and strengthening the case for reclamation wherever and whenever it is challenged.

By acting promptly and vigorously, we can keep the way opening up for additional growth and opportunity in the arid West.

No one questions the engineers' competency today as we use roads, bridges, elevators, automobiles, airplanes, ships, and innumerable other creations of sound engineering. These things were developed and improved by engineers of broad vision and with keen realization of the future needs.

We have not yet found, nor does anyone expect to find, a substitute for water. Our very lives depend on it. Industrial and agricultural need for water is tremendous and expanding. The entire economic growth of the country is keyed directly to adequate water supply.

There are many challenges to engineers today in many fields, but the greatest of these is, I believe, the need to provide adequate, usable water, and to convince the doubters of the necessity for planning and building for the future.

"Butter Over Guns" Disarmament Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the campaign which is being conducted by the Scripps-Howard newspapers known as the "butter over guns" disarmament plan, is attracting wide attention. It is certainly a campaign worth bringing to the attention of the people of the United States as proposed by the resolution which has been coauthored by a great number of Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several articles and editorials on this subject.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cincinnati Post of March 3, 1955]

THE CROSS OF IRON

It was President Eisenhower, as he himself recalled at his press conference yesterday, who first suggested the "butter over guns" disarmament plan. He did it in a speech in Washington April 16, 1953, and in that speech he said:

"The peace we seek . . . can be fortified, not by weapons of war, but by wheat and by cotton, by milk and wool, by meat, timber and rice."

Because the rearmament race, as he said, is not a way of life at all, but "humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

Now the "butter over guns" idea at last is getting a concrete use. The Senate Foreign Relations committee will take it up, under the urging of a Democrat, Senator Symington, and enjoined by a Republican, Minority Leader Knowland, to explore and debate it.

In this way, Russia's rulers can be challenged on the good faith of their vaunted peace intentions. Will they divert the resources of their land to the betterment of their people? Or will they stolidly drive on with their feverish production of war weapons, while their people continue to hang from a "cross of iron"?

Good faith, the President said, is essential to any disarmament plan, essential to a peaceful world. Do Russia's rulers have it?

And if they do, they can show it in another way by sending us some of their men of the soil.

We salute the Des Moines Register for bringing forth an idea with great propaganda punch. New Kremlin Bossman Khrushchev said one thing wrong with Russia was that the peasants needed to learn how to grow better corn and hogs.

The Des Moines paper promptly suggested that some Russian farmers be sent to Iowa where corn grows tall and hogs grow fat. They have no secrets to hide.

It's a marvelous idea! In fact, any idea which will permit the Russian people and other people to compare our way of life with theirs is to our advantage.

We have only one suggestion. If any Russian farmers are to be brought over here to learn how Iowans grow corn and hogs, let them be real farmers. They ought to be men our Iowa farmers can understand. Send us no bureaucrats, no men with soft palms!

[From the Washington Daily News of March 3, 1955]

KNOWLAND ASKS HEARING FOR "BUTTER OVER GUNS"

(By R. H. Shackford)

Republican and Democratic Senators today urged full debate and exploration of the "butter over guns" economic disarmament plan.

Senate Republican Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND of California, called for early hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine the proposal for limiting the proportion of a nation's resources that could be used for military purposes.

Senator KNOWLAND is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He asked that committee to study the proposal and discuss it with the State Department and other appropriate Government agencies.

The merits and demerits of the plan should be debated, he told the Senate, adding that there might be demerits as well as merits. His emphasis was on getting the subject discussed, and on trying to devise some kind of formula to get the world directed toward more peaceful pursuits.

Senator KNOWLAND spoke on the Senate floor and inserted the full plan, as published last week by the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after these other developments:

Senator STUART SYMINGTON (Democrat, Missouri), formally introduced a resolution,

embodying the "butter over guns" plan, and urged other Senators to join him in sponsoring it. His resolution asks the President to present the plan to the United Nations, which would try to find a formula for increasing living standards by putting a ceiling on resources that a nation could use on armaments.

President Eisenhower told his press conference that the United States was devoted to the idea of using the world's production for human welfare rather than human destruction.

"We believe in it (the idea) thoroughly," the President said, but warned that any disarmament plan must include implicit assurance that everyone was acting in good faith. The "butter over guns" plan provides for inspection and control.

Mr. Eisenhower said that on April 16, 1953, he had embraced the same general idea in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He had deplored the fact that the cold war and defense programs were not a way of life at all, but "humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

"The peace we seek," the President said then, "... can be fortified—not by weapons of war—but by wheat and by cotton, by milk and by wool; by meat, timber and rice."

The President's 1953 suggestion has remained dormant and never was studied or debated in the Senate.

The "butter over guns" plan would challenge the Soviets to devote more of their resources to food, clothing and housing for the oppressed Russian people. If the Kremlin refused and continued to put most of its resources into war industries, its aggressive aims would be unmasked before world opinion.

At the heart of the plan, as now sponsored by Senator SYMINGTON, is the principle that the peaceful or aggressive intentions of a nation can be determined by the way a nation divides its resources. The Soviets allocate only 25 percent to consumers, while about three-fourths of the United States massive production is for consumers' goods.

The Symington resolution points out that Russia, which never disarmed after World War II, "recently announced an increase in its armaments budget and has proclaimed as policy the expansion of arms production and war-supporting industries at the sacrifice of civilian production."

"Low living standards are one of the primary causes for war and improved living standards promote peace," the preamble says.

Aggressive wars, it follows, cannot be undertaken by nations who devote most of their production to promoting the welfare of their people.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 4, 1955]

TWO HUNDRED MILLION IVANS

President Eisenhower and Sir Winston Churchill have given the world a timely reminder—that our quarrel is not with the Russian people but with their Communist masters.

"I think the Russian people, as such, don't want war any more than we do," the President told his press conference. "They want opportunities to advance themselves economically, culturally and, of course, traditionally Russians are very devoted to all the arts."

Sir Winston urged the House of Commons to make a distinction between the Soviet regime and the Russian people—to refer to Soviet rather than Russian threats, to Soviet rather than Russian aggression.

"I have a strong admiration for the Russian people—for their bravery, their many gifts and their kindly nature," Sir Winston said.

"It is the Communist dictatorship and the declared ambition of the Communist Party and their proselytizing activities which we are bound to resist."

Wise words, these. Because our sympathies and hopes are with the Russian people.

If the day ever comes when the Communist conspiracy ceases to rule Russia, let us pray that the Russian people will look on us as friends.

One of the valuable possibilities in a Senate debate on the butter-over-guns disarmament plan is the chance to show the world that the American people would like nothing better than an end of the raw deal the millions of Ivans in Russia have been getting for 37 years.

Such a debate could—

Compare the life of an average American and an average Russian;

Show that our free society spends huge sums to defend itself against communism but still provides a high standard of living;

Dramatize how a slave Communist society disregards human welfare for the sake of piling armed might on armed might;

Disclose that the Soviets have the resources to raise the living standards of their people if they desired;

Challenge the men in the Kremlin to put up or shut up about their professed peaceful motives and concern for mankind.

There are 210 million people in the Soviet Union. But only about 6,800,000 are members of the Communist Party.

That leaves more than 200 million Russians who are the real victims of communism. We in the West are threatened by communism; those 200 million are already in its grasp. They are the people President Eisenhower says "don't want war"—they are those Sir Winston calls brave, gifted and kindly people.

The butter-over-guns disarmament plan offers a way for the Soviets to reverse their economy in favor of the common people—to give them something besides promises.

Senate debate on the plan offers the chance to show that our major interest is more food, more clothing, more houses, more of all the amenities of life for Russia's Ivans—things the Soviet rulers cannot give them if the Kremlin persists in its mad policy of building only war potential.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 7, 1955]

RUSSIA'S PROBLEMS ARE SAME OLD ONES—EXPERT CALLS SOVIET WAR ECONOMY A REAL THREAT

(By R. H. Shackford)

Soviet Russia is a poverty-stricken land—but the Soviet economy is a war economy and has been so since 1928. Soviet concentration on basic economic and military might is without parallel in human history.

That is why the Soviet war economy is a very real threat to us—as big if not a bigger long-range threat than the huge Soviet military establishment.

Those are the conclusions of the State Department's top intelligence expert on the Soviet Union—Mose L. Harvey. They were given in a speech before the fall of Georgi Malenkov, when many were indulging in a dreamy, wishful-thinking disregard of the cold, hard facts.

Those same conclusions are at the heart of the butter-over-guns economic disarmament plan, as published in the Scripps-Howard Newspapers and supported in a Senate resolution by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, former chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

CHALLENGE

The butter-over-guns plan would challenge the Communist rulers to shift to a peaceful economy after almost 25 years of war economy. All nations would agree to limit the proportion of key, war-vital re-

sources devoted to military purposes and to increase production of consumers goods.

The plan will be discussed on the Senate floor this week when the Symington resolution is referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

It may be a delightful emotional experience to think that the Soviet regime is cracking because of an internal economic crisis, says Mr. Harvey.

But all the Kremlin's current problems—agriculture, low standard of living, housing shortage, and so forth—are old and chronic ones—as old as the Soviet Union itself.

"In spite of them," the Russian expert told the National Industrial Conference Board "the Soviet system satisfies the requirements of the people on a level to which they are accustomed. . . ."

"(But) if you consider the masses available for employment in the military forces of the Soviet Union and its empire, and allow the possibility of the Soviet government's using the economy of the country almost exclusively to arm these masses . . . we do indeed face a very real Soviet threat."

SINGLE PURPOSE

The Soviet economy is relatively weak—a pigmy compared with a giant—when matched against the United States. But the important fact is that the Soviets use almost all of their economy for war or war preparation.

Mr. Harvey concludes that it is extremely dangerous to believe that Russia's relatively limited economic capabilities could prevent a Kremlin challenge to the United States.

Eighty-four percent of Soviet investments from 1928 to 1953 was for expansion of heavy industry and transportation, the sinews of war. In 1953, 70 percent of all Soviet industrial workers were employed in heavy industry which also accounted for over 70 percent of total industrial production.

The Soviet Union only produces thirty-eight to forty million tons of steel a year compared with our 100 million tons. But the Kremlin can use all but a couple million tons of their steel each year for potential or immediate war purpose—without denying the Russian people anything that they are now getting.

Mr. Harvey cites this most important reason why the United States cannot afford to be complacent about American economic superiority over the Soviet Union.

OUT OF PROPORTION

"The economic base of Soviet military power is far greater than the general economic capabilities of the U. S. S. R. would suggest. This derives from the simple circumstance that the Soviet Government controls production completely and is able to channel it where it will. It invariably has willed to channel it where it would contribute most to military potential."

The Symington "butter-over-guns" resolution urges the United States to take the initiative in economic disarmament, as well as in nuclear and conventional weapon disarmament. A limit on guns doesn't mean much if a nation remains on a war economy.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 5, 1953]

SOVIET POWER STRUGGLE IS IN FOURTH PHASE
(By R. H. Shackford)

Josef Stalin died 2 years ago today, but the struggle for his Kremlin throne still goes on.

The debate and speculation in the West, touched off by his death, still goes on too—did or did not March 5, 1953, mark the end of an era and open a more hopeful one?

It is far too soon for anyone to know. Among the certainties are these:

The power struggle is now in its fourth phase.

The internal debate over heavy industry versus consumers' goods has just zigged again in favor of heavy industry.

The agriculture situation is critical, but Russia is still selling grain abroad for political reasons.

The Kremlin got a lot of credit for more than a year with its peaceful coexistence campaign which is now being permitted to die a natural death. It also won important diplomatic victories in the Far East with this aged propaganda device.

By using weasel words, the Kremlin also fooled part of the West for a while by pretending to shift its economic emphasis away from heavy industry and armaments toward consumers' goods and agriculture. That fraud now has been unmasked.

NO CHANGE

But along with this zigging and zagging at home and abroad, 2 years after Stalin's death finds the Communist conspiracy about where it was in fundamental aims: Ultimate world domination.

Guns over butter, with the Russian people living in a perpetual war economy.

SAME OLD LINE

Meanwhile, Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov still peddles the same foreign policy line he has trumpeted since 1939.

Molotov is the only man in the Kremlin hierarchy who seems to have weathered the post-Stalin palace revolts.

Beria is gone. Malenkov is deposed. Krushchev and Bulganin are in the saddle today. But for how long?

MALENKOV MYTH

Short as was the Malenkov era, it was long enough for myths to be built around the man.

He was supposed to have a softer approach to the cold war. Yet it was Malenkov who first boasted of the Soviet hydrogen bomb in August 1953.

He was supposed to have a softer approach to Soviet economy. He got an unwarranted reputation for wanting to shift industry from a war to a peaceful basis.

OVERSIGHT

It generally was overlooked that in the same speech in which he urged more consumer goods he also warned the Russian people that heavy industry was the basis of Soviet economy and must have priority.

Malenkov had his chance at Berlin and at Geneva to prove whether his peaceful coexistence words were more than propaganda. They were not. There is no sign that the new rulers are any more sincere.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 8, 1955]

"BUTTER OVER GUNS" GETS ROLLING—THIRTY SENATORS BACK SYMINGTON PLAN
(By R. H. Shackford)

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri—supported by 30 other Senators—today urged the Government to consider the "butter over guns" economic disarmament plan as a new means of proving America's primary interest in peace and human welfare.

Senator SYMINGTON is sponsor of a resolution appealing to the President of the United Nations to explore possibilities of getting all nations to agree to limit the proportion of key resources, such as steel, it uses for military purposes.

The plan, authored by Samuel Lubell, an associate of Bernard M. Baruch, was published in the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers.

As of the close of business last night, Senator SYMINGTON had 30 bipartisan co-sponsors for the plan, representing all wings of both parties. More signatures were expected on the resolution today before it is

referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

CHALLENGE TO KREMLIN

In a speech prepared for delivery in the Senate this afternoon, Senator SYMINGTON pointed out that the plan would challenge the Kremlin, which deliberately keeps the Russian people on a poverty level, to devote more resources to butter and less to guns.

"Much of the continuing search for peace and freedom," he said, "lies in lifting the living standards of all people toward those which have been attained in America, instead of having them dragged down to the armed misery of a totalitarian fortress."

NO ILLUSIONS

Neither Senator SYMINGTON nor anyone else has any illusions about the Soviet leaders being willing even to discuss a plan which would turn the Soviet economy back to a peaceful one after 25 years of war economy.

"Rejection of the plan could only mean that sacrifices now being exacted from the Russian people are being exacted in order someday to be able to carry out the carefully planned long-term aggressive intentions and commitments of the rulers in the Kremlin," Senator SYMINGTON said.

Even before today's discussion in the Senate, the Kremlin reacted—as expected. In a Moscow radio broadcast, it laughed at the proposal and denounced it as "eloquent nonsense" and an attempt to hamstring Soviet development.

Senator SYMINGTON pointed out today that the most important step in such a plan would be agreement to limit the use of steel for military purposes—steel being the most important element in a war machine.

In 1950, he said, 1,260 pounds of steel were produced in the United States for each person.

If it could be agreed that no less than X percent of a nation's steel should be allocated to civilian economy, the Senator said, we would be on our way to effective disarmament.

INSPECTIONS

The Symington resolution provides for adequate inspection and control, to avoid cheating. It is based on the principles that low living standards are a primary cause of war, improved living standards promote peace, and that such improved living standards can be reached only if world resources are devoted increasingly to peaceful purposes.

"Since the same resources cannot be used simultaneously for both peaceful and warlike purposes," Senator SYMINGTON said, "a rapid increase in the standard of living in Communist countries would tend to curb their potential aggressive power."

SOVIETS LIKE LUBELL PLAN BUT SHIFT THE BLAME TO US

Moscow Radio conceded today that a government's peaceful or aggressive intentions can be determined by how it apportions its resources.

But it rejected, and laughed off, the butter-over-guns disarmament plan with the usual charge that it was the United States—not Russia—that was using most of its resources for war purposes.

The broadcast ignored the suggestion that the Soviets put more emphasis on better living standards as well as the recently announced increase in the Soviet military budget and the return to Stalin's primary emphasis on heavy military industry.

Soviet Commentator Nikolai Andreyev, however, devoted more than 1,000 words to the butter-over-guns proposal which was published by the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers and is sponsored in a Senate resolution by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri.

Referring to irresponsible commentators in the United States, the Soviet commentator said, "One can even get a real laugh out of them. As, for instance, the recent story of Samuel Lubell in the New York World-Telegram and Sun."

Senator SYMINGTON, the commentator continued, decided to make political capital out of Lubell's flight of fancy and is skating on thin ice.

The Soviet commentator not only distorted the plan but twisted statistics to charge that the United States military effort was more than three times greater than Russia's. The facts are that the U. S. S. R.'s direct military budget is about 15 percent of the gross national product compared with 9 percent in the United States. The Soviet budget is going up while the United States budget goes down.

Federal Appropriations for Forest-Fire Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I submitted last week to the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior. My remarks are in opposition to the proposed reduction of Federal funds for the forest fire suppression and control program. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to express my opposition to any reduction in moneys for the Federal forest fire control fund. It is my understanding that the President's budget would cut the appropriation by \$1,083,690, and I believe that it would be a great mistake to follow this course.

I am not in a position to speak for the Nation as a whole concerning this subject, but I do know something about the problem as it pertains to my State of West Virginia.

West Virginia, being situated in the heart of the Appalachian Mountains, has an extremely rugged terrain that provides numerous watersheds and produces many streams. These meandering streams are the source of the navigable rivers that serve West Virginia and many other States. Most of the slopes are covered with an indispensable form of plant life—trees. These trees produce a sponge on the forest floor that creates a continuous flow of small streams. Other types of vegetation are not consistent to proper land use of these rugged slopes.

Today we are faced with the tremendous problem of fire that is threatening to destroy this vital natural resource and West Virginia, I am sure, is only one of many States that are confronted with this enemy. Progress has been made in recent years in combating this serious enemy to our forests, but not sufficiently to bring the problem under control. Recently, we have experienced serious droughts that have added to the severity of the problem. In 1952 and 1953, West Virginia suffered a forest fire loss of more than one million acres. During the fall of 1952, the southern part of West Virginia was riding on the brink of disaster and, had high winds prevailed during this period,

there is every reason to believe that a loss of human lives and homes would have resulted. Presently, if West Virginia were to experience a severe outbreak of fires, we would be without adequate funds due to heavy expenditures in 1952 and 1953.

United States Weather Bureau records cause some experts to believe that there are more dry years just ahead. Should this be true, we would not be financially equipped to control forest fires.

In view of the fact that more States are increasing their areas of protection and the fact that all of West Virginia's forests are under protection, the Federal appropriations for West Virginia have been on the decline, as shown in the following table:

Federal allotments and State budgets

Fiscal year	Federal allotment	State budget
1955.....	\$136,431	\$200,538
1954.....	136,431	259,974
1953.....	141,379	283,343
1952.....	152,918	325,000
1951.....	163,462	349,023
1950.....	163,462	344,001
1949.....	175,766	232,169
1948.....	193,329	187,180

¹ Estimated.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake to follow a pennywise and pound-foolish policy in reducing funds for combating this great enemy of our natural resources. It is imperative that, during the critical days and years ahead, years which will spell the destiny of our Nation in world history, we exert every precaution for the protection of our forests which, in turn, preserve the watersheds and conserve the soil of America. I, therefore, urge the Committee not to reduce this important item, but, rather, that it be increased by \$2 million in order to provide an equitable Federal distribution of funds for the forest fire suppression and control program.

Government Participation in American Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, residents of inland States who may be inclined at times to question the need for Government participation in American shipping as something in which they have no immediate interest, may be interested to learn of certain facts developed by the research division of the committee of American steamship lines concerning the importance of the American merchant marine to the American farmer and to workers in industry as well.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD some excerpts from articles in the February 1955 issue of Maritime Affairs, a publication of the committee of American Steamship Lines, with regard to how the farmers and employees of Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri industries profit from the services of vessels flying the United States flag.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS, SHIPS SUPPLY GLOBAL, OCEAN BREADLINE

American farmers and ocean shipping became partners in the greatest movement of foodstuffs of all times when the international demand for wheat reached its peak during the postwar years, 1945-1953. One-third of the Nation's wheat production left United States farmlands to cross ocean highways bound for Europe, Japan, India and Pakistan during this period.

Farmers in Illinois and Missouri received \$40 million per year for the annual shipments of 20 million bushels they exported during this wheat heyday.

This eight-year overseas breadline bought annual revenues of \$821 million into the United States. This income meant jobs to thousands of farmers, their families and communities. All of this was made possible by ocean shipping.

United States farmers and American-flag merchant ships have teamed up to bring a new leading cash-crop to Illinois and Missouri within the past 20 years.

Soybeans, a product used for centuries in the Far East to do everything from making waterproof varnish for Chinese junks to baking oriental pastries, was almost unknown to the American farmer in the early 1930's.

More money is now earned by Missouri farmers from soybeans than any other crop and Illinois farmers find it their second best revenue producer. Between them, the two States account for from 40 to 45 percent of total United States soybean production. Their 1952 earnings from this crop were \$342 million.

Each year ships carry overseas about \$25 million worth of Illinois and Missouri soybeans. American flagships make an important contribution to farm income.

FORTY MILLION ACRES OF FARMLAND NEEDED FOR FOREIGN BUYERS

Imagine the entire State of Illinois, including cities and towns, being plowed under and converted into one gigantic farm. It would not be large enough to raise the crops and other farm products carried to overseas markets by oceangoing ships in 1953.

It would require 40 million acres of farmland, or 62,500 square miles, to produce the United States exports of farm products in 1953, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. This is an area 4,224,000 acres larger than Illinois.

More than \$11 million in processed milk left Wisconsin, Illinois, and Missouri farms, across ocean trade routes to foreign ports in 1952, it is estimated. Cuba and the far-away Philippines, both ocean islands, imported the bulk of this amount, buying almost all of the evaporated and condensed milk shipped abroad by United States farmers in 1952. Venezuela bought 75 percent of their dried milk exports.

Wisconsin, Illinois, and Missouri produce 20 percent of the Nation's dairy products, with Wisconsin—the leading United States dairy State—alone accounting for half of this combined percentage. Wisconsin's principal industry is processing dairy products. The 3 States combined employ 103,000 men and women in factories producing dairy foods, or 20 percent of the total United States dairy-processing work force.

ILLINOIS STEEL PLANTS GET VITAL METALS FROM WORLD BY UNITED STATES SHIPS

Jobs for 71,000 men and women are created by Illinois' steel industry, where 10 percent of the national output is produced.

Vital to these workers and their families is American shipping. Fifteen essential raw materials must be brought into Illinois by ship from five continents of the globe to operate its steel plants.

Manganese, for example, which goes into every pound of steel produced, comes to this country from ports in India, South Africa, the African Gold Coast, Cuba, and Brazil.

United States needs alloys

America is deficient in more than half of the 20 alloying elements required to produce steel. About a half-dozen imported materials go into the 160 types of steel required by the automobile industry.

Meanwhile, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri all benefit from the steel commodities shipped abroad on American-flag vessels.

LOCAL LEATHER PLANTS NEED GLOBAL NETWORK OF SHIPS TO OPERATE

It takes a global network of ocean-going supply lines to equip the Illinois-Missouri-Wisconsin leather goods industry with the raw materials it needs to meet the demands of the domestic market.

America boasts the most highly developed leather industry in the world, but leather goods manufacturers could not supply United States residents with their yearly 3.15 pair per-capita-consumption of shoes without imports from the 4 corners of the globe.

Two hundred and twenty-two million dollar payroll

Eighty thousand workers in Illinois, Wisconsin and Missouri are earning \$222 million per year in tanneries and leather goods plants, and are therefore directly dependent upon the existence of American-flag vessels bringing in hides, skins, kips and tanning materials from diverse, world-wide sources.

The Illinois-Missouri-Wisconsin area is the home of more than 22 percent of the Nation's leather goods industry. Leather goods plants in these 3 States import over 99 percent of their goat and kid skins from distant sources like India, Pakistan, Nigeria, and South and Central America.

About 55 percent of the sheep and lamb skins they use come mostly from Brazil and Africa.

Twenty-five percent of their calf skins and kips are shipped from India, Pakistan, Canada, France, and Poland. Kangaroo and Wallaby skins are found only in Australia and New Zealand.

Need tanning materials

Domestic sources of tanning materials are almost nonexistent. Chestnut, 1 of the 3 principal sources of tanning fluids, is imported mostly from Italy. Quebracho, the second most popular tanner, is only found in Argentina and Paraguay. Wattle, the third principal source, comes from the mimosa tree and is imported from British Africa, where harvesting labor is cheap.

Leather is a dramatic example of how American-flag merchant vessels serve to bring the world to the doorstep of United States industry.

WHY GOVERNMENT AIDS UNITED STATES SHIPPING

Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri residents have a direct stake in the Government parity payment program to shipping because so much of the three State agricultural and industrial output is exported abroad. Imports are as vital to these three States as they are to other sections of our Nation.

To help maintain a modern, strong American fleet so essential to this export and import trade, our Government assists United States shipbuilders and shipowners by sharing with them a portion of building and operating costs under the American flag.

Without this Government assistance, in the form of shipping subsidies, American

ships could not compete with low-cost foreign operators.

The biggest item in ship operation is wages. In 1952, for example, for every \$245 spent by an American operator of a C-2 cargo vessel, a foreign competitor paid from \$41 to \$69 for the same services.

Do not guarantee profit

Government operating payments help to make up this difference and to place American steamship lines on a parity basis with foreign lines. Government payments in no way guarantee an American shipowner a profit. In fact, if earnings permit, the owner is required to repay to the Government a part or all of what he received in subsidy payments.

As history has shown, if American shipowners do not receive Government assistance, American shipping disappears from the seas.

Important Change for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Important Change for Indians," printed in the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal on February 15, 1955, together with a letter signed by John B. Hart, executive director of the North Dakota Indian Affairs Commission.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Devils Lake (N. Dak.) Journal of February 15, 1955]

IMPORTANT CHANGE FOR INDIANS

In June an important transfer will take place that will affect persons on our Indian reservations.

At that time the Bureau of Indian Affairs will relinquish its operation of medical and health services for Indians to the United States Public Health Service, which is under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It would be difficult to know, at this time, how the new arrangement will work, but it could hardly be worse than the operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which has a record of irresponsibility in practically every field of operation.

It is hard to believe how the public Health Service could be more niggardly in the use of its funds for medical purposes than the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The Bureau does operate a clinic for the Indians at Fort Totten with a nurse to look after minor medical needs. Reluctantly, it would seem, the bureau picks up the bill for operation of the clinic, under an arrangement with the Public Health Service.

To the Bureau must go the credit for closing the Fort Totten hospital over the objections of the Indians. The action was taken despite the fact that local medical facilities are particularly overcrowded now that the city has but one hospital.

Cases have been reported, in addition, where Indians in need of emergency treatment have found it difficult or impossible to get the Bureau to accept financial responsibility. Hagglng has resulted between the Indian agency and the welfare

agencies of the State, who naturally have no jurisdiction in Indian matters.

Humanitarianisms on the part of the hospital and medical profession has prevented loss of life in at least one case. There can be no justification for such a state of affairs in a country where people place great value on even one human life.

Congress, which has many precedents for conducting investigations, should probe the operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in an attempt to find out who actually is benefiting from its operations.

Perhaps the Bureau, in an attempt to show the inadequacy of Federal jurisdiction over the Indians, believes that apathetic administration of its duties will convince the public that it would be better for the States to take over.

In many other fields, however, where the Federal Government has no particular business, it is ever willing to encroach on the rights of the States. Operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs would seem to indicate the Federal agency wants to drop the reservations and their residents like a hot potato.

Let the Bureau come forth with a construction program for making the Indians self-supporting, in order that the States will not be left with the welfare bills, and it will come in for less criticism. You just don't solve a problem in the traditional Army pattern of "passing the buck."

NORTH DAKOTA INDIAN

AFFAIRS COMMISSION,

Rolla, N. Dak., March 1, 1955.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,

Senator from the State of North Dakota, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Attached herewith you will find an editorial from the Devils Lake Journal under date of February 15, 1955 entitled "Important Change for Indians."

The thought occurs to me that it might be worth your while to insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It would certainly please the publisher of the Devils Lake newspaper and it would be adding a little heat to this entire medical care program. It might also add a little heat on this law enforcement program. If not, it might be a good idea for you to send the editorial to Mr. Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking him for his comments on the subject. I would certainly appreciate any correspondence you would have on the subject.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. HART.

Egypt-Israel Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following bulletin of the Israel Office of Information. In view of the current situation, I believe it to be of vital interest to our colleagues.

EGYPT-ISRAEL RELATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Egypt's attitude toward Israel has taken a sharp turn for the worse in the course of recent months. Tension has risen to new heights. The lives and property of

Israel's citizens have been attacked with increasing frequency. Egypt has persisted in its attitude of contempt for the resolution of the U. N. Security Council of September 1, 1951, and stubbornly refuses to release the Israel freighter, *Bat Galim*, and allow it to proceed through the Suez Canal. Threats by Egyptian leaders against Israel have continued with growing violence. The execution of two Jewish defendants in the Cairo trial, in spite of pleas for clemency from all over the world, has further exacerbated the situation. The latest instance of Egyptian recklessness took the form of a raid into Israel territory at the end of February 1955. The raiding party penetrated as far as the town of Rehovot, 18 miles inside Israel territory, where on February 25 they murdered an Israel civilian from ambush. The same band operated in the vicinity of Rehovot for a few days. Its tracks were found clearly leading back to the Egyptian-controlled Gaza territory.

2. When the regime of King Farouk was overturned in the summer of 1952 by the revolutionary council led by General Naguib, the then Israel Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, publicly expressed Israel's readiness to cooperate with the new regime. In a public statement on August 18, 1952, Mr. Ben-Gurion declared:

"Israel wishes to see Egypt free, independent, progressive. There were no grounds, nor are there now, for any quarrel between Egypt and Israel. There is no cause for territorial disputes, nor any reason for political or economic problems. We have no enmity against Egypt for what was done to us 4 years ago. We have never sought to exploit Egypt's political difficulties with a great power by attacking her or taking revenge upon her, as she did upon the establishment of our state."

3. These friendly overtures which have been frequently repeated, have brought no response. Indeed, the record of recent months indicates a growth in Egyptian hostility and a deliberate rejection of a policy of reconciliation.

B. BORDER UNREST GROWS

4. Between September 1954 and February 1, 1955, Egypt has been condemned on no fewer than 27 occasions for violations of the Israel-Egypt Armistice Agreement, including armed attack, murder, and sabotage. Repeated warnings by the Mixed Armistice Commission to Egypt to put a halt to these acts of aggression have had no effect.

5. In the period between August 1954 and February 1955 the Egyptians were responsible for 9 cases of sabotage and 34 armed clashes in Israel territory, in addition to numerous cases of illegal border crossings and plunder. The main targets of sabotage were the pipelines bringing water to the southern part of Israel on which all the settlements in the area depend for their very existence. The pipelines were blown up on four occasions causing considerable damage.

6. On January 21 an Egyptian army unit drove up to the armistice line and took up firing positions. Part of this unit crossed the frontier and attacked an Israel military post. Of the 3 Israel soldiers on duty, 1 was killed and 2 wounded. The Egyptians retreated only on the approach of Israel reinforcements. On January 24 the Israel-Egypt Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Egypt for this attack. The Commission's resolution was worded as follows:

"Decides that this aggressive action carried out by a unit of the Egyptian army is in flagrant violation of article II, paragraph 2 of the General Armistice Agreement with Egypt;

"Notes with extremely grave concern this aggressive action and calls upon the Egyptian authorities to terminate these aggressive acts against Israel."

7. Only a few hours after this resolution was passed, on the night of January 24, an armed band crossed the frontier into Israel from the Gaza strip and penetrated 4 miles into Israel territory, attacking the settlement of Ein Hashlosha. Two of the settlement's plowmen were ambushed, one killed and the other wounded. Three days later, Egypt was again condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission for this act of aggression and the Commission passed the following resolution:

"Notes with grave concern the serious situation prevailing along the Gaza strip, resulting from these repeated attacks;

"Notes once again with extremely grave concern, that despite obligations imposed upon Egypt by the General Armistice Agreement and a number of Mixed Armistice Commission resolutions, these penetrations and killings of Israel citizens have not been terminated;

"Calls upon the Egyptian authorities to put an immediate end to such aggressive acts."

8. The incidents in January were the continuation of a long series of incidents which had been increasing in number and gravity in the latter part of 1954. As early as October 2, 1954 the Mixed Armistice Commission, in condemning Egypt for the murder of two Israel farmers on September 20 near Migdal Ashkelon, had called upon Egypt "immediately and finally" to put an end to these acts of aggression. Since January 1955 the incidents have continued despite the demands of the Mixed Armistice Commission that Egypt refrain from continued aggression. On February 1, 1955 fire was directed from Egyptian positions against an Israel patrol, and once again, Egypt was condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission. The following day Egyptian soldiers fired at a member of an Israel border settlement at work in the fields. Later in February, an armed band was intercepted by an Israel patrol at Yad Mordecai in Israel territory. On February 25 two Israel police cars were fired at in Israel territory near Yavne. The same day, an armed band from the Gaza strip killed an Israel citizen near Rehovot, deep inside Israel's territory. Throughout this period illegal border crossings for the purpose of theft, espionage and illegal harvesting continued unabated.

C. ESPIONAGE, SABOTAGE BY INFILTRATORS

9. Egyptian Army Intelligence officers have been systematically organizing marauders who are sent into Israel, apparently from the Gaza strip, for purposes of espionage and sabotage. At the end of September 1954 a group sent to commit sabotage was caught after it had sniped at farmers and blown up houses in a border settlement. In December 1954 four youths were caught trying to gather military information in Israel. They admitted they had been trained and sent by Egyptian officers in Gaza.

10. Despite condemnations by the Mixed Armistice Commission, repeated well-organized military operations have taken place against the vital water pipeline to the Negev, Israel's arid southern area. For the second time within a month, the main pipeline near Nir Am was blown up with TNT on September 7 by a group of trained saboteurs. On October 25 a similar attack on the pipeline near Mefalsim took place.

11. Noting the serious damage incurred, the Mixed Armistice Commission on the latter occasion emphasized its "great concern over the repeated acts of planned demolition on main water pipelines in Israel by well-trained, organized, and armed groups coming from Egyptian-controlled territory."

12. Attacks on the Negev pipeline have not ceased. In December 1954 the pipeline near Uza was blown up. The Egyptian authorities

have taken no steps to prevent the continuation of these planned attacks.

D. THE CASE OF THE "BAT GALIM"

13. On September 28, 1954 the Israel freighter *Bat Galim*, carrying a cargo of tinned beef, hides and plywood en route from Eritrea to Israel, was detained by the Egyptian authorities at Port Tewfik at the entrance to the Suez Canal. In an attempt to justify this illegal action, the Egyptian Government charged the crew of the *Bat Galim* with having committed various crimes in Egyptian territorial waters, ranging from trespassing to the killing of Egyptian fishermen.

These allegations were put forward not only to explain the detention of the vessel, but also to justify the detention of its ten crew members in a military prison under inhumane conditions, and the confiscation of the ship's treasury and cargo.

14. Investigations by United Nations Military Observers of the Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission, carried out at the request of the Security Council of the United Nations, proved the complete falsehood of these allegations, and, as a result, the Egyptian Government was forced to withdraw the charges, even from its own courts, and to release the crew. The *Bat Galim* and its cargo are still held by Egypt.

15. At meetings of the Security Council of the United Nations held on January 4 and January 13, 1955, Egypt's attitude was severely criticized by the majority of representatives. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, on behalf of the United States, said: "we cannot fail to state our view that Egyptian restrictions on ships passing through the Suez Canal whether bound to or from Israel, or whether flying the Israeli or some other flag, are inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement, contrary to the Security Council resolution of September 1, 1951, and a retrogression from the stated objectives to which both sides committed themselves in signing the armistice agreement."

16. Under the Charter of the United Nations, decisions of the Security Council, as distinct from recommendations of the General Assembly, are binding upon all members. Egypt, by flouting the Security Council decision of September 1, 1951, which called upon her to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound, and to cease all interference with such shipping has consistently and deliberately violated the charter which she signed in 1945. The records of the United Nations contain no parallel to this willful and persistent defiance of the Security Council.

17. On January 13, 1955, the President of the Security Council, Sir Leslie Munro of New Zealand, summed up the wish of that body to see the *Bat Galim* released through the Suez Canal within the context of the 1951 resolution. Egypt has to this day ignored this expression of international opinion.

E. CAIRO SENTENCES SHOCK WORLD OPINION

18. While assaults increased against Israeli citizens, and Egypt persisted in her defiance of United Nations' wishes concerning the *Bat Galim*, 12 Jews were charged with espionage on behalf of Israel before a military court in Cairo. During the trial, the defendants testified that torture had been used to extract confessions from them. One defendant, Elias Cremona, died under torture before coming to trial; another, Max Bennett, committed suicide during the trial; a third, Victorine Nino, threw herself from a window during pretrial interrogation, but survived; the French Consul-General in Cairo, who attended all sessions of the trial, reported that the body of one of the defendants, Moshe Marzouk, a French citizen, bore

the marks of the brutal treatment he had received during the interrogation.

The crimes of which these people were accused were described in the London Times as "too amateurish to be taken seriously." Mr. Roger Baldwin, chairman of the International League for the Rights of Man, who was in Cairo during the trial, described the charges of espionage and sabotage as "childish and irrational."

19. On January 27, 1955, 2 of the defendants, Moshe Marzouk, a physician, and Shmuel Azar, a schoolteacher, were sentenced to hang; 2 defendants were given life terms, and 4 others long sentences. The death sentences, which were confirmed by Colonel Nasser, the Egyptian Prime Minister, were carried out on January 31 despite pleas for clemency from all over the world and from all quarters, including the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Governments of the United States and France, the Latin American delegations to the United Nations, and prominent individuals the world over.

20. Condemnation of the brutality of these sentences was worldwide. The Washington Post (February 4) called the hangings judicial lynching and described them as representing the lengths to which the Egyptian Government would go in its desperate effort to retain the seniority of the Arab bloc. The New York Herald Tribune of February 1 said: "The hasty executions stemmed as much from political conditions as from the demands of justice." Mr. Baldwin stated that "the conclusion is inescapable that the executions were ordered for political reasons, despite prior private official assurances of leniency."

F. CAIRO THREATS CONTINUE UNABATED

21. In this recent period marked by growing border unrest, Egyptian defiance of the U. N., and disregard of world opinion in regard to the mock trial in Cairo, Egyptian leaders and official publications have maintained their anti-Israel propaganda offensive. Not only is all prospect of peace rejected, but threats against the very existence of Israel are made.

22. An editorial in *Al Gomhouria*, official mouthpiece of the regime, stated recently: "Egypt and the Arabs must turn in the name of humanity and its culture to all nations of the world who will aid in wiping Israel off the face of the map because of its barbarism" (October 15, 1954).

The following statement was made on Saut El-Arab (Voice of the Arabs), the official broadcasting station:

"Egypt sees Israel as a cancer endangering the Arab people. Egypt is the physician who can uproot this cancer. Egypt does not forget that it is her obligation to take revenge, and she is mobilizing all her forces in anticipation of the hoped-for day" (November 16, 1954).

23. Recent statements by Maj. Saleh Saleh, Egyptian Minister of National Guidance, stress the refusal to make peace under any circumstances. Speaking to visiting Syrian journalists in connection with Egyptian armament plans, Saleh said:

"Egypt's policy has not ceased to rest on the principle of 'no peace with Israel' in any form and at any time. Egypt will not make peace with Israel even if Israel were to implement the U. N. resolutions on Palestine" (December 27, 1954).

Again, in similar vein, Major Saleh stated to another group of visitors on January 9:

"Egypt will strive to erase the shame of the Palestine war even if Israel should fulfill the U. N. resolutions. It will not sign a peace with her. Even if Israel should consist only of Tel Aviv, we should never put up with that" (as quoted in the Manchester Guardian, January 28, 1955).

Appendix

Fort Dix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony J. Volpe, who had distinguished combat service in World War II, and was severely disabled therein, is presently the county service officer of the Cape May County (N. J.) Veterans Bureau. He recently made a very thorough inspection trip at Fort Dix and his extremely interesting report on that visit is herewith included for the information of the Congress.

The report follows:

CAPE MAY COUNTY VETERANS' BUREAU,
Cape May, N. J., February 21, 1955.

HON. T. MILLET HAND,
Second Congressional District,
State of New Jersey,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAND: Sometime ago I communicated with the Public Information Office at Fort Dix, N. J., requesting an invitation to conduct an impartial objective survey among the troops regarding questions of military pay, military housing, legislation which is before the 84th Congress, how the average GI in all grades felt about our international circumstances, what they thought of the army generally, etc. Also this survey was made by the undersigned to determine or evaluate and observe physical fitness, discipline, tactical teaching, quality of weapons, and usage, morale of troops, alertness of troops, psychological adaptability to army life, instructors and quality of instruction, food, special services, etc. The PIO Office at Fort Dix graciously granted my request and invited me up to Fort Dix to conduct this survey as a public relation and liaison. On February 14, 1955, I arrived at Fort Dix and reported to the PIO Office, and arrangements were made for me to be quartered in the officer's guest house, and a copy of training program for the 14th and 15th of February was placed at my disposal. Further Capt. Hamrick, PIO officer, assigned Lieutenant Young of his office as my guide around the training areas of Fort Dix including observation of housing, kitchens, hospital, service facilities, and religious facilities. The cooperation I received from the PIO Office, gave me a proud feeling of respect for that particular office and allowed me to observe the excellent ability and functions of Captain Hamrick, Lieutenant Young, and their staff.

It is my request and desire that you make the following report a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that your colleagues and others concerned may have the benefit of the contents of this report.

Lieutenant Young and I proceeded to one of the training regiments in the field on one of the rifle ranges. With 8-week recruits, I began my objective survey and the following questions and answers on remarks made:

1. "What do you feel to be a sufficient military pay raise?" Ninety percent of the men questioned during this entire day on this question answered, "We think a 10-percent raise in military pay to be fair and adequate." Others replied, "We'd be glad to get whatever we can."

2. Question asked, "Do you go to religious service more since being in the service than you did in the civilian life?" Eighty-five percent of the men questioned said "Yes." On this score official records in the P. I. O. office show that the 13 chapels at Fort Dix show an attendance of 324,069 worshipers during 1954. This is an amazing attendance record and a definite credit to the chaplains and to the commanding general of Fort Dix. This in itself should show the parents and the average civilian that men in the service are more religiously inclined than in civilian life. I would like to add that during 1954 the troops of Fort Dix voluntarily contributed \$40,000 to charitable civilian purposes.

3. Question asked of noncommissioned officers and field grade commissioned officers, "Do you feel that the new army of these recruits show a tendency toward sufficient and proper discipline?" The majority replied that "discipline is nowhere near to what it should be." I then asked what they thought some of the reasons for this lax in discipline might be. Some remarked, "It is difficult to discipline a young man entering the service today when discipline in civilian life had been lax and also that the new trainee has too many avenues of redress," a great many of which are abused by the serviceman. For example, a new man in his first 8 weeks of basic training must undergo an entirely different change of environment and adaptation which is admittedly somewhat difficult. These factors are considered by troop commanders and field instructors. However, the men themselves feel the restrictions and are too prone to write aggravated letters home, and as a result of these letters the parents immediately wish to contact their Congressman or the commanding general of the base. Upon this question my survey finds that many noncommissioned officers and field grade officers have been embarrassed by such intervention by parents and congressional inquiries. The consensus of opinion among the line grade noncommissioned officers and troop commanders is that they feel that their primary mission in training new troops is to teach and discipline them so that these men will remain alive in combat and participate in the success of any military mission. Unless the ideology of rugged training and discipline and fair and adequate authority to noncommissioned officers and troop commanders is reinstated, we shall suffer not only a greater amount of casualties on a potential battlefield but we shall have an army with manpower but without discipline. I thought that this was an important matter to bring to the attention of the readers of this report.

Another question asked was: "Do you think that servicemen should have free postal or mailing benefits restored?" All personnel questioned answered "Yes." This free or postal mailing benefits represents one of several fringe benefits that Army or Armed Forces personnel have lost since World War II.

4. Question asked, "Do you believe that wartime veteran benefits should be retained so long as an international crisis such as we

face in the Far East is apparent?" Sixty percent of the men questioned answered, "Yes," 40 percent answered, "No."

5. Question asked, "Are you a high school graduate?" Approximately 75 percent indicated that they either had 3 years of completed high school or a high school diploma. Those that were not high school graduates expressed the fact that they did have an opportunity to continue or complete high school in the military service.

6. Question asked, "Do you think the civilians generally show sufficient or proper respect to members of the Armed Forces?" Seventy percent of the men questioned answered "No." 30 percent answered "Yes." Those that answered "No" were asked why they felt this way. Some of the remarks were as follows: "We are basically a non-military country. The average civilian is not basically interested in servicemen or legislation for servicemen unless they as individuals have a member of their family in the military service."

7. Question asked of both enlisted men with dependents, NCO's, and commissioned officers, "Do you think that service housing for dependents is adequate?" The answer was over 95 percent "No." After asking this question I then requested my PIO officer guide to take me to some of the NCO quarters, officer's quarters, guest homes, and dependents' housing. Without any reservation it is very obvious that these quarters are very poor, inadequate, poorly heated and ventilated, and most of them consist of old World War II temporary barracks. One large housing area for officer personnel and their families is a former old original station hospital of Fort Dix. This would be a very interesting and enlightening factor to witness by members of the House Armed Forces Committee and Members of Congress, and I am sure that after they saw these conditions they would readily understand why veteran NCO's and field grade officers are leaving the military service on a greater scale every year. The housing situation outside of post in and around Fort Dix is almost ridiculous. However, on a lighter side of this picture, in 1954 there were 55 modern steel and masonry buildings built by civilian contractors at Fort Dix. Twenty-three of these buildings were company-sized barracks which house an entire infantry company with modern heating and ventilating, kitchen and recreation facilities. One of these new buildings was built for a regimental headquarters. Twelve were made into regimental classrooms. One new building was built as a firehouse; 5 as maintenance shops, and 1 as a boiler central control house. There is a joke amongst the regiments still housed in the old ramshackled World War II temporary buildings that the one regiment housed in these modern barracks were known as the "Hollywood Regiment." These 55 new buildings represent a step in the right direction. However, the allocation of funds for Fort Dix for more of these new barracks is very limited and there should be some study made for the purpose of increasing the funds for Fort Dix. We must remember that Fort Dix has approximately 40,000 troops. A considerable number of these troops are married personnel. We should also consider the fact that Fort Dix is a permanent military installation with very few permanent-type buildings. We should consider too, that Fort Dix maintains a training division status.

The new inductees receive their very first impression of the military service while at Fort Dix. Certainly this impression of military facilities cannot be considered by these men as favorable. A very important fact to consider is that the commanding officer and his staff, the personnel of the public information services, the chaplain services, the special services office, and primarily the NCO's, the field grade officers, who must care and train these men, are doing an excellent and commendable job in spite of the fact that they themselves are not properly or adequately taken care of. It was amazing for me, as an observer, to note and to listen to and sense the feeling of pride that the NCO's and troop commanders have in their particular positions. They show a valid desire to do such an effective job to save men's lives and ready them for war that all of us concerned can feel justly proud and privileged to have such men in the military service. The entire staff, from the commanding general, down to the NCO in the field, have a feeling and a desire to express and recommend to the parents of these young men that they, in order to do a job to their young sons properly and to insure that these young men will survive combat, that they honestly and objectively feel that too many ties and too much interference is detrimental to their own sons and daughters. It must be appreciated that these men must be converted from ordinary civilians to fighting men in a short space of time. The value of discipline here in training camps spells the difference of life and death or success or failure in a combat military situation.

Emphasis is being reinstated on physical fitness and stamina of these troops in training. The tactical training being given at Fort Dix is excellent. Fort Dix has a program, nighttime combat operation training, which will ready our young men to fight offensively during the dark hours. We saw with much misgivings and casualties in the Asiatic theater, in both World War II and Korea, that the Asiatic was more adept at night fighting than we were. I was especially glad to see at Fort Dix that night combat operational training is a must factor there and that it is proving to be some of the best training our men are receiving.

Psychological training: The command at Fort Dix has instructed a phase of psychological training which will certainly help the combat soldier to combat the ideology and the propaganda of potential enemies.

SUMMARY

In summation, my observations at Fort Dix resulted in the following:

1. That as a retired ex-infantryman and as a taxpayer I am extremely proud of the entire command of Fort Dix and I can objectively say that from the commanding general on down to the line officer and NCO, these men are doing an excellent job in spite of hardships and poor facilities as outlined and remarked above. Fort Dix should be considered a great asset to the Department of the Army.

2. There should be an objective survey by Department of Army officials and congressional officials into the need of better housing and facilities at Fort Dix. A movement should be initiated at Fort Dix to make a reality of its permanent base status by eliminating as many of these temporary old World War II units as possible. This can be accomplished by increasing the amount of funds for buildings and facilities for Fort Dix.

3. That there should be some type of educational program whereby the Department of the Army can impress upon the parents and taxpayers of our country that their primary mission is to train men in order to survive. This factor can be assisted by returning the authority and prestige to the line grade NCO's, and field grade commissioned officers.

4. The House Armed Forces Committee or any other congressional committee may indicate by their favorable action on service-men's legislation that they do care and are interested in the welfare of service personnel and their dependents, to a greater extent.

5. Letters of appreciation or any other commendable communication should be forwarded to troop commanders and others of their staff for the fine work that they do.

In conclusion may I add that I have in this survey, compared my World War II training and discipline with the so-called new army and I honestly find that the only reason that I survived combat and many subsequent surgical operations was because I had had good training, good stamina, and a profound pride of military service. If this can be incorporated into the new men of our present army, we should have nothing whatsoever to fear.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTHONY J. VOLPE,
County Service Officer.

Tenth Anniversary of Capture of Remagen Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment briefly on the significance of the 10th anniversary of the capture of the Remagen Bridge on March 7, 1945. This was one of the heroic acts which turned the tide of battle during World War II. I quote from the Washington News of March 9, 1945, the report sent by C. R. Cunningham, United Press war correspondent:

Victory is in the air on this side of the Rhine, where American troops hit the pay dirt of Germany.

It can't be told yet how the Americans crossed the Rhine, but it took only 15 minutes to get at least one company of infantry to the eastern side yesterday afternoon.

The crossing was a case of spotting an opportunity and grabbing it. Maj. Murray Deevers, of Hagarville, Ark., ordered his men across and the company swept into inner Germany.

An earlier dispatch from Cunningham had reported that a Second Lieutenant Burroughs and 1st Lt. Carl Timmerman, of West Point, Nebr., spotted the opportunity and flashed the word to battalion headquarters where Lt. Col. Leonard Engemann, of Minnesota, made the historic decision.

It is with understandable pride that I mention the outstanding contribution made in this historic advance by the late Maj. Murray Deevers, of Hagarville, Johnson County, Ark., at that time within the Fifth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. Johnson County is now a part of the district represented by our able colleague Mr. TRIMBLE.

I am sure that the Members share my feeling of deep appreciation for the service of Major Deevers, and those associated with him who contributed so much to the defense of our country.

Civil-Service Retirement Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 25, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a recent publication of the National Planning Association called the Budget in Transition, contains important material bearing on the civil-service retirement fund.

HANDLING THE GOVERNMENT'S SHARE OF THE COST OF THE CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

For many years Federal Government employees and the United States Government have shared the cost of a retirement and disability plan operated through the civil-service retirement fund. From 1929 through 1953 the budget included an allowance for the Government's contribution to the cost of the system; appropriations were made, and the amounts involved were recorded as a Government expenditure. They were added to the total deficit as reported on the administrative basis.

The amount appropriated for many years was a compromise figure—below true actuarial cost and above the cost of current benefits and payments and for this reason and others, the liability of the Government not represented by appropriations has grown to a figure in excess of \$10 billion. This led to proposals for a reconsideration of the policy of financing the retirement fund, and studies of various possibilities have been going on for some time.

Because a policy had not been worked out, Congress has refused to make appropriations for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 in line with the pattern established during the previous 30 years of the system's life. The appropriation would have been \$368 million in fiscal 1954 (President's budget message for 1954, p. M52) and a somewhat greater amount in fiscal 1955, roughly about \$390 million.

For fiscal year 1956, on the old basis, the figure would have been still greater, roughly about \$416 million, but the President suggested (message for 1956, p. M82) only \$216 million. These figures exclude certain cost-of-living increases for workers who have already retired, which have continued to be appropriated each year.

The failure of Congress to appropriate the amounts involved reduced the accounting totals of expenditures and the deficit. It has no effect on payments to retired employees but it allows the Government's unfunded liability figure to grow faster than would otherwise have been the case.

Highlights of changing policy with regard to the appropriation for the civil service retirement fund appear in the budget messages sent by the President to the Congress during the past few years. In the message on the 1953 budget, the President said (p. M75):

"The cost of civilian employee's retirement benefits is financed by contributions from the employees and the Government. By law, Federal employees covered under the system are required to contribute to a trust fund 6 percent of their salaries, and the Government is required to contribute an amount sufficient to cover the remaining cost of benefits.

"The Government contribution for the fiscal year 1953 consists of a normal contribution of 2.78 percent of payroll to pay currently accruing costs, and a deficiency contribution to pay interest on and provide for amortization of the Government's accrued liability to the fund.

"This liability results from employees' services rendered prior to the effective date of the system, credits for military service, and insufficient appropriations for the Government contribution in some years. This budget includes \$458 million for the annual contribution to the Government for the fiscal year 1953 to the civil-service retirement and disability trust fund, \$148 million more than in the current fiscal year.

"This estimate takes into account the higher benefits for future annuitants which will result from a recent advance in the pay rates for Government employees.

"It also provides for the first of 30 annual payments to amortize the Government's accrued liability to the fund so that the retirement system eventually will be financed on a full reserve basis, as is contemplated by the Retirement Act."

Congress questioned the program suggested by the President and established a committee to report on the problem. It appropriated \$324 million for 1953, however, which represented a continuation of past Government policy.

In the message on the 1954 budget, the President said (p. M52):

"I am recommending appropriations of \$427 million to cover the Government's obligations to the civil service retirement and disability fund and \$3 million to pay annuities under special laws.

"The Government's obligations to the civil service retirement and disability fund include \$59 million to cover the cost for 1953 and 1954 of the temporary increase in benefits voted last summer for persons then receiving annuities from the civil-service retirement system, and \$368 million for its contribution as employed for the fiscal year 1954.

"The amounts I am recommending do not provide for payments on the Government's outstanding liability to the fund, since this is one of the problems to be studied by the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel recently established by the Congress."

Congress failed to appropriate the amount requested by the President, waiting instead for the report of the committee that it had established.

In the message on the 1955 budget, the President said (p. M101):

"An appropriation of \$30 million is recommended to permit the continued payment to retired Federal workers of temporary cost-of-living increases as authorized by the Congress in 1952. The budget also includes \$2 million to pay annuities under special laws.

"The civil-service retirement system is financed jointly by employee contributions and appropriations by the Government. The Congress, at its last session, however, did not appropriate for the Government's payments to the fund. The resumption of these payments is not included in this budget.

"Recommendations for financing this system as well as other retirement programs for Federal personnel will be determined after the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel completes its study and reports to the Congress on or before June 30, 1954."

No appropriation was requested for the fiscal year 1955, and none was made.

In the message on the 1956 budget, the President said (p. M82):

"The civil-service retirement and disability system should be financed on a more satisfactory basis. Employees now contribute 6 percent of pay, covering about one-half the currently accruing cost, and the Government is responsible for the rest of the cost.

"In the past the Government's share of payments to this fund has not been provided on a consistent basis and in the last 2 years appropriations have been deferred

pending the report of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel.

"The Committee's report to the 83d Congress establishes the necessity for a sound and lasting financial basis for the civil-service retirement system. Financing of the civil-service system is a problem requiring careful consideration because of its importance to the Federal career service.

"For 1956 I am recommending a Government contribution of \$216 million, which is estimated to be the difference in that year between the Government's share of current benefit disbursements and the interest earned on its part of the fund. This will serve to maintain at its present level the equity the Government already has built up in the fund through its past contributions."

A table showing the figures on appropriations to the civil-service retirement fund by the Government on the basis of policy decisions existing in 1953 and prior years, compared with actual and proposed appropriations, is set forth below:

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Old basis	Actual and proposed	Difference
1952.....	310	310	0
1953.....	398	0	398
1954.....	1,390	0	390
1955.....	1,416	216	200

¹ Estimated.

The estimates for 1955 and 1956 are rough projections based on the figures used in 1953 and prior years. They are lower than the estimated \$794 million level premium cost to the Government, carried in the tables of the report of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel which was submitted to the 83d Congress on June 29, 1954. Included in the level premium cost are amounts necessary to put the system on a self-sustaining basis.

The Achievement of a Just Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the joint commission on social action of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis recommended to the 43d general assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations concerted action on various problems.

Although I was unable to attend the convention, I heartily endorse the recommendation of the commission, of which I am honored to be a member, as well as the action of its parent body in adopting the following statement:

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF A JUST PEACE

(A statement of principles adopted by 43d general assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in Los Angeles, Calif., February 14, 1955, upon recommendation of the commission on social action)

The quest for peace has been stamped indelibly upon the character of Judaism. Our prayers and hopes have always been directed toward the achievement of peace for all humanity. At a time when war was the normal relationship among the nations of the

world, the prophets proclaimed the vision of universal peace. From its earliest beginnings, Judaism has praised the peacemaker, condemned the warmonger; indeed, the early rabbis forbade Jews to traffic in the instruments of war. The majestic dream of a time when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more, has been an essential element of Judaism's heritage to all mankind.

As heirs of the great religious tradition which conceives of its ultimate goal as the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, we rededicate ourselves to the goal of universal peace. We confront the modern threats to peace, symbolized by the awesome power of thermonuclear weapons, with deep anxiety and concern but with undimmed faith in the even mightier power of God and man.

Only when there is a universal will for peace, can peace be achieved. In a world divided into two mutually hostile spheres, tensions inevitably develop, poisoning the very atmosphere of international relations. We recognize that aggressive communism is primarily responsible for this division and for many of the tensions threatening world peace.

That Communist imperialism is the chief threat to world peace does not, however, absolve the United States from the heavy responsibility of constantly examining our own policies and conduct to make sure that we do not, in discouragement and frustration, weaken in our determination to build a peaceful world. As Americans and as Jews, drawing upon our religious experience and insights, we must urge our Nation to intensify its positive efforts and to repudiate certain tendencies which in themselves constitute impediments to the achievement of world peace.

Accordingly, we urge—

1. That the United Nations be made in deed as well as in word the cornerstone of United States foreign policy. There is little doubt that the prestige and influence of the United Nations have been weakened by a tendency to bypass it, or to fail to make full use of its machinery in crucial matters. Our task must be to strengthen the United Nations. We believe that such strengthening requires the United Nations to become truly a world organization which it cannot be until it becomes a council of all nations. We darken the hope of world peace when we neglect the United Nations, disparage its values, and especially when we give vent to irresponsible threats to withdraw from this assembly of nations.

2. That the United States not yield to despair in the search for universal peace. We must not fail to pursue every path, to consider openmindedly every proposal, that might lead in the direction of easing world tension. We take pride in United States sponsorship of the uniquely generous Baruch plan for control of atomic armaments. But we are aware that this plan has been dead for years. We warmly commend President Eisenhower for his imaginative proposal for an atomic pool for peacetime purposes, and for our country's contribution of fissionable materials for peaceful uses. The United States should similarly seize the initiative in the quest for universal disarmament. Until a workable, realistic program of world disarmament is in force, however, the United States must continue, in concert with other free nations to maintain its military strength, including its atomic stockpiles. It is an ironic truth that these stockpiles may be the most effective present deterrent to a world war.

3. That consideration of a preventive war as a possible instrument of American policy be rejected as immoral and a blasphemy both of religion and of democracy. We heartily commend President Eisenhower for repeatedly repudiating such an alternative, and

for courageously urging patience and maturity in the pursuit of peace, but we are disturbed by the continued prevalence in places of high authority of a state of mind which seems to regard a preventive war as a solution to our difficulties. Religious groups especially have a profound obligation to inspire in the hearts of men the conviction that the achievement of peace is man's greatest challenge in our time.

4. That the fundamental contest between democracy and tyranny be recognized as a long-range struggle, which may continue for generations, and which will be won ultimately not by armaments but in the loyalties and minds of men. We can win this contest only by demonstrating constantly and conclusively that democracy is dynamic, that it spurns colonialism and racism, that it can and will address itself to the crushing problems of world poverty. In this connection, we welcome the achievements of the point 4 and U. N. technical assistance programs and urge that they be greatly expanded. We urge the speediest possible implementation of President Eisenhower's plan for peacetime use of atomic energy through an international pool.

5. That the processes of free discussion in the United States be revitalized. Too many Americans, distressed by the painful complexities of international affairs, have left thinking on these questions to their leaders. We are also disturbed by the tendency to stifle free discussion and healthy controversy by resort to loose charges and pressure toward conformity. The result of these tendencies is that the very processes of international diplomacy, negotiation, and compromise have been held up to contempt; honest criticism of existing policies and even advocacy of coexistence have frequently been equated with procommunism. These are among the factors contributing to the weakening of United States prestige throughout the world and to the grave impairment of morale in the United States diplomatic service, thus increasing the difficulties of achieving a genuine peace.

To revitalize public discussion and debate of crucial international issues, we urge the convening of an international conference of religious, educational, scientific, and civic leaders from all nations to discuss the threats to peace and to consider ways of strengthening the fabric of universal harmony.

6. That religious bodies of all denominations intensify their efforts to instill in the hearts of man a renewed dedication to peace. Only the ringing cry of faith can cross the barriers and curtains now separating man from man. The voice of religion, the message of salvation through righteousness and justice, must be heard above the clatter of the weapons of war. Reaffirming our belief in the sovereignty of God over all humanity, we pledge ourselves to join with all men of conscience in seeking a way to achieve mankind's opportunity for redemption: A world at peace.

Congressman Horan Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following news release issued by Congressman WALTER HORAN, of Washington, which contains very interesting information about the

extension of rural electric light and power to the farm homes of America:

CONGRESSMAN HORAN REPORTS

WE LEAD

The great State of Washington leads the entire Nation in the percentage of our farms that are electrified—99.1 percent. We are still working on the remaining 0.9 percent. Moreover, our rural folks have electricity in abundance, thanks to our forward-looking leaders in every farming area.

BUILDERS

In fact, it has been men of courage throughout our State that have helped to banish the treadmill and the lantern. It has not always been easy to extend and expand our transmission lines into the remoter areas, yet it has been and is being done. The paradox of living remotely within an easy horseshoe ride of great dams like Grand Coulee or Chief Joseph without the blessings of electricity is being overcome. We are even lighting our skiing areas atop our majestic mountains.

This progress is a tribute to our leadership and to the spirit of neighborly cooperation that has seen those in the so-called cream areas help to extend service to those far distant from them. A score of years ago only 47 percent of Washington's farms had electricity, and those were in the more thickly populated sections. In the Nation the picture is also astounding. In Mississippi, 20 years ago, less than 1 percent of the farms had power or light; only 1.2 percent in Arkansas, 2.3 percent in North Dakota, and 2.3 percent in Texas. Strangely, Utah, with over half her farms electrified, was among the leaders then, second only to California and New Hampshire. Today the Nation's average is a little over 92 percent whereas 20 years ago, the national average was 10.9 percent.

NEW APPROACHES

For 20 years the emphasis has been on extending the blessings of electricity farther and farther into the rural areas. A formula still is in the law that requires: "One-half of each year's new (REA) funds for electric loans shall be allotted for loan use among the States in the proportion which the number of unelectrified farms in the State bears to the number of unelectrified farms in the whole country." Thus, in effect, out of all annual new REA funds, each State's allotted funds are reserved for applicants from that State for a period of 1 year.

When only 10.9 percent were electrified that was a wise formula. But when less than 10 percent lack electricity today, that formula stands in the way, as it is presently written, of a wise and flexible use of new funds for the consolidation of present rural systems, for the creation of new sources of supply, the rephasing of outmoded transmission systems and many other improvements that will give better service, more power and lower charges to our rural people.

A GOOD ADMINISTRATOR

Anchor Nelsen, for nearly 2 years now the Administrator of REA, wants this formula brought up to date. During his administration he has done marvels. One achievement stands out. He found a Hatfield-McCoy type of feud going on among the various rural electrical services in Kentucky. He moved in with his engineers, both electrical and, may we say, diplomatic. Meetings were held in Washington and Kentucky. Differences were overcome, agreements were reached. Integration was established and interconnections were made. Three million dollars was saved. Rates were reduced.

Now Anchor Nelsen is working on rural telephone extensions. More than 50 percent of our Nation's farms still lack telephones. Nelsen plans to carry on an aggressive and effective program to meet the needs.

WASHINGTON

I have served on the subcommittee that supplies funds to the Department of Agriculture for more than a decade now. I have good reason to be proud of the farmers of our great State of Washington for, from my vantage point, I can see the rural progress—or the lack of it—across the Nation. Our folks meet problems honestly and take full advantage of every just and proper opportunity for better, more productive and, therefore, more secure rural living. We will always have our problems but working together we will solve them. Thus we strengthen ourselves and provide a wholesome example for farmers in other sections.

Another Drought Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, we continue to receive alarming reports of the imminent danger of another great Dust Bowl in the Southwest, where 3 years of drought have created a national disaster area.

An illustration of these grave reports is afforded by an article printed on March 7, 1955, in the Daily Oklahoman, by the veteran reporter, Roy P. Stewart. Mr. Stewart, who has covered leading news events of the region for many years, speaks with authority on this important subject. The article follows:

ACRES OF DUST READY TO MOVE

(By Roy P. Stewart)

This is not intended as a scare story, but unless a beneficent providence sends gentle rains over the Southwest soon, there are more than 18 million acres of land restless to lend their unwanted grit to black blizzards of dust.

Oklahoma has less of it to contribute than its 4 sister States—only 1,334,000 acres—but as the winds come principally from eastern Colorado, western Kansas, northeastern New Mexico, and northwest Texas, this State will be on both the receiving end and a contributor, as dust seeks target areas far removed.

Last week's sudden, unseasonal warm weather, felt good to bodies chilled by winter winds, but throughout the Southwest, and particularly colder areas to the Northwest, it melted a frost pan which held down light soil, powder dry from lack of moisture.

That is true of most of Colorado's 4,519,000 acres all set to blow; of Kansas' 5,696,000 surveyed dry, light lands; of New Mexico's 1,444,000 acres and Texas' additional 5,397,000, making a total of 18,390,000 acres with too little cover to stop blowing.

Recent blizzards off the Rocky Mountain highlands brought snow but winds were so strong it was almost all swept off fields. It filled ditches and canyons, where sudden warm suns melted it, leaving pools of water beside parched fields, still cracking from thirst.

On thousands of abandoned wheat acres in Colorado, some in the high plains country of Texas and even some in Oklahoma, farmers could hardly do an effective job of listing soil in furrows quartered to prevailing winds because it was almost dust.

Some farmers are still hopeful, particularly in some Oklahoma areas where soil is light

enough to switch from wheat to grain sorghums, or to cotton, provided late moisture comes, and hesitate to plow up land with buried wheat seed. They could have a chance to overplant with another crop if moisture comes before too long.

Overgrazing the past 2 seasons because of drought, even by men who know how dangerous that practice is but hope rain comes in quantity before permanent damage is done, also contributes to the possibility of dust, soil conservation service officials will tell you. That is particularly true of semiarid, desert grass country, where there is sparse cover at best.

One reason there has been such a clamor for larger cotton acreage than present allotments call for is the possibility of seeding cotton if April rains come—right on top of wheat land. Grain sorghums, although not a basic crop under the support plan, also come into that view because so much layout land was shifted to feed raising.

Off Years Are Minority Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower, in a recent press conference, advocated the election of Members of the House for 4-year terms.

In its December 28, 1954, publication, the Patriot, a newspaper in my district, made some interesting observations with regard to the merits of such a proposal.

Because there is a keen and widespread interest in 4-year terms for Congressmen, I am submitting this newspaper's editorial for the convenience of my colleagues:

OFF YEARS ARE MINORITY YEARS

Next week, the 84th Congress of the United States convenes.

Final tabulations of the official vote reveal the fact that this Congress was elected by a total vote cast of 44,447,496, which is 42.7 percent of the qualified voters as of last November.

Whatever mandate was given the 84th Congress was by less than 43 people out of 100 in these United States who could have voted. Obviously, it is a Congress authorized by a minority of the voters.

That is not peculiar for off-year elections. In fact, it is something of an improvement. Some States made notable records—New York with 84.4 percent of registered voters, Connecticut 81.3 and Arizona 81.1. But even this was of registered, not eligible, voters.

When compared to the 61 percent of eligible voters who turned out for the presidential elections of 1952, the off-year vote was pretty sad. Of about 100 million eligible to vote in 1952, a total of 61,679,882 went to the polls. Of some 104 million eligible in 1954, only 44,447,496 took the trouble to vote.

Of course, it is the fault of the 57 out of 100 who stayed at home that they are without representation in the halls of Congress for the next 2 years. They forfeited their right by staying away. They have been staying away in increasingly large numbers on off-years since the beginning of the Republic.

Doesn't that suggest the question, are off-year elections necessary? Do they serve any valid reason? Are the time, effort, and cost of a modern off-year election justified? If

the answers are all in the negative, as we suspect, then what is the remedy?

A Member of the House of Representatives hardly gets his feet under his desk when he is back campaigning for another 2-year term. As the more popular and responsive House, its Members should be elected and serve concurrently with the President, for a 4-year term. Senators might serve for 8 years and half of them be elected every 4 years with the President. In this way, a mandate of a majority of the electorate will be given the President and the Congress. A more responsible and representative government should result. It would always be a government by the majority of the American voters through their elected representatives.

Miss Adina De Zavala, Noted Texan, Historian, and Writer, Called by Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1955, Miss Alina De Zavala, granddaughter of Gen. Lorenzo De Zavala, first vice president of the Republic of Texas, died at San Antonio. The Southern Messenger, of San Antonio, carried the news of her death in an item which I include under authority granted me to extend my remarks:

MISS ADINA DE ZAVALA, NOTED TEXAN, HISTORIAN AND WRITER, CALLED BY DEATH

On the eve of Texas Independence Day Miss Adina De Zavala, 93, pioneer San Antonio resident whose grandfather, Gen. Lorenzo De Zavala, played a prominent part in the establishment of the Republic of Texas and served as its first vice president, died Tuesday, March 1, at 6:10 p. m., in Santa Rosa Hospital. Her home was at 141 Taylor Street, but since last summer she had resided at Incarnate Word College.

All her life she was interested in Texas and Texans especially of historic interest and because of her enthusiasm manifested on all occasions the De Zavala Chapter of the Texas Historical and Landmarks Association, which she founded and in which she was the guiding spirit, was named in her honor and that of her father and grandfather.

Another prominent member of this organization, Col. Martin Crimmins, died in San Antonio a few weeks ago.

Miss Adina, as she was affectionately known to her many friends not alone in San Antonio but all over the State, traveled to all parts of Texas, sometimes on horseback, doing research work for her writings on early pioneers and attending their gatherings. She was well versed in all phases of Texas history, rich in the tradition of this great State whose cause her grandfather so ardently espoused.

Miss De Zavala, daughter of Augustine De Zavala and Julia Tyrrell De Zavala, was born at De Zavala's Point, the homestead of her father and grandfather, opposite the battlefield of San Jacinto in Harris County.

She received her early education at her home from a private teacher until she was old enough to attend the Ursuline Academy in Galveston. Following her attendance there, she was sent to a normal college.

Later she spent some time as a teacher in the public school on Avenue E, on the site now occupied by the Express Publishing Co.

Through a life of devotion to Texas history, folklore and general civic, patriotic, and uplift work, Miss De Zavala had, perhaps, more than any one person in Texas, aroused in the general public a desire for a fuller knowledge of the history of the Lone Star State.

She was, perhaps more than anyone else, responsible for interest manifested on the part of the public in celebrating the birthday of Texas Independence and other State holidays in recent years. She was also highly successful in bringing about a more general display of the Texas flag on all holidays.

As an author, she wrote the publication, History and Legends of the Alamo and Other Missions in and Around San Antonio and A Collation of Kingsborough's Antiquities of Mexico. For some years she edited a Texas History Department in a Texas magazine.

All the tablets and monuments erected by the Daughters and Son of the Heroes and Pioneers of the Republic of Texas and by the Texas Historical and Landmarks Association were placed by Miss De Zavala as chairman and historian of tablets and monuments.

SAVED SHRINE

It was Miss De Zavala's action in barricading herself in the Alamo for 3 days and nights, with a shotgun on her lap, that is credited with keeping the Shrine of Texas Liberty from being sold to hotel interests shortly after the turn of the century.

She obtained an option on the Alamo which she held for many years and in 1906 dictated the memorial and bill presented in the 29th Texas Legislature appropriating \$65,000 to complete the purchase of the famous mission.

It was the De Zavala chapter of the Daughters of the Texas Republic, of which she was president, that raised and paid the first part of the purchase price of the Alamo.

Of a brilliant mind, even at her advanced age, she was keen and alert and abreast of the times notwithstanding the fact she had lost her eyesight a few years ago.

A person, firm in her convictions and of sterling Catholicity, Miss De Zavala was generous in her benefactions to education and other worthwhile projects, and did untold good to the needy and unfortunate.

The eldest of the three De Zavala children, Miss De Zavala was the last to die. Her sister, Miss Mary, died a few years ago. Their brother, Capt. Augustine De Zavala, a former student of St. Edward's University, Austin, was active in the Spanish-American War and in the draft board during World Wars I and II. He served also as bank director in Austin and died in that city in 1952. He is buried in the family plot in St. Mary's Cemetery, San Antonio.

Results of Statewide Poll Among Nevada Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I have recently conducted a statewide poll among Nevada citizens on seven important issues facing this Congress.

The results have been tabulated by International Business Machines Corp., and I wish to call them to the attention of my colleagues.

May I also make formal expression of my appreciation to the thousands of Nevadans who took the time to express their views and thus render a valuable

contribution to the shaping of national policy.

The poll follows:

	Yes	No	Undecided
	Percent	Percent	Percent
1. Regarding foreign policy do you feel:			
(a) Red China should be admitted to the U. N.?	9.8	81.6	8.6
(b) The United States should withdraw from the U. N. if Red China is admitted?	33.9	54.0	12.1
(c) Economic assistance and technical advice to non-Communist countries should be continued?	69.9	17.5	12.6
2. Regarding taxation and the budget (the national debt now totals over \$274 billion; the interest on this costs American taxpayers more than \$6 billion each year; the deficit for present fiscal year is \$4 billion plus), do you favor:			
(a) Higher taxes to balance the budget?	15.9	65.7	18.4
(b) Following the President's recommendations which continue the gradual trend toward a balanced budget but still maintain a deficit?	75.3	11.3	13.4
(c) Reducing taxes by increasing the individual exemptions from \$600 to \$700 (will cause loss of \$2.4 billion annually)?	22.9	60.0	17.1
3. With regard to national security do you feel:			
(a) Administration is placing sufficient emphasis—over 45 percent of military budget—on airpower?	66.5	15.7	17.8
(b) Universal military training is preferable to extension of selective service?	66.2	20.5	13.3
4. Which of the following statements expresses your views on the Taft-Hartley law?			
(a) "Slave labor law which is unfair to unions and the average workingman."	7.3	40.1	52.6
(b) "Not strict enough in prohibiting monopolistic, unjust, and dangerous practices by unions."	31.9	18.6	49.5
(c) "Experience has shown that law is fair and just; may need some amendments but over all is a good law."	77.0	4.5	18.5
5. Do you favor the health reinsurance program whereby the Federal Government plans to encourage expansion of private health insurance by assuming exceptional risks?	42	39.4	18.6
6. Regarding natural resources do you favor:			
(a) More emphasis on State and local participation in reclamation projects?	69.9	12.4	17.7
(b) Encouraging private enterprise to participate in developing atomic power for peacetime use?	85.2	7.4	7.4
7. Do you feel postal rates should be increased to assist in cutting down the postal deficit (now \$1 million plus per day)?	74.1	20.9	5.0

Thirty-Seventh Anniversary of Renewed Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from Dr. A. Zukowsky, president of the State branch of North Dakota of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., the speech given by Dr. Zukov on the 37th anniversary of renewed Ukrainian independence, and the Ukrainian Independence Day declaration.

The continuing determination of the people of Ukraina to throw off oppression and the spirit of liberty which has remained strong and unyielding through generations of tyrannical rule by their conquerors should prove an inspiration to all those who believe in freedom and individual rights.

The matters follow:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 6, 1955.
Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BURDICK: I am taking the liberty of writing you regarding our recent celebration of the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of free and independent Ukrainian Republic, and 36th anniversary of act of union of all Ukrainian territories in one independent and indivisible state.

Radio programs, special church services, and other celebrations were held in North Dakota during January, with newspapers

carrying publicity on these events commemorating Ukrainian independence.

This proclamation was issued by the Ukrainian Parliament, the Central Council on the 22d day of January 1918, in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine. The free and independent Ukrainian Republic was recognized by countries all over the world, among them Russia, which soon afterward attacked the independent state.

The love of democracy and freedom lives on in the suppressed Ukraine, for although the Republic was short-lived and fell under the forcible occupation of the Russian Communists in 1922, the resistance of the Ukrainian people to Communist totalitarianism has not ceased until this day.

At the same time our committee had the opportunity to read the staff reports of the Subcommittee To Study the U. N. Charter, of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In this series of studies (particularly in staff study No. 4) Ukraine is referred to in comparison with Texas, i. e., that Ukraine is as much a part of the Soviet Union as Texas is of the United States. Moreover, the study urges the exclusion of Ukraine from the U. N. on the basis that it is not a nation but a part of the Soviet Union.

This sort of thinking is of course completely without basis, since Ukraine, in the international sense was, and is, a Nation in itself. It has been recognized by the great powers including Soviet Russia, England, France, and others throughout its history. To disclaim its status as a nation simply because it is under Soviet Russian tyranny would necessitate the exclusion of Czechoslovakia and Poland from the U. N. because they are also under Soviet domination.

The object of the Soviet regime is to absorb cultures and nations in order that the peoples which they enslave would offer less resistance to their tyranny. Such a move on the part of the United States would greatly diminish the feelings of the enslaved Ukrainians toward this country, because they look upon America as an ally in their struggle. Were America to deny their very existence as a nation we would play into the hands of the Communists.

Enclosed is a copy of the speech I gave on January 23d by transcription over the Bis-

marck and Dickinson radio stations. Also is enclosed declarations signed by people at rallies held at Wilton and Belfield during January.

On behalf of our Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State branch of North Dakota, and the 20,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living in North Dakota, I would appreciate your inserting these statements, including this letter, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of public record.

Very sincerely yours,

Dr. A. ZUKOWSKY,
President, State Branch, UCCA, Inc.

SPEECH GIVEN BY DR. A. ZUKOWSKY, PRESIDENT OF STATE BRANCH OF UCCA, INC., OVER STATIONS KFYR, BISMARCK AND KDIX, DICKINSON, ON JANUARY 23, 1955

THIRTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF RENEWED UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

From coast to coast Americans of Ukrainian descent today are observing solemnly the 37th anniversary of the renewal of the independence of the Ukraine which was proclaimed by the Ukrainian Parliament—the Central Council (Rada) on January 22, 1918, in Kiev.

This celebration is not merely a Ukrainian one.

With the growth of understanding of the meaning of the celebration in America it increasingly becomes an American celebration. The governors of many American States, the mayors of many American cities proclaimed today as Ukraine Day.

So it was last year. So it was 2 years ago.

Today many of our States have raised the historical yellow and blue flag of independent Ukraine together with our star-spangled banner to demonstrate the identity of ideal which the two nations fought for under these flags.

What is the meaning of today's celebration for America? To find it we must look back into the yellowed pages of history and the blood-stained pages of the recent decades, and also look ahead into the future.

Ukraine is one of the oldest European nations, with a cultural and governmental tradition going back for more than a thousand years. This should no longer be news to any American. Many elaborate statements by eminent Americans about the glorious past of Ukraine can be found not only in books and articles but also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of recent years.

The Ukrainian people are a traditionally democratic nation having always cherished freedom above all material treasures, and having throughout many centuries never ceased to fight for it.

Through her vital geographical position, through her immeasurable wealth of natural resources, the fabulous richness of her soil—Ukraine was always the main object of aggression of her neighbors, whereas Ukraine fighting for her own rights never had any aggressive intentions toward others.

So the history of Ukraine is a history of an unafraid and determined struggle for freedom and independence, for the unification of all the Ukrainian territories in one free and independent Ukraina state—a struggle which in recent history brought a short-lived but complete renewal of independence for Ukraine 37 years ago and the unification of all the Ukrainian territories in the Ukrainian Democratic National Republic of January 22, 1919.

It was then that the Ukrainian people rightfully and freely expressed their will concerning their state. And the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence of 37 years ago is as lawful and valid today and for the future as is our own American Declaration of Independence.

The fact that the tyrannical forces of Communist Russia have overrun the independent Ukrainian Republic does as little change the validity of this declaration as the fact that the predecessor of Communist

Russia—Czarist Russia—brutally violated the Pereyaslav Treaty, which was exclusively a military alliance, has ever changed the historical right of Ukraine to independence.

The Ukrainian people, having the sole right to decide upon their own destiny, rightfully and freely decided 37 years ago. Therefore, all discussion whether Ukraine should be federated with Russia or possibly torn apart for the convenience of her neighbors is now belated.

We repeat, the Ukrainian people have proclaimed their will when they were free to do so. So there was and there continues to be an independent Ukrainian state.

This state is enslaved now.

It is enslaved because there was no understanding of Ukraine's struggle against Communist Russia 3½ decades ago. Communist Russia now threatens the entire yet free world. Ukraine was her first victim. There were many to follow years later: The Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and so on. There will be more if there will be no real understanding of the enslaved people here in the free world, particularly in America.

The Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives for the investigation of the Communist takeover and occupation of the non-Russian nations of the U. S. S. R. has given through eye-witness testimony ample evidence of the unlawful tyrannical rule of Soviet Russia in Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the other countries incorporated in the U. S. S. R.

Ukraine is our strongest ally behind the Iron Curtain; it is an ally which never stopped and will never stop fighting the enemy of human freedom. The Ukrainian people look for encouragement primarily from America, for they recognized long ago the identity of American and Ukrainian ideals.

The policy of liberation proclaimed by President Eisenhower is an essential part of our foreign policy. It is a part which will play a vital role in future developments of the world. And in designing this our policy, we should always keep in mind that Ukraine is the key problem of Europe, that as long as justice is not restored to Ukraine there will be no peace for the world.

Had we helped Ukraine when she fought Communist Russia so desperately 3½ decades ago, the world would be different today. There would be no Soviet Union, the life of millions and millions starved and tortured to death by this regime would have been spared, our American sons would not need to die in Korea, they would not have to perish in Communist prisons, there would be no fighting in Indochina, there would be no universal constant fear.

How else can we explain the recent proposals to alter the charter of the United Nations to exclude Ukraine and Byelorussia from membership in that organization, with the argument that this would reduce the voting strength of the Soviet Union and that Soviet Ukraine and Byelorussia are even so not independent.

Why not go even further and exclude all the nations of the Soviet bloc, such as Poland or Czechoslovakia? At the present they are exactly as independent as Ukraine or Byelorussia are. Their representatives are all representatives of the Soviet Government and none of them is the representative of his nation.

By excluding Ukraine and Byelorussia from membership in the United Nations we would only hurt our strongest allies behind the Iron Curtain, showing them that we are going along with their enemies and denying their right to independence.

Ukraine and Byelorussia alone should not be excluded from the U. N. in order to leave the Soviet Union with two less votes, which, with the existence of the veto, would not improve the situation. In the event that the

Soviet Union itself should be excluded, Ukraine and Byelorussia should remain as members, because they are victims of Soviet aggression.

Not the nations should be questioned, but their representatives. And we would gain immeasurably in our international position and moral strength if we would deny the acceptance of the present U. N. representatives of Ukraine and Byelorussia which were put there exactly as those of Poland or Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. This would leave their seats empty for the time being until their nations are liberated or representation could be given to those who will really represent the Ukrainian and Byelorussian people, as the representatives of Nationalist China in the U. N. do now.

We should be able to realize that by questioning the right of Ukraine or Byelorussia to their place in the U. N. we make another fatal mistake. We would actually strengthen the Soviet Union by hurting our allies behind the Iron Curtain. Let us not repeat the ignorance of three and a half decades ago which has cost our Nation so many precious lives. If we are not actively helping our allies now let us not discourage them by doing injustice.

The celebration of the anniversary of the renewal of Ukrainian independence is the occasion for us Americans to think of the future of the world, of the future of America.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY DECLARATION

Thirty-seven years ago the Ukrainian people renewed their sovereign rights on Ukrainian territory.

The Ukrainian Parliament—the Central Council (Rada)—proclaimed the renewal of the Independent Ukrainian State on the 22d of January 1918 in the Capital—Kiev.

The free and independent Ukrainian National Democratic Republic was recognized by England, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Latvia, Estonia, Finland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Italy, the Vatican, Argentina, Georgia, the Don Cossack Republic, and Russia.

But continuing along the old path of Russian imperialism, Communist Moscow attacked the independent Ukrainian Republic and overran it despite the desperate resistance of the Ukrainian people. Thus the new Republic became the first victim of Communist Russian aggression. It also became the first nation to resist the aggression of Communist Moscow which today threatens the entire still free world.

The Ukrainian Government of the Independent Ukrainian Democratic Republic went into exile. Communist Moscow set up by force and violence the Communist regime and Government in Ukraine.

But the people, faithful to their democratic traditions continue to fight against this regime and the Soviet Government.

We, Americans of Ukrainian descent, gathered at the celebration of the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of the independent and free Ukrainian Republic in Belfield, on January 23, appeal to the Government, Representatives, and people of the United States of America to help the Ukrainian people to restore their own democratic Government.

We declare that the proposal to exclude Ukraine from the United Nations is against the interests of our country, against our American policy of liberation. The present regime in Ukraine and its right to represent the Ukrainian people can and should be questioned. But no one can question the right of Ukraine to be a member of the United Nations.

N. M. PROKOP,

Chairman.

FRANK KORDONOWY.

JOHN B. SHYKOWSKI.

JOHN KYTTO.

BELFIELD, N. DAK., January 23, 1955.

Modern Day Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 25, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following article from the New York Times:

ALONG THE HIGHWAYS AND BYWAYS OF FINANCE
(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

Here's a success story built of a shrewd conviction that two sewing machine makers are too few for a country as big as the United States. It is the story of Leon Jolson, late of Warsaw, Poland, and Benjamin Krisloff, a Polish compatriot of some years' earlier arrival in America. It took 7 years' labors, a \$2,000 loan from the United Service for New Americans and one of \$50,000 from Mr. Krisloff to attain success.

Their \$50-million-a-year business is the Necchi-Elna Sewing Machine Sales Corp. Mr. Jolson, a 42-year-old refugee, is the organization's president. He owns 43 percent of its stock. Mr. Krisloff, 45, a former New York City cab driver who saved his tips and went into the sewing machine business with his brothers in the early 1930's, is secretary of the company. As the supplier of the original \$50,000, he heads a group which also owns 43 percent of Necchi-Elna's stock. The remaining shares are owned by persons outside the company.

DOES NOT MANUFACTURE

The concern does not manufacture sewing machines. It is the American sales distributor for the Swiss-made Elna portable sewing machine. Its biggest business, however, is the assembling and distributing of the standard-size Italian Necchi sewing machine. The latter uses American-made components. Only the basic machines are manufactured abroad.

For three generations the Jolsons of Poland and the Necchis of Italy were friends and business associates. Mr. Jolson's father was east European representative of the Necchi Sewing Machine Co. of Pavia, Italy, until his death in 1936. Leon, a graduate of the University of Warsaw, ran the family's \$700,000 plant in Warsaw from 1936 until it was confiscated by the Nazis in 1942.

Because Mr. Jolson was a skilled machinist he was given special work by the Hitler regime and was kept busy going from one concentration camp to another putting sewing machines into working order. One day word reached him through the underground that all 3,000 men in a camp where he was stationed were to be killed. Mr. Jolson managed to escape and joined General Bor's Polish underground organization.

IN HIDING 20 MONTHS

He did not come out from hiding for 20 months—until the Russian Army marched through Warsaw. But he found the Russians as bad as the Nazis. So he and his wife entered a displaced-persons camp. They placed their names on a Red Cross list for transfer to America. When the Jolsons reached the United States, 8 years ago last Friday, he turned to the one thing he knew—repairing sewing machines.

For several weeks he went from floor to floor in every building in Manhattan's vast garment area repairing sewing machines until he had saved enough to rent a small shop on West 29th Street. The times favored him. Mr. Jolson discovered, he says, that America's two big sewing-machine

companies had been content to change their models very slowly so that many features remained just as in the days before power machines came into use.

Opportunity, he felt, was fairly knocking his door down. In Europe 43 manufacturers fought for a slimmer market. This had forced developments which Mr. Jolson thought needed only to be introduced here to sell a great many machines. Without attachments European machines could stitch zig zag, embroider, make buttonholes, blind-stitch hems and overcast edges.

He managed to import four such machines from the Necchi factory in Italy late in 1947. He and his wife worked day and night using them to create an unusual advertisement. They embroidered cards with 98 varieties of machine needlework. They sent these to hundreds of retailers whose names they had obtained from a purchased mailing list.

The response was exactly what Mr. Jolson had hoped for. He used the inquiries to persuade Mr. Krisloff, with whom he had been dealing for supplies for his repair shop, to go into business with him. Necchi Sewing Machine Sales opened its doors as a company on February 6, 1948. The first year the company sold 10,000 machines. Last year, with the average price of a machine \$300, sales at retail reached \$50 million, roughly 10 percent of the American market.

Mr. Jolson became an American citizen in 1952. He still has to do some catching up on his Americanization, however, most notably in the matter of the 40-hour week. He toils from 8 o'clock in the morning to 7 o'clock in the evening and takes work home. Home is in Forest Hills, Queens. When he gets further from home than his backyard he is headed either for his office, the company's 2,200 dealers and distributors across the country, or for the synagogue.

Absurd Legal Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, where a person testifies under oath in a completely contradictory manner, he shows his utter contempt for the sanctity of his oath and should be found guilty of perjury. Under the present Federal statute on this subject, before proceeding to obtain an indictment, the prosecution must decide which time he was lying and then allege and prove that was the time he gave false testimony. All he has to do to escape conviction is to show that he happened to tell the truth that time and was lying the other time. Such a situation simply cannot be understood by the layman and should not be tolerated by the lawmaker.

It was to correct this intolerable and absurd loophole in the law that I introduced H. R. 799, to extend the law relating to perjury to cover the wilful giving of contradictory testimony under oath. The Attorney General has recently endorsed the principle behind this measure. I have requested the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to grant an early hearing to plug this loophole. I hope this Congress will act promptly to wipe out this absurdity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following splendid editorial on this subject from the Washington Star:

ABSURD LEGAL LOOPHOLE

A big loophole in the Federal perjury law will be plugged up if Congress approves an amendment proposed by Attorney General Brownell. Under the present law it is not sufficient to prove that a person made contradictory statements under oath. The Government must show which of the statements was false and which was true. In some cases this is not easy to do—and the Matusow case would seem to be one of those in the difficult category. Yet the former Communist has made false statements, at one time or another, before grand juries, in the courts and at congressional hearings. A grand jury and a Senate committee are trying to sift fact from fiction.

But it ought not to be necessary to spend time and money in such a search when it is plain from two sets of contradictory sworn statements that a person is a deliberate perjurer, or when such a person states that he has lied. Last year, to meet just such a situation, Mr. Brownell asked Congress to amend the perjury law so as to permit conviction on the mere showing that sworn contradictions have been given to a grand jury, a court or congressional committees. The request was made so late in the session, however, that no action was taken. Now the Attorney General, with the Matusow type of case in mind, has renewed his request. (The proposed amendment makes no mention of perjury committed before such an administrative agency as the Federal Communications Commission, to which Mrs. Marie Natvig gave conflicting testimony that has led to her indictment for perjury.) Mr. Brownell is right in describing as "ridiculous" the shortcomings of the present law. No self-confessed perjurer should be permitted to escape the consequences of his falsifications because of Government difficulty in proving which of two conflicting statements was a lie.

The \$20 Cut in Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks into the RECORD, I should like to include the following letter, a copy of which was forwarded to me by the writer, Mrs. Sowards:

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., March 2, 1955.

The PRESIDENT

The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a secretary in the offices of a large corporation here in West Virginia, I have transcribed many letters to various Government officials throughout the years—letters of criticism as well as letters of commendation. I now feel compelled to write this one on my own.

I understand you are opposing a \$20 cut in income taxes. A \$20 tax reduction may seem a trivial matter to you, but I would like for you to look at the situation from another's point of view. I have a friend who is a widow, living alone in the little house where she and her husband lived for years. Since her husband's death she has been

forced to earn her living by doing housework, babysitting, etc. It will be several years before she can draw social security and in the meantime she is working for \$15 a week, out of which she must pay for rent, utilities, food, insurance burial fund, social security, and medical treatment (I know that she often foregoes medical treatment she actually needs to keep her frail body going simply because she does not have the money to pay for such care). Her clothing is hand-me-downs from neighbors and friends.

Do you realize that this woman makes \$780 a year, and is required to pay an income tax of \$22? This came as quite a surprise to me. She called me today and told me that her employer had not deducted any income taxes throughout the year, and asked me if she would have to file a return. Without stopping to look at the complicated book of instructions for filing income-tax returns, I assured her she wouldn't have to worry about income taxes—I knew she made only \$15 a week, and I thought there was some provision for head of a household in the income-tax setup. After talking to her, I dug out the instructions and found that the head-of-a-household provision does not reduce your taxes unless you have a dependent, and that the poor woman would owe the United States Government \$22 which she will have to borrow.

I know that our Congressmen and Senators are quite busy voting themselves a substantial increase in their own salaries, but some of them have seen fit to sponsor a bill to reduce income taxes by the munificent sum of \$20. Reports seem to indicate that this effort will be defeated and I am appealing to you for consideration. I believe you were elected by the voters of our country because they felt that your wide experience in dealing with people throughout the world would enable you to understand and sympathize with the problems of the individual, as well as the masses.

If the taxes cannot be reduced on an equal basis, I most certainly believe that in this land of plenty no human being who is obliged to maintain a home on \$15 a week should be required to pay any income taxes. Instead, they should be admired for doing the best they can and not asking for charity. Do you not feel that this is true?

Very respectfully yours,

SHIRLEY SOWARDS
(Mrs. Harvey Sowards).

Platform of the Slovak National Council Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House that March 14 marks the 16th anniversary of the creation of the Slovak Republic, which remained in existence for approximately 6 years before it was dissolved by postwar developments. The memory of independent Slovakia has, however, been kept alive by many Slovak organizations here in the United States, notably the Slovak League of America.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the text of the platform of the Slovak National Council

abroad which was adopted by the executive council of this organization last July 4 at Niagara Falls:

We, the representatives of the Slovak political exile, solemnly declare:

1. That we hold to the right of self-determination of all nations, including the Slovak nation;

2. That the best safeguard of the political, cultural, and economic rights of the Slovak nation we perceive in the democratic Slovak state, whose government and all its branches shall be elected, after liberation, in free, secret, and direct elections by the Slovak nation;

3. That we deem European federation as the most fitting form of political organization of the free nations of Europe; the realization of this idea we shall support;

4. That in line with the tradition of Slovak generations we repudiate bolshevism and all forms of communism and declare that there cannot be freedom for the Slovak nation as long as democratic governments shall seek a compromise with the Soviets or with states having a communistic government;

5. That we stand for close cooperation of all nations which adhere to democratic principles and whose aims are equal rights, liberty, and independence also for those nations which today cannot freely decide their own destinies;

6. That we are willing to cooperate with all anticommunistic regional and international movements in the West which aim to win the struggle against communism and set up a natural legal order behind the Iron Curtain;

7. That we demand equal rights for Slovak exiles—the same as those enjoyed by groups of other nations from Central and Eastern Europe;

8. That we do not recognize the right to the existence of Czechoslovakia and, therefore, also the right of exile institutions which presume to speak in behalf of Slovakia within the Czechoslovakia framework; we also deny this right to the Council of Free Czechoslovakia which expresses neither the will of the Slovak nation, nor the will of Slovaks in exile;

9. That we welcome the existence of free Czech representation abroad as well as the representations of other neighbors of the Slovak nation and are willing to cooperate with them as equals with equals against communism and for the freedom of our nations;

10. That we are for close and effective cooperation of all Slovaks in the free world, and for this purpose we shall further willingly maintain cordial relations with the Slovak League of America, and with every Slovak organization in the United States, in Canada, in South and Central America, as well as with those on the other continents, whose program and aims are identical with the program and aims of the Slovak League of America;

11. That in the United States and its allies we see a guaranty of the protection of human rights and of political liberties, compatible with the Christian character of the Slovak nation and, therefore, on the one hand, we thank the Government of the United States and the governments of its allies for receiving our organization, its leadership and its membership in their lands and granting them political asylum and, on the other hand, in the spirit of their traditions and sublime ideals of liberty and democracy, we hope to secure the program we have here outlined, which binds us as a constituent part of the crusade for the freedom of the entire Western World;

12. That we again stress these principles and requests, because we are convinced that this is in accord with the will of the Slovak nation whose present enslavement obliges us to remind free governments and nations of the demands which for ages have been acclaimed by all free humanity.

It is unfortunate that we have a continuing controversy on the subject of federation versus independence between various Czech and Slovak groups. I think the application of the principle of self-determination for all enslaved peoples, including the Slovaks, is the wisest policy for our Government to pursue under the present circumstances. In the meantime, I am sure that my colleagues will join with me in extending sincere sympathy to the suffering Slovak people behind the Iron Curtain and hope that the day will come when they will again be able to choose freely not only their political but also economic and social institutions under which they wish to live.

Judaism and Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, an important statement of principles was adopted by the 43d general assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 15, 1955, upon the recommendation of the commission on social action.

Although unable to be present during the deliberation there, I am in complete accord with the action of the assembly as well as of the commission, of which I am happy to be a member.

STATEMENT ON JUDAISM AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

Judaism teaches that liberty stems inalienably from God, and that the soul is the divine element in man which should not be interfered with by other men or governments of men. Deep respect for the right of conscience inheres in Jewish reverence for human personality. The right to express or keep private the dictates of his conscience, and to give utterance to honest differences among men, is part of the Jewish tradition: "These and those are the words of the living God." In the conviction that these principles of Judaism are equally relevant to the contemporary scene, and because we believe that the preservation of democracy everywhere rests in large part upon preservation of the principles of civil liberties and civil rights, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, at this biennial assembly, hereby declares these basic principles:

The most significant trend in the area of civil liberties is the steady encroachment upon our freedoms by certain elements in Government. The legitimate and necessary requirements of protecting ourselves from Communist infiltration and espionage have been grossly exploited by some to justify certain governmental procedures which corrode freedom of speech and of conscience under the claim that these must yield to the larger security of the Nation. The need for a calm, steady, and positive program to insure the triumph of democracy over communism has given way to a pathological fear of communism which inhibits the thinking of some political leaders and colors the judgment of many citizens. We oppose any effort, legislative or otherwise, which would make criminal the expression of opinion, no matter how controversial. We must not hark back to the days of the alien and sedi-

tion laws which the people repudiated 150 years ago. The anomaly of the concept that the state can preserve its security while it weakens individual freedom seems to have been lost upon us. Seven centuries of travail, blood, and sacrifice, from Magna Carta to the Atlantic charter, hang in the balance.

We have tended to proscribe every person and organization at any time pro-Soviet, including many of the most effective present opponents of communism, and regardless of whether former attitudes now condemned were at the time consistent with our national policy. Those loyalty-security procedures which deny confrontation and thus encourage false witness; the type of congressional investigation which in contravention of constitutional liberties tries individuals for their beliefs; the public condemnation by the Attorney General of organizations without previous hearing; these must not become accepted techniques of government.

We deny the validity of the proposition that our Government can make itself more secure by denying justice to any man. Absolute security for the state is possible of achievement only in a totalitarian regime and is unattainable in a democracy. There can be no freedom without some measure of risk. In the current demand for absolute security, we must not utilize the totalitarian practices of the enemies of democracy, thus destroying the human and spiritual values which are the mark of civilized men.

Irked by the constitutional inhibition against self-incrimination, some congressional investigators are calling upon schools, colleges, and other institutions to deny the right to work to those who would seek refuge in the charter of our liberties. The university is being attacked because of the presence on its faculty of persons claimed to be politically undesirable. The unfortunate result is that the campus and classrooms in a number of our institutions are ceasing to be places where the youth of America may learn the spiritual values of dissent and non-conformity.

Within the framework of the national community relations advisory council we have taken our position with respect to the usurpation of power by some congressional investigating committees, and have made suggestions for curbing their excesses.

We protest the irresponsible use of political informers by our law-enforcement agencies. We deplore the view that citizens should be encouraged to inform against fellow citizens with respect to their opinions and political associations.

We would defend all constitutional privileges and immunities without regard to the guilt or innocence of those who invoke them. In our view, the preservation of these rights is of greater significance to our way of life than any benefit our law-enforcement agencies can derive from curtailment or suspension of these rights.

We abhor the test oath and its loyalty oath derivations. As did our forefathers before us, we reject the notion that the techniques of the inquisition, the high commission, and the star chamber are to have acceptance by us in any form.

We favor the vitalization of the Civil Rights Section in the Department of Justice by whatever legislative and administrative procedures are necessary. We believe that the preservation of civil rights and civil liberties is a function of Government equal in importance to the prosecution of subversive offenses.

There are heartening signs of increased awareness of the need to reverse current assaults on fundamental liberties. Yet the fever of suspicion and fear, which has impaired our country's prestige throughout the world, has not yet abated. We know that the price of civil liberties is eternal vigilance.

Liberty cannot be stored away, even for a day. Therefore—

1. We reaffirm the recommendation, adopted at our 42d biennial assembly, that the President of the United States be requested to appoint a commission of outstanding citizens representative of the broadest possible cross-section of American life to study the best ways of protecting our Nation from totalitarian dangers without subverting our traditional American freedoms.

2. We urge the rabbis and leaders of our congregations to join forthrightly in the struggle to safeguard civil liberties and to speak out with dignity and with courage for their preservation. The Jewish ethnic supports, indeed is the spiritual source of, these liberties. As teachers and adherents of Judaism, we are, by our religious faith, committed to defend them for the benefit of all men.

3. We urge the appointment of congregational social action committees to study the application of ethical principles to the problems of civil liberties, and to consider ways of resisting all efforts to enjoin upon us conformity of thought or speech.

4. We urge our national commission on social action to seek the cooperation of all groups which share our concern for the maintenance of American liberties. Our political and religious faiths are both bound up with the preservation of our liberties; as Americans and as Jews we must cooperate with those who would defend them.

Ames President Warns Against Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks into the RECORD, I should like to include the following news item entitled "Ames President Warns Against Trade Act—Harte Fears Tariff Squeeze," by Marie Wood, of the News staff, which appeared in the Parkersburg News, Thursday morning, February 3, 1955, of Parkersburg, W. Va:

Every American business is going to be affected if Congress extends the present so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, Richard Harte, president of Parkersburg's O. Ames company, warned last night.

Already the two O. Ames plants in Parkersburg with a payroll of over 800, are beginning to feel the tariff-imposed squeeze, Mr. Harte reported.

The O. Ames-manufactured shovels—made by American workmen to wholesale to American consumers at \$22 a dozen—are facing the competition of German-manufactured shovels which are shipped in under present United States tariff rates to wholesale at only \$16 a dozen.

Already heavily hit by the dieselization of American railroads, the local O. Ames plants now stand to be even harder hit.

The sardonic feature in this, Mr. Harte added, is that Germany's present unemployment is only 6 percent, and economic conditions in Germany and western Europe are so good that the British economists are using the word prosperity to describe them—in contrast to American unemployment of over 3½ million, representing 5 percent of the United States working force, and double the United States unemployed percentage of last year, despite the United States multi-billion-dollar defense program.

Further, he pointed out that the present United States tariff program is heading the Nation toward conditions of 1894, 1907, and 1917, and that means these low tariff rates will continue until enough American workmen lose their jobs. Congress will have to do something.

"The sad part of it is that we have to have such a visual demonstration," the O. Ames head commented.

Then: "What makes the difference is where you sit in the grandstand," he summed up the attitude of what he described as American big business.

"It's the difference of whether you manufacture 7 million automobiles or a few hundred thousand. As if I couldn't make 7 million automobiles cheaper than someone who makes a few thousand, and if I made 7 million I could take the attitude everybody ought to work for a low tariff.

"Those are the ones who can poke out their chests and haul up the American flag," Mr. Harte added.

He went on to say that business that does its job mostly with machinery doesn't have to worry.

However, the O. Ames Co. use 40 percent labor, and cannot be so successful, as the human element enters in, the company official pointed out.

Warnings have been issued that continuation of the present tariff program will put out of business over 100 American basic small producers who cannot possibly meet the competition they have been asked to meet from European and Japanese imports.

Congress itself has been held partly to blame since the 83d session approved a tax bill that reduced income tax on dividends coming from foreign investments.

By that act alone, Congress set up a 14-percentage-point advantage for American capital to go abroad and establish factories and to exploit cheap labor abroad in order to make products to be brought into America under American trade-treaty regulations to take jobs from American workmen.

The tariff situation plus the congressional actions making it more profitable to invest American capital abroad than to invest capital at home to develop American resources, is beginning to take a heavy toll.

The American marine industry, with 6 of its 7 plants located in West Virginia, was the first to raise its voice in protest.

The American Viscose Corp., with 2 of its 7 plants in West Virginia, subsequently protested.

Protestants appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington, conducting hearings on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act have included spokesmen for the glass industry, with many plants in West Virginia, and the Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., whose combined membership represents more than 90 percent of the tonnage of chemicals produced in the United States.

They have warned of the widespread unemployment which will result should the reciprocal trade agreements program be continued as proposed.

Commemoration of the 105th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in observing the birthday of one of those

great men of our times who belongs not only to his own homeland but to the entire world. March 7 was the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, who was such a man. Born in Moravia, of a humble parentage, Thomas Masaryk rose to prominence as a scholar, author, philosopher, and man of affairs.

It was his vision and tenacity that led to the emergence of the Czechoslovak state, out of the wreckage of World War I. He established the Czech National Council in 1917. He organized the famous Czech Legion which marched through the great expanse of Russia in the aftermath of the Bolshevik revolution. He came to the United States and, winning the support and friendship of President Wilson, proclaimed the independence of the Republic of Czechoslovakia and secured its recognition by all the great powers.

Masaryk became the first President of Czechoslovakia, and dominated its sound development as a European power until 1935, when he resigned on account of his health. It is perhaps a blessing that Thomas Masaryk died before the Nazi scourge immersed Europe. His complete dedication to his country and to the ideals of freedom and democracy will live on forever in his memory and teachings. His great friendship for the United States will remain as an inspiration to all of us who feel the strong bond of friendship in return toward the brave men and women who are keeping their country alive through the ordeal of Russian domination behind the Iron Curtain.

The Harvest: Nixon Visit Solidifies Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to introduce the following editorial from the San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., of March 5, 1955, pointing out the significance of the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon's goodwill tour of Central America:

THE HARVEST: NIXON VISIT SOLIDIFIES AMERICAS

It is difficult for us in the United States to realize what a tremendous effect the goodwill tour by Vice President and Mrs. Nixon has had on Central America.

This is true in part because not many of us are fully aware of the well-organized minority hate campaigns which have been undertaken in our neighboring countries. Some evidence of this was spotlighted when the Communists controlled Guatemala, but the signs about "Yankee imperialism" can be found on walls in almost any country south of our border.

The impact of the Nixon tour has been described by Robert C. Hill, United States Ambassador to El Salvador:

"Perhaps the original announcement of this proposed visit by Mr. Nixon to Central America was received by the public with an understandable lack of enthusiasm. The

people of Central America are our friends, but they are also our neighbors. Here, as at home, neighbors have a way of being critical. . . .

"Central America also has memories of of times gone by when, rightly or wrongly, they considered Uncle Sam the neighborhood bully. It has been a long time since there was a basis for such recollections, but neighbors have long memories. . . .

"And these are the countries which—just because they are considered to be our solid friends—we have largely ignored in our international efforts to win friends and influence people on the side of democracy.

"Now, in a matter of days, public opinion here has changed. I have talked with newspaper men and with men on the street. They say: 'Mr. Nixon's visit proves you really are interested in us—it is not just words'. . . .

"This trip is exerting a tremendous influence toward achieving the hemispheric solidarity which is vital to the future of the United States and Latin America."

The comment is typical of that found in newspapers throughout the area covered by Mr. and Mrs. Nixon.

Perhaps the most tangible result of this trip has been the smoothing of relations between Costa Rica and Nicaragua. The enmity between the presidents of these countries has built up over a period of years, but Mr. Nixon, in statesman-like fashion, was able to influence both sides in a few days to a point where normal relations now are being restored.

The Vice President has indicated he has some serious recommendations to make—based on his observations during this trip. This should be given immediate consideration so as to take full advantage of the statesmanship which has done more good than armies or promises of years past.

The Vice President Makes Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower selected Vice President Nixon as his personal representative to tour the Far East and, more recently, Central America and the Caribbean islands, our Chief Executive again displayed one of the qualities which has marked him as a great and inspiring leader—the ability to pick just the right man for the right spot.

If it were possible for the Vice President, accompanied by his charming wife, to visit every country in the world, including those outside and behind the Iron Curtain, much of the misunderstanding about our country's motives, intentions, and aspirations would surely be dispelled.

It is the warmth of their personalities and the sincerity of their interest in people which have endeared the Vice President and Mrs. Nixon to the people of all races and all stations in life whom they have visited. Floyd Barger, of the New York Sunday News, has so dramatically and interestingly caught the spirit of the recent good-will mission to our neighbors to the south that it is worthy of the attention of the Members. Under leave

to extend my remarks, I include this article.

Also included is an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

[From the New York Sunday News of March 6, 1955]

NIXON IS HOME; HE CONQUERED CENTRAL AMERICA BY LANDSLIDE

(By Floyd Barger)

Washington, March 5.—The man who never wastes a smile or forgets to wave a hand when two or more people are gathered together came home today, mission fulfilled. He has just entwined Central America and the Caribbean islands with the United States in new and tightened bonds of friendship.

Vice President and Mrs. Nixon arrived back here this afternoon from Haiti, completing a 7,500-mile, 4-week tour of 10 countries. If this had been a political campaign—and the smiles, hand-shakes, and waves reminded one of the hustings—Nixon would have won by a landslide.

CONQUERED HEARTS OF THE PEOPLE

Everywhere, the Spanish-speaking people had a word for him—"simpatico"—meaning, he conquered their hearts. But the payoff of the trip—at an estimated cost of \$1 million—will begin when action (some of it urgently) is taken on Nixon's recommendations to President Eisenhower and the National Security Council.

What Nixon and his gracious wife Patricia brought back they also left in countless unforgettable memories etched on many who saw and were touched by the good-will couple.

The little orphan girl who never knew mother love and had a precious moment of it when Mrs. Nixon cuddled her in her arms in El Salvador.

The old men and women in a hospital at Colon, Panama, who wept at the sight of Mrs. Nixon.

RELUCTANT TO SHAKE MRS. NIXON'S HAND

In Panama City a dozen top-crust society women were reluctant to shake Mrs. Nixon's hand because she had shaken hands with lepers that day.

"I assured them it was all right," Mrs. Nixon said. "I didn't touch any leper inmates who had running sores, although some of the hands I shook were mere stubs. I wasn't afraid."

To Mrs. Nixon this was the most indelible experience of her trip which included appearances with her husband at luncheons, receptions, dinners, and doing 400 miles of tours on her own to 19 hospitals, 51 schools and 9 other institutions.

"The 160 inmates of the leprosarium really appreciated our visit," she said. "They see so little of the outside world."

SHOESHINE BOY BECOMES A MAN

Then there was the shoeshine boy in Guatemala City just turned nine who became a man the day he met Nixon. Rodolfo Gonzales ran alongside the Vice President's car 2 miles from the airport to the palace. The next day this free enterprise boy caught up with Nixon at the Independent Monument and gave him a shine.

Coinless, Nixon turned to Assistant Secretary of State Henry Holland and said: "Pay him three times what it's worth." A protocol official protested that Nixon would "spoil the boy." Nixon, in effect, said nuts.

Holland shelled out a quarter while Nixon wrote on his personal card, "Good luck. Come see me some day in Washington."

Today a local newspaper is conducting a campaign for a scholarship to send Rodolfo to the States.

In Panama a 10-year-old waited 2 days to get Nixon's autograph. His name was Franklin Delano Wasson. A line in his autograph book, under the signature, was

reserved for the signer's hobby. Nixon wrote: "Shaking hands."

PAT LOOKED FRESH IN BROILING SUN

Even in the broiling tropical sun, Pat looked as wholesome and fresh as the girl next door.

"Que bonita," the boys shouted, the Latin equivalent to a wolf call.

In Guatemala City, one big 12-year-old youth kissed her hand and tried to throw his arms around her.

Rafael Trujillo, ex-President of the Dominican Republic who now wears the title of benefactor, lit 10,000 lights outside the palace for the Nixons' first night there. When the Nixons made their enchanted entrance—300 feet across an Arabian Nights rug to the awaiting Trujillos—it was like a storybook picture of a kingdom of the past.

BARRELS OF CHAMPAGNE OPENED AT RECEPTIONS

And even though he had said a few hours earlier that he preferred a soft drink, Nixon was served champagne—the most golden, expensive brand obtainable. He merely sipped it, for he much prefers coffee or a small beer.

Nixon is known to feel that the money-pinched Latin-American Republics should have saved lots of money by not cracking open barrels of champagne on his behalf.

It was during his stops along throng-lined streets, visits to a textile factory in Ciudad Trujillo, a housing development in Puerto Rico, a banana plantation in Costa Rica, coffee farm in Honduras, sugarcane plantation in Cuba, that Nixon revealed himself as an uncannily shrewd politician. He sucked sugarcane, posed with bags of coffee beans, munched pineapple, gulped a banana, wore a Panama hat.

HE ALWAYS FACED THE CAMERAS

Every moment of his working day—he averaged 5 hours sleep a night—he was like an actor on stage. The play had to go on no matter how tired he was. But the amazing thing was that he and Pat are almost physically indestructible.

"If he rests, he'll rust," cracked one observer.

He played every moment to the hilt. He always faced the cameras. Yet there was no ham in him. He spoke in booming tones as if he had rehearsed a speech all day long, instead of making it up on the spot.

The smile was his charm and he could turn it on and off without waste, making it feel warm. He waved and waved, gesticulated with his left hand and grasped the fingers of strangers with his right.

For that handshake moment the stranger was alone in the world with Nixon. Words tumbled out: "How are you? What is your name? So nice to see you. Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes."

[From the Washington Evening Star]

THE VICE PRESIDENT MAKES FRIENDS

Efforts have been made during several administrations to expand the duties of the Vice President and to give the holder of that office a more important voice in policymaking. In the present administration, President Eisenhower appears to have found a formula for Vice President Nixon that is proving effective and valuable. It is the practice of having Mr. Nixon travel as a sort of special representative of the President, authorized to talk on a level of high responsibility with leaders of foreign governments and their associates.

The good impression which Mr. Nixon makes during these travels was illustrated first in his trip last year to Asia. It has been evident again in the journey just finished through Central America and the Caribbean area, a region that is highly important to us and that has been deeply disturbed in recent months by internal political crises and conflict between neighboring gov-

ernments. The Vice President took a good look at all of these problems, talked realistically to some of the key political figures and left behind his renewed and improved determination on the part of the local government spokesmen to resolve their area problems peaceably.

In turn, Mr. NIXON has brought back to this country an encouraging report on the trade potential in most of the area visited. He foresees a new period of political and economic stability there and he feels that private enterprise from our own country should explore the investment and commercial opportunities more thoroughly. One of his warnings to the Central American authorities, however, was that they could not expect capital investment from the United States unless the political and economic environment is such as to assure protection from unreasonable risk.

The Vice President is planning a more detailed report to the Nation soon. It promises to be a constructive and informative one.

Three Hundred Years of Jews in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. MILLET HAND

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I was privileged to make to the Jewish community of the city of Wildwood, N. J., and their friends and neighbors, on February 28, 1955, celebrating the completion of three centuries of the participation of the Jewish people in our national life:

THREE HUNDRED YEARS OF JEWS IN AMERICA

It is always an honor to be called upon to speak before a substantial congregation of your fellow citizens, because I think that the invitation must imply that you expect, or at least hope, that the speaker will have something of merit to say to you. I trust that in this instance you will not be too disappointed. In this case, however, I feel a particular sense of honor and responsibility that you should have selected a non-Jew to speak to you on an occasion which is not only essentially a Jewish one, but one which is very close to your hearts, and which in a sense is a huge family celebration. I take this to mean a recognition that you and I, with all of our differences of race and creed and background and past cultures, are nevertheless one in our viewpoint of what makes a great society and a good life; that you and I are one in our Americanism, and in our intense pride in being Americans.

I like to think too that I am honored partly because of your appreciation for the small but sincere and continuous efforts that I have made over a period of many years in behalf of the Palestine homeland, and finally in behalf of the creation of the State of Israel. It can be truly said that Israel exists as the results of the devoted work and support of the American Jewish Community, and of the consistent support of the Congress of the United States. I think we can both take great pride in our work, and have great hopes for the future of this State, which is at once both spiritually and materially of the greatest significance.

We are here tonight to celebrate the Tercentenary of Jews in America. It is surprising how few people realize that Jews have

been a substantial part of our history from the very beginning. A great many people associate the incorporation of the Jews into American society as beginning after the great pogroms in Russia at about 1880, and it is true that there was a huge influx of eastern Europeans at that time, but centuries before that, your people had identified themselves with the very beginning of what was to become the United States. It is true beyond a doubt that Jewish merchants and Jewish adventurers were associated with the first voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World, assisted in the financing of those voyages, and were actually aboard. There were records of Jews in North America in 1621, which was within 1 year of the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers. About the first Jewish group to settle permanently in North America, apparently landed at New Amsterdam (now New York) in 1654, and thus you are well within historical limits in marking your 300th birthday.

You came for the same reason that the Pilgrims came; to achieve religious and political freedom. And while America, from the beginning, was heavenly in contrast with the Old World, progress toward acceptance was slow. Governor Stuyvesant was unfriendly, as indeed he was to Lutherans and "Papists" and it was 30-odd years before any measure of rights were won. Restrictions were not removed until 1785 in Virginia, 1816 in Maryland, and as late as 1868 in North Carolina. The first prayer by a rabbi was uttered in the House of Representatives on February 1, 1860. The first Jewish chaplain was appointed in the United States Army during the Civil War.

It is a strange paradox of history that some of our ancestors, who came here for their liberties, were unwilling to grant it to others who did not conform to their views. Thus Protestants were as unwelcome in Maryland as Catholics were in parts of New England.

Too many people, even now, are for freedom of speech only so long as what you say pleases them. Too few, even now, really believe with Voltaire, who said: "I disagree with all that you say, but I will fight to the end for your right to say it."

But there were giants in the land, too, and one of them was Roger Williams. The tiny province of Rhode Island, under his liberal influence, provided that "all men whatever nation soever they may be, that shall be received inhabitants of any of the towns, shall have the same privileges as Englishmen, any law to the contrary notwithstanding."

With the climate of freedom thus provided, one of the earliest settlements was Newport, R. I., where a congregation was established in 1658. It was to the Hebrew congregation there that, in 1790, George Washington wrote in part:

"The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now, no more, that toleration is spoken of as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support."

Remember these glorious words, "The United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

The fact that you were here from our beginnings is not important, but your full participation in our development is important. It is safe to say that as high a percentage of Jews backed the movement for

independence as did the English. There were only 2,000 Jews in the Colonies at the time of the Revolution. Most of them backed General Washington. At least one of them, Haym Solomon, was necessary to its success. A man of great wealth, he impoverished himself in behalf of the patriots' cause.

The pattern set by the Revolution has been followed in all our wars, the Jewish people serving their country valiantly and well.

And so, in peace, they have helped to weave the strong social fabric of America, both in the humanities and in commerce.

Abraham Duker says: "Jews pioneered in philanthropy, initiating through federations, the Community Chest movement, and introducing free loans, cooperative credit, visiting housekeepers, settlement work and visiting nurse services. Jewish workers pioneered in trade unionism, in unemployment insurance, cooperative housing, labor banking, medical care and recreational facilities for workers, with names like Samuel Gompers and Sidney Hillman among the outstanding labor leaders. Together with Jewish industrialists they often set the pattern of arbitration and peaceful settlement of disputes."

"In commerce and industry, they are best known for pioneering in the garment, motion picture and plastic industries, and for activities in the publishing field. They have been particularly active in the sciences, scholarship, and medicine. Like Americans of other faiths, Jews have also been prominent, and frequently made notable contributions, in all three branches of government."

Enemies of your race view with alarm your great influence in the fields of public opinion. But you can point with pride to their conduct. Who can say that the National Broadcasting Co., headed by David Sarnoff, or the Columbia Broadcasting Co., largely Jewish controlled, are not wholly American in their outlook? Who will argue that the Jewish-owned New York Times is not, by and large, the world's greatest newspaper, or that its columns reflect bias or prejudice?

But the activities of the Jewish people in the business world can be overemphasized. You have made preeminent contributions to your country in the world of literature, music, and the arts. Louis Untermeyer, the poet; Edna Ferber and Fannie Hurst, the novelists; David Belasco in the theater; Elman and Menuhin in music; Isadore Baline, if you please (whom all Americans love as Irving Berlin), come to mind amongst literally hundreds and thousands of others who have brought culture and pleasure to our millions.

In the field of enlightened capital, shall we mention the Kuhns, the Strausses, the Guggenheims; in the field of labor leadership, Sam Gompers, who for 40 years, was the American Federation of Labor.

And because the Jewish people have loved their country and wish to serve it, they have given us a dozen Senators, 50 or more Representatives, and other great public servants, of which Bernard Baruch, Eugene Meyer and Henry Morgenthau are but a few. Because of their love of law and order, justice and freedom, they have given us Brandeis and Cardozo.

But I labor the point. It is even more important that the everyday lives of the families of the 5 million Jews in America can and do teach us lessons in self-reliance, in law and order, in culture and decency, and good living.

And so you have won, and deserved to win, a full measure of acceptance in this great society which is America, but you and all of us must continue to guard our inalienable rights, remembering that to secure them is the highest purpose of government; remembering too that 2,500 years ago Solon said: "That is the most perfect government under which a wrong to the humblest is an affront to all."

Again quoting the Father of his Country in his letter to Newport congregation:

"May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the Father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy."

I again thank you for the privilege of participating with you tonight on this memorable occasion and I express to you my everlasting gratitude for the good citizenship award which you have so graciously given me.

The Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I arise to congratulate Robert Post, of Pittsburgh, whom we all know as Bob Post, on the production of his motion picture *The Law of the Land*, which is doing so much to explain to the people of the United States the method of the making of the laws in the United States, as well as the practical working of the United States Congress.

We who have known Bob Post for many years, are pleased with the recognition which is being given both to the picture and the producer. On Tuesday, February 22, 1955, at Valley Forge, Pa., Robert Post has received Freedom Foundation's award for producing the picture which they say is "an outstanding achievement in helping to bring about a greater understanding of the American way of life during 1954." I believe that Freedom Foundation has made a wise choice in naming as one of the recipients of the George Washington Honor Medal for 1954 both my good friend Bob Post as well as the fine motion picture *The Law of the Land*.

Another individual who has by his support contributed much to the success of the picture is David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America with headquarters in the Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. David McDonald is to be complimented for recognizing the value of the picture *The Law of the Land* and arranging for its distribution and showing among the members of the United Steelworkers, in order to bring to the working men and women a fine view of the working of the United States Congress and our United States Government.

Mr. McDonald knows the eager interest with which our working people are learning and taking new part in our local State and National Government bodies, which is making for an informed and intelligent electorate among the people. The action of labor leaders in our labor relations in developing an informed and experienced electorate, will make for efficient and stable Government in the fu-

ture, and contribute to the stability of our system of Government.

We hear many cries against various groups in this country, but there is one point on which we can all unite, and that is the development of an intelligent and informed, free electorate. We are proud that David McDonald and the United Steelworkers of America have seen fit to purchase copies of this picture that will give the congressional story national distribution. In its preface Mr. McDonald states:

Unselfishly, this picture is available to other labor unions, schools, church groups, fraternal and civic organizations—in fact, anywhere that Americans congregate.

This is labor statesmanship.

Statement to the California Congressional Delegation by the Department of California of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent having been heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present herewith the statement to the California congressional delegation on February 28 by the Department of California of the American Legion. It is self-explanatory and I believe will be of timely information to all who read it:

STATEMENT TO THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 28, 1955

Mr. Chairman and Members of the California congressional delegation, it is a genuine pleasure to again be given this opportunity to meet with you. We bring you greetings from the American Legion, Department of California. Your courtesy in extending to us this privilege to present some of the major problems concerning veterans' affairs in California for your sincere consideration is appreciated.

We have given each of the various subjects a number for your convenience only. They do not necessarily reflect the importance of one over the other.

1. We again request further assistance for the construction of the new 1,000-bed Veterans' Administration neuropsychiatric hospital approved for the San Francisco area, without any further unnecessary delay.

Comment: The approval for construction of this hospital was granted October 19, 1946. Subsequent to approval there have been many unreasonable and unnecessary delays. It was not until August 7, 1948, that the first site—a 200-acre tract at Fort Funston, San Francisco—was selected. Preliminary plans were then drawn and were later changed to provide for bombproof inner-core construction. The latter plans were not completed until May 9, 1950. Not until October 21, 1952, was the clearing, grading, and other excavation work completed at the Fort Funston site, at the cost of \$413,307. Early in December 1953 the site at Fort Funston was abandoned, following the placing of a ban by the Civil Defense Administration on such structures within 10 miles of any critical atomic-bomb target area.

Shortly thereafter, a site-finding committee from central office of the Veterans' Administration looked over several other prospective hospital sites in the San Francisco area, which finally resulted in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs announcing on December 19, 1954, that a 115-acre site on the southwest perimeter of the Stanford University grounds (Palo Alto, Calif.), was accepted and that the Veterans' Administration would go ahead immediately with the condemnation proceedings to acquire the site. This hospital was badly needed even before approved for construction, and the need for it has continued to grow in each of the more than 8 years since approval.

2. The urgent need for replacements of the Oakland Veterans' Administration Hospital, Oakland, Calif.

Comment: Last year, in discussing the physical condition of this hospital with you, we were told you would appreciate having the views of the American Legion, Department of California, as to whether it was feasible and economical to remodel the present structure into a modern hospital building, or should a completely new hospital be built.

A special subcommittee from our department rehabilitation commission was appointed to make a thorough investigation of this problem and bring its findings and recommendations to our full commission. This subcommittee's study and investigation was made. Its report and recommendation were presented to our full commission. Among the major things they found were:

(a) The building was originally constructed in 1910 as a hotel of approximately 350 rooms and operated as such for 45 years.

(b) The Army took it over early during World War II and operated it as a general medical and surgical hospital until the year 1946. It was then transferred to the Veterans Administration and since then, operated by it as an 800-bed (standard capacity) general medical and surgical hospital.

(c) The building was never reconstructed by either the Army or the Veterans' Administration as a hospital.

(d) A great loss of space is taken up by bathrooms, hallways, clothes closets, etc. Such wasted space in this building—not feasible for hospital use—is estimated to be enough to provide sufficient space for one more floor.

(e) When the building was constructed it was along the lines of the larger type hotel rooms. No reasonably sized wards are available. Only 2, 3, 4, and 5 hospital beds can be placed to a room. Most of the rooms can accommodate only 2 or 3 beds. Such arrangements are very unsatisfactory for a general medical and surgical hospital because of the varied types of patients to be cared for. The doors in very room on all floors are too small to accommodate a hospital bed for moving patients, whether it be in case of fire, or interroom transfers. The elevator facilities are most inadequate. They are the original 1910 installation. Any replacement of parts requires having them especially machined and fabricated. They are too small to accommodate a hospital bed for such necessary movements from one floor to another. A guernsey cannot be accommodated in the elevators unless placed diagonally. Patients in wheelchairs and on stretchers, must be carried on the same elevator with visitors, other patients, and personnel. The bodies of deceased patients must be removed by the same elevators as used by the general public. The conditions of the plumbing and electrical wiring are deplorable. The plumbing system was installed for hotel services of approximately 500 guests. It is most inadequate for the demands necessary for an 800-bed general medical and surgical hospital. The hot-water pipes are so old that the pressure has had to be reduced to the lowest possible degree to eliminate the possibility

of a major shutdown because the pipes are known to contain a multitude of potential leaks. The electric-wiring system would be most inadequate for a hospital one-fourth the bed capacity, due to the varied pieces of technical and clinical apparatuses and other electrical equipment, necessary to properly operate a general medical and surgical hospital. Some independent electric power leads have had to be carried to equipment which is both costly and time consuming.

The four major surgical suites are old converted hotel sample rooms located on the mezzanine floor. They are inadequate to handle the surgical workload of this active general medical and surgical hospital. The air-conditioning system for this area is ancient in design, inefficient in operation, and skillfully balanced on an old bathtub, and is a source of constant deep concern to the surgical staff and the engineering division.

To sum all of this up, it adds terrifically to the cost, to say nothing of the fire hazard involved. It requires 800 employees working under hardship and many difficulties to take care of 661 patients in this 800-bed general medical and surgical hospital.

(f) It is the findings of our department, after considerable study, that it is physically impossible to convert the present structure into a modern economical hospital. Study was also given to the possibility of remodeling by adding another wing to the present structure. This was also studied by central office of the Veterans' Administration and rejected as economically unsound, as it would cost approximately \$10 million and, when completed, would still be inadequate for the increased needs, especially as it pertains to intermediary care; that is, the patient who has reached maximum hospital benefits and unable to care for himself makes him ineligible for domiciliary care, but is in need of nursing and attendant care.

Recommendation: It is our recommendation that an 800- to 1,000-bed general medical and surgical hospital building of modern design be constructed on the adjoining lot now owned by the Government. The lot in question is bound by 13th, Alice, 14th, and Jackson Streets. It takes up a full city block, or approximately 60,000 square feet, immediately east of the present structure, just separating the 2 by the width of Alice Street; that this addition be connected with the present building by overhead passageways or corridors and tunnel or corridors under Alice Street. When completed the present load of patients be moved to the new addition; the old or present building be moderately remodeled, furnished with adequate plumbing and electric power; the first floor be used for administrative space and that other necessary space be used for all types of services, such as overall rehabilitation, physical therapy, occupational therapy, etc.; and the balance of the building, exclusive of the basement, be used as an annex to care for patients requiring intermediary care. These are the veterans denied domiciliary care because they are too helpless to meet the requirements for membership and denied hospitalization because there is little that medicine can do for them, and to admit them would freeze beds badly needed for acutely ill patients.

There is room for much improvement in the basement of the present building to provide for employees' lockers, space for care and storage of patients' clothing, improved conditions for storage of oxygen tanks, and by adding one additional boiler to the present heating plant, it is believed, would sufficiently care for the heating requirements of the present and recommended addition.

Our committee estimates the total cost of the new addition, plus the remodeling and repairing of the new structure as outlined, to be approximately \$22 million to \$25 million.

Our committee's study took into consideration the location. Among the many ad-

vantages in having the hospital located at the present site and adjacent property in downtown Oakland are:

Transportation for patients, personnel, visitors, and economic delivery of supplies.

Maintaining adequate consultants and attending physicians.

Fire protection. The Oakland fire department cooperates 100 percent, and fire stations are within minutes of the hospital.

There would be many disadvantages should a new hospital be constructed in an outlying territory away from this present central location. Among some of these are: Loss of personnel, creating a recruitment problem; difficult to maintain consultant and attending physician service; loss or curtailment of many volunteer services such as volunteers nursing aid; the added cost of building and equipping a fire station, plus recruiting, training, and maintaining personnel for fire protection.

The only disadvantage advanced from any source to our knowledge, is that downtown Oakland may be considered a prime military target. For protection against an atomic bomb attack, the Civil Defense Administration has indicated such buildings must be constructed 10 miles away from a prime target area. It is not believed that such a hospital building or the patients would be any safer in an atomic or hydrogen bomb attack 10 miles out of downtown Oakland than they would be in the heart of that city.

3. The need for repair and rehabilitation of the Palo Alto Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Comment: This hospital was constructed in 1922, at which time the patient population was approximately 50 percent of what it is today. Practically nothing, with the exception of emergency alterations and repairs, has been undertaken since the hospital was constructed. All buildings are in need of alteration and repairs. Some should be replaced. A few of the buildings that are more urgently in need of alterations and repairs than some of the others are the general medical and surgical, the infirmary, and the admission or reception.

There are 104 temporary buildings used for nonpatient use. For 13 years now, consideration has continuously been given to the construction of a new dietetic building. The present structure is inadequate to accommodate the patient load. Equipment is poor and storage space, insufficient. Electric lines and transformers installed in 1922 cannot carry the necessary load and are badly in need of replacement. The surgical unit, the ear, eye, nose, and throat, and dental clinics, are badly in need of alterations. For over 9 years there has been a real need for an administration building. For several years there has been need for expansion of the section for female patients. Only 26 beds are available for this class of patient, with 38 mentally ill female veterans on the waiting list. The Veterans' Administration is paying for their care in other hospitals. We have been told, however, that when the new neuropsychiatric hospital for Palo Alto is completed, adequate facilities will be made available for mentally ill female patients.

4. The necessity for the expansion and modernization of the Wadsworth General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Veterans' Administration Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

Comment: We have been advised that the plans for the new pathological wing for this hospital were completed February 1, 1955; further, that it is expected that bids will be called for in March. This is considered a two-phase program. The second phase of the project anticipates the modernization of the present hospital building. The present building was originally constructed for intermediate care in connection with the domiciliary unit; that is, the care of the chronic patients, more in need of nursing and attendant care. It was not planned for

it to be, and it is not now suited for, a general medical and surgical hospital. The new pathological wing will house such services as surgery, X-ray laboratories, the reception and outpatient services.

It is our study and recommendation that the new pathological wing form the anchor for an additional 1,000-bed general medical and surgical hospital and the present facilities being used as a hospital under most difficult and trying conditions, be used or converted for the type of care it was originally intended. All Government and private medicine will agree that there is a growing need for the care of those chronically ill, who have reached maximum hospital benefits, but are unable to care for themselves.

5. Urgent necessity of replacing all temporary construction at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Long Beach, Calif.

Comment: This is a 1,600-bed hospital. Approximately 200 beds and the administrative offices are housed in good, modern, permanent construction. Other buildings are in the rambling type of temporary wartime construction, built 12 or 13 years ago to care for Navy and Marine Corps patients during World War II. Thanks to the 83d Congress and more particularly to its Members from California, an appropriation of \$8 million was granted for additional permanent construction to replace a portion of the temporary barracks-type buildings. We are told the preliminary plans for the new addition were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget on February 1, 1955, and within 15 days after receiving these plans a member of the Bureau of the Budget inspected the present facilities. One could not make such inspection even though inexperienced, without observing the very poor, rundown condition of the temporary buildings, which are most difficult and expensive, if not impossible, to maintain. Roofs are continuously springing leaks, floors are buckling and splintering, a fire hazard exists, and conditions are unsanitary.

The present plan for this hospital is reported to be a two-phase plan. The \$8 million appropriated is to complete the first phase. It will provide permanent construction for 561 beds and one additional surgical suite. The second phase is to bring the remaining 761 beds under permanent construction at an estimated cost of \$12 million.

During the construction program, approximately 200 beds for veteran patients will be lost, if provisions are not made to care for an equal number of veteran patients elsewhere, such as the Corona Naval Hospital. The veteran population continues to increase in California, far more than in any other State in the Union. In spite of this, since 1949, California has lost over 1,700 general medical and surgical beds for veterans, while several other States—New York as an example—has had huge increases in the number of hospital beds for veterans, by new construction. We urge your continued interest in this project to the end that there will be no unnecessary delays.

6. Hospital beds for sick and disabled veterans in the San Diego and Imperial Counties area continue to present a problem.

Comment: The 200-bed General Medical and Surgical Veterans' Administration Hospital for San Diego, originally approved in October 1946, progressed to where the site was acquired, plans were completed, bids were called for and the low bidder was announced. Just before actual construction started, in January 1949, this project was eliminated by Executive order.

The Veterans' Administration has had for a number of years, a contract with the United States Naval Hospital in San Diego for a various number of general medical and surgical beds. The number contracted has varied from 250 to 100. It is believed that a fair minimum of 110 beds for general medical and surgical veteran patients (quick

turnover patients) would be adequate at this time, provided an additional 100 beds were made available for chronically ill veteran patients. Under the present and past contracts, the naval hospital does not admit the chronically ill, in need of hospitalization. Should our recommendations for the General Medical and Surgical Hospital at the Veterans' Administration Center, Los Angeles, be carried out, the provisions in the recommendations for the care of the chronically ill patients in need of nursing and attendant care would bring needed and perhaps adequate relief for this type of service for the entire southern California area.

7. The need for Federal aid to State and Territorial veterans' homes for capital outlay expenditures.

Comment: A majority of States have established, and operate veterans' homes for domiciliary and/or hospital care of disabled war veterans. The Federal Government has recognized the assistance given by the States in caring for thousands of disabled war veterans through Federal aid subsidies in part payment for the operating expense of maintaining veterans' homes. As you know, our very fine California Veterans' Home is in Napa County.

The ever increasing veteran population eligible to our California Veterans' Home has continuously required additional construction, modernization, additions, and/or improvements of domiciliary, hospital, and auxiliary buildings. Financial assistance is required by the several States, including California, in providing additional and planned facilities in relation to the veteran patient and member population.

Our department executive committee, meeting in Sacramento, February 5-6, 1955, by unanimous vote, adopted a resolution calling on our State legislature at the current session, to memorialize the United States Congress to appropriate the sum of \$5 million annually for 5 consecutive years to remain available annually until expended for the purpose of matching similar funds by States that qualify to receive grants for the construction, modernization, additions and/or improvements of domiciliary, hospital and auxiliary structures at State or Territorial soldiers' homes.

Our State government has been very generous in maintaining and modernizing our California Veterans' Home. It is considered the finest in the land today. At present there are over 1,900 members, both male and female, in domiciliary, chronic and convalescent, and hospital. Modernization and construction of new additions are presently under way. The overall plans call for accommodations to care for a maximum of 3,250 members.

8. The need for amending legislation to provide for payment by the Federal Government for cost and transportation to any place within the continental limits of the United States of bodies of veterans who die in State veterans' homes.

Comment: When a veteran dies in a Veterans' Administration hospital, or domiciliary Home, payment for transporting the body for burial to any place in the continental limits of the United States may be authorized. Veterans in our State veterans' home, without exception, met the Veterans' Administration requirements for hospital or domiciliary care. When they die, the next of kin or the State of California now have to pay for the transportation of their bodies to the place of burial.

9. The need for a national cemetery in the Los Angeles area.

Comment: It is reliably estimated that there are 818,000 veterans residing in Los Angeles County. There are well over a million veterans residing in the Los Angeles area. We have many complaints of the next of kin who cannot afford transportation to

the Golden Gate Cemetery, San Bruno, or Fort Rosecrans, San Diego, for the purpose of attending the funeral of their loved one who was killed overseas and returned to the United States for burial. The same holds true with respect to the next of kin of veterans, where it is the desire to bury them in a national cemetery. We know of no place in the United States with such heavy concentration of veterans where a national cemetery is so far away for their burial. The Veterans' Administration Cemetery in West Los Angeles is not available for burial of deceased servicemen or veterans who die outside of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

10. The urgent need for adequate funds to maintain the hospital and medical services for veterans in California.

Comment: The lack of sufficient funds allocated to Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical clinics in regional offices in California for the fiscal year 1954-55 have caused—

(a) A further reduction in the number of available hospital beds that are so urgently needed. As an example, 131 general medical and surgical beds are closed at the Veterans' Administration Center, Los Angeles, Calif., because of insufficient funds.

(b) Reduced badly needed and justified out-patient treatment to veterans for their service-connected disabilities. This reduction is causing hardship on veterans with service-connected disabilities and has now reached a point to where many private practicing physicians are dropping out or losing interest in the home town care program.

(c) A decided lowering of morale of Veterans' Administration employees, especially those in the department of medicine and surgery. They are only human and want some assurance of security. Under present conditions they never know from one day to the next whether they have a job or not.

(d) The reduction in the wonderful research program which was providing excellent medical and scientific information for the benefit of all peoples.

We urgently request that you give sincere consideration of appropriating the necessary funds for these justified services and/or seeing that the Veterans' Administration medical facilities in California receive sufficient funds from the appropriation to maintain their operations on a basis equal to the demand.

11. Veterans' hospitalization:

Comment: Some groups or organizations continue to oppose the laws that established the veterans' hospitalization program. This opposition appears to be purely selfish for economic reasons. It is based on:

(a) Alleged widespread abuse of hospitalization for the so-called non-service-connected veterans.

(b) Veterans do not constitute a special class and should not be entitled to this privilege.

The story about widespread abuse of this program by veterans falsely swearing under oath as to their financial and economic ability to pay for their hospital and medical care, is definitely contrary to the findings of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 1st session, July 1953.

The right of American veterans to preferred treatment as a special class by reason of their military services has been long established as public policy supported by specific legislation extending throughout the history of our country. Those opposing the care of veterans as a class, are in direct contradiction to the will of the American people, as repeatedly expressed through enactments by the Congress. Their misrepresentations operate to deny privileges and entitlements to the sick, broke, and disabled veterans, which the American people desire that they receive.

Only recently the board of directors of one of our local chambers of commerce made public, a resolution adopted by them, opposing hospital and medical care for veterans. It is loaded with false statements and untrue accusations. This chamber . . . emphatically opposes the furnishing of free hospital, medical, or surgical care for non-service-connected ailments and urges that such services be discontinued. . . . They apparently favor free hospitalization in county and State hospitals for nonveterans who cannot afford to pay, but by their action, they have officially placed our Nation's war veterans below any other citizens. While we deplore their action, we think they were misled by false information emanating from those who have a selfish, economic interest for financial gain, and possibly those favoring socialized medicine.

Hospitalization for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks into the RECORD, I should like to include the following letter I have received from Mrs. Gilbert Q. Duncan, 729 Washington Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.:

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your letter of February 16 and for trying to secure hospitalization for my husband. I realize the situation is deplorable and that, you did all you could. It is deeply appreciated. You asked me to write to you if there was anything you could do for me. So I am taking this opportunity to seek aid not just for my husband, but for all veterans.

Today I talked with Mr. Linten at the Veterans' Administration (Veterans' representative of Huntington, W. Va.). He told me there were 18,000 veterans in this country with mental conditions. Most of them are in jails and can't even get into a State hospital. I am not going to try further to get hospitalization for Gilbert (her husband) since he is better off than so many others. It is heartbreaking to see a brilliant man in such a condition, especially since he could be helped with proper treatment. They are not equipped to give insulin at the Huntington State Hospital. He does not respond to other treatments. It is also heartbreaking to think that so many mental patients are in jails. Anyone who has had mental illness in the family knows that jail is no place for these patients. It seems that veterans are forgotten men now, and it is about time something is done about them, especially the mentally ill. So it is my hope that you can introduce a bill that would take care of the men in jail who do not belong there. It seems reasonable that the Government would be far ahead to cure these men and get them back on the job instead of paying pensions. I know that without proper treatment, many people will be in hospitals the rest of their lives.

If there is anything you can do to help this terrible situation, it will be deeply appreciated. You may use my letter if it will help any. It is very difficult to try and raise two little boys under these conditions. So if you can help any of the others, it would certainly help me. Let me know if there is anything I can do. Thank you again.

Respectfully,

Mrs. MARIAN DUNCAN.

The Great Contribution of the Irish People to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of St. Patrick's Day, I deem it appropriate to speak on the great contribution of the Irish people to America.

Many people believe that there were only a few Irish in America at the time of the Revolutionary War and that no considerable portion of them arrived until around the middle of the last century. However, the facts disprove this statement. In Pennsylvania, for example, there is evidence to show that an important Irish colony came over with William Penn in 1682. Penn was well acquainted with the Irish people for he lived many years at Kinsale, county of Cork, as manager of his father's estate. When he first came to America he brought with him a number of Irish people from Cork and Wexford. Seventeen years later, on one of his return voyages, he brought with him a brilliant young Irishman, James Logan, of County Armagh, who later became Chief Justice of the provincial courts. In 1723 a considerable number of Irish people located in Dauphin, and in the next year Irish settlements were established west of the Susquehanna River, what is now York County. In 1728, 5,600 Irish arrived in Philadelphia.

It looks as if Ireland is to send all her inhabitants hither—

Wrote Secretary Logan in 1729—

for last week not less than 6 ships arrived. The common fear is that if they continue to come they will make themselves proprietors of the Province.

When the British Government started to suppress the American Colonists, the Irish unanimously gave their support to the Colonists for two reasons: the first was the inherent love of liberty which ever dwells in an Irishman's heart and his sympathy for all people struggling against political inequality; the other was the bitter heritage of struggle with the British Empire which heritage they brought with them to America, and which was transmitted with undiminished fervor to their descendants. It was easy to show that the power which had trampled upon the affections of their fathers and tyrannized over their rights in the Old World was aiming at the same object in the case of their children in the New. Only one generation removed from the exiled and suffering generation the sons had as lively recollections of the tyrannies of Britain as if the experience had been immediately their own.

Three native-born Irish—Smith, Taylor, and Thornton, were signers of the Declaration of Independence, as were six descendants of Irish—Carroll, McKean, Read, Lynch, Paine, and Rutledge.

Washington had a high regard for the Irish people and the records show that he had many of them as friends and associates. In 1748, when surveying land for Lord Fairfax, his journal shows that several Irishmen accompanied him—he mentioned among them Patrick Rice, Patrick Matthews, James McCormick, and Timothy McCarthy. Many of the Irish officers of the Army and Navy of the Revolution enjoyed his friendship and esteem. On March 4, 1776, he appointed Colonel Stephen Moylan his aide, and private secretary. Moylan was born in County Cork and was a brother of the Catholic Bishop of that diocese. When Colonel Moylan was promoted to the command of the Fourth Pennsylvania Dragoons, Washington appointed Colonel John Fitzgerald, a native of Wicklow, as his aide. Fitzgerald's successor in the office of aide to Washington was Major James McHenry, a native of Antrim. A later secretary to General Washington was Colonel Joseph Reed "The Incorruptible," whose parents were from Dublin. At Cambridge on March 16, 1776, Washington selected "St. Patrick" as the password and he named General John Sullivan as officer of the day. At Valley Forge on St. Patrick's Day, 1778, General Washington directed "that all the Army keep the day" and on March 16, 1780, in his general orders he directed "that all fatigue and working parties cease for tomorrow, the 17th, a day held in particular regard by the people of the Irish Nation." On December 18, 1781, Washington attended a banquet of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia and was then "adopted a member of the society." On the same day he wrote the president of the society accepting "with singular pleasure the gold badge of membership in so worthy a fraternity as that of the Sons of St. Patrick in this city, a society distinguished for the firm adherence of its members to the glorious cause in which we are embarked."

The Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia contributed approximately \$500,000 to the cause of the colonists and from its own members supplied the Colonial Armies with 11 generals: Stephen Moylan, Edward Hand, William Maxwell, William Thompson, Griffith Rutherford, John Patton, Anthony Wayne, Walter Stewart, Richard Butler, William Irvine, and John Shee.

One of the most brilliant generals in the Revolutionary War was Gen. Anthony Wayne, born at Waynesboro, Pa. His father and grandfather were born in Ireland. Wayne was an active member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Philadelphia, and was also a member of the Hibernian Society of Philadelphia. He was commander of one of the most effective fighting arms of the Revolutionary forces known as the Pennsylvania Line. Gen. Henry Lee, afterward Governor of Virginia, in his *Memoirs of the War in the Southern Department*, makes the following reference to General Wayne and the Pennsylvania Line:

Wayne had a constitutional attachment to the decision of the sword and this cast of character had acquired strength from indulgence as well as from the native temper of the troops he commanded. They were

by the designation of the Line of Pennsylvania whereas they might have been, with more propriety, called the Line of Ireland.

The muster roll of the Pennsylvania Line, as shown by the archives of Pennsylvania, reads like the registry of a parish in Ireland as, for instance, the muster roll of the 7th Regiment company commanded by Capt. John McDowell, shows 76 percent natives of Ireland; the company commanded by Capt. Jeremiah Talbot, 70 percent; Capt. Samuel Montgomery, 69 percent.

When Washington evacuated Long Island on August 30, 1776, he personally selected 4 regiments of the Pennsylvania Line and 1 from Maryland to cover the retreat. The Pennsylvania regiments were commanded by four native-born Irishmen: Col. John Shee—later General Shee—from Westmeath; Col. Robert Magaw from Strabane, County Tyrone; Col. Edward Hand—later adjutant general of the Continental Army—from Kings County, now Offaly; and Col. John Haslet from Dublin.

After the evacuation of Long Island, Col. Robert Magaw, with 3,000 soldiers from the Pennsylvania Line, was selected to defend Fort Washington in upper Manhattan against a force of 14,000 under the combined commands of Generals Howe and Matthew, Lord Cornwallis, and the Hessian commander, Baron von Knyphausen.

Among other Irish generals in the Revolutionary War were Gen. John Sullivan, who captured Fort William and Mary 6 months before the Battle of Lexington; Gen. Richard Montgomery, killed at the Battle of Quebec; General Warren, killed at Bunker Hill; and General Stark.

The first captain to be commissioned in the American Navy was an Irishman, John Barry; he was also the first American commander to receive the title of "Commodore."

Among the French troops sent by France to aid the American Colonies were the regiments of the famous Irish Brigade under the commands of Gen. (Count) Arthur Dillon and Colonel Walsh.

Among the members of the convention that framed the United States Constitution were four native-born Irishmen: Thomas Fitzsimons, Pennsylvania; Pierce Butler, South Carolina; Dr. James McHenry, Maryland; and William Paterson, New Jersey. Four were of Irish descent: George Reade, Delaware; Daniel Carroll, Maryland; Hugh Williamson, North Carolina; and John Rutledge, South Carolina. William Paterson was later appointed Justice of the United States Supreme Court. John Rutledge served as Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States from 1789 to 1791, was chief justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina from 1791 to 1795. In 1795 he was appointed by President Washington as the second Chief Justice of the United States, but was not confirmed by the Senate.

In St. Paul's Cemetery on the west side of Broadway from Fulton to Vesey Street, two of the most imposing monuments are erected to Irishmen. On the Fulton Street side is the tall obelisk erected to the memory of Thomas Addis

Emmett, a brother of Robert Emmett; the Gaelic inscription on this monument is by Rev. John English, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Charleston, S. C., born in the city of Cork. On the Vesey Street side is a monument to the memory of Dr. William J. McNeven, one of the men of 1798, an associate of Robert Emmett. The inscription is in Latin, Gaelic, and English. Dr. McNeven, however, is not buried in St. Paul's Cemetery, but is buried in the Riker family cemetery on Long Island.

Right at the entrance of St. Paul's Church is the grave of Gen. Richard Montgomery, born in County Donegal, one of the brilliant young leaders of the Revolutionary War who was killed in the Battle of Quebec.

The equestrian statue of General Sherman at the plaza, 5th Avenue and 59th Street, is the work of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, born in Dublin, Ireland.

The first colonial Governor of New York was Thomas Dougan, a native of County Kildare. He was responsible for the charter which set up public schools, and he also proclaimed the doctrine of religious toleration. The first mayor of New York after the Revolution was James Duane, a son of Anthony Duane, of County Galway, Ireland. Duane had been a member of the Continental Congress. The first Governor of New York after the Revolution was George Clinton.

The Clinton family played a very important part in the history of New York and the United States. George Clinton and his brother James were born in Orange County. Their father came from County Longford, Ireland. George Clinton was a member of the Continental Congress; a brigadier general in the Revolutionary War; elected Governor of New York in 1777. In 1804 and in 1808 he was elected Vice President of the United States.

James Clinton served as a colonel and brigadier general in the Revolutionary War; took part in the siege of Yorktown; served in the New York Legislature and constitutional convention.

DeWitt Clinton, son of James Clinton, was born in 1769. In 1797-99 he was a member of the New York Legislature; in 1801 he was a United States Senator; in 1803 elected mayor of New York City; from 1811 to 1815 he was mayor of New York City and also lieutenant governor of New York; in 1812 he was a candidate for President of the United States against James Madison and received 89 electoral votes. From 1817 to 1828 he was Governor of New York, and died in office in 1828.

That many Irish families bear names of other than Irish origin is due to the fact that under the reigns of Henry and Edward IV many penal laws were passed by Parliament compelling the Irish families to adopt English names, or the name of a town, or a color, or an art or science. These laws were forerunner to the Austrian Empire law of 1787, and Napoleon's decree of 1808 ordering Jews to adopt surnames.

These laws of the Henrys and the Edwards resulted in Irish families adopting such names as White, Brown, and Black, Butler, Carpenter, Mason, and

Taylor. They also resulted in a rough translation of the Gaelic names into English; for example, James Smith, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a native of Dublin, a descendant of a family named MacGowan. In Gaelic "Mac" means "son of" or descendant of. The prefix "O" also means "son of," and "Gow" means smith or blacksmith. When the laws of Edward IV became effective this branch of the MacGowan family changed their name to Smith. Other changes were "McShane" meaning literally in Gaelic son of Shane, or John became Johnson or Jackson. McTiernan, literally the son of Master, became Masterson. O'Donnall became Donaldson. McFergus became Ferguson. O'Cleary became Clark.

How a name is changed from English to Gaelic is illustrated by the fact that a few years ago an energetic man from Ireland, Erie O'Gowan, toured America in support of a campaign to remove the border between North Ireland and Ireland. During World War II he was a well-known brigadier general in the British Army, known as Eric Smith, and he changed the name to the Gaelic O'Gowan when he realized the injustice the border was inflicting on the Irish people.

As an example of the Irish contribution to America, we might look at the record of James Shields, born in Dungannon, County Tyrone. He was a brigadier general in the United States Army during the Mexican War; in 1848 he was appointed Governor of the Territory of Oregon; in 1849 he was United States Senator from Illinois; 1858-59 he was United States Senator from Minnesota. He was commissioned a brigadier general in the Union Army in the Civil War, was wounded at the Battle of Winchester, and finished his public career as a member of the State Legislature of Missouri from 1877 to 1879.

President Theodore Roosevelt boasted that two collateral branches of his family were Irish.

The ancestors of Presidents Buchanan, Polk, and McKinley were from County Donegal; the ancestors of President Chester A. Arthur from County Antrim, Ireland.

Andrew Jackson, the 7th President of the United States was born in the Waxhaw settlement between North and South Carolina on March 15, 1767. His parents came from Carrickfergus County Antrim, Ireland in 1765. His father, a poor farm laborer, died before Andrew's birth. In 1780, at the age of 13 he enlisted in the Revolutionary forces under General Sumter. In 1781, he was captured by the British and experienced brutal treatment from his captors.

Jackson taught school and began the study of law at the age of 18. In 1823, he was elected to the United States Senate, and the next year was a candidate for President. He received the largest popular vote among the four candidates, though John Quincy Adams was elected by the House of Representatives through the influence of Henry Clay.

In 1828, Jackson was triumphantly elected President over John Quincy

Adams after a campaign of great bitterness.

With Jackson began a new era in American politics. His was the age of "Jacksonian democracy," the rule of the people.

Former presidents, even Jefferson, had been chosen from the more learned aristocratic class—from the "rich and well born" as Alexander Hamilton put it during the Constitutional Convention. In the early years of the Republic it was understood this favored class should take the lead in managing public affairs, while the masses were to follow and obey. With the election of Jackson the people came into their own. Himself a sturdy frontiersman who had risen from lowest poverty, "Old Hickory" was one of the plain common people, and they gave him their confidence and trust more fully than any other President. Victor in two Indian wars; hero of the battle of New Orleans. Men acclaimed Jackson for his proven courage and directness in accomplishing results; even his enemies, and he made them by the score, could not deny his honesty, sincerity of purpose, and his warm heart.

John C. Calhoun, Senator from South Carolina, one of Jackson's political opponents, was a son of Patrick Calhoun born in Ireland.

The New York World-Telegram in March 1947 had the following news item:

HONOR MRS. ROOSEVELT

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whose great grandfather, Valentine G. Hall, emigrated from Ulster, Ireland, and settled in Flatbush, will receive the honor medal of the Ulster Irish Society of New York at the organization's banquet Friday night in the Wedgewood Room of the Waldorf-Astoria, it was announced today. The medal is awarded to Americans of Ulster ancestry for notable service rendered to the United States.

In the field of invention the Irish have given us Fulton of the steamboat, Morse of the telegraph, McCormack of the reaper and binder, and John P. Holland, inventor of the submarine.

In surgery they gave us Drs. Agnew and Murphy.

In journalism: Greely, Laffin, Grady, and S. S. McClure.

On the stage: Bouccicault, Barrett, the elder Drew, and Keane.

In poetry: Father Ryan, the poet of the South, John Boyle O'Reilly, O'Hara, and James Whitcomb Riley.

In industry: Orr and McCall of life insurance; James J. Hill, the railroad builder; A. T. Stewart; O'Day of the oil industry; Cudahy, meat packer; Mellon and Farrell of steel industry.

In music: Patrick Sarsfield Gilmore, predecessor to John Philip Sousa, Victor Herbert, and John McCormack.

In athletics: Sheridan, Ryan, McGrath and McDonald, and in baseball McGraw, Jennings, and Connie Mack.

In religion: Dr. Francis Mackenzie, founder of the Presbyterian Church; Rev. James Waddell known as "the blind preacher"; Father Matthews who preached temperance; Archbishop Ireland, Cardinal Gibbons. The first Catholic bishop in New York was a native-born Irishman, Rt. Rev. Luke Concanon.

During the Civil War President Lincoln selected the first Catholic Archbishop of New York, John Hughes, born in County Tyrone, Ireland, to visit Europe as a special envoy.

A few years ago Reader's Digest published an article entitled "Prelude to Fame," a copy of an article previously published in the Queen's Work. It told dramatically the story of nine young Irishmen who were convicted of treason in the young Ireland uprising in 1948, and sentenced to death, which sentence was later commuted to banishment for life to Van Diemen's Land, then an English penal colony, now Tasmania. They all escaped; and later when the Queens authorities investigated the convicts were located as follows:

Richard O'Gorman was Governor of Newfoundland.

Thomas D'Arcy McGee was a member of Parliament from Montreal, Minister of Agriculture, and President of the Cabinet of the Dominion of Canada.

Sir Charles Gavan Duffy was Prime Minister of Victoria in 1871.

Morris Lyne was Attorney General of Australia, and was succeeded in that office by his assistant and fellow convict, Michael Ireland.

Four of the convicts came to the United States:

Patrick Donohue was a brigadier general in the Union Army during the Civil War.

Terence Bellew McManus was a brigadier general in the Union Army during the Civil War, and is known for his intense spirit of Irish nationalism.

Thomas Francis Meagher was a brigadier general in the Union Army in the Civil War, and was in command of the famous Irish Brigade made up of New York's 69th, 88th, and 63d regiments, the 28th Massachusetts, and 116th Pennsylvania Regiments. Later he was Governor of Montana.

John Mitchell was the only one of the nine convicts who did not hold public office. He was an editor and publisher, and a fearless, caustic writer. He lived in New York City after his escape from prison. In 1862 he became editor of Jefferson Davis' paper, the Richmond Enquirer; this caused a breach with his Irish friends who were all fighting on the Union side.

When the war ended, two of Mitchell's sons had been killed while soldiers in the Confederate Army; Mitchell's property in Richmond had been destroyed by fire in the siege of Richmond, and Mitchell was imprisoned in Fortress Monroe with Jefferson Davis. When he was released, he returned to New York, became reconciled with his old friends, and took an active part in the Fenian movement to free Ireland. In 1874 he returned to Ireland and was elected to the British Parliament from County Tipperary. Then ensued a vitriolic battle between Mitchell and the Prime Minister. Mitchell refused to take the oath of allegiance to Queen Victoria, and the Prime Minister insisted he could not be seated because he was an escaped convict. In the midst of the controversy Mitchell died.

His grandson, John Purroy Mitchell became the Fusion mayor of New York in 1913.

No matter how one may view the Irish contribution to America, these facts cannot be controverted. In the 48 States of the United States there are 253 counties bearing distinctive Irish names; there are 65 places beginning with "O"; there are 1,000 places beginning with "Mc"; there are 7,000 places bearing Irish names; there are 24 Dublins; 24 Waterfords; 18 Belfasts; 16 Tyrone's; and 10 Limericks.

Irish blood, brain, and brawn have played a valiant part in the fabric of America, and the people of Irish descent may take a pardonable pride in the Irish contribution to the development and preservation of the American Government.

The Law of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, on George Washington's birthday last week, February 22, Robert Post, of Glenshaw, Pa., a constituent of mine, was awarded the George Washington Honor Medal by the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa.

This coveted honor was bestowed upon Mr. Post because of his achievement in producing a motion picture entitled "The Law of the Land." The picture was selected from over one hundred submitted as being distinctly effective in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life during the year 1954.

Of particular interest to us is the fact that the Congress of the United States is the "star" of Mr. Post's picture. His story is that of a proposed bill being made a law of the land. It is told in a highly dramatic style and captures all the significant highlights, the heat and heartaches, the trials and tribulations that go into making a law.

Special permission was given to Mr. Post to set up his cameras in the House of Representatives and the Senate. His cast is one that I am sure would be a Hollywood casting agent's dream. It includes our present and former Speaker, the President of the United States and the Vice President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and many individual members of the House and Senate.

The film is strictly nonpartisan and attempts only to tell the story of how we make laws with proper emphasis on, democratic principles at work. It has received enthusiastic reviews from educators, civic leaders, fraternal groups and service clubs all over the Nation.

A comparative newcomer into the field of documentary motion pictures, Mr. Post conceived the idea for The Law of

the Land, wrote the story and was the "spark-plug" behind the picture's production. To him and to all those who worked with him to make his achievement and award possible, I offer my most sincere congratulations.

German Assets in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following up-to-date editorial from the New York Times of March 9, concerning German assets in the United States, is worthy of our attention.

We, in the Congress, are prone to overlook minorities, no matter how just their case. I am afraid we are more interested at times in the number of votes than in the case of justice for the individual.

There are some cases, not many, of elderly women who were married to German nationals in the days when a woman had to relinquish her American citizenship when marrying a foreigner and assume his nationality. These women had trust funds set up for them by their American parents who did not want their money taken out of the United States. During the last war these trust funds were confiscated by the Attorney General's Office. These individuals are now to have their claims settled at the rate of \$10,000 per head. With luck, they may get an income of \$500 a year. Their money, these trust funds are American money and American trust funds. Not 1 penny has ever left the United States or been invested outside this country. These funds have been taxed, and have paid taxes into the United States Treasury. Only the income was sent to foreign nationals.

Mr. Speaker, this is a new approach to the problems resulting from the dislocations caused by war. Maybe it is true that we should proceed on the theory that "to the victor belong the spoils," but it is not justice, and it is not American.

The New York Times editorial follows:

GERMAN ASSETS IN THE UNITED STATES

The United States and Germany have reached a preliminary understanding on an American plan calling for a partial return of German property in this country seized during the war. According to this plan, which must still be approved by Congress, the United States proposes to return such property to individual owners in West Germany up to a maximum of \$10,000 per person, and to restore all German copyrights, trademarks, and cultural property. The same formula will be applied to residents of East Germany when Germany is reunited.

Germany welcomes this plan as a constructive step, but it is not a final solution in either principle or substance. The property is to be returned as a matter of grace, not as a matter of respect for private property—a principle to which the United States has frequently pledged itself and which it observed in large measure after the First World

War. Furthermore, the plan does not cover corporate property, which constitutes the bulk of the \$450 million worth of German assets seized. This is left to future settlement.

The problem has been complicated, first, by the ruthless Nazi treatment of private property, which prompted European nations to look askance at any return of German property; and second, by counterclaims of American nationals against Germany for war damages. The latter claims are now to be settled up to a maximum of \$10,000 in each case, from a fund of \$100 million to be set aside out of payments made by Germany for American economic aid after the war. But taking into consideration the scandals attending the alien property administration after the First World War, the use of such property for political rewards after the last war and the long delays in and exorbitant cost of any settlement, it cannot be said that the treatment of private property constitutes the most glorious chapter in the history of Western democracy. The sooner that problem is finally solved with full vindication for the principles for which we stand the better will we be able to meet the Communist challenge to the free world.

Commemoration of Hungarian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution, adopted on March 5, 1955, at the commemoration of Hungarian independence, Hunter College, New York City:

Whereas Hungary by tradition and history had been the bastion of Christianity since the 14th century and by three centuries of continuous fighting at the sacrifice of 4 million of her people, had secured peace and progress for Western Europe; and

Whereas the unjust and cruel consequences of the agreements of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam have led to Hungary's subjection to Soviet domination and Communist rule; and

Whereas the Hungarian people have never ceased to remain dedicated to national independence, individual freedom, and western cultural standards as has been demonstrated even under Soviet military occupation at the 1945 and 1947 elections; and

Whereas the present Communist regime and Soviet colonial exploitation are being maintained in Hungary only by violent domination by the Red army and arbitrary rule by the Communist secret police; and

Whereas the Hungarian people silenced by Communist terrorism have been deprived of all possibilities of expressing their true will and communicating with the free world: Therefore,

We assemble tonight under the banner of "free Americans for free Hungary," and raise our voice in behalf of our brethren in protest against their subjugation and the intolerable slavery into which they have been plunged: Be it

Resolved, That we herewith create a committee representing 1 million Americans of Hungarian descent and designate the American Hungarian Federation as our agent. The federation is herewith authorized and

directed to submit our appeal to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and simultaneously to call upon him as the leader not only of the American people but of the free world, to reaffirm his solemn pledge against all tyrannies, never to compromise for the sake of illusory coexistence, those eternal ideals of national freedom and human rights defended throughout American history and to do all in his power to liberate our enslaved people from under Soviet tyranny and Communist degradation.

Tax Cut Move Purely Political

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Tax Cut Move Purely Political," which appeared in the Grand Haven (Mich.) Daily Tribune on March 5, 1955:

The obvious purpose of the House Democratic move to write a \$20 income tax cut for everyone was, and still is, political.

Fortunately, a Senate committee blocked action in its chamber to include this provision in its version of the bill, which the House had written into the administration's recommendations. This hasn't blocked a similar move on the Senate floor, but it has put a temporary kink in the tactic.

President Eisenhower properly described as irresponsible the proposal which would have cost the Treasury an estimated \$2,200,000,000 in revenue.

We don't say that the Republicans have all the right answers on tax legislation. There was widespread feeling that the GOP hurt itself in the last session of Congress by not making more allowances for the so-called little fellow. But blanket reductions of this nature, which have no scientific application to the whole problem of maintaining a balance between tax revenue and Government costs, could be both inflationary and dangerous to the national economy.

Nor do we claim that President Eisenhower has done all he could to bring down the high cost of government. He has a much improved record over the preceding Truman administration in this respect, but the money still being poured into projects abroad could stand some sharp scrutiny.

We simply contend that a "\$20 cut for all" is an oversimplification of the tax problem. The aim of any tax structure is to maintain balance and proportion. You kill initiative if you have nothing more to offer in a tax program than to "soak the rich." And you aren't solving the problem of ability to pay by spreading a somewhat nominal tax cut among all and sundry.

Not only have Republican Presidents had to combat this pernicious congressional habit of trying to upset the tax appellation for the benefit of a few votes back home, but both President Roosevelt and President Truman had to resist similar moves to embarrass the executive branch of Government.

This sort of slap-happy politicking provokes a great deal of the trouble in this country. It reflects on the ability of some of the Congressmen to dig into the tax problem realistically. The whole strategy seems to be to make the voter think that his dear Congressman is for him by trying to buy his support, as it were, with a \$20 bill. This is all the more ridiculous in the light of con-

gressional determination to boost its own pay checks by no miserly amount.

Let's get that budget in balance before we resort to the political wrecking bars.

Who Are the Disciples of Christ?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, an article *Who Are the Disciples of Christ?*, appeared in the November 30, 1954 issue of *Look* magazine. It describes the beliefs, background and emphases of the Disciples of Christ Churches—usually known locally as Christian Churches. The Disciples of Christ Churches, according to latest figures, number more than 8,000 comprising a membership of nearly 2 million. The Disciples of Christ have been leaders among protestantism in working with other religious communions in cooperative efforts through the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America and the World Council of Churches. It is not a sect—but one of the larger protestant communions in the United States and around the world.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article entitled "Who Are the Disciples of Christ?"

(By James E. Craig, elder and trustee of the Park Avenue Christian Church, New York City)

Who are the Disciples of Christ? The Disciples of Christ constitute the largest indigenous American religious group, with around 1,800,000 adult communicants and some 8,000 autonomous congregations. In point of origin, the beliefs of the Disciples are as American as the Declaration of Independence. In point of liberty of individual conscience, they are as American as the Bill of Rights.

Some will say that the Disciples of Christ are a great evangelical Protestant denomination. Others will say that they are not a denomination at all, but the pure New Testament Church of Christ. Still others will prefer to describe them as a brotherhood, or a communion. Perhaps the most favored word among Disciples themselves is movement—a movement back to the New Testament and forward under God to ultimate unity of all who call themselves Christians.

Of the total of 1,800,000 communicants, some 1,300,000 are members of congregations cooperating through the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, which is a voluntary fellowship of local churches in the United States and Canada and of their various missionary, benevolent, and educational agencies. A "reporting convention" rather than a legislative body, it presents recommendations on every subject affecting the movement. These are advisory only, but, such is the convention's prestige, most of the recommendations are accepted by local congregations. Any Disciple may attend its meetings and vote. In this article, the word "Disciples" (unless otherwise specified) relates only to the congregations cooperating through the international convention.

What are the tenets of their creed? The Disciples have no creed but Christ and no

doctrines save those which are found in the New Testament or are reasonably to be inferred therefrom. The Disciples are God-centered, Christ-centered, Bible-centered, with no creedal formula but one—the answer of the Apostle Peter to a question from Jesus Himself: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." Open confession of this faith and acceptance of the Nazarene as Lord and Savior, and baptism (by immersion) are all that may be demanded of a candidate for admission. The Disciples are inclined to regard formal creeds and historical sects as milestones on the highway of an evolving theology.

The Disciples believe in the priesthood of all believers; that is, that the believer can reach the Throne of Grace without any human intermediary. According to authorizations they find in the New Testament, they have evangelists, pastors, elders, and deacons. But they look upon these officers only as useful instruments sanctioned by the Apostles. They never doubt the right of any man to go directly to God, by prayer, for guidance in all problems arising in the conscience. They place absolute trust in divine mercy and good will. They nevertheless encourage pastoral consultation and advice.

How do the Disciples differ from other Protestants? Disciples have no catechism and no prescribed rituals. Disciples do not accept the doctrine of apostolic succession. Hence, they have no archbishops or bishops or hierarchy of ecclesiastical authority. They interpret the New Testament words for "bishop" and "elder" as synonyms for a single lay office, elective by the congregation, and in no sense authorized or regulated from above.

Disciples believe that confession of faith in Jesus as the Christ requires no added metaphysical doctrine. They regard conversion as a voluntary, rational act which does not require special revelation. In receiving a new member, they take the applicant's statement at face value. They employ no formula of interrogation.

Disciples believe that a Christian's right to Holy Communion is a matter for his own conscience. They admit to the Lord's Supper any baptized person, without regard to his secretarial affiliation.

Perhaps the most notable difference between Disciples and many other Protestant groups is the Disciples' emphasis upon individual liberty of opinion; upon each believer's right to interpret the Scriptures in his own way.

Disciples base their whole appeal upon a simple outline of faith and a democratic system of church government. They have no sense of rivalry among the denominations. They hold that so long as a member accepts the simple faith and the idea of democratic government in the church he may believe what his mind dictates about many of the tenets of other Christian bodies.

Disciples observe with joy that the differences among Protestants are receiving less and less attention today, while the many things they have in common are receiving more and more. To Disciples, the rising trend toward mutual grounds of faith marks a steady advance toward ultimate church unity. And in this field the Disciples have made their influence most heavily felt. They have been in the forefront of almost every important cooperative and ecumenical movement. Thirty-nine Disciples were active in establishing the old Federal Council of Churches; 200 are enrolled in the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America; 14 Disciple leaders serve the World Council of Churches.

What do the Disciples believe about the Bible? The Disciples share the common Protestant belief that the Bible (except for the apocryphal books) is the word of God, written by different persons at different times under the inspiration of the Holy

Spirit. They use the Old Testament for meditation and instruction, as a schoolmaster bringing the faithful to Christ.

Many Disciples believe, however, that the Old Testament represents two dispensations—one for the patriarchal age before Moses, the other for the age from Moses to the resurrection of Jesus. These accept the New Testament as a third and purely Christian dispensation, for the guidance of Christian churches and peoples.

In common with other Christian bodies, the disciples have their fundamentalists and their liberals. The literalists, or fundamentalists, accept every word of the authorized version of the Bible as the infallible word of God. The liberals believe that newer translations, and the studies of inspired scholars, have thrown new light upon many passages of the Scriptures. There is nothing to prevent liberals and literalists from sitting down together around the table of the Lord's Supper, each responsible for his own beliefs and each serving God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Do disciples believe in the Holy Trinity? The disciples have had little trouble in discarding most of the dogmas which sprang up between the 1st century and the 19th. Hence, speculation about the Holy Trinity has bothered them little or not at all. They baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as Christ commanded. They believe that the Holy Spirit is the comforter promised in the New Testament, but they do not worry over its constitution or the nature of its operations. They accept its guidance as constantly enlarging the horizons of Christian thought. They are not concerned about such matters as original sin and predestination.

Whom do the disciples baptize? They baptize only those adult enough to know what they are doing. They baptize by immersion, believing it to have been the New Testament way—an act of obedience and surrender, a symbol of the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus.

Do the disciples believe in the Virgin birth? It is probable that about 99 percent of them do. It is possible that others have doubts. But there is no authority—except in individual congregations—which can accept one belief as orthodox and reject the other as heretical.

What do the disciples believe about sin and salvation? No answer covering all the congregations is possible. The disciples as a rule reject the doctrine of original sin; but most of them believe that we are all sinful creatures unless redeemed by the saving sacrifice of the Lord Jesus.

Early in the history of the movement, the conception gained ground that a reasonable God would not leave His creatures without a rational plan of salvation which any person could understand and follow. Walter Scott, a kinsman of the novelist, was perhaps the first notable exponent of this idea. He suggested a five-fold plan: Faith, repentance, baptism, newness of life, gift of the Holy Spirit. By faith, he meant a sincere belief in the power and goodness of God. By repentance, he meant not merely sorrow for past misdeeds but perfect contrition, coupled with resolution not to sin again. By baptism, he meant obedience to a command of the Savior and emulation of the example of the apostles. By newness of life, he meant such conduct thereafter as would be void of further offense to God and of scandal to the church. By the gift of the Holy Spirit he meant the coming of the indwelling comforter promised in the Gospels.

It was Walter Scott's belief that when a sinner honestly fulfilled these requirements, he had no need to look for some mystical inner manifestation of saving grace.

Do the Disciples believe in heaven and hell? Here, again, it is difficult to give an answer that will prove satisfactory to all

members of the fellowship. Almost all believe in the immortality of the soul and in a blissful reunion hereafter for all the faithful who have died in the Lord. Many doubtless believe in a literal Paradise and a literal hell. Others are content to leave the details of future rewards and punishments to Divine mercy. Disciple faith in general is a matter of personal conviction, rooted in confidence that the Kingdom of God will prove invincible.

How did the Disciples begin? The Disciples began by the confluence of two main currents of religious thought. One, that of the Christian church, developed in Kentucky and Ohio under Barton W. Stone. The other, that of a body which came to call itself Disciples of Christ, developed in western Pennsylvania and western Virginia under Thomas Campbell, his son Alexander Campbell, and Walter Scott. All these men, known as the Big Four, were of Presbyterian antecedents; all were well-educated according to the scholarship of their time, which laid emphasis upon Greek, Latin, and Hebrew.

These scholars and religious statesmen cast their lot among pioneers. In the early 19th century, a great westward migration was in swing. Men and women of various church allegiances found church homes among denominations with which they were familiar. Many others were unchurched wanderers. Out of this emergency, a great opportunity and a great vision came into flower.

The opportunity was that of bringing all these drifters into a single Christian fold. The vision was that of an ultimately united Protestant Church. This revolutionary idea cannot be ascribed to any one person. As early as 1803, Stone and his supporters gave voice to it in Kentucky. In 1809, Thomas Campbell gave it literary expression in his Declaration and Address. Scott and such popular preachers as "Raccoon John" Smith, Baptist, of Tennessee, imparted to it an evangelistic fervor. Alexander Campbell, a skillful debater, gave it forensic and theological expression.

Simple as the program may sound, the practical business of putting it into effect encountered enormous difficulties. It was easy enough to say there should be no creed but Christ, and to adopt the ordinance of Baptism, by immersion, and weekly observance of the Lord's supper. After the New Testament was declared to be the guide for Christian faith and practice, it seemed logically possible to ask for strict fidelity to the essentials of faith while allowing complete liberty of opinion regarding the non-essentials. Here, of course, came the rub: How do you decide what the essentials are and who is to make the decision? The distinction has troubled individual disciples to this day.

Are the disciples of Christ, Christian church, and churches of Christ all the same? In 1832, the disciples of the East and the Christians of the West came together in a single union. From that day on, the term "Christian Church" has been more commonly used in the Midwest and South; the term "disciples of Christ" has been favored in the East. In the international convention, and in many congregations, the words are used interchangeably. Two other groups formerly called themselves Churchian Churches. One of them, James O'Kelly's group, called itself Republican Methodists and then changed its name to Christian. A New England group has since united with the Congregationalists as the Congregational-Christian Church.

One branch from the family tree of Disciples and Christian Churches calls its congregations Churches of Christ. Its members form an extremely conservative body, adhering literally to the New Testament. It does not, in the main, believe in instrumental music in churches, in missionary societies or in other matters for which its

members see no specific authorization in the New Testament. Other conservative congregations do not support the international convention for reasons concerning New Testament interpretation.

Do the Disciples have an ordained ministry? Except in a few remote sections where ordained ministers are not available, almost all the cooperating churches do have ordained pastors. In an emergency, an elder or other layman may fill the pulpit. Elders usually, but not always, conduct the communion service.

In the early days, distrust of clericalism was so great that ministers were called elder, not reverent, and the wearing of gowns or cassocks in the pulpit was looked upon as smacking of prelacy. (Both these prejudices have now largely passed away.) No important distinction was made between clergy and laity. Indeed, any elder could perform any ministerial duty—except that of performing marriage ceremonies, a function usually regulated by the State. Certain weaknesses in this system became obvious. Congregations began to demand ordained pastors, especially trained for the ministry. Today, more than 34 Disciple colleges, universities, and biblical training schools are trying to keep abreast of that demand.

What are the Disciples' views on divorce? There is no central church authority on this subject. In practice, ministers and congregations differ in their attitudes. Some believe that the questions propounded to Jesus by Pharisees were trick questions based on then current Jewish law, and that what Jesus answered must be viewed in that light. Some take the Master's answer as binding and oppose any remarriage of divorced persons. Others are willing to consent to remarriage of the innocent party in a divorce obtained on the ground of adultery. Still others, perhaps a majority, believe that divorce has become a legal function of the State, and do not hesitate to remarry any person to whom the civil government has accorded the right of remarriage.

What are the Disciples' views on birth control? The old Disciple rule is that where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where they are silent, we are silent. There can be no doubt, however, that a majority of Disciple ministers believe that, in certain circumstances, birth control is justifiable. The one sure test of this attitude rests in the fact that no Disciple minister can be silenced, either by the brotherhood at large or by his own congregation. By the terms of his ordination, each considers himself empowered, as were the prophets of old, to denounce whatever he considers amiss in the life of his people—and silence seems to give at least a modified consent. In general, Disciples are content to leave such matters as birth control to the individual consciences of husband and wife.

What is the church service like? Sunday morning worship in Disciple churches follows pretty much the same pattern. With or without processions, and with or without organ, the service begins with the singing of hymns. This is followed by responsive readings, recitation of the Lord's Prayer, reading the Scriptures, pastoral prayer, an anthem or two, sermon, invitation to fellowship, gathering of tithes and offerings, communion service, benediction, and final hymn or recessional. Sometimes communion precedes the sermon. On occasion, the sermon may be omitted, but never communion. Many Disciples attribute their large and steady gains in membership to the weekly practice of offering the right hand of fellowship to all who desire to join a congregation.

How are the Disciples governed? The average Disciple church is governed by a pastor, an official board of elders, deacons, deaconesses, and perhaps representatives of the

Christian Women's Fellowship. Women are taking an increasingly greater part in disciplic activities, from pulpit to pew.

Elders look after the spiritual welfare of members; deacons manage incidental business. Laymen play a growing part; at least 50 laymen are giving national service at heavy financial sacrifices to themselves. The Christian Women's Fellowship and the Christian Men's Fellowship have a membership in excess of 200,000 each.

All matters of fundamental importance must ultimately be decided by the congregation as a whole. Trials for heresy are almost unknown among the Disciples, although withdrawals of fellowship for immoral or scandalously un-Christian conduct are subjects for congregational action. Disciples believe that only the Lord himself can expel any person from the Church Universal.

Do the disciples believe theirs the only true religion? Certainly not. They believe theirs to be most nearly in accord with the early Christian churches. They also believe that their greatest mission in life is to bring Christians of all faiths into one church of Christ. Their ancient retort to an ancient gibe about their name was to say: "We are not the only Christians, but are Christians only."

Great Game of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial entitled "Great Game of Politics," from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of March 7, 1955:

Early climax of the "\$20 income-tax cut for everybody" political game is in sight.

It appears all but certain that the Senate will turn down the rider attached to an administration bill by House Democrats and passed there 205 to 201. Senator BYRD of Virginia, who with his fiscally astute Democratic colleague, Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, won a 9 to 6 vote against it in the Finance Committee, says he will have a minimum of 10 Democratic Senators on his side.

Then it would go to Senate-House conference, where Senator BYRD hopes to get it disposed of as soon as possible.

One victory for responsible fiscal policy has been won and another is in sight.

But even though the rider is finally thrown out, we shall not have heard the last of it.

The irresponsible proposal is sure to be campaign material for 1956.

At this point, its House sponsors probably don't much care if it is doomed to defeat. They can say they tried to reduce taxes, and that's enough of a claim for a stump-speaker.

It has even been suggested that the House Democratic leadership did not actually expect or want the rider finally adopted.

Certainly the leaders must have known that Senator BYRD and Senator GEORGE would oppose it, with good prospects of success. The reputations of these men, in matters fiscal, are such that they could not be compromised by politically inspired but reckless moves.

If and when the rider is unhorsed, they will have made their point, however. A majority of Democrats will have voted for tax reduction.

It will then be up to the Republicans to shoulder the far more difficult task of defending a realistic and equitable, but far less flashy, tax policy.

Although the \$20 tax handout is a thoroughly bad idea, it may be hard to convince the 5- to 7-million small taxpayers whom it would relieve of all income tax liability.

It is a bad idea, to begin with, because it is no time to reduce taxes when the budget is still unbalanced and when at the same time personal income is the highest in the Nation's history and still rising. To do so means more deficit financing, further postponement of the reckoning, more taxes in the long run because a higher debt results in additional interest payments.

This particular tax-cut plan is particularly bad because it is not a part of a coherent tax proposal, but something tacked onto the administration's own carefully conceived program for tax reduction as that becomes practical.

The method of offering it was, indeed, suspect. It showed that its sponsors had no hope of getting it passed on its merits. They tacked it onto the bill to extend present corporation and excise rates which are now due to drop on April 1. In other words, they added a tax-cutting proposal to a tax-raising proposal.

It was a spectacular gesture, but we give enough credit to the Democrats to assume they wouldn't really want to be responsible for a tax cut that might or might not be justified by the time it would go into effect. It is more generous to assume they are simply playing the great old game of politics.

To the Eyes and Ears of the World We Must Seem Pretty Silly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we must seem pretty silly in the eyes and ears of the world when we look upon certain incidents occurring within our own shores.

We are spending billions of dollars to stop communism all over the world, and yet permit known Communists freedom of action within our own shores.

To give an idea of such an incident, I would like to quote from a newspaper column appearing in the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune. In the column, titled "Between Us," by Siinto Wessman, there appears the following very pertinent and oh so truthful, pointed statement:

Knut Heikkinen . . . the man convicted of being a commie-alien . . . still doing whatever commie-alien do on a newspaper in Superior . . . the Tyomies . . . Government has tried to deport him for 4 years . . . but every time, Knut appeals . . . He's now free on \$5,000 bail while court of appeals ponders his case . . . Here we spend 15 million bucks on the Duluth airbase . . . to defend ourselves against them . . . while one of their number runs around loose in our own backyard.

I want to say that Siinto Wessman speaks the mind and the heart of many millions of Americans who are getting pretty impatient with our silk-glove treatment of Communists within our own midst.

The Navy Needs the "Forrestal" Type Carrier as Replacement for World War II Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1955, Adm. D. B. Duncan, United States Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, read the following statement of Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, to the House Armed Services Committee, urging support for the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding and conversion program.

Admiral Carney's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ADM. ROBERT B. CARNEY, UNITED STATES NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WITH RESPECT TO H. R. 4393

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to have my personal statement with respect to H. R. 4393 presented to you today by the Vice Chief of Naval Operations.

This bill incorporates the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding and conversion program, approved by the President, and for which we are now seeking funds from the Congress. Mindful that this committee already has an extensive knowledge of the Navy's shipbuilding requirements, it is my intention to present as concise and meaningful a picture as possible to this group, dealing with the program as a whole, and then follow by a more detailed discussion of one item in the program. I thank the committee for giving its time and attention to this program, so important to the Navy.

At the outset I should like to comment on the relation of military strategy to national policy. The fundamental character of military strategy derives from and must be in consonance with national policy. The Armed Forces functioning in accordance with approved military strategy are thus carrying out the mission of support of the national policy, from which a large number of functions and activities extend. Since our Government, to mention a few examples, is a party to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which ties us to the general area of Europe, from the North Cape to north Africa and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Middle East, and since we have mutual security arrangements with many of the nations in the western and southwestern Pacific, not to mention those in our own hemisphere, and since national policy involves cooperation and collaboration with the free nations of the world, it is evident that our grand military strategy must be a forward one. From the fact that our grand military strategy is a forward one is derived the Navy's overall task to control the seas. The proper performance of this task is essential in order to project the power of our Armed Forces overseas and to any part of the world where it is needed and includes direct and positive support of the land battle and the air battle in overseas theaters of operation. The Navy is a primary and indispensable element in the projection of military power to overseas areas and naval airpower is an essential element in all phases of naval operations. The Navy on the sea, under the sea, and in the air, may well be the factor which determines whether a war is fought far from our

shores or in our own homeland. This is important. Ships and aircraft and the means of operating them, of the kinds and numbers required to fight in the kind of a war which we may expect if we are so unfortunate as to be plunged into one, are essentials to the Navy, and a continuing, progressive and forward looking shipbuilding program is a good part of the lifeblood of the Navy.

The basic objective of our annual shipbuilding and conversion programs is direct and clear-cut. Each is an increment of a longer range plan, designed to maintain the most modern Navy possible, with the needs of the future always in mind.

The two most important factors affecting our programs are, first, the specter of obsolescence and block obsolescence as it affects many of our existing ships; and, second, the vital necessity of maintaining the lead in today's race in the technological field. There are other factors which we must take into consideration. Our programs must be orderly, keeping pace with evolutionary transition, for it would neither be practicable nor desirable to replace the entire fleet at once. We will always have some old and some new. We must consider the importance of maintaining the know-how and mobilization base in the shipbuilding industry.

In preparing our annual shipbuilding and conversion program, we are also mindful of the naval capabilities of unfriendly powers. While such naval capabilities do not directly control the level of our forces, they do have a most definite impact on the tasks that we will have to accomplish. In the case of the Soviet Navy the most dangerous element is its submarine force. A large part of the U. S. S. R. undersea craft, now estimated at about 350, are modern and are certain to be well-armed and equipped. While we have no information that the U. S. S. R. has built, or is building, aircraft carriers, the number of Soviet naval aircraft is upwards of 3,000. This weakness in the lack of aircraft carriers is a weakness which we must exploit, and for which, I may add, we may take some measure of comfort. Soviet naval construction of surface combat ships, as well as submarines, is increasing. Both cruisers and destroyers in relatively large numbers have been built by the Soviets since the end of World War II. The U. S. S. R. has more ships in active service in commission than any other navy except our own.

Of major importance—our programs must place the emphasis on hitting power rather than on massive numbers of ships, mindful that balance must be retained.

Most of the ships now in our active and reserve fleets are World War II vintage; many have already passed the midpoint of their useful life expectancy. Unless a continuing and orderly shipbuilding and replacement program is provided, large numbers will become obsolete at about the same time, and because of the long lead-time for building ships, it would be impossible to replace these ships in a relatively short time, even if unlimited authorization and funds were available. In the technological weapons race of our era, yesterday's or even today's weapons in old or new hulls soon become marginal or obsolescent. We must not fail to continue our strenuous drive to develop new weapons, and when ready, to incorporate them in our ships without delay.

Our shipbuilding and conversion program is designed to achieve a proper balance between useful modernizing of the old and acquisition of new and advanced types with modern characteristics not achievable through modernization, and we are mindful of the need for proper phasing of our programs in order that economy and efficiency may both be realized to greater measure.

In every case where it would be economical and practicable to modernize an existing type, we have taken that course; but

where an existing hull cannot meet the need, or where a conversion would be disproportionately costly in the light of future value of the ship, we have requested that a new ship be built. I think that the committee understands that the point of diminishing returns is eventually reached with regard to the modernization of existing ships. When that point is reached, we must either replace the ship or vacate its place in the fleet.

My own philosophy with respect to this program may be briefly stated as follows:

It is a program designed around long-range needs—the fast carrier task force, to project airpower where it will be most effective; the development and employment of nuclear power for propulsion; weapons modernization, including missiles; greater sea-keeping qualities in our ships; and last, but far from least, the improvement of our anti-submarine effort, including the procurement of a few prototype escort types which could be produced rapidly and cheaply with a minimum of material and labor.

The bill before you would authorize and direct the President to undertake the construction of, or to acquire and convert, 34 naval vessels, large and small, plus about 14,000 tons of landing craft; and to convert or modernize 28 existing ships. The individual types and their respective tonnages are listed in the bill, but in summary, I should like to indicate briefly, for the more important items some of the features or reasons why they are included in the program.

(a) One, *Forrestal* type carrier has been requested in the program in order to continue an orderly replacement program of World War II carriers; to meet the operational demands of carrier aircraft envisioned for the future, such as requirements for increased catapult capacity, increased arresting gear capacity, stronger flight decks, larger elevators with higher lifting capacity, higher hangar deck overhead to accommodate larger aircraft; and in order to provide for increased jet fuel capacity, greater speed, and survival power.

(b) Eight submarines, three of which are nuclear powered, and five with improved conventional diesel powerplants. One of the latter will have guided missile capabilities.

We attach great importance to the 3 nuclear-powered submarines, 1 of which is a large radar-picket submarine. They represent a progressive advance in nuclear power, and will incorporate the latest developments available. The 3 nuclear-powered submarines represent a part of our continuing efforts to phase in nuclear power for ship propulsion as rapidly as practicable, depending upon the state of the art and upon the capacity of industry to produce the required powerplants. This transition must proceed in a prudent, orderly, and forward-looking manner, recognizing that development of nuclear-power propulsion is still in its infancy, and that the ships which we build must be useful for many years.

The 5 submarines with conventional propulsion systems are included in the program as a part of our efforts to overcome the acute problem of block obsolescence in this type. I would point out that the conventional propulsion powerplants are not obsolescent, or will they become so in the near future. The submarines in this program, with the diesel-electric-propulsion machinery, will have many advanced features, including new weapons, deep-diving capacity, and are badly needed in the fleet. We cannot afford to delay submarine construction until adequate nuclear powerplants are proven and available. We are confident that the conventional powerplants in the 5 non-nuclear-powered submarines in this program will be useful and effective for the life of the ship.

(c) World War II destroyers are rapidly becoming obsolescent, and on a modest re-

placement basis, we are requesting as new construction:

(1) Seven conventional destroyers with the latest antiaircraft armament, sonar, and antisubmarine weapons.

(2) Six frigates, a type similar to the destroyer *Leader* previously constructed, which will now also be classified as frigates. These ships will have improved antisubmarine and antiaircraft warfare capabilities, and improved sea-keeping qualities. We now plan that 3 of the 6 will have guided-missiles capabilities.

(3) Two escort vessels. Upon mobilization there will be a requirement for a large number of escorts for merchant convoys and slower naval forces, and these new escort vessels are being developed as a low-cost prototype that could be mass produced.

(d) The program includes 3 auxiliary ships—2 fast ammunition ships, and 1 fast general stores issue ship. In the design of these ships, consideration was given to increased speed and to a more rapid replenishment-at-sea rate.

The principal items in the conversion program are:

(1) The installation of angled decks on six carriers to gain improved performance from jet aircraft, plus the additional safety factor inherent in the angled deck.

(2) One austere conversion of a light cruiser to carry the Talos missile and one conversion of a destroyer to carry the Terrier missile. Again, these are prototypes.

(3) To permit the Navy to carry out its commitments in support of continental defense, it is planned to convert 12 escort vessels and 4 Liberty hull cargo vessels into radar picket ships. This is a continuation of a previous program.

The ships in this program have been recommended by me as Chief of Naval Operations, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, and the President. It has been included as a program deemed essential by those who are responsible not only for the effectiveness of our naval forces, but also by those of the executive branch, who have great responsibilities for the security of the United States and the responsibility of making recommendations in the premises to the Congress. Notwithstanding the approval by these officials, some questions have been raised with respect to the carrier included in this program and therefore, I feel it would be appropriate to discuss in more detail the need for this particular ship.

I mentioned earlier that we place greatest dependence on hitting power rather than on massive numbers of ships. Our greatest hitting power today is spearheaded by our mobile carrier task force, and this bespeaks the importance attached to developments in aircraft carriers, aircraft, weapons and techniques, in order that we keep abreast of technological advances. It is essential that we keep abreast if we expect to carry out effectively our missions and tasks.

Our striking power must be available on D-day to initiate immediately our offensive and defensive tasks.

The inescapable effects of age are such that by 1965 we will have only 7 attack carriers fully capable of operating our high performance aircraft if the carrier program is discontinued; and 3 of the 7 would be 16 to 20 years old. Six more ships, incorporating every possible improvement, will have become marginal in capability. Such a situation would not meet the security requirements as envisaged today by those who are responsible for the military security of the United States.

It is the clearly and emphatically stated policy of our Government today that we should strengthen our airpower. The President has defined the United States airpower as the total airpower of the military forces.

The foregoing considerations constitute the basis for including an aircraft carrier in the fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program.

For the nuclear deterrent role, the United States must possess striking forces which are powerful, varied in their nature and employment, and as invulnerable to surprise attack as we can make them. They must be varied in character because, if we were to rely on only one type of striking force, the enemy's defense problem would be much more easily solved, or he might more easily persuade himself he has solved it, and in this belief launch his surprise attack. A variety of types of forces also lessens the vulnerability of our national striking power to any single type of enemy attack. A mobile base, for example, will not be vulnerable to the very long-range ballistics missiles of the 1960-70 era. A sea base can be more readily defended against many forms of air attack, particularly in the atomic area. The sea base from which we can employ airpower, offensively and defensively, on the seas and contiguous land areas where the use of airpower would otherwise be unfeasible, impracticable, or impossible, is the carrier striking force. I would like to evaluate the capabilities of a carrier striking force.

A sea-based carrier striking force has the following capabilities:

1. An ability to deliver nuclear weapons in considerable quantity.

2. An ability to deliver such weapons against the very bases from which the enemy may challenge our control of the seas, such as enemy submarine pens, or other bases from which the enemy might operate vessels or aircraft against our forces.

3. Dispersal of part of our national power upon the sea where it is able to move about and thus, because it does not remain in a fixed position, reduce its likelihood of destruction.

4. An ability to operate effectively against targets the destruction of which requires very accurate delivery of weapons.

5. An ability to participate readily and effectively in "brush fire" type of warfare, such as Korean war and the Tachens, while retaining a power to join in an all-out nuclear attack.

6. An ability readily to shift pressure as the center of the threat shifts without constructing new bases and without danger of the old base falling into enemy hands.

7. And finally, the carrier striking force represents power that we can place overseas and use as we will, without negotiation or consultation with foreign governments, and without the advance build-up for which there may not always be time.

I can state unequivocally that the most important ship in the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program is the aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class. This ship, together with the four *Forrestal* class carriers previously authorized, is necessarily larger than any of our present carriers in order to be able to operate, without restrictions, new and more powerful carrier aircraft, as I have mentioned earlier. The modernization program for World War II carriers has permitted the Navy to date to keep abreast of carrier aircraft development and the needs of naval aviation. However, the practical limit for a substantial improvement of these carriers is clearly in sight. Anticipating this situation, the Navy designed the *Forrestal* class carrier with aeronautical and other features which will provide substantial operating margins for aircraft envisioned for its useful life. The *Forrestal* class carrier is a logical and forward looking step in the development of a proven weapon.

Carrier forces are deemed essential elements of the Armed Forces and are incorporated in approved force levels recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and approved by the Secretary of Defense and the

President for the fiscal year 1956. As a matter of interest, the fiscal year 1956 naval force levels include one more carrier and one more carrier air group than in fiscal year 1955. This, I believe, clearly demonstrates the essentiality of the carrier forces.

Furthermore, the approved force levels for fiscal year 1956 include the operations of the best and most formidable carriers in our inventory, a fact which indicates the necessity for obtaining the best possible capabilities from this essential component.

Under the philosophy that we are girding for the long pull, and are leveling off with powerful forces that can be supported for such a period, it is to be expected that carrier forces will be needed for the foreseeable future, and it is axiomatic that the carrier forces in commission should have the maximum capabilities attainable. The aircraft carrier and the Fast Carrier Task Group make up a vitally important weapons system in which we have a major advantage over our most likely enemy. Any action at this time that would forfeit this advantage would appear to be a most unwise course indeed.

In conclusion, I should like to assure this committee that every ship included in this program is essential. Each type has a definite mission and definite tasks to perform in our concept of modern naval warfare. Each is designed to be useful for the maximum period of time. I earnestly hope that we will have the support of this committee in obtaining approval of this program and I recommend the enactment of H. R. 4393.

Upper Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, while the upper Colorado River storage project is being supported in the following letter by George T. Hansen, Republican national committeeman from Utah, the project is in no wise a partisan affair. I insert in the RECORD Mr. Hansen's letter to show the vital importance of this project to the people of our entire country:

FEBRUARY 14, 1955.

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HAD: For the 3 million people of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the most important issue facing the 84th Congress is the upper Colorado River storage project. It is more than important—it is vital.

Upon the legislative determination of that issue depends the economic life or death of this area. The Colorado River is the last big waterhole and unless the opportunity is provided to utilize their fair share of the water, the end to expansion and growth in these arid States is already in sight.

Paralyzing thirst already is being felt. Water rationing is necessary in some areas and the specter of water shortage discourages future expansion of population as well as industrial and agricultural development.

Water will make of this area the "treasure house of the West," and thus confirm the faith of the pioneers who coined this appropriate designation.

Objections to this project have been circulated from certain sources. The sources

cite opposition to the invasion of Dinosaur National Monument, and the destruction of scenery and natural beauties of the area.

The President of the United States in 1938 made a promise to the people of the West that the extension of the area of Dinosaur Monument would not interfere with power or grazing developments. Provision for power dams preceded the establishment of, and was years ahead of, the monument. Obviously the Echo Park Dam can be no invasion of a national monument.

Contrary to the theory of destruction, the facts are that the beauty of the area actually will be enhanced. Clear, still water will cover only the present flood-washed canyon floors. The impressive canyon walls will tower far above the water level. Their beauties will be made accessible for all Americans to see and enjoy for the first time. The project will open up a new recreational area for millions.

Our national administration has endorsed the Colorado River Storage Project after thorough study and first-hand investigations. The project has the support of the Secretary of the Interior, has been passed by the Bureau of the Budget, and has received favorable action by both the House and Senate committees in the 83d Congress.

No issue more vital to our western area has ever come before the Congress. When it reaches your House, you will have it in your power to provide a new economic life for the people of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. As a resident of the area and a representative of the Republican Party of one of the States vitally concerned, may I earnestly solicit your support.

Sincerely,

GEORGE T. HANSEN,
Republican National Committeeman
from Utah.

The Founder of Czechoslovakia: Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, first president of the Czechoslovak Republic, it is only fitting that we should do him honor. As much as George Washington was the father of our country, Thomas G. Masaryk was the father of his. Yet the people of Czechoslovakia are not permitted to celebrate his birthday, because those who rule Czechoslovakia today represent the negation of everything Thomas G. Masaryk stood for. He stood for truth; they stand for falsehood. He stood for liberty; they stand for the bitterest kind of oppression. He stood for a religious and moral basis of life; they stand for atheistic materialism. He was the friend of America, and they are our sworn enemies.

Under the inspiration of Masaryk, Czechoslovakia became a model of democracy in the heart of Europe. Her fate at Munich left the friends of freedom dismayed. After enduring the worst of Nazi tyranny the Czechoslovak

people looked forward to an era of peace and freedom. Those hopes were cruelly dashed by Communist conspiracy and betrayal. Today the people of Czechoslovakia and the other enslaved peoples of the world need our continued support and encouragement. We will furnish that support and encouragement, for we believe that the spirit of the Czech people is still the spirit of Thomas G. Masaryk.

The Administration's School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner on February 21, 1955, carried a perceptive article on the administration's program for school construction. I commend it to the membership of the House. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD. The article:

WILL IKE'S PROGRAM REALLY HELP SCHOOLS?

In 1950 there were somewhat more than 25 million American school children enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools. Last fall the number had climbed to more than 29 million. By 1960 it is expected to go more than 37 million.

This terrific boom in children is magnificent assurance for the future of America. Yet the United States today is facing a desperate shortage of school buildings and teachers to take care of this unprecedented growth.

The other day President Eisenhower presented the long-awaited administration program to take care of the problem. It met with expressions of bitter disappointment in labor, educational, and liberal circles in general.

"Too inadequate and too cumbersome," was the restrained verdict of leading educators. "Too little and too late" was the tart criticism of political leaders such as Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Labor and Education Committee. A scheme for the benefit of bankers was the even sharper charge of other critics.

The President himself, in his special education message to Congress, said that there was a shortage of more than 300,000 classrooms. In addition "to keep up with mounting enrollments, the Nation must build at least 50,000 new elementary and high school classrooms yearly." It must also replace thousands of classrooms that become unsafe or unusable as the years go by.

To meet this emergency, the President proposed:

1. Bond purchases by the Federal Government from school districts unable to market their bonds at reasonable rates of interest.

2. Federal assistance to States in establishing special school building agencies which would build schools for local school districts on a lease-purchase basis.

3. Federal grants, to be matched by the States, to enable school districts to qualify for either of the first two forms of Federal assistance.

4. Federal grants, to be matched by the States, to stimulate the development of long-range plans to overcome obstacles to school construction.

The President spoke of this program as envisaging a total of \$7 billion over the next

three years. Such were the headlines the program got. Actually, critics answered sharply that the program called for only \$200 million direct Federal aid over the next 3 years, the rest having to come out of State and local financing. Yet it is because the States and local communities don't have the money that most of today's school shortage exists.

From the viewpoint of most critics of the program, the President simply is dumping virtually the whole program back in the laps of the State and local communities. This is in line with general administration policy. But critics declare that the program simply adds the banks which will help float bond issues and dump the whole burden on States and local communities.

American Victory in Korea Twice Abandoned on Orders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are still many big holes in the history of America's first military defeat—in Korea, June 1950–53. But thanks to the determined inquiries of the Jenner Committee on Internal Security, the day-to-day chronicle of Dean Acheson's personal management of the war from the State Department, in Washington, has gradually been unfolded.

Our military forces had two great opportunities to win the Korean war decisively and conclusively. But on each occasion the smashing final stroke of victory was countermanded from Washington. Who ordered the victory twice to be abandoned, and why?

The most recent chapter on Acheson's "limited war" was related on November 23, 1954, by Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, retired, who had been Gen. Douglas MacArthur's chief of staff in Korea. He was asked in public session: "General, how many opportunities did our side have to win the war in Korea?"

His answer, illustrated with 13 field maps from the Korean theater, was two—first, in November 1950, following the historic Inchon envelopment of the North Korean forces; and second, in June 1951, when some 50 Chinese divisions were trapped and routed clear across the peninsula on a line extending roughly from Seoul to Kansong. At that point—2 months after Truman's sacking of General MacArthur—the whole American offensive was halted and abandoned on direct orders from Washington—hearings, page 2109.

Your answer is, then, we had two opportunities to win the war?

I think so—

General Almond responded.

General Almond's testimony comprises 78 printed pages, including 13 detailed operations maps depicting various phases of the Korean war.

We believe—

Said Senator Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, in his opening statement—

That there have been and still are, hostile forces working tirelessly to corrupt, to misdirect, and to destroy us from within. We believe that the most skillful, and the most menacing, of these forces are engaged in trying to subvert our political and military policy.

The Senator then recalled that the committee earlier had heard Gens. Mark Clark, George Stratemeyer, and James Van Fleet.

In each instance, information was gleaned that helped clarify the still confused, partly undisclosed, story of the Korean war. In each instance, it was discovered that these great generals shared our uneasiness and had asked themselves some of the questions the American people are asking—Why? And who? And when? And how will it end?

General Almond was assigned to General MacArthur's staff in Tokyo in June, 1946, advancing to Chief of Staff in February 1949. He returned to duty in the States in July 1951, and retired in January, 1953.

From 60 percent of normal peacetime strength as of October, 1946, MacArthur's command gradually was built up to approximately 75 percent by June 1948; and by June 1950, General Walker's Eighth Army had been built up almost to full peace strength, Almond told the committee.

But peacetime organization meant a battalion of infantry with only 3 companies, instead of 4. It meant a regiment of infantry with only 2 battalions instead of 3. It meant a tank battalion with only 1 company instead of 3. It meant an artillery battalion with 1 battery instead of 3 in it. That was the condition of the Eighth Army when we were faced with throwing our troops into Korea (hearings, p. 2056).

The Communist aggression in Korea broke on June 25, 1950, just 6 months after the British Government had extended formal recognition to the Chinese Communist regime at Peiping.

From the very outset it was a confused and uncertain war.

Many things happened back here that I didn't understand, and I would hesitate to try to assign reasons for them—

General Almond told the committee. In other words—

Questioned Senator WELKER, of Idaho—

Your impression was that the State Department was calling the signals at that time?

That is correct, sir—

Replied General Almond.

On June 20, 5 days before the war began, 2 distinguished visitors had been in Tokyo from Washington. They were Secretary of Defense Johnson, and Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Did you get any impression or intelligence from those officers to the effect that trouble was brewing in Korea?—

Senator WELKER asked.

No, sir; we did not. I don't think they knew it—

General Almond responded.

General Almond was at his desk in Tokyo when first word of the Communist invasion reached him, about 2 p. m. Sun-

day, June 25. During the next 2 hours the whole peninsula burst into flame. Almost 200,000 North Korean aggressors swept into action in a military operation which had been skillfully planned and meticulously organized for almost 3 years. The South Korean forces were, as planned, overwhelmed and routed in 48 hours.

Two days later, June 27, the Pentagon directed Tokyo to send a reconnaissance party to Korea to determine the nature and extent of the Communist military operation. But so swift and demoralizing had been the Communist thrust from the north that this American party never reached the Seoul airport, already in Communist hands. The party was forced to put down at Suwon. On June 29, MacArthur himself joined this reconnaissance group at Suwon. Everywhere the ROK defenders were in utter rout.

At best, there were some 24,000 ROK troops available to resist the swiftly advancing column of 150,000 North Korean Communist troops. Back in Tokyo that night General MacArthur began a series of two-way ticker conferences with the Pentagon.

It was during that period, just before and during this trip to Korea—

General Almond continued—

that it became known to us, much to our surprise, I will say, and much to General MacArthur's surprise, that this country was going to participate in armed action in Korea. None of our plans had included this.

This was the beginning of the Truman-Acheson "police action," which was to cost 143,000 American casualties and \$20 billions, during the coming 3 years.

The first directive from the Pentagon suggested that MacArthur send a regiment of infantry to Pusan to protect the supply base there. Later MacArthur was directed by the Pentagon ticker to use whatever forces he deemed necessary to protect the supply lines through Pusan.

That terminated the telecon, and General MacArthur immediately ordered 3 divisions under General Walker, the bulk of the Eighth Army, to Korea; because he knew the situation was so bad that nothing short of a fundamentally sound military movement would salvage it. I don't think you have to have me testify that even that wasn't enough for the next 3 months. The immediate action that was taken was barely enough to drag along, so that General Walker could maintain the semblance of a continuous line in defense of Pusan, called the Pusan perimeter (hearings, p. 2062).

That is how Truman and Acheson pushed the United States into the Korean war—unprepared, under-equipped, still at less than full peacetime strength, and into a campaign which never had been considered even as a theoretical possibility by the staff headquarters in Tokyo. Korea was not in the Far Eastern Command's defensive area. Congress was not consulted on the decision for war.

At this point, General Almond told the committee:

Our lines held, in spite of the restrictions and limitations imposed by our own Gov-

ernment, and our casualty lists were enormous (hearings, p. 2063).

From this tenuous beginning, however, General MacArthur was able at length to fashion victory. The historic Inchon landing was planned and executed in 23 days, and was effected on September 15, 1950. In another 60 days our United States forces were up to the Yalu River.

But Formosa had been neutralized by Truman late in June, thus releasing all the Communist Chinese coastal forces to be concentrated in the north, in defense of Manchuria. As General MacArthur himself asserted:

Actually it was this protection which permitted the transfer of the very Communist armies assigned to the coastal defense of central China, for the attack upon our forces in Korea (hearings, p. 2069).

President Eisenhower revoked this neutralization of Formosa by our 7th Fleet late in January 1953, an act applauded publicly by MacArthur as one which "should be supported by all loyal Americans irrespective of party." The Korean armistice followed in 6 months.

But as soon as MacArthur hit the Yalu, in November 1950, the question of bombing the Yalu bridges developed. Specific orders from Washington sharply forbade this interruption of the Communist lines of supply and retreat—hearings, page 2068.

Similarly, the question of "hot pursuit" by American fighter planes was resolved by Washington in favor of the Communist forces sheltered in Manchuria.

So, too, was the issue of bombing the Manchurian bases resolved in Washington in favor of the Communist position. Of this situation, General Stratemeyer, commander of the United States Air Forces in the Far East, complained:

The enemy can hit me where I am based. I cannot hit him.

Precisely at this point the first victory in Korea was abandoned and forfeited on specific orders from Washington.

General Almond was asked at this juncture of his recital if he ever had heard of any commitments made in Washington not to win the Korean war.

His response:

Senator, I have no way of knowing what commitments were made. I can only answer that the things as they happened looked very strange insofar as the assurance with which the enemy appeared to operate. I think it would have been a very hazardous thing for the Chinese to enter North Korea in the abundant numbers in which they did, if they had thought that their bases of rice or ammunition, or any other kind of base, would be subject to attack.

That's the whole story of the first Korean victory abandoned by Washington. The Chinese Communists, somehow, had obtained complete assurances that they would not be bombed in Manchuria.

In November 1950 the Chinese Communists entered from their sheltered north to drive the Eighth Army and General Almond's X Corps back to Seoul. For the American forces, the brilliant and smashing Inchon victory of late September had been turned, in less than 3 months, into a tragic Dunkirk at Hungnam.

In this first Chinese attack from the protected north our Eighth Army was outnumbered 20 to 1—hearings, page 2072. But still MacArthur was not permitted to bomb the Communist bases in Manchuria. History one day will tell us who in Washington ordered this brilliant military victory at Inchon turned into shocking and humiliating defeat.

The second great victory for our United States forces in Korea came in May and June 1951. General MacArthur had been removed from his command by President Truman on April 11.

The Chinese Communists sent in a massive offensive on April 22, 1951. These forces comprised 38 Communist divisions, of which 24 were destroyed, and the Chinese withdrew on April 30.

But on May 16 the Chinese Communists returned to the attack with 175,000 new troops, principally against the United States 2d Infantry Division of approximately 20,000 men. This operation lasted 6 days and nights, during which General Almond's X Corps of 7 divisions suffered 14,000 casualties, and was driven back at some points almost 100 miles.

Nevertheless, on May 22, Almond launched his counterattack, slashing through the enemy at every point of contact, "and in the next 2 or 3 days this complete enemy force reversed itself and started hiking for the rear," General Almond continued.

They lost every piece of transportation that they had in this area. . . . With the result, by the 1st of June we had regained much of this territory that we had lost in December-January 1950-51, and some more besides.

About this time—I will say, between the 1st of June and the 1st of July, when we were adjusting this new line—a thing happened to me that I have never experienced before. By private conversation with my commander, the Eighth Army Commander, General Van Fleet, I was told to halt my troops on that line and advance no further. . . . In other words, it was decided somewhere above General Van Fleet's head—and where, I do not know—I complied with the orders—that when we had defeated this huge force . . . the cream of their army . . . I think we were entitled to capitalize on it . . . the mission of any battlefield commander is to win in the field, and not be denied a victory for his forces—hearings, page 2074.

Dean Acheson testified before the MacArthur hearings, in early June 1951 that the 38th parallel limited the official area of United States operations in Korea.

General Almond was asked:

When were you informed that the 38th parallel would constitute victory?

He replied:

I was never informed of that fact or decision. I was only informed that my troops, which I considered victorious, and which were prepared to destroy the enemy—that could have been easily done; the only knowledge I had of that statement by Mr. Acheson is the fact that we were ordered not to advance further.

This, then, was the second specific occasion on which the State Department ordered the American Forces in Korea not to win the war.

And, of course, they never did.

Acheson's policy—never to crush the Communist forces—prevailed to the very opening of the cease-fire talks.

When the Chinese Communist forces first were spotted in massive formations in Manchuria, in November 1950, President Truman met in emergency session with the National Security Council, in Washington. After the session he issued a public statement, November 16, declaring in part "that we have never at any time entertained any intention of carrying hostilities into China."

That was all the Communists needed. Seven days later, on November 24, the first Chinese units appeared in North Korea in organized massive offensive operations. And when these new forces finally were destroyed the following June, Washington summarily ordered the American counterattack halted in its tracks.

Mr. Acheson's war was America's first military defeat—not because our forces were wanting in valor, courage, or sacrifice—but only because it was a war rigged against victory from the very outset.

As soon as MacArthur's forces got close to winning it—"in spite of the restrictions and limitations imposed by our own Government"—MacArthur was summarily sacked.

And when MacArthur finally was busted, the New York Daily Worker heralded the news in screaming headlines of Communist triumph.

"Good riddance" roared the Daily Worker headline, in 72-point blackface.

The Owen Lattimore plan of 1947, to deliver China to communism, was now a fait accompli.

Hello Uncle Sucker: American Shipyards Close and Lose \$1.8 Billion—Foreign Shipyards Boom and Take in \$1.2 Billion From Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, of the 1,347 merchant vessels under construction today in the world's shipyards, being paid for by Uncle Sucker, only 14 of these vessels are being built in the United States of America. In 1954, United States ships carried only 29 percent of our own Nation's foreign trade.

Vessels aggregating 3,884,749 gross and 6,054,831 deadweight tons have been ordered in foreign yards by American interests during the postwar period. If placed in American yards these vessels would have cost \$1.8 billion. Their cost abroad is approximately \$1.2 billion. Here then is the wholesale flight of American capital—which has made the difference between a sound shipbuilding establishment in the United States and one that has been reduced to a state of emergency. The answer—lower shipbuilding costs.

However, there is no reason to blame the shipowner. Sound business practice dictates his orders. He needed ships. He could get them built in foreign yards for 33 to 45 percent less than it would cost in this country. Some had funds tied up in foreign currency which were not convertible to dollars. It was the only way to get their money out.

The high cost of American-built tonnage is keyed to higher wages enjoyed by this country's labor force. Certainly the solution to making our shipyards more competitive is not to lower our standard of living. The only alternatives are greater efficiency and Government aid.

Our shipyards have been operating on an austerity basis for some time, and a minimum of man-hours and a maximum of efficiency go into each ship. Therefore, Government help is necessary to keep some of this work in our own shipyards.

It would have cost the Government approximately \$67 million a year to have held this business for United States shipyards. However, the Government would have received back in taxes at least \$50 million each year.

The cost to the American economy is greater. The shipyards alone would have had to employ 17,000 more workers. An equal number would have been employed in supporting industries throughout the country. What it will cost in an emergency cannot be calculated.

At last report with the small backlog of orders on hand, our yards had dropped to 12th place in world shipbuilding.

An exclusive survey just concluded by Marine Engineering shows that shipbuilding contracts placed abroad by United States and affiliated interests in the postwar years now total 302 vessels of 3,884,749 gross tons, 6,054,831 deadweight tons, equipped with propulsion machinery aggregating 2,691,165 horsepower.

The contract value of this work if it had been placed with United States shipyards is estimated at \$1.8 billion. It is estimated that the cost of these 302 vessels built by shipyards in Europe and Japan will total about \$1.2 billion.

This great volume of new shipbuilding business placed abroad by American and affiliated interests had its beginnings in 1949. It far exceeds the total business contracted for with United States shipyards in the postwar years. During the past 8 years, beginning January 1947 and running through 1954, American shipyards completed 247 major-sized vessels of 4,642,000 deadweight tons for Government and private shipping interests. This is one-third less than the total tonnage ordered abroad in the past 6 years by these same private shipping interests.

This very definite and disturbing trend toward buying abroad, with its attendant neglect of the United States shipbuilding industry, is entirely a postwar development. In the 20 years between the two great wars very few vessels had been ordered from foreign shipyards by American interests. These were principally a few fruit carriers constructed for subsidiaries of the United Fruit Co. However, this trend has been developing very rapidly in recent years as will be

noted from the following tabulation which shows the accumulated total of orders placed with foreign shipyards at various dates of exclusive surveys conducted by Marine Engineering.

Date of survey	Number of vessels	Deadweight tons
September 1950.....	32	559,900
June 1951.....	100	1,630,310
February 1952.....	178	3,313,970
September 1953.....	261	5,273,034
March 1955.....	302	6,054,831

It will be noted that the rate of increase in the total of these orders has slowed somewhat in the past 18 months as compared with the period represented by the other surveys. Part of this is due to the cancellation of some few orders during the past 2 years, and to the considerable contraction in ocean commerce and activity experienced since the end of the Korean war. During the past 6 months, however, there has been a very definite revival in the ordering of new ships in the principal maritime nations of the world. American interests have participated in this and ordered some especially large vessels from Japanese and European shipyards.

If only one-half of these 302 orders had been placed in the United States, the shipbuilding industry would be in a flourishing condition. Instead it has reached a point where shipyard employment is now at a postwar low. However, due to remedial measures passed by the last Congress the prospects ahead for the United States shipbuilding industry have brightened considerably. This has been brought about by cooperative efforts on the part of the Maritime Administration, the Shipbuilders Council of America, and the trade associations of the American shipowners.

This loss of business by American shipbuilding establishments to foreign competitors has meant not only a reduction in employment at the yards, but contraction for the very many affiliated industries in the 48 States which supply materials and parts for the building of ships. The United States Government and State governments also have been big losers through reduced income taxes from individuals and smaller corporation taxes.

The shipyards of the world now have orders on hand for the construction of 1,300 seagoing vessels of about 16,500,000 deadweight tons. A large percentage of this huge deadweight tonnage is for American interests as, of the over 6 million tons ordered from foreign shipyards, well over 50 percent remains to be constructed. Many of these vessels ordered abroad by American interests will not be completed until the end of 1956, and some few in 1957.

During the postwar years the shipbuilding industry of most maritime nations has experienced an almost constantly expanding volume of business, except for the last 2 years. The American orders placed abroad have been a

major contribution to this condition and in effect has been a major source of export business for these nations. While the vessels cannot be classed as imports into the United States, the business does represent tremendous purchases from foreign interests, and in many cases is paid for in American dollars. To import these vessels into the United States and register them here would hardly be practical in view of the high duty that would have to be paid.

WHY ORDERS ARE PLACED ABROAD

All of these vessels ordered abroad will fly foreign flags upon completion. Most will be registered in Liberia and Panama. A liberal number, however, will be documented in Honduras, Great Britain, Holland, France, Norway, Italy, and Germany. This will enable the owners to employ foreign crews at greatly reduced rates over those paid to American seamen. A number of these vessels will never come to the United States as they will be utilized by foreign subsidiaries of American interests trading to the countries in which they are registered. However, many will be employed in the foreign trade of the United States and will fly the flags of Panama and Liberia. These vessels, of course, cannot be used in the coastwise and intercoastal trade of the United States as these routes are restricted by law to American built and registered ships.

This postwar trend of ordering new ships from foreign shipyards will continue and additional contracts will be placed this year and for the next few years if world conditions warrant. The principal reason for this is, of course, the cost factor. The higher cost of labor and materials in the United States makes it practically impossible for American shipbuilders to compete in the world shipbuilding market.

Another major reason for ordering tonnage abroad is blocked currency owned by American oil companies in foreign countries. This has been principally in the sterling areas. In return for the privilege of marketing their products in these sterling and other areas, American oil companies have been forced into agreements to accept payment in sterling, and so forth, without conversion privileges. As a result, considerable balances, through profits, have been built up abroad. The most practical method to retrieve these profits is to invest in goods produced in the foreign areas involved, and take them out upon completion. Therefore, American oil companies with profits on hand in foreign countries have ordered a large number of oil tankers, oilfield equipment and other materials required in the conduct of their business. Under these conditions United States shipyards are practically eliminated from bidding on the construction of any of these new tankers.

Among the American oil companies affected by the blocked currency condition are the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Standard-Vacuum Oil Co., Gulf Oil Corp., Tide

Water Associated Oil Co., The Texas Co., and the Caltex group. The latter is a combination composed of the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co.

While a considerable number of tankers have been ordered abroad by this American oil company group because of blocked currency, the total represents only a small percentage of the grand total of tankers and other types of vessels contracted for with foreign shipbuilders by American interests, mainly because of the cost factor. Some of the tanker orders placed abroad, however, have been contracted for by subsidiaries of American oil companies established principally in Great Britain, Italy, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Norway, and Denmark, and will be used by these subsidiaries to import oil into these particular countries where their products are marketed. A brief study of the companies listed in table 1 will reveal, through similarity of names, the foreign affiliates of American companies established for marketing or tanker operating. A number of oil refineries have been built in many of these countries since the end of the war by American oil companies.

Many of the 217 tankers listed in table 1 have been ordered abroad, chiefly because of the cost factor, by other than oil companies. Included in this grouping are the National Bulk Carriers, Tidewater Commercial Co. of Baltimore, Hillcone Steamship Co. of San Francisco, Naess Shipping Co. of New York. Also, large investment groups composed in many cases of Greek-American backed by American bankers and insurance companies. Several of the largest banking institutions in the United States, among them the National City Bank and the Chase National Bank, have loaned money for the building of tankers, as have, also, insurance companies like the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. These vessels when completed are long-term chartered to oil companies for periods ranging up to 15 years. Among the Greek-American groups ordering tankers abroad are the Orion Shipping & Trading Co., J. M. Carras, Inc., Olympic Oil Lines, Onassis, North American Shipping & Trading Co., Niarchos, Atlantic Oil Lines, Livanos, and many smaller organizations.

The oil companies, both here and abroad, have for a long period encouraged the construction of tankers by independent investment groups, as by so doing the oil people are able to retain their capital for the development of oil properties and the marketing of oil. In many cases the investment group orders the size and type of vessel needed by the interested oil company, complying with their established construction practices and specifications.

A principal factor contributing to this postwar development of ordering new vessels built abroad is the vast increase in the amount of imports required by the United States since the end of the war. While the importation of all types of basic materials has experienced great in-

creases compared with pre-war figures, the big volume has been in iron ore, bauxite ore, gypsum, and oil, and this movement will continue.

For the transportation of this type of bulk cargo there is no necessity to operate ships under the American flag with attendant higher operating costs. Therefore, lacking the proper ships to move these bulk cargoes, American interests have gone abroad to secure most of the tonnage needed, mainly because of the difference in production cost between United States and foreign shipyards.

The types of cargoes moved has led to an ever-increasing size of vessel, and this has proven economically feasible because of the long hauls involved and the constantly spiraling cost of shipboard labor, upkeep, and maintenance. Along with this has come in the post-war years a new trend toward increased speed of ships. Accordingly, where one new 30,000- to 45,000-ton tanker now is displacing 2 and 3 smaller ones this same vessel with the sea speeds now being adopted is making almost twice the number of yearly voyages her counterpart of prewar days accomplished.

Before the war the number of large bulk iron-ore carriers in existence for ocean transportation was negligible. This situation is fast changing in the postwar years due to the development of new ore fields and the approaching exhaustion of American mines. This has necessitated the construction of big bulk carriers especially designed for long-haul runs.

The major steel producers, such as United States Steel Corp., Bethlehem Steel Co., Republic Steel Co., and the Inland Steel Co., have developed these new foreign iron-ore sources to serve the new and expanded steelmaking capacity created in recent years. None of these companies desire to engage in the transportation business, preferring to retain their capital for the development of steel mills and ore mines. Therefore, contracts have been made with shipping companies to move the ore into the United States.

Ships had to be built for this service and, based on costs, the business went to foreign shipbuilders. A number of iron-ore carriers already have been completed in foreign shipyards for American interests, ranging in size from 24,000 to 62,000 deadweight tons each. Bids currently are being solicited in Europe and Japan for the construction of additional ore carriers. Combination vessels also are being built which alternately can carry oil or iron ore and thus be in a position to participate in whichever trade offers the best freight rates.

Ore is being moved in new bulk-ore carriers by the States Marine Corp. from Liberian ore fields to Baltimore, where

it is transhipped to railroad cars traveling inland to Republic Steel Co. mills. Considerable ore now is being taken from the Venezuelan mines of the United States Steel Corp. and the Bethlehem Steel Co. The National Bulk Carriers and the Joshua Hendy Corp., with new ships, are bringing the United States Steel ore into Mobile and the new Fairless Works at Philadelphia. The Bethlehem Steel Co. is moving its Venezuelan ore into Baltimore with its existing vessels.

The new Labrador ore fields being developed by a United States-Canadian combination headed by the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, now is beginning to produce. Ore has been moved down the St. Lawrence River from the Labrador fields by the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. with new vessels. Also, the M. A. Hanna Co. has ordered two 30,000-ton bulk-ore carriers from British shipyards to participate in this ore movement. Ore soon will be mined in new fields in Peru by the Utah Construction Co. and moved to the United States in big bulk carriers being built in Japan for an affiliate, Associated Ocean Freight Services of San Francisco.

TYPES OF VESSELS ORDERED ABROAD

The increase in the total of orders placed abroad since our last report has been mainly in the tanker and bulk-carrier categories. It will be noted from table 2 that five-sixths of the total deadweight tonnage ordered is of the oil-tanker type, these accounting for 217 vessels of 5,100,828 tons. Large bulk-ore and bauxite carriers total 27 of 615,450 tons, while dry cargo and refrigerated cargo ships add up to 43 of 321,673 tons. The very large majority of these 302 vessels ordered from shipyards in foreign countries are of the large transoceanic type.

From table 3 it will be observed that almost 30 percent of the total deadweight tonnage has been ordered from shipyards in Scotland and England, totaling 102 vessels of 1,698,152 tons. Japanese shipbuilding establishments secured the second largest percentage of the deadweight tonnage ordered, this representing 47 vessels of 1,331,249 tons. German plants are running a close third with 64 vessels of 1,238,368 tons.

While these three nations secured between them more than two-thirds of these particular vessel orders and almost 70 percent of the tonnage, totaling 213 vessels of 4,267,769 tons, the balance spread around among shipyards in other nations amounted to 89 vessels of 1,787,062 tons. This went to yards in France, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, and Canada.

Low building costs has been the principal reason for attracting so much of this new construction to shipyards in

Germany and Japan. In 1954 contracts were reported placed in Japan for the building of some of the tankers included in table 1 at costs ranging between \$105 and \$130 a deadweight ton. Japanese yards were aided to some extent by indirect Government subsidies and by building contracts directly linked to the importation of sugar. Dutch and German yards currently are reputed to have the lowest building costs in Europe, and this has attracted much of the building for American interests. Italian yards, although aided by direct Government subsidies, have not been successful in securing the orders.

Largest of the vessels ordered abroad by American interests are the three bulk-ore carriers built at the Kure Shipyard, Japan, for the National Bulk Carriers. Two of these were finished in 1954 and the third in January 1955. These vessels have been registered in Liberia under the ownership of a National Bulk subsidiary, the Universe Tankships, Inc. Each is 794 feet long overall, 116-foot beam, 56-foot depth, twin screws, propelled by geared turbines of 16,500 shaft horsepower. These are the largest cargo vessels in the world.

Also completed at the Kure Shipyard for the National Bulk Carriers last year was the 47,000-deadweight-ton tankship *Phoenix*.

The largest oil tankers owned by any oil company in the world were ordered in January of this year by the Tide Water Associated Oil Co., western division, from two French shipyards. These vessels will be of 48,000 deadweight tons, and two each will be constructed by Chantiers de Penhoet, and Ateliers and Chantiers de France.

Four 39,000-ton tankships have been ordered in Japan by Orion Shipping & Trading Co. Two will be constructed by Harima Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., and two by Mitsubishi-Yokohama.

Among the many tankers being built abroad for the Afran Transport Co., affiliate of the Gulf Oil Corp., are two 37,000-ton vessels ordered from the Netherlands Dock & Shipbuilding Co., and one 36,800-ton ship now nearing the launching stage at Chantier de Penhoet, France. Two 47,000-ton tankers are underway at Vickers-Armstrongs, England, for the World Tankers Corp., and one 38,500-ton vessel at Howaldts-werke Hamburg A. G., Germany.

These are but a few of the very many outstanding vessels which have been completed or are on order in foreign shipyards of the world for the account of American or affiliated interests. Many slightly smaller vessels of 30,000 to 32,000 tons have been finished or are now underway together with an even greater number ranging in size between 20,000 and 30,000 tons.

TABLE 1.—Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years

BULK ORE

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length ft.	Gross tons	Dead- weight tons	Horse- power	Drive	Knots	Year of delivery
Carl Schmedman—Tropical S. S. Co. (Reynolds Metals Co.)	Vickers Armstrong—England	British	504	10,839	15,500	7,000	Turbine	15	1952
Boni Hills—States Marine Corp.	Fairfield S. B. Co.—England	Norway	613 1	17,318	22,400	8,500	Diesel	14½	1952
Enduro—States Marine Corp.	do	do	613 1	17,318	22,400	8,500	do	14½	1953
Chateaugay—States Marine Corp.	do	do	613 1	18,232	22,400	8,500	do	14½	1954
Alone Bay—States Marine Corp.	do	do	613 1	18,232	22,400	8,500	do	14½	1955
Not completed (2) States Marine Corp.	do	do	613 1	18,200	22,400	8,500	do	14½	1955
Pathfinder—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.)	Hawthorn, Leslie—England	Panama	447	5,466	7,500	3,400	do	12	1950
Prospector—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.)	do	do	447	5,466	7,500	3,400	do	12	1950
Dispatcher—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.)	Burntisland S. B.—England	do	425	6,650	8,000	3,300	Turbine	12	1954
Discoverer—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.)	Burntisland S. B.—England	do	425	6,650	8,000	3,300	do	12	1954
Not completed—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.)	Ommell Laird—England	British	650	21,300	31,000	7,700	do	12	1955
do	Lindholmens—Sweden	do	601	18,500	26,000	8,000	Diesel	12	1955
Wanderer—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.)	do	Panama	425	6,715	8,000	4,150	do	12½	1953
Wayfarer—Pan Ore S. S. Co. (Aluminum Co.)	do	do	425	6,715	8,000	4,150	do	12½	1954
Not completed (2)—National Gypsum Co.	Nordseewerke—Germany	do	500	10,000	15,000	4,500	do	12	1955
Not completed—U. S. Gypsum Corp.	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Panama	425	8,000	10,600	3,000	Turbine	12	1955
Cerro Bolivar—Joshua Hendy Corp.	Eriksbergs—Sweden	Canada	549	12,000	19,000	7,500	Diesel	15½	1955
Sunbwaylon—Saguenay Terminals (Alcoa)	Burntisland—England	Canada	427 3	6,650	7,850	4,000	Reciprocating	12	1951
Not completed—Utah Construction Co.	Nippon Steel Tube—Japan	do	625	11,300	31,400	13,000	Turbine	16	1955
Ore Chief—National Bulk Carriers	Kure Shipyard—Japan	Liberia	756	20,910	62,000	16,500	do	15	1954
Ore Transport—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	756	21,690	62,000	16,500	do	15	1954
Ore Titan—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	756	21,690	62,000	16,500	do	15	1955
Sunrip—Saguenay Terminals (Aluminum Co.)	Davie Shipb., Ltd.—Canada	British	450	8,000	12,700	5,000	do	13½	1954
Not completed—M. A. Hanna Co.	Furness S. B. Co.—England	do	630	22,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955
do	Swan, Hunter & W. Richardson—England	do	630	22,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955

REFRIGERATED

Almirante—United Fruit Company	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	Honduras	343 3	3,677	3,430	3,920	Diesel	15	1954
Aragon—United Fruit Company	do	do	343 3	3,677	3,430	3,920	do	15	1954
Atenas—United Fruit Company	do	do	343 3	3,677	3,430	3,920	do	15	1955
Not completed (3)—United Fruit Co.	Cammell Laird & Co.—England	do	426	6,500	5,500	9,000	Turbine	17	1955

CARGO

Leon—United Fruit Co.	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	Honduras	315	2,765	2,900	2,800	Diesel	12½	1952
Lempa—United Fruit Co.	do	do	315	2,765	2,900	2,800	do	12½	1952
Simoa—Global Transport (States Marine Corp.)	Fairfield S. B. Co.—England	Norway	461	9,516	12,500	7,000	Turbine	16	1953
Sjog—Global Transport (States Marine Corp.)	do	do	461	9,506	12,500	7,000	do	16	1954
Sira—Global Transport (States Marine Corp.)	do	do	461	9,538	12,500	7,000	do	16	1953
South African Merchant—Global Transport States Marine Corp.	do	do	461	9,506	12,500	7,000	do	16	1955
El Cafelero—Gulf & Atlantic Shipping Co.	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Panama	349	2,743	4,320	3,500	Diesel	14	1952
Sekura—Nortuna Shipping Co.	Yokohama S. & E.—Japan	Liberia	442 11	5,976	8,873	7,000	do	16	1950
Egenia—Monrovia Shipping Co.	Wm. Gray & Co.—England	do	438	7,404	10,000	3,000	Recip. turbine	11½	1952
Aliki Litane—Monrovia Shipping Co.	do	do	438	7,404	10,000	3,000	do	11½	1953
George—A. G. Pappadakis	Wm. Denny & Bros.—England	do	475 5	7,200	10,500	7,000	Turbine	16	1953
Not completed (2) P. D. Marchessini	A. G. Weser—Germany	do	475	7,300	10,600	7,500	do	16½	1953
Not completed (2) St. S. Narchos, N. Y.	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	475	8,000	12,500	5,400	Diesel	15	1955
Not completed—West Africa S. S. Co.	Bartram & Sons—England	Liberia	445	6,100	10,750	5,500	do	15	1956
Bate Comeau—Quebec-Ontario Trans. Co.	Atlantic S. B. Co.—England	Canada	252 3	2,260	3,000	1,220	do	10	1954
Not completed—Quebec-Ontario Trans. Co.	do	do	252 3	2,260	3,000	1,220	do	10	1955
Not completed—Canadian Gulf Line	Uddevallavarvet—Sweden	do	330	3,800	5,400	5,600	do	16	1955
Anna C—West African S. S. Co.	Bartram & Sons—England	Liberia	445	6,100	10,800	4,800	do	15	1954
Not completed (3)—Consolidated S. S. Corp.	Hitachi S. B.—Japan	do	262 8	1,500	2,000	2,900	do	15	1955
Not completed—Comp. Nav. Valiente S. A.	do	do	475 8	7,000	12,000	6,600	Turbine	15	1955
Not completed (2)—Fianza Comp. Nav. S. A.	do	do	475 8	7,100	12,000	6,250	Diesel	15	1955
Not completed—Parana Comp. de Vapores, S. A.	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	470	6,400	11,100	6,300	do	15	1955
Pindar—Parana de Vapores	Short Bros.—England	Panama	450	6,129	10,200	5,550	do	14	1954
Aghios Nicolaos—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	W. Doxford & Sons—England	do	450	6,590	11,000	5,000	do	14	1954
Aghia Marina—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	do	do	450	6,590	11,000	5,000	do	14	1954
Atlantic Countess—St. S. Livanos	W. Gray & Co.—England	Liberia	475	8,000	12,500	6,000	Turbine	14	1954
Daphne—Cia Arm. Transoceanic	do	Panama	450	6,000	9,000	4,000	Diesel	14	1954
Nymphé—Cia Arm. Transoceanic	Furness, S. B. Co.—England	do	450	6,000	9,000	4,000	do	14	1954

TUGBOAT

Sandy—United Fruit Co.	Elsflether—Germany	Ecuador	75	100	100	600	Diesel	10	1954
------------------------	--------------------	---------	----	-----	-----	-----	--------	----	------

WORKBOATS

Not named (4)—Arabian American Oil Co.	Haarlemsche S. B.—Holland	Liberia	61	60	110	240	Diesel	10	1954
--	---------------------------	---------	----	----	-----	-----	--------	----	------

TABLE 1.—Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years—Continued

TANKERS

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length BP	Gross tons	Dead- weight tons	Horse- power	Drive	Knots	Year of deliv- ery
<i>Maritime Leader</i> —Maritime Transportation Co.	Jn. Cockerill—Belgium	Panama	548 6	12,064	18,519	8,000	Turbine	16	1953
<i>Maritime Trader</i> —Maritime Transportation Co.	do	do	548 6	12,064	18,519	8,000	do	16	1953
<i>North America</i> —The Texas Co. (Norway)	Kockums—Sweden	Norway	531 8	15,925	23,925	8,500	Diesel	14	1952
<i>Brasil</i> —The Texas Co. (Norway)	do	do	513 3	10,546	15,625	6,800	do	14½	1952
Not completed—The Texas Co. (Norway)	Deutsche Werft—Germany	do	540	12,000	18,300	9,500	do	16	1955
<i>Britannia</i> —The Texas Co. (Norway)	do	do	540	12,000	18,300	9,500	do	16	1954
<i>South America</i> —The Texas Co. (Norway)	do	do	540	12,000	18,300	9,500	do	16	1954
Not completed (2)—The Texas Co.	do	Panama	505	18,000	28,000	13,750	Turbine	17	1955
Not completed—The Texas Co.	Frammaes Mek Verkstaal—Norway	Norway	520	10,000	15,750	7,000	Diesel	14½	1956
Not completed—Oriental Trade & Trans. (Std. Vac. Oil)	At. & Ch. de la Seine Mar.—France	British	406	7,300	11,000	3,660	do	12	1956
<i>Royal Arrow</i> —Sovosco Transp. Co.	Netherlands Dock—Holland	do	630	20,413	31,000	15,000	Turbine	16	1954
<i>Sylvan Arrow</i> —Sovosco Transp. Co.	do	do	630	20,413	31,000	15,000	do	16	1955
<i>Aramis</i> —Soc. Mazout Transports (Socony-Vacuum)	Chantier de Penhoet—France	France	600	18,200	27,400	13,750	do	17	1953
<i>Seahawk</i> —Seabird Tankers, Inc.	Mitsui S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	Panama	539 8	12,200	19,000	8,000	Diesel	15	1953
<i>Parthos</i> —Soc. Mazout Transports	Chantier de France—France	France	600	16,000	27,000	13,750	Turbine	16½	1954
<i>Thermidor</i> —Soc. Mazout Transports	Odense Skibs—Denmark	do	539	11,000	18,000	8,000	Diesel	15	1954
Not completed—Deutsche Vacuum Oil	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	German	500	10,000	16,500	7,000	do	14½	1955
<i>Vacuum Pioneer</i> —Vacuum Oil Co.	Grangemouth Dock—England	British	245	1,300	2,000	2,000	Reciprocating	11½	1953
<i>Mogwa</i> —Afran Transport Co. (Gulf Oil Corp.)	Furness S. B. Co.—England	Liberia	600	15,813	24,600	6,800	Diesel	14	1951
<i>Sukad</i> —Afran Transport Co. (Gulf Oil Corp.)	do	do	600	15,813	24,600	6,800	do	14	1952
<i>Melika</i> —Afran Transport Co.	do	do	630	20,550	32,000	13,750	Turbine	16	1954
Not completed—Afran Transport Co.	do	do	630	20,550	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>Persian Gulf</i> —Afran Transport Co.	Chantier de Penhoet—France	do	631	20,390	31,461	15,000	do	16	1954
Not completed—Afran Transport Co.	do	do	660	24,800	36,800	16,250	do	16	1955
Not completed (2)—Afran Transport Co.	Netherlands Dock—Holland	do	660	23,000	37,000	13,750	do	15	1955
do	do	do	630	20,000	31,000	13,750	do	16	1955
Not completed—Gulf Oil (Netherlands)	Terneuzensche S. B.—Holland	Holland	181 1	220	450	250	Diesel	10	1955
<i>Cubimes</i> —Afran Transport Co.	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Liberia	630 11	22,000	32,000	13,750	Turbine	16	1955
<i>Lagunillas</i> —Afran Transport Co.	do	do	630 11	22,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1955
Not completed (2)—Tide Water Associated Oil Co.	Mitsubishi S. B. & E.—Japan	do	608 10	27,400	45,000	16,000	do	16	1956
do	Chantier de Penhoet—France	do	698 10	27,400	48,000	16,000	do	16	1956
do	At. & Ch. de France—France	do	608 10	27,400	48,000	16,000	do	16	1956
<i>Monagas</i> —Afran Transport Co.	A. G. Weser—Germany	Venezuela	446	8,000	12,750	6,000	Reciprocating	15	1954
<i>Andros Venture</i> —Andros Shipping Co.	Davie S. B. & R. Co.—Canada	Canada	505	17,845	28,070	13,750	Turbine	17	1953
<i>Andros Fortune</i> —Andros Shipping Co.	do	do	525	17,845	28,070	13,750	do	17	1954
<i>Esso Margarita</i> —Comp. de Petroleo Lago	Rotterdam D. D. Co.—Holland	Panama	406	7,434	10,905	4,000	Reciprocating	14	1954
<i>Esso France</i> —Esso Std. Francaise	At. & Ch. de la Loire—France	France	666	25,000	37,350	17,000	Turbine	17	1955
Not completed—Panama Transport Co.	do	Panama	660	25,000	35,550	16,500	do	16	1955
do	dell Adriatico—Italy	do	660	25,000	35,550	16,500	do	16	1955
<i>Esso Antwerp</i> —Esso Standard Co.	Cockerill Yard—Belgium	Belgium	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>Esso La Guaira</i> —Comp. de Petroleo Lago	Gieslen & Zonen—Holland	Panama	406	7,434	10,905	4,000	Reciprocating	14	1954
<i>Esso La Caroubier</i> —Esso Std. Francaise	van der Werf—Holland	France	280	1,800	2,730	2,000	Diesel	10½	1952
Not completed—Esso Nederland, N. V.	Gieslen & Zonen—Holland	Holland	601	17,000	26,650	13,750	Turbine	16	1955
<i>Esso Liguria</i> —Esso La Columbia	del Tirreno—Italy	Italy	406	6,836	10,248	4,000	do	14	1954
<i>Esso Venezia</i> —Esso La Columbia	Navali Riuniti—Italy	do	558 1	14,700	21,500	10,000	do	16	1955
Not completed (2)—Esso Waried Tankers	Deutsche Werft—Germany	German	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>Esso Düsseldorf</i> —Esso Waried Tankers	A. G. Weser—Germany	do	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>Esso München</i> —Esso Waried Tankers	do	do	601 2	17,000	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>Esso Westminster</i> —Esso Petroleum Co.	Vickers-Armstrong—England	British	601 2	17,515	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
<i>Esso Canterbury</i> —Esso Petroleum Co.	do	do	601 2	17,515	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
<i>Esso York</i> —Esso Petroleum Co.	do	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>Esso Eder</i> —Esso Petroleum Co.	do	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>Esso Oxford</i> —Esso Petroleum Co.	Cammell Laird & Co.—England	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1953
<i>Esso Cambridge</i> —Esso Petroleum Co.	do	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
<i>Esso Paris</i> —Esso Std. Francaise	Penhoet—France	France	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1954
Not completed—Standard-Vacuum Transp. Co.	Jn. Brown & Co.—England	do	601 2	17,600	26,650	13,750	do	16	1955
<i>River Boat</i> —Esso Transportation Co.	Dunston, Thorne, Hessle—England	do	600	350	500	800	Diesel	9	1954
10 barges—Esso Transportation Co.	do	do	400	600	900	do	do	9	1954
<i>Esso Odin</i> —Dansk Esso A/S	Kremer Sohn—Germany	Denmark	621	17,600	26,400	11,000	Diesel	15 3	1955
Not completed—Dansk Esso A/S	Odense Yard—Denmark	do	190	700	1,070	865	D-E	9	1955
Not completed—Esso Petroleum Co.	R. Dunston, Ltd.—England	British	240	500	750	500	Diesel	9	1954
<i>River Boat</i> —Esso Nederland N. V.	Schram & Zonen—Holland	Holland	290	1,500	2,300	1,300	Recip.	11	1955
<i>Bitumen Boat</i> —Esso Petroleum Co.	Hull, Russell & Co.—Scotland	British	100	200	300	200	Diesel	9	1955
Not completed—Esso A. G.	Schoel & Johnk—Germany	German	170	600	900	400	do	9	1955
Not completed—Esso Std. Belgium	Cockerill—Belgium	Belgium	100	200	300	200	do	9	1955
Not completed—Esso Std. Belgium	do	do	100	200	300	200	do	9	1955
<i>Sannac India</i> —Std. Vacuum Oil Co.	Cammell, Laird & Co.—England	British	601 2	17,350	26,700	13,750	Turbine	17	1954
<i>Sannac Japan</i> —Std. Vacuum Oil Co.	Mitsubishi S. B. & E.—Japan	do	601 2	17,379	26,700	13,750	do	17	1953
<i>Sannac South Africa</i> —Std. Vacuum Oil Co.	do	do	601 2	17,379	26,700	13,750	do	17	1953
<i>Imperial Leduc</i> —Imperial Oil Ltd.	Collingwood Shipyds.—Canada	Canada	600	12,639	18,000	4,500	do	12	1951
<i>Imperial Woodbend</i> —Imperial Oil Ltd.	do	do	600	12,639	18,000	4,500	do	12	1952
<i>Imperial Sarnia</i> —Imperial Oil Ltd.	do	do	380 6	4,580	6,800	2,500	do	12	1948
<i>Imperial Redwater</i> —Imperial Oil Ltd.	Port Arthur S. B. Co.—Canada	do	600	12,582	18,000	4,500	do	12	1951
<i>Caltex Pakanharu</i> —Caltex Oceanic Ltd.	Jn. Cockerill—Belgium	Holland	250	2,030	3,200	1,600	Diesel	11	1952
<i>Caltex Bangkok</i> —Caltex Oceanic Ltd.	A. F. Smulders—Holland	do	250 5	1,984	3,220	1,600	do	11	1952
<i>Caltex Rupa</i> —Caltex Oceanic Ltd.	I. Smit & Zoon—Holland	do	250	1,984	3,220	1,600	do	11	1952
<i>Caltex Antwerp</i> —Overseas Tankship Corp.	Jn. Cockerill—Belgium	Panama	517 7	11,863	17,000	7,300	Turbine	15	1950
<i>Caltex Brussels</i> —Overseas Tankship Corp.	do	do	517 7	11,863	17,000	7,300	do	15	1951
<i>Caltex Liege</i> —Overseas Tankship Corp.	do	do	517 7	11,863	17,000	7,300	do	15	1951
<i>Caltex Delhi</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	Wm. Duxford & Sons—England	British	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	Diesel	14	1952
<i>Caltex Kenya</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	do	14	1952
<i>Caltex Tanganyika</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	do	14	1952
<i>Caltex Calcutta</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	470 6	8,527	12,500	5,150	do	14	1952
<i>Caltex Liverpool</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	Hawthorn Leslie & Co.—England	do	524 3	11,814	17,000	7,300	Turbine	15	1952
<i>Caltex Bahrain</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	524 3	11,814	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
<i>Caltex Manchester</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	524 3	11,814	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
<i>Caltex Canberra</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	Furness S. B. Co.—England	do	524 3	11,800	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
<i>Caltex Perth</i> —Overseas Tankship U. K. Ltd.	do	do	524 3	11,800	17,000	7,300	do	15	1953
<i>Caltex Padang</i> —Caltex Oceanic Ltd.	Smit & Zoon's—Holland	Holland	250	2,038	3,220	1,640	Diesel	11	1954
Not completed—Caltex Oceanic Ltd.	van P. Smit—Holland	do	540	11,000	18,000	9,200	do	16	1955
Not completed—Caltex Oceanic Ltd.	Rotterdam D. D.—Holland	do	530	12,000	18,000	8,800	Turbine	16	1956
Not completed—Caltex Oceanic Ltd.	Wilton-Fijenoord—Holland	do	630	20,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1956
Not completed—Nederland Pacific Tankvaart	Hitachi S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	do	270	2,150	3,400	1,600	Diesel	14	1955

TABLE 1.—Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years—Continued

TANKERS—Continued

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length ft.	Breadth ft.	Gross tons	Dead- weight tons	Horse- power	Drive	Knots	Year of delivery
Not completed—Overseas Tankship U.K.	Hawthorn Leslie & Co.—England	British	524	3	11,814	18,000	7,300	Turbine	14½	1957
Not completed—Overseas Tankship U.K.	Scott's S. B. & E. Co.—England	do	524	3	11,800	18,000	7,300	do	14½	1956
Not completed—Alvion S. S. Corp.	Vickers-Armstrong—England	Panama	640	21,000	32,000	13,750	do	do	16	1955
Not completed—Alvion S. S. Corp.	Jn. Brown & Co.—Scotland	do	640	21,000	32,000	13,750	do	do	16	1955
Not completed—Alvion S. S. Corp.	Blythwood S. B. Co.—Scotland	do	540	11,000	18,500	8,000	Diesel	do	15	1956
Cygnus—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	Furness S. B. Co.—England	do	500	10,800	16,300	5,500	do	do	16	1954
Arcturus—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	595	18,288	28,238	13,300	Turbine	do	16	1953
Proteus—Rethymnis & Kulukundis	Netherlands Dok. Co.—Holland	Greek	600	15,800	24,000	9,200	Diesel	do	14½	1955
Not completed (3)—Atlantic Refining Co.	Cockerill Yd.—Holland	do	530	12,500	18,700	11,000	Turbine	do	16	1955
Not completed—Marine Enterprises, Ltd.	Bartram & Sons—England	Panama	525	10,000	17,000	6,800	Diesel	do	15	1955
Not completed (2)—Western Shipping Corp.	Harima S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	do	630	21,000	32,000	15,000	Turbine	do	16	1955
Not completed—Comp. Maritime La Empresa	do	do	630	21,000	32,000	13,750	do	do	16	1956
Not completed (2)—Orion Ship. & T. Co.	do	do	656	2	24,200	39,000	17,500	do	16	1956
Do.	Mitsubishi-Yokohama—Japan	do	698	10	26,000	39,000	19,600	do	16	1956
Not completed—United Shippers, Ltd.	Kawasaki Dockyard—Japan	do	659	5	24,200	39,000	20,250	do	16	1955
Not completed—Petromar S. A.	Mitsubishi-Kobe—Japan	do	629	11	21,000	32,000	13,750	do	16	1956
Not completed—J. A. Cosmas, San Francisco	Oresundsvaret—Sweden	Panama	535	13,000	20,000	8,150	Diesel	do	15	1956
Ionian Messenger—Transocean Carriers Co.	Nippon Steel Tube Co.—Japan	Liberia	551	4	13,490	20,000	9,500	Turbine	15	1953
Ionian Challenger—Transocean Carriers Co.	do	do	551	4	13,490	20,000	9,500	do	15	1953
Ionian Traveler—Transocean Carriers Co.	Mitsubishi—Japan	do	585	2	15,825	24,000	8,500	do	14	1952
Tini—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras)	Hitachi S. B. & E. Co.—Japan	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1952
Genie—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras)	do	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1953
Dornie—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras)	do	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1953
Christina—United Cross Nav. Co. (John Carras)	do	do	541	4	12,556	19,980	8,000	do	14½	1953
Leonidas—Miramonte Cia Naviera	Nippon Steel Tube—Japan	Panama	550	13,000	20,000	9,500	do	do	15	1953
Andrew Dillon—Tanker Transports Co.	Uraga Dock Co.—Japan	do	555	8	13,500	20,000	9,000	do	15	1953
Virgin Islands—Caribbean Land & Shipping Corp.	Deutsche Werft—Germany	do	517	5	11,362	17,000	8,000	Diesel	15	1952
Windward Islands—Caribbean Land & Shipping Corp.	Bremer Vulkan—Germany	do	513	6	11,197	17,000	6,300	do	14	1952
Patricia—Oriental Nav. Corp. (Caribbean L. & S. Corp.)	Kawasaki Dockyard Co.—Japan	do	600	1	18,000	28,400	12,500	Turbine	17	1953
Mosai—Neptune Shipping Co.	Deutsche Werft—Germany	do	517	5	11,349	17,000	7,600	Diesel	15	1952
Moatank—Neptune Shipping Co.	do	do	517	5	11,349	17,000	7,600	do	15	1952
Almak—Alvion S. S. Corp.	Jn. Brown & Co.—England	do	540	12,618	19,000	8,000	do	do	14½	1952
Algot—Alvion S. S. Corp.	do	do	540	12,618	19,000	8,000	do	do	14½	1952
Alkaid—Alvion S. S. Corp.	Netherlands D. & S. B.—Holland	do	600	16,000	24,000	7,550	do	do	14½	1953
Alkor—Alvion S. S. Corp.	do	do	600	16,000	24,000	7,550	do	do	14½	1953
Karen Naess—Normess Shipping Co. (Naess Mellander & Co.)	Deutsche Werft—Germany	Liberia	510	11	11,157	16,870	8,000	do	15	1952
North King—Comp. Petrolera Armadora, S. A. (Pappadakis)	Blythwood S. B. Co.—England	do	536	7	12,191	18,500	7,300	do	15	1952
North Prince—Comp. Petrolera Armadora, S. A.	Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	540	12,029	18,300	7,300	do	do	15	1952
Nicolas—Parana Cia de Vapores	Blythwood S. B. Co.—England	Costa Rica	530	12,350	18,500	7,500	do	do	15	1953
Chloe—Cia Armadora Transoceanica, S. A.	Furness S. B. Co.—England	Panama	560	15,800	24,500	6,900	do	do	14	1953
Sakura—Oceanic Shipping Co.	Kawasaki Dockyard Co.—Japan	Liberia	554	3	13,000	19,000	9,500	Turbine	15½	1953
Eurycleia—Soc. Maritime San Nicolas, S. A.	East Japan Heavy Ind.—Japan	do	584	15,869	24,223	8,500	Diesel	do	15	1952
Alfa—Republique Marine Co.	Nippon Steel Tube Co.—Japan	do	551	4	13,752	20,000	9,500	Turbine	15½	1953
Kipaka—Unitas, Inc. (Maritime Trading Co.)	Jn. Brown & Co.—England	Panama	535	13,099	20,000	6,500	Diesel	do	15	1951
Olhava—Unitas, Inc. (Maritime Trading Co.)	do	do	535	13,099	20,000	6,500	do	do	15	1951
Clydewater—Tidewater Commercial Co.	do	do	535	6	12,774	19,000	6,500	do	15	1951
Petrokure—National Bulk Carriers	Kure Shipyard—Japan	Liberia	645	21,262	38,000	17,600	Turbine	do	18	1953
Petroking—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645	21,262	38,000	17,600	do	do	18	1953
Petroqueen—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645	21,262	38,000	17,600	do	do	18	1953
Petroperger—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645	21,240	38,000	17,600	do	do	18	1953
Phoenix—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645	21,733	44,633	17,600	do	do	16	1954
Not completed—National Bulk Carriers	do	do	645	21,300	38,000	12,500	do	do	16	1955
Atlantic Duchess—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Wm. Gray & Co.—England	do	470	8,631	12,910	4,750	Diesel	do	13	1950
Atlantic Duke—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Smith's Dock Co.—England	do	508	16,930	16,652	5,500	do	do	13½	1952
Atlantic Baron—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Fairfield S. B. & E. Co.—England	do	545	12,700	20,000	8,000	Turbine	do	15	1953
Atlantic Baroness—Atlantic Oil Carriers	do	do	545	12,700	20,000	8,000	do	do	15	1953
Atlantic Lord—Atlantic Oil Carriers	Furness S. B. Co.—England	do	525	12,000	18,100	7,600	Diesel	do	15	1953
Atlantic Viscount—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers	A. G. Weser—Germany	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	Turbine	15	1954
Atlantic Viscountess—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers	do	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	do	15	1954
Atlantic Marques—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers	do	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	do	15	1954
Atlantic Marchioness—Atlantic Petroleum Carriers	do	do	534	9	11,300	18,100	8,250	do	15	1955
Atlantic Lady—Atlantic Oil Carriers	de la Seine Mar.—France	do	538	12,000	19,800	9,800	do	do	15	1955
Atlantic Earl—Atlantic Tankers, Ltd.	Kockums—Sweden	do	500	11,000	16,800	8,100	do	do	15½	1954
Not completed—Naess Shipping Co.	Netherlands Dock—Holland	Norway	450	24,000	38,000	18,000	do	do	16	1956
Not completed (2)—Naess Shipping Co.	do	Holland	580	15,500	24,700	8,400	Diesel	do	15	1956
Milton—Naess Shipping Co.	Kockums—Sweden	Panama	570	15,800	24,830	9,200	Turbine	do	15½	1954
Olympic Light—Olympic Oil Lines	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	Liberia	552	13,923	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1952
Olympic Mountain—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,923	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1953
Olympic Valley—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,652	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Hill—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,580	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Snow—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,665	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Rock—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,665	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Ice—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,665	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Brook—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,678	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Lake—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	552	13,678	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Dale—Olympic Oil Lines	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	552	13,678	21,500	10,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Cloud—Olympic Oil Lines	A. G. Weser—Germany	do	557	9	14,047	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Wind—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	14,047	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Storm—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	14,047	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Freeze—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	13,934	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1954
Olympic Rainbow—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	13,934	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1955
Not completed—Olympic Oil Lines	do	do	557	9	13,934	21,500	10,000	do	16½	1955
Olympic Valour—Palmas Transp. Co.	Penhoet—France	do	631	20,453	31,688	15,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Honour—Monteserrado Transp. Co.	At. & Ch. de France—France	do	631	20,611	31,397	15,000	do	do	16½	1954
Olympic Splendour—Olympic Oil Line	de la Ciotat—France	do	628	3	20,895	31,440	15,000	do	16½	1954
World Enterprise—World Tankers Corp.	Vickers-Armstrongs—England	do	635	20,536	33,040	13,750	do	do	16	1953
World Harmony—World Tankers Corp.	do	do	635	20,991	33,040	13,750	do	do	16	1954
Not completed (2)—World Tankers Corp.	do	do	725	28,000	47,000	20,000	do	do	16	1954
World Unity—World Tankers Corp.	do	do	625	20,131	31,745	13,750	do	do	17	1952
World Concord—World Tankers Corp.	do	do	625	20,131	31,745	13,750	do	do	17	1952
Saxones—No. Am. S. & T. Co.	Kockums—Sweden	British	625	13,000	20,000	10,000	do	do	16½	1953
Saxonesky—No. Am. S. & T. Co.	do	do	625	13,000	20,000	10,000	do	do	16½	1953

TABLE 1.—Vessels ordered or completed in foreign shipyards for United States or affiliated interests during postwar years—Continued

TANKERS—Continued

Name and owner	Builder and country	Flag	Length BP	Gross tons	Dead- weight tons	Horse- power	Drive	Knots	Year of delivery
Saxonheath—Oriental Tanker Corp.	Nederland Dok—Holland	Liberia	538 9	12,705	18,500	9,000	Turbine	15½	1952
Saxonhill—Oriental Tanker Corp.	do	do	538 9	12,705	18,500	9,000	do	15½	1953
Saronglade—No. Amer. S. & T. Co.	Vickers-Armstrongs—England	British	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1952
Sarongdale—No. Amer. S. & T. Co.	do	do	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1952
Saronglen—No. Amer. S. & T. Co.	do	do	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1953
Sarongmead—No. Amer. S. & T. Co.	do	do	528	13,321	20,450	8,300	do	14	1953
Tina Onassis—A. S. Onassis	Howaldtswerke A. G.—Germany	Liberia	723 2	25,910	46,000	17,600	do	15	1953
Al-Malik Saud Al-Awal—A. S. Onassis	do	do	723 2	28,738	46,000	17,600	do	15	1955
World Gratitude—World Tankers Corp.	Kieler Howaldtswerke—Germany	do	630	20,035	32,500	17,600	do	16	1954
World Grace—World Tankers Corp.	do	do	630	20,431	32,500	17,600	do	16	1954
World Guardian—World Tankers Corp.	do	do	630	20,431	32,500	17,600	do	16	1955
Not completed—World Tankers Corp.	do	do	630	20,431	32,500	17,600	do	16	1955
World Justice—Intermarine Nav. Corp.	Mitsubishi-Nagasaki—Japan	do	630	20,500	32,000	15,000	do	16	1954
World Jury—Intermarine Nav. Corp.	do	do	630	20,500	32,000	15,000	do	16	1954
Not completed—Stavros S. Niarchos	Kockums—Sweden	British	640	22,000	32,500	16,500	do	16	1955
Not completed—Stavros S. Niarchos	Howaldtswerke—Germany	Panama	663	24,000	38,500	16,000	do	16	1955
East River—Tidewater Commercial Co.	Ju. Brown & Co.—England	Liberia	535 6	12,775	19,000	7,000	do	15	1954
Not completed—Tidewater Commercial Co.	do	Panama	631	20,400	32,000	15,000	do	16	1955
Not completed—Stavros S. Niarchos	Kockums—Sweden	Liberia	663	24,000	38,500	16,500	do	16	1957

CAR FERRY

New Grand Haven—West India Fruit & S. S. Co.	Canadian Vickers—Canada	Honduras	436	5,074	4,280	8,560	Unaflow	18	1951
--	-------------------------	----------	-----	-------	-------	-------	---------	----	------

DREDGE

Sandpiper—Creole Petroleum Co.	Canadian Vickers—Canada	Dutch	237	1,902	2,500	2,880	D-E	14	1950
Clarence B. Randall—Construction Aggregates	Port Arthur Sy.—Canada	Canadian	174	1,800	2,500	10,000	D-E	1955	
Joseph L. Block—Construction Aggregates	do	do	174	1,800	2,500	10,000	D-E	1955	

Totals—302 vessels; 3,884,749 gross tons; 6,054,831 deadweight tons; 2,691,165 horsepower.

TABLE 2.—Types of vessels ordered from foreign shipyards by United States and affiliated interests during the postwar years

Type	Number	Gross tons	Dead-weight tons	Horsepower
Tanker	217	3,270,685	5,100,828	2,241,515
Bulk carrier	27	372,251	615,450	213,900
Reefer	6	30,531	26,700	37,800
Freighter	37	197,106	294,883	165,850
Car ferry	1	5,074	4,280	8,560
Dredge	3	5,502	7,500	22,880
Tugboat	1	100	100	600
Oil barge	10	3,500	5,000	—
Total	302	3,884,749	6,054,831	2,691,165

TABLE 3.—Countries building vessels for American and affiliated interests during the postwar years

Type	Number	Gross tons	Dead-weight tons	Horsepower
United Kingdom:				
Cargo	17	116,117	170,750	83,290
Reefer	3	19,500	10,500	27,000
Bulk	15	216,221	283,750	110,600
Oil barge	10	3,500	5,000	—
Tanker	57	808,921	1,221,152	510,715
Total	102	1,164,259	1,698,152	737,605
Germany:				
Cargo	8	45,273	67,420	41,200
Reefer	3	11,031	10,290	10,850
Bulk	3	28,000	40,600	12,000
Tugboat	1	100	100	600
Tanker	49	715,879	1,119,958	525,500
Total	64	806,283	1,238,368	590,160
Canada:				
Bulk	1	8,000	12,700	5,000
Ferry	1	5,074	4,280	8,560
Dredge	3	5,502	7,500	22,880
Tanker	6	78,130	116,940	43,500
Total	11	96,706	141,420	79,940
Japan:				
Cargo	7	31,676	50,873	33,800
Bulk	4	76,100	217,400	62,500
Tanker	36	608,652	1,062,976	468,330
Total	47	774,428	1,331,249	564,630

TABLE 3.—Countries building vessels for American and affiliated interests during the postwar years—Continued

Type	Number	Gross tons	Dead-weight tons	Horsepower
Sweden:				
Cargo	1	3,800	5,400	5,600
Bulk	4	43,930	61,000	23,800
Tanker	9	138,271	212,180	93,750
Total	14	186,001	278,580	123,150
Denmark:				
Tanker	2	28,600	44,400	19,000
Norway:				
Tanker	1	10,000	15,750	7,000
Italy:				
Tanker	3	46,536	67,298	32,200
Belgium:				
Tanker	9	79,517	119,088	53,850
Holland:				
Tanker	29	360,630	580,550	254,190
Workboat	4	240	440	900
Total	33	390,870	580,990	255,150
France:				
Tanker	10	337,549	539,530	228,400
Grand total	302	3,884,749	6,054,831	2,691,165

TABLE 4.—Number of vessels ordered abroad by major American organizations in post-war period

Organization	Number
United Fruit Co.	9
States Marine Corp.	10
Aluminum Company of America	10
Reynolds Metals Co.	1
M. A. Hanna Co.	2
Standard Oil Co., New Jersey, and affiliates	45
Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.	6
Socony-Vacuum Oil Co.	7
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.	6
Gulf Oil Co.	13
The Texas Co.	8
Caltex group	21
Atlantic Refining Co.	3
National Bulk Carriers	9
North American Shipping & Trading Co.	25
Atlantic Oil Carriers	14
Olympic Oil Lines	21
Orion Shipping & Trading Co.	6

Naess Shipping Co.	7
J. M. Carras, Inc.	4
Hillcone Steamship Co.	2
United States Gypsum Co.	1
National Gypsum Co.	2
Chicago Tribune	2

Lawyers Entitled to Benefits of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the February 25, 1955, issue of the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser:

IT TAKES TIME

After all these years, the American Bar Association, traditionally a conservative body, has decided that social security is not socialistic after all. At the annual midwinter meeting of the house of delegates, policymaking body of ABA, the lawyers went on record as favoring voluntary admission to the Social Security System.

In a countrywide poll, it was revealed, State and local bar association presidents had voted 4 to 1 in favor of the plan—making the bar's 50,000 members the first professional group in the Nation to seek what once was denounced as the diabolical plan of bearded revolutionaries.

There were a few sour notes, of course. Judge Floyd E. Thompson, of Chicago, said that he was still against "making Socialists out of lawyers." The president of the Illinois State bar said that the move was "a first step toward renunciation of the independence of our profession."

But, in the main, the lawyers have recognized that social security is here to stay. The 8,000 members of the New York County

Lawyers Association had voted overwhelmingly for the proposal, the New York delegate said. Others reported similar lopsided votes in favor of voluntary social security.

A footnote to this change might be the old and new attitudes of another organization hardly noted for radicalism, the American Medical Association. In 1932, when a small group of medical economists had recommended the expansion of voluntary health insurance, AMA's official organ had denounced the proposal editorially as socialism and communism, inciting to revolution. Today, as half the Nation has some form of voluntary health insurance, AMA is the plan's most aggressive advocate, calling it "the American way toward better health."

And President Eisenhower's health insurance plan, which AMA has denounced in about the same language it used against voluntary health insurance in 1932, will probably be advocated by the doctors in a few years as a moderate American way to meet the health needs of the Nation.

Should the U. N. Expel Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following reprint issued by the U. S. News & World Report, of an exclusive interview with Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Ambassador to the United Nations, which was held in the conference room of the U. S. News & World Report, Washington, D. C.:

SHOULD THE U. N. EXPEL RUSSIA?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Should Soviet Russia be expelled from the United Nations for conspiring in and aiding open aggression? Could Russia be expelled under present rules? What can the U. N. do to prevent help to an aggressor in the future? What, also, are the chances that Communist China, an aggressor, will get into U. N.? If that should happen, should the United States get out? For the answers to these and other questions, U. S. News & World Report invited Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., chief American delegate to the U. N. to its conference room. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., 52, former Republican Senator from Massachusetts, 10 years ago resigned his Senate seat in order to fight in World War II. He came home a colonel with five battle stars, and with a new interest in international affairs. Mr. Lodge's grandfather, the first Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, helped block United States entry into the League of Nations. The grandson, President Eisenhower's choice to head the United States mission to the United Nations, believes in the U. N. as a preventive of war and an important forum in the cold war.)

Question. How would you define the purpose of the United Nations Charter, Mr. Lodge? Is it the purpose of the charter to provide a meeting place for governments?

Answer. No. The purpose of the charter was to create an organization of peace-loving nations—and I underline those two words "peace loving"—who would get together in case of an aggression and repel it—who'd try to prevent aggression in the first place, and, if an aggression occurred, would get together and repel it.

Question. You don't regard the machinery of the United Nations itself as a formal structure such as a federation would be?

Answer. I think "federation" is much too strong a word. It's not even as much like a confederation as the Confederacy at the time of the Civil War, and that proved to be too weak to maintain itself in the face of opposition. The United Nations is nothing like as formal an organization as that was. Nothing like it.

Question. Is it an alliance?

Answer. It's not an alliance. We have no alliance with the Soviet Union. It's a center for harmonizing.

Question. In practice is it any more than a debating society?

Answer. It isn't a society. We are not on a basis of a society with the Soviet Union. It's an arena, it's a device, it's an instrumentality. It is, among other things, a place where we stand up against the Soviets when they try to use the U. N. as a forum for prosecuting their cold war. And, if we're successful in doing that, we can generate world opinions which will influence the Communists in the Kremlin. We've proven that several times.

Question. You underline the words "peace loving." Do you mean by that that if we had it to do over again, Soviet Russia might not have been in it?

Answer. Absolutely. I do mean that.

Question. What is your definition of peace-loving?

Answer. Well, I can define it negatively. It is a nation that has not been convicted of aggression by the United Nations. I'll put that down as a minimum definition.

Question. That would take care of Red China, wouldn't it?

Answer. In my opinion, that takes care of Red China.

Question. Would you be in favor of pushing the Soviet Union out of the United Nations?

Answer. That's a calculation you have to make. There are lots of pros and cons on that, you know. From the standpoint of logic, yes, they ought to be out. And, as I say, if we had known in San Francisco the way they were going to act, I don't think we would have ever been in favor of admitting them. But there are certain advantages in having them there, too. It gives them a chance to make an exhibition of themselves, and that's a chance of which they take very frequent advantage. And part of the effect of their making an exhibition of themselves is a unifying of the free world.

I've seen it happen many times—the free nations, being free, start to drift apart, and everyone follows his own way. The politicians in the free nations start attacking each other. But when it gets to that point, the Soviet representative will say something that is so monstrous, so shocking, so irritating, that the free people start pulling together again. If they were to leave it would not be the end of the U. N.

Question. What countries are now being kept out of the U. N.?

Answer. They are Japan, Italy, South Korea, Finland, Ireland, Portugal, Austria, Ceylon, Nepal, Jordan, Libya, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia. West Germany is not eligible.

Now the Communists want to get in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, and the section called Outer Mongolia, which they are trying to contend is a country.

Question. And China—

Answer. Well, China is there. It's a question of who represents China.

Question. We should be entitled to have Texas in there, too, then, shouldn't we?

Answer. If they've got the Ukraine and Byelorussia, then we certainly ought to have Texas—and I would add Massachusetts.

Question. Is this subject often discussed, this idea of taking in some and letting others go?

Answer. We talk about it all the time.

Question. In the circles around the United Nations—

Answer. Yes, and we've tried one scheme after the other. If there is one thing that I think we ought to unite public opinion on in this country, and in the other free countries, it is that when the revision of the charter comes up, we should amend it so as to eliminate the veto on admission of new members. I'm not advocating it necessarily on anything else, but on the admission of new members we ought to eliminate the veto.

Question. Would you make it a majority vote?

Answer. Well, you could require seven votes in the Security Council and two-thirds in the General Assembly. I'd just as soon do that.

Question. Getting back to the work of the United Nations, you spoke of some of these subsidiary organizations. What do you visualize as regards the new setup in the Assembly which permits nations to take group action as we did in Korea, but, without recourse to the Security Council where the Soviets have the veto? What constructive value do you think that may hold for the future in the way of preserving peace?

Answer. You mean the uniting for peace resolution of 1950? I think that if there ever is another aggression that United Nations gets into, like this Korean one, I think the response is going to be very much better. I think this uniting for peace thing, if it is ever needed, will completely bypass the Soviet veto, and I think there will be a much greater percentage of troops from other United Nations members than we had this last time. The Korea affair was the first time in human history that there had been collective military resistance to aggression under the auspices of an international organization.

Now, while it could have been better, it also could have been worse. We've learned a lot from it. I'm sure that if there is another aggression—which God prevent—we'll have a much better participation.

Question. What have you done to cure the defect to which many people point—namely, that the United Nations on its surface takes the position on a resolution against acts of aggression and still there are neutrals who do not obey and deliberately violate it? Mr. Vishinsky announced that defiantly in December of 1951—he said they had been sending ammunition and supplies to Red China's forces. Yet, the resolution of the U. N. called on all members to refrain from aiding the aggressor. What have you done about that situation?

Answer. I personally favor revision of the expulsion procedures—

Question. To deal with that sort of thing—

Answer. That's right. You see, when I came in there, the first speech I made was listing 10 specific things that the Russians had done in the way of guns, tanks, planes and so on—the calibers, types, and everything else—to show how they were actually aiding and abetting the aggressor. I was planning to lay a foundation for doing something like that, and then the aggression stopped. But one way to cope with that might be to strengthen the expulsion procedures.

Question. How do you deal, then, with the country which says it is "neutral"?

Answer. I think a country which just stays out of the fight has a perfect right to do that. But a country that claims to be neutral and is actually aiding and abetting a convicted aggressor—the U. N. ought to have a stronger sanction against that sort of thing, and a stronger expulsion procedure might be one answer.

Question. There wouldn't be any place for a "neutral," really, would there?

Answer. Well, if you aid and abet the aggressor, you are not a neutral.

Question. What specifically is "aid"? What about trade?

Answer. With trade, it always depends upon who's getting the benefit of the trade.

Trade isn't bad as such. I think we ought to grow up a little bit more on the subject of trade. There are many advantages to trading with countries that you don't like at all. You get in there and may get things out of them that you will be glad to have. Of course, when you trade with a Communist you have to know exactly what you're doing. He trades as a matter of politics and strategy, not out of the ordinary business motives that animate traders in a free country.

Question. That is one phase of it. But what about the authority and moral power of the United Nations to enforce this resolution which says, in effect, you shall not aid the aggressor? How far does that go toward stopping countries which claim to be neutral from giving direct aid to those people and saying that it's mere trade?

Answer. When the Soviet Union sent all those tanks and guns and planes to the Chinese Communists and the North Koreans, they were acting contrary to the resolution as passed by the United Nations. It was illegal as far as the United Nations was concerned.

Question. What about the sale of rubber that was made by Ceylon to the Chinese Communists during the same period?

Answer. That is contrary to the spirit of the resolution, but, of course, Ceylon is not a member.

Question. Britain sent rubber, too, to Russia during the war. They claimed that it wasn't strategic, or else they claimed they had enough of it anyhow—

Answer. Morally, of course, Soviet Russia was an aggressor in Korea. We have machinery outside the United Nations that does a pretty fair job of controlling strategic trade with the Iron Curtain countries. It would have been hard to deal with that in the United Nations.

Question. Shouldn't that be considered in the Charter if you are going to be an effective organization?

Answer. It is a defect, no doubt about it, and one that ought to be remedied.

Question. Can it be remedied without creating a superstate with authority?

Answer. I think you can have a very good try at it; yes.

Question. You are relying on moral force to do it, then?

Answer. Public opinion; yes.

Question. Do you think the threat of expulsion would prevent aid to aggressors or discourage them after they had started it?

Answer. I think it certainly would. I think if we had an easier expulsion method, that would be a very good thing.

Question. Is the revision of the expulsion method also subject to veto?

Answer. Yes. Every revision is subject to veto. That's why you have to gather a lot of public opinion behind it.

Question. As a practical matter, is there any way to expel anybody from the U. N.?

Answer. Not now, if any permanent member of the Security Council doesn't want them to be expelled.

Question. They have to agree to the expulsion?

Answer. That's right.

Question. How do you assess the Russians' present "soft" approach to the United Nations and the world?

Answer. I think it's superficial. It's very evident. I see it every day. But the basic premise hasn't changed a bit. They want to take over everything that they possibly can. The don't want to do the way we have done the past 150 years and develop their own resources. I don't know why they don't. They've got a great big continent there to develop. They have this mania to go out and subvert and conquer.

Question. How interested do you think the Soviet Union is in staying in the U. N.?

Answer. They want to stay in. They don't dare leave it. They can't destroy it, and they

don't dare leave it. They never miss a meeting.

Question. How do you account for some of their inconsistencies? For instance, Red China wants to be admitted. The Soviet Union wants Red China admitted, and yet Red China will not accept United Nations auspices in settling the Korean problem.

Answer. That's one of the strong arguments for keeping Red China out—she not only won't accept United Nations auspices but attacks and holds the United Nations in contempt.

Question. Is there much sentiment for admitting Red China among some of the countries?

Answer. I don't think so. I've heard it said that there is, but I have always felt the votes would be with our side if we ever had to get a vote on the merits of it. Of course, we've gone along now simply saying that we would not consider it. Last year we voted to postpone it. This year we had a resolution that was a little stronger. We didn't use the word "postpone," which implies that we'd let it come up automatically. We said, "We shall not consider it this session." We got 43 votes, which is 3 more than I thought we would get.

Question. Is the British position closer to ours on that?

Answer. The British voted with us on the motion not to consider it.

Question. Mr. Lodge, what do you think has been the greatest benefit to the United States in its participation in the United Nations?

Answer. I would say that the United Nations, in spite of the fact that one of the basic assumptions on which it was founded—which was an alliance between the United States and Soviet Russia—has never materialized, in spite of that fact has had a vital effect in preventing world war III from breaking out, as a result of United Nations action in the following incidents: The presence of Russian troops in Iran, the Communist encroachment on Greece, the independence of Israel, the independence of Indonesia, the struggle between Pakistan and India over Kashmir, and the aggression in Korea.

Any one of those affairs could have mushroomed out into world war III. They were all accompanied by violence and at least minor fighting. While the United Nations didn't play the sole part—and in many cases the United States played an enormous part—still the United Nations played an essential part in preventing world war III from coming out of those incidents.

Question. Would you say that if there had not been a United Nations, diplomacy would have accomplished the same thing?

Answer. No, I don't think so. I don't think it would in any case because, while the legal power of the United Nations has been nullified by the Soviet abuse of the veto, something has happened that was not foreseen and that is the development of a thing known as "world public opinion."

The increase in radio and television and journalism and printing, all that, all over the world, means that world public opinion, while it isn't in so sharp a focus as public opinion in New York State or public opinion in the United States, nevertheless is a very real force. And the Soviet Union, while it maintains an iron dictatorship wherever it has the legal power to do so, is very sensitive to public opinion in the world outside its borders.

Question. To what extent do you think that the criticisms made in the United States are due to what we often have heard as the overselling of the United Nations in the first instance?

Answer. Oh, I think that's a very big factor. Even at the founding of the United Nations, some people in 1945 in San Francisco, and some of the people who followed

them, undertook to get the idea spread around that here was an automatic peace producer, an automatic war preventive, like a patent medicine—you could take a swallow of it, and the disease would be cured. Well, of course, there isn't any such thing, and there never will be any such thing. If the United Nations is as automatic as a burglar alarm, why, that's all you can expect of it. Now, what happens after the bell rings is up to the members every time.

NO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Question. How far do you think that misunderstanding went? Do you think many people thought of it as a world government, as a supranational government?

Answer. There were a few. A very small percentage. Of course, it is not a world government and should not be a world government. In fact, I don't think world government is in the cards at all.

Question. How do you distinguish between what is called a world government and what we have in the United Nations?

Answer. In the United Nations, everything that is done is purely recommendatory, except in the Security Council. And in the Security Council we are completely protected by the veto. That's all there is that's legally binding. Now a government can take your boy out of your home and stick him into the army, a government can impose a tax on you, a government can issue coinage, a government commands your allegiance.

Question. Would you regard the United Nations, then, as a federation of governments?

Answer. No. I think it's a device, a contrivance, an instrumentality. It's a very useful, necessary thing, but when a man goes to work for the United Nations, he doesn't stop being an American, and there isn't any higher loyalty than to the American flag. There are 1,800 Americans working over there, running the elevators, fixing the electric lights, doing expert work of the intellectual type—of course, they owe the United Nations a day's work, and they owe it not to agitate and make trouble. But their allegiance is to the United States.

Question. When you say that it is not a federation, you mean that it is not part of a structure known as a federation, like a formal alliance. But isn't it actually a loose federation of states?

Answer. No, it is not a loose federation of states, because the Communists are in it and we have no such relationship as a federation with the Communists. All that the Communists and we are united on—if we are united on it—is the common desire not to be blown into destruction by the atomic bomb, and we hope we are united on that.

PROBLEM OF UNESCO

Question. What importance do you attribute to all the collateral, or subsidiary, organizations of the United Nations, like the U. N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization?

Answer. I am not a great admirer of the way UNESCO has been administered although it has a fine purpose. I issued a statement to the press not long ago which indicates my view.

Question. Aren't you referring to the personnel and policies? What about the actual organizational setup itself? Should we have such subsidiary organizations?

Answer. It's a bad organizational setup. We have about 11 specialized agencies, and some are doing such a good job that you never hear of them. It's always the ones in which there is trouble that get into the papers. The International Civil Aviation Organization does a terrific piece of work, and you never hear about it because it works perfectly. They run the guides to navigation across the North Atlantic for airplanes. Every pilot swears by them. You don't worry about them. That takes care of itself.

The World Health Organization does a good job.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—I was just amazed at the number of enthusiastic supporters it has in this country.

I think the International Labor Office is well run.

But the administrative setup for these agencies is poor because there is no overall administrative direction at all. The Secretary General of the United Nations doesn't control them. They are considered to be specialized agencies of the United Nations, but he has no real legal authority over them. They are hard to touch from New York.

You may hear a lot of complaining about a specialized agency, but I can't do what you think I can do—go over to the Secretary General and say, "Here's this complaint about such and such." I can't do that.

Question. Are they floating international commissions?

Answer. They are floating international bodies. They are more than commissions. Each has its own governing body and makes its own rules and selects its own administrative chief and everything else. The point of contact is not through me. It's through the State Department.

Question. What do you mean by governing bodies? They don't govern any more than the United Nations itself does, do they?

Answer. Yes, they govern the specialized agency.

Question. But the United Nations does not govern them?

Answer. No.

Question. And they are independent, but they are often referred to as a part of the United Nations?

Answer. That's the point.

Question. The World Bank and the Monetary Fund are in that category?

Answer. Yes, specialized agencies.

Question. And yet there are people in this country who are blaming the United Nations for what UNESCO does?

Answer. Absolutely. I've made a study of why the U. N. is unpopular with some people in America—so far as it is unpopular; it's very popular with most people—and it's usually due to bad publicity attributed to UNESCO.

ONE-FLAG TROUBLES

Question. What are some of the things that arouse comment?

Answer. Well, some fellow in UNESCO writes an article saying we ought to have 1 flag, or we ought to have 1 citizenship, or we ought to have 1 this or that. The first time I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee asking for money—I had been a member of it for 7 years in the Senate, on the other side of the table—the first day I appeared, one Senator, an old friend of mine, handed me a thing that had "UNUM" printed on it, that looked like stage money, and said, "What is this? Is the United Nations beginning to emit currency?"

Well, of course, I repudiated it immediately. It was something that some joker in UNESCO had put out. It didn't really mean anything. But that kind of thing infuriates people. They think people are trying to destroy our Government, and I don't blame them for being infuriated.

Question. What branches of UNESCO are guilty of that sort of thing?

Answer. We don't know. There's no one in New York I can talk to about UNESCO. I'm just as remote from UNESCO as you are.

Question. Does UNESCO serve any useful purpose as far as this government is concerned?

Answer. The idea behind it is a good idea. I don't know about its specific accomplishments. The Russians joined it this year. They have never been in it before. I question the prudence of our getting out of it.

Question. Are these functions of other organizations, such as the World Health Organization, valuable to UNESCO?

Answer. Oh, they are not UNESCO. I haven't thought this through, but I question whether we ought to leave UNESCO and leave the Russians in it as the dominant voice. I just don't like to leave them in any of these organizations without our being there too.

Question. Why do you feel the Russians should stay in?

Answer. I've heard people say, "Let's get out." If we had been out of the United Nations when the Soviet Union tried to use the United Nations as a device to try to take over Guatemala, we would have been in very serious trouble.

Question. We would have been in the same position that they were when the Korean affair came along—

Answer. Yes, and look at what that got them into. And, believe me, on a thing like that nobody's going to fight for Uncle Sam the way Uncle Sam will. You just can't assume anything else. Now, we have marvelous cooperation from other members, but we are a big member of the team. We have to be there. To get out would look cowardly, but, apart from the looks of it, it would be a very imprudent thing to do, a very unwise and dangerous thing to do.

Question. Then you don't think the proposal that we get out of the United States very feasible—

Answer. I think it very dangerous.

Question. Even if they let Red China in?

Answer. I don't think they are going to get in.

MORE IN UNITED STATES FAVOR U. N.

Question. Have you ever found out in your informal chats with these people whether the Russians deliberately absented themselves in June, 1950?

Answer. I don't know, but I think it was accidental. It caused an awful lot of trouble for them.

Let me add one thing here. In 1951 the percentage of Americans who said they thought the United Nations was doing a good job was 43 percent; in 1954 it is 63 percent.

Question. Is this on the basis of a public-opinion poll?

Answer. National Opinion Research Center.

Question. To what do you attribute that increase?

Answer. I attribute it to one word—"Eisenhower." There are a lot of other things that go with it, of course.

You've got the Korean armistice, with the principle of voluntary repatriation.

You've got the fact that we foiled their attempt to go in and take over Guatemala.

You've got the fact that we've kept the Chinese Communists out, and Americans know that there would be great danger if the Chinese Communists were in. You've got the atomic-energy proposals.

Question. What really is UNESCO?

Answer. UNESCO is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, not to be confused with the Economic and Social Council, which is altogether different. There are three councils in the United Nations—Security Council, Trusteeship Council, and Economic and Social Council.

Question. Who is our representative to UNESCO?

Answer. The Director General of UNESCO is an American gentleman with whom you are all acquainted—Dr. Luther Evans.

Question. Formerly of the Library of Congress—

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do we have a representative also?

Answer. Not an official representative. On the governing board there's a United States national who serves as an individual in his expert capacity.

Question. Isn't that the person responsible to and appointed by the State Department—or appointed by the President?

Answer. No. We are trying to get the UNESCO Charter changed to make him an official representative responsible to the President. But the Director is the responsible administrative head.

Question. We read about the American Association for the United Nations—Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt is active in it—

Answer. Dr. Charles W. Mayo is president of it.

Question. Mrs. Roosevelt was identified with UNESCO, wasn't she?

Answer. I don't believe she was. She was on the United Nations Human Rights Commission, I know.

ISSUE OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Question. Is that a separate Commission—the Human Rights Commission—of UNESCO?

Answer. That's not UNESCO. But what the Human Rights Commission did that aroused a great deal of commotion in this country was to negotiate these human-rights covenants, and although they were approved by the executive branch at that time, none of them ever got ratified by the Senate.

Question. What year was this?

Answer. This was in 1950, 1951, 1952. When this administration took office, we took the position that we didn't approve the use of the treaty powers to effectuate internal social changes, that the treaty power existed for the regulation of international relations.

If, for example, they want to make it legal for a foreign-born person to become President of the United States, the way to do it is not to make a treaty with some country, but to amend the Constitution and pass an act of Congress. So that whole idea has been dropped now. But that infuriated a lot of people, and understandably so. Any internal changes we want to make in this country should not be done by treaty—we want to do it ourselves. Treaties are for international affairs. This had to do also with minimum-wage and sanitation conditions in factories and all that. Well, that's not a proper subject for treaties, we think.

Question. To what extent is point 4 under the U. N. or under a separate agency

Answer. Well, there is a technical-assistance program directly under the U. N., and I think it's been well run. I think we get as much out of it for our dollar as we do in our bilateral technical assistance, because we've got a lot of other nations represented that we don't get in the other, and we don't get that invidious feeling that we are dispensing charity, which tends to kill the prestige value of the gift.

Question. Conversely, though, do the people of the rest of the world know the part we play in it?

Answer. They do. It's a good-will builder.

Question. The UN doesn't get the credit?

Answer. No. I don't think so. I think that's done us a tremendous amount of good. And it isn't much money compared with most of these things.

Question. What's the budget of the UN, roughly?

Answer. We contribute \$13 million, and that's a third. The budget is 39 million.

WHAT RUSSIA PAYS

Question. What does Soviet Russia contribute?

Answer. We contribute 33 percent. The Soviets are up to about 14 percent. We got them up and got ourselves down.

Question. How are those shares fixed?

Answer. They are fixed by an expert committee in accordance with national income adjusted for per capita income. The United States share is established by the ceiling of one-third which has been fixed for the largest contributor.

Question. How do you determine Soviet wealth?

Answer. What I did when I went there as a Senator in 1950 was take all their own statements about the progress they've made. I quoted all their own figures, and on the basis of that we got it raised.

Question. Are they any wealthier than we on paper?

Answer. No. They are not as wealthy as we are on paper. You see, what happened was that in 1948, when the thing started, the expert committee, the contributions committee, took a very theoretical view and produced a recommendation that the United States ought to pay nearly 50 percent of the total. Senator Vandenberg was our representative. He told me about it. He was horrified when this thing happened. Well, there we were faced with an expert recommendation that the United States should pay half of the budget. So, it's been a constant process since then to bring it down. Senator Vandenberg got it down under 40 percent. Now it is down to 33 percent. I think that's about right.

Question. Speaking of contributions, one of the main things people are interested in is how you allocate troops when these big aggressions occur. We gave 90 percent in Korea, and they killed a lot of our boys. What is the principle of equity on which that's based?

Answer. My idea is that when an aggression occurs, broadly speaking, nations should put up troops in proportion to population. They should not be expected to put up hardware or dollar exchange, because many of them just can't do it. In 1950 at the time of the Korean aggression, somebody at the Pentagon in effect said we were not going to take any troops unless they put up their own logistic support.

Largely as a result of that policy, United Nations members, other than the United States, put up the equivalent of only two divisions. I believe that if there had not been that policy, and we had taken them just by military manpower alone, supplying the dollar logistic support where they couldn't, we'd have had six divisions. As it is, the equivalent of two divisions that we had from the other countries would have cost us \$600 million a year at World War II prices had we paid for them ourselves, which we probably would have had to do.

The cost today is a military secret, but \$600 million a year is what two divisions cost during World War II. And also there's the higher arithmetic of nearly 17,000 casualties and 3,000 dead, which we would have had probably to absorb.

So, when you measure that \$600 million against the 13 million we put in as our basic annual contribution to the United Nations budget, it is not a bad deal. But it could be a much better deal if there hadn't been this shortsighted view, and I may say that if we have another aggression that mistake will not be repeated. The President has very strong views on that.

Question. That we shouldn't allocate a disproportionate amount of our people—is that it?

Answer. Yes. When a nation has effective, valuable manpower, the United Nations should get the service of that manpower even though they haven't got dollars.

Question. And we furnish all the logistic support—

Answer. Yes. We furnish the logistic support the way we did in World War II.

MORE FIGHTING MEN

Question. What reason do you have to believe that they would have contributed four additional divisions?

Answer. I know of cases where they offered them.

Question. From other countries—

Answer. Yes. And I also believe that others could have been very easily persuaded.

Question. The Turks wanted to send more, didn't they?

Answer. Yes. The Turks wanted to send more and the Greeks wanted to send more.

Question. How about Italy and places like that?

Answer. Italy's not in the U. N., although Italy did contribute hospitals.

Question. What is the legal situation as to renewal or amendment of the charter? Is this an automatic review that does bring it up this next year?

Answer. Yes; in 1955.

Question. Does that leave it entirely open to our Congress and the other legislatures to do with it as we will?

Answer. Well, the veto applies on changing the charter, and that's why you have to get a big hue and cry going throughout the world. That's where journalism comes into the picture. Legally, any changes can be vetoed. As I have said, many times the Soviets have proven their sensitivity to public opinion, and if we could get a big hue and cry going throughout the world to want to eliminate the veto on the admission of new members, that would make it unpopular for them. They'd lose some skin by opposing, and then they might not veto.

Question. Is that a little dangerous? Isn't that a precedent that might lead to loss of the veto in other matters which Congress itself is very anxious to retain?

Answer. I don't think so. I'd fight to the death to keep the veto on troops and things of that sort.

Question. It won't be a precedent?

Answer. I don't think so. It will be just on this one thing—the admission of new members. It will just lift the admission of new members out of the category of vetoable subjects.

Question. It's a procedural question, having to do with organization rather than sovereignty, isn't it?

Answer. I wouldn't say it's "procedural." It's pretty fundamental. It involves how much of the world's population will be in or not.

TWO KINDS OF VETO

Question. But isn't it a technical point between the use of the veto to protect your own interests and the use of the veto to prevent somebody else's government from being admitted? They're two different things, aren't they?

Answer. They are two entirely different things. I haven't any doubts that we could get the votes for the countries that belong in and get the votes against the countries that don't belong in.

Question. Suppose Congress takes no action whatsoever this next year with regard to amendment, just doesn't legislate at all—is there any automatic provision that expires with regard to the U. N.?

Answer. Oh, no. The charter is a treaty, you know. There's no time limit on it. What happens is that if a modification of the charter is agreed to, then it will go to Congress for ratification by two-thirds vote. That's what will happen. Anything that is proposed must be done with that in mind.

Question. To what extent are you a free agent as the head of the United States delegation? Do you have general instructions from the State Department and you implement them yourself?

Answer. I am in the Cabinet and go to almost all the Cabinet meetings. I can't go right now. This is a very busy time for me. Usually, however, when the Assembly is not going the way it is now, I come down to Washington every Friday for Cabinet meetings. So, I get policy guidance there. And I get it from the State Department.

Question. Would you say that the United Nations, as you have studied it, is a more effective instrument than the League of Nations?

Answer. Yes. I think it's a more realistic thing. I think they've learned from some of the mistakes of the League of Nations. There isn't any question about guaranteeing territorial integrity in the United Nations, which I think was one of the major mistakes in the League of Nations under article X. I don't think anyone seriously advocates that any more today. Even the Atlantic Pact doesn't do that. Because such a guaranty commits troops to precise geographic locations which may be very bad tactically.

Question. Your grandfather—Senator Lodge—was one of those who opposed that article X very vigorously, wasn't he?

Answer. Yes. I think my grandfather was ahead of his time.

Question. Do you think your grandfather would oppose what you're doing?

Answer. Oh, not at all. This thing is like an airport. It's something you've got to have. It's not a big, transcendental, world socialistic supergovernment. It's a practical device that you have to have, with the world getting smaller all the time.

Question. Why doesn't diplomacy still do that job today?

Answer. Well, diplomacy still does 90 percent of foreign relations. There's 10 percent that's very international in character where you waste too much time trying to take it up all the way round, one by one.

Question. To what extent are diplomats who are accredited to the United Nations performing diplomatic tasks at the U. N.? Is there much of that?

Answer. An Ambassador at the U. N., for instance, doesn't conflict at all with the Ambassador of his country here in Washington. He reports directly to his home government. They have no administrative connection. Of course, they may see each other at social functions. But it's a distinct work.

Question. Is it utilized for interchange?

Answer. Oh, yes, all the time.

MEETING THE RUSSIANS

Question. Is there more interchange, perhaps, with the Soviet Union representative at the time of the U. N. meetings than there is in the way of contacts in Moscow itself?

Answer. More than in Moscow, more than in Washington.

Question. It's permanent diplomacy in effect, isn't it? Instead of occasional contacts, it is continuous—you are always there—

Answer. You are always there, and you bump into each other all the time in committee rooms, in corridors, in the delegates' lounge, and so on. It hasn't ever meant anything tangible since I've been there, but there's always the possibility that it may, and, if so, there's one less door for you to go through. I think the President feels that that contact is an asset for the American people to have just in case of need. It doesn't cost you anything.

Question. It boosts the caliber of the men who meet, too, doesn't it? In other words, ambassadors can meet in a capital, but the caliber of those men is not always the level of the men we send to the United Nations—

Answer. I've never served with a higher grade group of men than I am serving with there. The foreign governments make a tremendous effort to send intelligent men. It is a very interesting group of men to be associated with. The small countries make a tremendous effort. Because a man can have weight at the U. N. on his individual merits regardless of the size of his country.

ATOMIC ENERGY NEXT

Question. What is your opinion as to what is going to happen in the next few weeks in the Assembly? What is the nature of the subjects that you have up before this next Assembly?

Answer. Well, this is a wonderful year at the U. N., in my opinion, because for the first time there is no organized fighting going on anywhere and we have this chance

to take a step forward for President Eisenhower's plan of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

As a great man once said, "The United Nations is not created to take us to heaven, but to prevent us from going to hell." Nevertheless, if the United Nations can play a helpful part in the material well-being of the human race, it's a good thing, and it is a particularly good thing for us.

As this session we hope to do the United Nations side of implementing this proposal for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The other side of the plan is a treaty being negotiated now and setting up the agency which will put the fissionable materials to work. The United Nations should, we believe, set up a scientific conference whereby all these nations can make known their wants and get plans that transcend national frontiers so that these fissionable materials will be used in the most intelligent way. That is going to be—to me, anyway—the biggest thing in the Ninth General Assembly.

Of course, in the Security Council you never can tell what you're going to have. You can get anything there on short notice. But that, I think, is the biggest thing in the General Assembly. I have my doubts as to the Soviet's disarmament proposal that they're discussing now. It looks to me like lots of window dressing. They don't ever want to come to a serious talk about inspection.

They want to talk about inspection in the Security Council where they have the veto. Whenever they want to put anything into the Security Council you want to look out, because that's where they have the veto. They wanted to do that at the time of the Guatemala thing last June. They wanted to use the Security Council as a cover to take over Guatemala and so torpedo the Inter-American system.

Question. What do you think is the overall value in our proposals with reference to the civilian uses of atomic energy?

Answer. It's very real. The world politicians, as I see them at the U. N., are fed up with propaganda and gestures and cold-war stuff. There isn't a single cold-war device that they don't see. Now, certain parts of the public may be fooled by them, but the politicians are not. They think we are genuine and we mean it. This peaceful use of atomic energy is a proof of our genuineness.

I think, perhaps, one of our greatest national assets throughout the world is that people think we are kind. I hear it said that we're the first powerful nation in history that has been kind and hasn't wanted to imperialize and throw its weight around. This atomic proposal is tangible proof that we have a heart and we are kind, and I think it has done us an enormous amount of good.

The fact that after President Eisenhower made it, on the 8th of December, we worked quietly all this time without making a lot of propaganda out of it, I think, shows our sincerity. It showed that we were making a sincere effort to have productive bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union, which failed.

WHY WARMONGERS?

Question. And yet people come back from Europe and tell us repeatedly that throughout the world we are regarded as warmongers—

Answer. The Communists are trying to make it seem that way, and I will say that some of our fellow citizens cooperate with them, sometimes unwittingly, because we do have some people who talk of nothing but dropping the bomb. Many of our magazines print these long articles about how we are going to attack and how this is going to happen and that is going to happen. Of course, every time we do that, the Communists pick it up and say, "There's the voice of the United States Government," and repeat it.

We don't always put our best foot forward. The noises that come out of America are often not the representative noises. The things that go out abroad about us are the things that are trivial—vulgar movies, arm-chair strategists, braggarts, and things like that.

The Soviets send pianists, ballet dancers, chess players, and in Europe they're beginning to think how civilized the Russians are and that the Americans think about nothing but the atomic bomb. I think we ought to put more money into showing the world what we really are.

Question. Isn't it amazing that men such as Clement Attlee, of Britain, who you think would know better, or Aneurin Bevan make the same charges?

Answer. Well, of course, I am speechless when I think of some of the things Attlee and Bevan have been saying.

Question. But they are representative of lots of people in Europe—

Answers. I don't know how representative they really are. I saw what Prime Minister Churchill said recently about the Anglo-American alliance, which I thought was pretty good, and I don't think if it came right down to a vote that the rank and file of the Labor Party would follow Bevan on cutting off ties with the United States.

INDIA'S INFLUENCE

Question. Do people like India's Krishna Menon have much influence in the U. N.?

Answer. Well, India is a great country in population. People pay a lot of attention to India. I pay a lot of attention to India. Whoever is representative of India is going to have a lot of attention paid him.

Question. You have a pretty good speaking knowledge of French, don't you?

Answer. Yes. I speak French.

Question. Would you say it has been helpful?

Answer. Very helpful indeed. French is a second language with many, many people.

Question. Do you write French as well as you do English?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Do many of the Russians there speak French?

Answer. Yes, quite a few Russians speak French. There are lots of Latin Americans who speak French—although I speak a little bad Spanish. French is a second language for some of the Arabs. French is very, very useful.

Question. How about the other people in your delegation—do any of them have other languages?

Answer. I make it a point always to have a Russian-language man on my staff. I have some very good Spanish-language men. There are five official languages in the U. N. I haven't a man who speaks Chinese because the Chinese all speak perfect English.

Question. How many members are there in the United States delegation?

Answer. Every country is entitled to 10 delegates—5 delegates, 5 alternates—to the General Assembly. The alternates are not like alternates to a national convention. They do everything the delegates do. The only difference is they sit lower down. There are 60 countries, most of them with a delegation of 10, so there are nearly 600 delegates.

Question. There are a good many social functions?

Answer. There have to be. You see, it's like a national convention that runs for 3 months—if you can imagine such a thing. You get all these people coming in from all over the world. There are not only the 600 delegates. There are X number of attachés and juniors, and you have to get to know everybody quickly and try to maintain a friendly atmosphere.

Question. Going back to a point we touched on, this document issued by the International Civil Service Advisory Board which indicated to some people that the

allegiance of a United Nations employee was forsaken to his own country and greater allegiance given to the United Nations—how is that really viewed in the U. N.?

Answer. Well, of course, that is a perfectly preposterous concept. When I was asked about it on Meet the Press recently, I denounced it immediately because no American who works for an international organization puts himself above the law of the United States. It's perfectly ridiculous.

There is no higher allegiance there than the allegiance to our own flag. There's no allegiance at all to the United Nations. It's an organization, it's an instrumentality, it's a contrivance. It's a very useful, necessary thing, but it has none of the attributes of government.

It was a very wrong and unfortunate use of the word "loyalty." I went around to the United Nations the next day, and the Secretary General issued a statement to the press completely sustaining my viewpoint. The report was badly worded in the first place, and then it was further misunderstood in the press. The Chairman of the Board issued a statement to that effect. Of course, the Board is only advisory to the Secretary General, anyway.

QUESTION OF LOYALTY

Question. How does this question of allegiance come up? Is there any occasion on which a professional employee of the United Nations would be asked to do something that would be contrary to the interests of the United States?

Answer. I can't imagine it. It's never happened.

Question. Why does the question come up, then?

Answer. In this U. N. Secretariat case it was really a misunderstanding because of poor choice of words. But a real loyalty question has come up in the case of UNESCO, because eight Americans employed by UNESCO have had a negative loyalty report from the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board of the United States Government. Seven of them wouldn't even appear, let alone answer any questions. These people evidently think because they work for UNESCO they don't have to do what every other American would.

Question. What redress do we have in a case like this?

Answer. To state the facts and press the organization to correct the situation.

Question. How can those people receive funds from the United States Government?

Answer. They do so indirectly through our contribution to UNESCO. However, that's up to the Congress and the State Department. UNESCO is not in my jurisdiction. The question is important only in UNESCO. It has no reality as far as the U. N. itself is concerned because we have never had any such problem.

Question. Are those people still functioning as employees of UNESCO?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Can they be held in contempt of anything? Can they be arrested?

Answer. I don't know what you can do with them. They are in Paris. You can take away their passports, perhaps. I don't know. The State Department has tried patiently. Mr. Gerety, who has been chairman of this International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board, has been very patient. I should imagine that the United States Government could do quite a number of things. But you ought to ask the State Department about that. You're getting out of my field.

"STATELESS" FRIENDS

Question. Are there any stateless people on the secretariats of international organizations?

Answer. Yes, there are, and some are very good friends of ours. That's why I think it would be a pity to pass a law which says that nobody shall work for the United Nations

who isn't approved by the Attorney General. If we did that, then all countries would be able to do the same thing and we might lose some of these anti-Communists who are very friendly to us and who do us a lot of good. It would be a good idea to pass a law like that if we weren't screening our nationals in the Secretariat in other ways, but we are weeding them out through the President's Executive order.

We have 1,800 Americans there and all of the policymaking ones in important positions have been cleared, from Ralph Bunche, Director of the U. N. Trusteeship Division, on down. There are only a handful, about 50, who have not yet been cleared, and they are in very minor jobs. They will be reviewed shortly. So, when you are working it out effectively that way, why hamstringing yourself by passing a law which will result in some of your good friends in their being dismissed?

Federal Payroll Reduced by \$612 Million in 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal payroll for civilian employees of the executive branch during the calendar year 1954 was \$612,123,000 less than for the preceding calendar year.

In December 1954, the number of Federal civilian employees was 186,238 less than in January 1953.

Since 1930 the population of the United States has increased 30 percent. In the same period the number of Federal employees increased 300 percent and the dollar amount of the payrolls increased 900 percent.

However much we may wish for even more substantial reductions in the payroll figures than were accomplished in 1954, the achievement of President Eisenhower's administration on this score is tremendously significant and heartening.

Not only have the brakes been put on, so far as a dangerous 20-year trend is concerned, but the trend has actually been reversed.

The following charts, taken from News Bulletin No. 49, issued by Paul O. Peters, give the comparative executive payroll figures for the calendar years 1953 and 1954:

Calendar year 1953

Month	Employees	Payrolls
January.....	2,554,310	\$893,513,000
February.....	2,540,954	836,739,000
March.....	2,526,819	897,785,000
April.....	2,502,772	887,745,000
May.....	2,478,963	799,638,000
June.....	2,482,359	823,980,000
July.....	2,454,714	834,482,000
August.....	2,430,412	785,594,000
September.....	2,401,912	808,805,000
October.....	2,373,113	787,943,000
November.....	2,366,710	757,788,000
December.....	2,357,294	874,352,000
Total for 1953.....		9,980,386,000

Calendar year 1954

Month	Employees	Payrolls
January.....	2,346,892	\$756,498,000
February.....	2,340,962	729,975,000
March.....	2,340,137	803,530,000
April.....	2,335,296	782,146,000
May.....	2,330,509	751,688,000
June.....	2,333,894	781,945,000
July.....	2,332,200	774,902,000
August.....	2,331,508	774,464,000
September.....	2,317,565	780,632,000
October.....	2,323,029	753,513,000
November.....	2,343,707	780,632,000
December.....	2,368,072	904,338,000
Total for 1954.....		9,374,263,000

George Washington: The Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Clem D. Johnson, of Roanoke, Va., who is the president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. He delivered the address entitled "George Washington: The Businessman," at the annual George Washington Day dinner of the American Good Government Society, at Washington, D. C., on February 22, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deem it a high privilege to have a special part in this tribute to the Father of our country.

One of our 19th century historians, Herbert B. Adams, once observed that, "It would seem as though in one way or another, all lines of our public policy lead back to George Washington, as all roads led to Rome."

In my opinion, Mr. Adams' comment would be no less true had it been written yesterday. It is safe to say that we have never gone wrong by heeding Washington's advice.

Lord Brougham, the Scottish statesman, referred to Washington as "the greatest man that ever lived in this world uninspired by divine wisdom and unsustained by supernatural virtue."

Of course, his lordship's judgment might have been colored just a little bit. Brougham was the author of a manuscript entitled "Statesmen in the Time of George III," and considering the caliber of the British Ministry in that day and age, this must have been a dismal undertaking.

By contrast, it seems logical that Washington assumed an almost Olympian luster. Nevertheless, Lord Brougham's superlative appraisal of the first President is by no means undeserved, although I believe that we prefer to think of Washington as sort of a common denominator of ourselves—as the average American raised to the nth power.

For all his special qualities, George Washington was intensely human, and the more we think of him in that perspective, the more his memory becomes our surest anchor to the fundamentals of our Republic and to the precepts of the men who brought it into being.

My assignment in this annual seminar on the life of George Washington is to discuss him as a businessman. No subject could be more to my liking, but I confess that I approached it with some trepidation. The stereotyped stories of the Washington career say little or nothing of his business talent and commercial adventures.

As children, we are exposed to the ridiculous legend of the hatchet and the cheery tree, which as you know, was a fabrication of a certain Parson Weems.

Then we find Washington as an attaché of a very foolish British general named Braddock. It was Braddock, you recall, who thought it was most unsporting of the Indians to shoot at him from ambush. One can only hope that in his final moments the general was sustained by the knowledge that he himself had obeyed every rule of war as he had learned them on the vacant lots and the cobblestoned squares of the Old World.

The third chapter in the Washington stereotype finds Washington summoned to command the continental troops. He is victorious—he is elected President—he refuses a third term and retires to Mount Vernon.

Somewhere along the line, the stereotype tells us that George Washington married the wealthiest young widow in Virginia, and we are left with the unhappy impression that he never really knew what it was to work for a living.

This assumption is absurd on the face of it. As many a man has discovered, it is frequently more difficult to marry money and to live with what comes with it than to earn a competence on his own hook.

The truth is that if ever there was a self-made man, it was George Washington, and those are not my words. I was quoting from the late Calvin Coolidge, and Mr. Coolidge was so cautious in his judgment that he wouldn't admit a sheep has been sheared unless he had walked all around it and seen both sides of it.

A little research in the business life of Washington reveals that he was not only a self-made man but got off to an early start.

He was worth at least \$20,000 by the time he was 21, and every shilling had been acquired through his own efforts, and no thanks to anyone. At the age of 16, he was a qualified surveyor, with a commission to survey a vast acreage in the Shenandoah Valley then possessed by Lord Fairfax.

The young Washington spent 3 rugged years in the wilderness, working at daily wages that varied from \$7.20 to \$21.70 in terms of our money—and no squirrel was ever more thrifty. Or any young eagle more farsighted.

While on his mission for Lord Fairfax, Washington patented 500 acres of wild land in Frederick County for himself, and proudly called it My Bull-Skin Plantation, because of its proximity to Bullskin Creek. At the age of 18, his savings were sufficient for him to buy 456 acres adjoining this plantation for \$112.

And when he was 20, he bought 525 additional acres of Bullskin Creek for \$150. At 21, he had about 1,500 acres of good land and had spent considerable money on improvements. The clearing and cultivating of his holdings were not long delayed after he had staked out his claim and made his purchases.

The young Washington had known from childhood that he must make his own way. He was a younger son, while the principal heir to his father's estate was his half-brother Lawrence. His father left George a typical younger son's portion—a few acres on the Rappahannock—but not until the death of his mother, when he was a middle-aged man, did Washington come into possession of this bequest—and by that time it was only frosting on the cake he had baked for himself.

It is true, of course, that he came into possession of Mount Vernon through the untimely death of his half-brother Lawrence and the even more untimely death of Lawrence's daughter, Sarah, but Washington had already started on the road to wealth and would have acquired it without assistance.

The popular picture of George Washington as the pampered son of a rich father rather fades away when one peruses this record, and there emerges instead the portrait of a determined young free enterpriser who knows exactly where he is going and how to get there.

George Washington was a born businessman with a knack for management and a head for figures that his fellow executors of his half-brother's estate were not slow to discover. The other four dumped the burden of administration on his youthful shoulders. Lawrence had been the principal stockholder in the Principio Iron Works which operated profitable mines in Maryland and Virginia, and had been active in the business. George stepped into his place until the estate's interests were sold, thus acquiring his initial experience in an industrial concern.

At the same time, he was the administrator of a farflung empire known as the Ohio Company of which Lawrence had been president and principal stockholder. It was a development project involving a half million acres of western Virginia land—and a ticklish operation all the way around, for the French thumbed their noses at Virginia titles and claimed the whole of it.

Fortunately for young Washington—and fortunately for the United States as it turned out—Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia was disposed to argue with the French, partly because he too was a stockholder in the enterprise.

And so we find George, at the age of 21, commissioned by the governor to dispute the French claims—first by exploring the territory and then as an officer of militia with orders to settle the matter by force, if need be.

While these adventures more properly belong in the military phase of the Washington career, they served to introduce Washington to a territory in which he was to be much interested later on, both as a land owner and as President struggling to establish the land policies of a nation.

Meanwhile, there was Mount Vernon, an operation so large for its day, that it needed a strong hand to guide it in order to pay off, and Washington, the businessman, plunged into the multiple duties of a farm manager.

We can dismiss from our minds any picture of Washington as the gay young blade of the fox hunts, revels, balls, and routs of an easy going country squire life. There was social life aplenty, true enough, but the work came first.

Soldiering had not been a moneymaking enterprise, and while George was rich enough in land when he returned to Mount Vernon he was almost penniless as far as ready cash was concerned. The estate was neglected, run by indifferent management, and its records were either nonexistent or in a wild tangle.

As a farm manager, Washington would have no trouble filling one of the top jobs in that field today. Besides that he loved the life, and he once said that "the life of the husbandman of all others, is the most delightful. It is honorable, it is amusing, and with judicious management, it is profitable."

Every acre he owned or managed he sought to make profitable, and it might well be said that he was several generations ahead of his time in soil conservation, crop rotation, and fertilizing methods. We find among his writings the comment that "the present mode of cropping practiced among us, is destructive to landed property, and must, if

persisted in much longer, ultimately ruin the holders of it."

It is regrettable that Washington left us no thoughts on the subject of farm price supports, but as one reads between the lines of his agricultural methods, one is given the impression that he probably would not have approved.

Mount Vernon had produced some bumper crops of tobacco, but Washington disliked the manner in which tobacco drained the soil of its substance and he concentrated on the small grains, particularly wheat. In later years, he built his own flour mills, becoming the largest flour producer and merchant in the colonies.

He was then a surveyor, a dealer in lands, a coal-mine operator, a farmer, a miller, and on the side, a fisherman.

He tells of catching 50,000 herring in one night, all of which were salted down for sale.

This operation and others made it necessary for him to employ skilled labor on rather an extensive scale, and his relations with his help were uniformly excellent.

The term "fringe benefit" was then unknown, but we find him signing a contract with an expert gardener wherein it is specified that the gardener was to have "\$4 at Christmas with which he may be drunk for 4 days and 4 nights; \$2 at Easter to effect the same purpose, so at Whitsuntide to be drunk for 2 days; a dram in the morning and a drink of grog at dinner at noon." Those of course, were the happy days of strong beer at tuppence the quart.

It was against this background as a colonial businessman that Washington was summoned to command the first American Army.

As an officer of Virginia militia, he had learned more than the art of war. He had learned the infinite details of administration that enter into preparing an army for the field and maintaining its lifeline of supplies.

As a private entrepreneur, he was known throughout the colonies for his shrewd business brains, his meticulous honesty, and his almost uncanny ability to pick the right man for the right job.

Washington's mind was the business mind. He was not a businessman in the modern sense of the word, solely because he did not live in a business age. But the problems which he understood and knew how to solve were executive problems, and he approached them in the executive manner. His ability expressed itself in the selection of subordinates and in getting results through them.

And he needed all of this ability when he took over as Commander in Chief of the American forces. We all like to think that the Revolution represented a popular uprising of an outraged citizenry—when the truth is that only a minority of the citizens were sufficiently aroused to give aid and comfort to the cause.

The total population of the colonies was about 2½ million. Of these, half a million were slaves. Of the remaining 2 million, one-third, at least, were definitely Tories. This left 1,400,000, about one-fifth of which were potential soldiers.

Had all of them entered the service, Washington might have had an armed force of 280,000 men. But he never had any more than 25,000 men in his command at any one time, and that number rarely.

He found himself in command of an army without food or clothing; an army that was beset by short-term enlistments and rankled by hand-to-mouth pay in dubious currency. It had little artillery, and gunpowder was frequently so scarce there were only 10 rounds issued to a man.

We have all been told of the rigors of Valley Forge, and we are given a pathetic picture of Washington retiring to the quiet of a snow-swept glen to kneel in prayer for

divine guidance in an hour of dreadful crisis. Perhaps he did pray, but we might just as well be told a little more often that Washington was strong for the idea that God helps those who help themselves.

He had chosen Valley Forge as winter quarters in 1777 partly because of its proximity to Philadelphia, which was occupied by the British, and partly because the countryside was rich in wheat and cattle, which the honest farmers were eager to sell—if someone had the wherewithal in gold.

Washington had no gold, and the farmers seemed to be somewhat lacking in that impulsive quality of patriotism so necessary to make continental money look attractive. As a result, the British in Philadelphia got the beef and wheat—and the troops at Valley Forge gnawed on their belts and bootlaces.

Then Washington went into action. He issued an order—quite without authority, of course—that all farmers within a distance of 70 miles must thresh one-half of their wheat by the first of February, and the other half by the first of March.

Otherwise, he would seize it all and pay for it as straw. He sent his officers to enforce this order, and on the side, they contrived to persuade the reluctant agriculturists to part with cattle as well. Perhaps we had better not inquire too closely into the methods by which this persuasion was accomplished.

We do know, however, that Washington insisted that careful records be kept, so that every farmer would be paid in the end.

Naturally, there were many complaints to the Continental Congress, and in answer to charges filed against him, Washington replied that "necessity had warranted" his conduct, and he added that "a character to lose, an estate to forfeit, the inestimable blessing of liberty at stake, and a life devoted must be my excuse."

He was the original "Do it now man," and I have often wondered if the phrase, "Let George do it," might not have originated as a result of his administration of the Continental Army.

The Congress hesitated to make adequate provisions for arms and provisions in the weird concept that the people might protest from fear of military tyranny, and the public felt that patriotism from a small group of men was all that was required to insure success.

It was well known then, as now, you see, that any American could lick 10 lobsterbacks or 10 foreigners from anywhere—with his hands tied behind him.

Washington was under no such illusions, which probably accounts for his welcome to Baron von Steuben as drill master of the Army and his welcome to other foreign officers of experience in specialized arts of war.

While it is true that he might have bumbled in choosing Benedict Arnold to command West Point, he more than made up for this by the selection of such officers as Nathaniel Greene for important commands.

Greene was to Washington what Stonewall Jackson was to Robert E. Lee—a faithful subordinate of superior skill, the dependable vice president of what might well be called a new corporation—a man who could be given an assignment and then left to his own resources to carry it through with success.

Washington's career as a general was rather aptly summed up by Calvin Coolidge when he said that "we see the qualities of a great man of business which he brings to serve the vast task of organizing and equipping his armies."

The business general became the business President.

Once again, he surrounded himself with capable subordinates. Alexander Hamilton he had known and trusted for 12 years, and

he made him Secretary of the Treasury. Henry Knox was a trusted officer of the Revolution and became Secretary of War; Edmund Randolph was Attorney General, and Thomas Jefferson—largely because of his experience abroad—became Secretary of State.

One biographer of George Washington describes the launching of the first administration in the following words:

"The business in hand was to maintain and strengthen a new Nation with the aid of nation-builders of vision and courage. The war experience, coupled with a knowledge of the everyday man, since that time, had convinced Washington that the average citizen was not thinking nationally—that he had no conception of what was really taking place in the formation of a republic but was still immersed in local self-government. The education of the average citizen was a job to be performed by wise and efficient service from men who, like himself, were ready to set an example and live and act for the common good."

One of the first orders directed to the executive staff of the infant Government by the first President reads like this:

"Let me impress the following maxim upon executive officers. In all important matters, deliberate maturely, but execute promptly and vigorously and do not put things off until tomorrow which can be done and require to be done today. Without an adherence to these rules, business will never be done, or done in an easy manner, but will always be in arrears, with one thing treading upon the heels of another."

The word "arrears" in that quotation is highly pertinent, for if the new nation was anything at all, it was busted. There is no need to dwell on the manner in which the first Washington administration tackled the question of sound money and the public debt.

We will all be hearing more of that during the Alexander Hamilton bicentennial in 1957. And in passing, may I say that I am happy to note that the Alexander Hamilton Commission for which plans were first announced at this dinner last year, is now a going concern, with the blessing of the Congress and the administration.

Hamilton's program, it goes without saying, could not have succeeded without the strong shoulder of Washington behind the wheel. Washington viewed a public debt with the same repugnance that he had always viewed a private debt. He abhorred the idea of cheap money; he was anti-inflationary—and while we usually look to his writings for inspiration in more esthetic matters, it might behoove us to remember that he was what we today would call a bug on economy. This extended to his personal life as president.

On one occasion, the steward of his household found that only one shad was available in the market, and knowing Washington's liking for this fish, he bought it without stopping to count the cost.

When the fish was served, the President asked him how much it had cost. Washington knew the shad season as well as any fisherman of his day, and this wasn't the shad season.

"Three dollars," said the steward.

"Take it away," Washington thundered. "Take it away. It shall never be said that my table sets such an example of luxury and extravagance."

It would be fatuous for me to suggest that George Washington was the prototype of the modern man of business, and yet I believe that a businessman can read his biographies and his writings with an understanding that needs but little nudging from those who make a profession of interpreting the Washington career.

The fundamental principle underlying all of his private business operations was that

the possession of property carried with it an obligation to make it produce profitably for the owner and at the same time contribute something to the common good.

He carried that same principle into public life, translating it to mean that stewardship of national affairs must function on the business pattern.

Nowhere do we find any record of Washington subscribing to the present-day picture of work as an evil or to the philosophy that a man with a 20-hour workweek is somehow twice as happy as a man with a 40-hour workweek, and that presumably the happiest man of all is the man with a "no-hour" workweek—what the wags now refer to as a guaranteed annual wage with full unemployment.

George Washington was not only prudent, thrifty, and industrious—he got real joy out of his work—he knew the satisfaction of a good job well done.

His whole life was dedicated to building, to producing, to uplifting. I suspect that he did these things instinctively, not from his high sense of duty, but because he found them pleasant and satisfying and because they appealed to his innate sense of rightness.

Somehow it is hard for us to imagine George Washington demanding rigid price supports or free Government fertilizer, more pay for less work or advocating repeal of a State right-to-work law, or buying off a labor racketeer.

It would be hard to picture him in a movement to obtain freedom from want and freedom from fear at the cost of his own personal freedom of action.

George Washington, businessman, farmer, one of the richest Americans of his day, did not hesitate to risk his fortune and life when freedom was at stake.

Have times changed so much that we can now afford to ignore his example?

Failure To Educate Young Americans Is Good News to the Russians Who Are Going Strong With Their Own Educational Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the February 21, 1955, issue of the *Montgomery (Ala.) Examiner*:

IKE'S EDUCATION PLAN A DUB

President Eisenhower has been sold a bill of goods on his program for school construction, according to top school men over the Nation, including those in Montgomery.

They say the administration plan amounts to little more than saying to the States—"Do it yourselves."

Senator LISTER HILL is among those who do not take the school crisis lightly. He says there must be a substantial school construction program if our American children are to get a decent education. Senator HILL insists that the United States, as the world's richest nation and its leader, must prepare youngsters to lead.

The issue boils down to this: Either Uncle Sam does the job, or it won't be done.

And failure to educate young Americans is good news to the Russians, who are going

strong with their own educational program, including the preparation of technical men and scientists.

Ike would do well to get behind the education plans being offered by Senator HILL and other Democrats.

Conditions in Foreign Shipyards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee, of which I had the privilege of serving as chairman, made an inspection trip in Europe last fall, and upon its return submitted a comprehensive report relating to conditions in foreign shipyards. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, obtained unanimous consent, on February 18, to have this report printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it is contained on page A1044.

As a supplement to that report, I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to comments which were made on December 8, 1954, at a panel discussion on shipbuilding and ship repair, held in connection with the American Merchant Marine Conference and 28th annual meeting of the Propeller Club of the United States at Miami, Fla. These observations very succinctly emphasize the point that the relative efficiency of the United States shipyards in world shipbuilding is a matter of great importance to the economy and security of the United States.

With the hope that this excellent paper, entitled "Relative Efficiency of United States Shipyards in World Shipbuilding," prepared and delivered by Mr. Harry W. Pierce, president, New York Shipbuilding Corp., will contribute to a better understanding of the problems of our shipbuilding and ship repair industries, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the year just past, I have talked to a great many people in an attempt to impress them with two urgent needs; that of a strong and modern American merchant marine and that of a healthy shipbuilding industry in these United States. My interest is not wholly altruistic or objective—in fact, I will cheerfully admit that it is partially self-serving. As president of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., my own interests and personal welfare are bound up with shipbuilding. If there is no American merchant fleet there will be little, if any, shipbuilding beyond that carried on by our own Navy. As one who finds a peculiar and lasting satisfaction in ships and shipping, and because I believe sincerely and wholeheartedly in the importance of both to our national defense, as well as to the national economy, my labor sprang also from conviction that the cause is just.

A great many ships have been built by the maritime countries of the world since the end of World War II. A surprisingly large number—over 250 seagoing ships—aggregating over 5 million tons—have been built by American companies or American capital, but not in the United States. Shipbuilding has thrived in England, in Sweden, in Holland, to mention some of the leaders. It continues to flourish, particularly now in Western Germany and Japan. Yet with all this activity the shipyards of the United States have seen few similarly busy or prosperous years. At no time has there been anything like full utilization of the relatively modest peace-time potential of our established building yards. Why not?

The basic answer, of course, is price—that is, the cost of the ship to the customer. Of course, the price tag is not always the only consideration, for we have seen in recent years a situation in tankers, where time of delivery was more important than first cost. There are many other factors as well—financing arrangements or inducements, tax considerations, exchange rates or frozen currencies, indirect subsidies, protective laws and governmental regulations and, in many cases, national pride.

Nevertheless, I think there will be little dispute with the general premise that the bulk of shipbuilding contracts flow to the area where the customer gets the best price, all factors considered. Why then is the United States at such a disadvantage in the world market for ships? To put it another way, if ships for other than coastwise trade are to be built in this country, it is apparent that this can be done only through subsidy. For what, then, does this subsidy from the taxpayer pay? Are we only equalizing cost factors which result from the high American wage rates, or are we compensating for inefficiency and lack of enterprise and ingenuity on the part of American shipyards? If it is solely the matter of American wage scales or living standards, then why do not the same circumstances apply with equal force to all manufactured products? How do we sell anything in the world markets without subsidy, or protect our own home markets without excessive tariffs or regulations?

I am not going to attempt an exhaustive discussion on so wide a field as the questions above imply. Nor will I belabor this group with a debate on fundamental policies on which I feel sure we would find little disagreement. Rather, I would like to attempt to answer in terms understandable to our average fellow citizens, the question of relative efficiency and why we find ourselves at a particular disadvantage in shipbuilding. As anyone who has been involved even slightly in the question of shipbuilding subsidies knows full well, precise and mathematical determination of cost differentials are wellnigh impossible. This difficulty itself would force me to keep my observations in general terms. Regardless of differentials, the selling price of any fabricated article the world over is made up of four parts: (1) Labor, direct and indirect; (2) materials or services bought by the builder; (3) fixed charges or overhead, taxes, insurance, etc.; (4) profit.

Of these factors, we today will deal principally with only one—labor—which is by far the major consideration. It is obvious that labor enters into the cost of materials and services bought and therefore any advantage in general labor costs is reflected in lower material costs to the foreign shipbuilder. In any specific case this is susceptible of reasonably accurate determination. The cost of indirect labor is likewise a large part of overhead, but the real importance of overhead lies in the volume of work to which it must be allocated. Exorbitant profit margins simply do not exist in this competitive day; and if anything, percentagewise, higher margins are a matter of accepted practice abroad.

The labor cost is the product of two factors: the man-hours spent in performing work multiplied by the rate of pay.

The second of these factors—the rate of pay—is very largely beyond the control of the shipbuilder. The charge is often made that in the wartime days of cost-plus, or where subsidies are concerned, the shipbuilding employer has no incentive to oppose exorbitant demands made by his labor and that he cheerfully submits the bill to the Government. This is a charge neither easily proven or disproven. When management and labor sit down in collective bargaining to negotiate wage rates, many elements enter the picture. Certainly no shipbuilder has a desire to price himself out of the market, even as far as his American competition is concerned, although this is a consideration that apparently does not enter into some union thinking.

Nevertheless, in shipbuilding there is no great departure from the general industry pattern when all factors are considered, nor are there great differences between that pattern and corresponding rates in other heavy industry. Fringe benefits, which are so large a part of present day labor costs, premiums paid by various incentive or bonus systems, holidays and other payments for time not worked, make direct comparisons within our own country difficult. A comparison is practically impossible when applied to foreign countries, with the added complications of exchange rates and Government aid, particularly in those countries with a socialistic regime. In a paper presented in March 1953 at the meeting of the Philadelphia section of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, Mr. Ingvar Jung gave a table of average wages for shipyard workers, reduced to United States dollars per hour as follows:

United States of America.....	1.80
Scandinavia.....	.80
Sweden.....	.90
Denmark.....	.64
Norway.....	.55
Great Britain.....	.54
Germany.....	.40
Holland.....	.38
Italy.....	.33
Japan.....	.10

As has been pointed out, exact comparisons are difficult or impossible. The figures quoted, however, are in general agreement with other sources and can be taken to at least indicate the tremendous cost handicap faced by the American shipyards.

If it were possible to reduce all elements to real wages, we could better evaluate the differential faced by the American shipbuilder. The major differences in the standard of living are quite evident to even the most casual visitor to foreign lands. One has only to look at the bicycles parked around a Dutch shipyard, and the automobiles at one of our own. Or look at the average workingman's home in this country with its television, electrical appliances, and other luxuries. Or look at the relatively expensive hobbies or recreational pursuits of the average American in comparison with his foreign counterpart.

I am sure no one wants to see the standard of living reduced in this country. It is what makes America great. Nor is the skilled shipyard worker one bit less deserving of the wages with which to enjoy these good things than the plumber, machinist, or the electrician in other industry. In fact, the fluctuation in shipyard employment, some of shipbuilding's physical drawbacks and hazards, make it sufficiently less desirable an occupation so that wages paid should not be considered so grossly out of line as they are frequently represented to be.

We here are primarily interested in the relative efficiency of foreign and American yards, i. e., the output per man-hour. For the purpose of further analysis in this di-

rection, differences in output per man-hour could be due to some or all of the following: (a) Greater industry on the part of men; (b) greater skill as craftsmen; (c) more extensive or better use of modern tools; (d) development of new and timesaving methods; (e) simplification of product. Each of these deserves a bit of elaboration, if only to stimulate later discussion.

There is little published data to substantiate or disprove the relative diligence of various national groups. Further, as in America, there is significant variation between yards in the same country. We hear much of the native industriousness of the Japanese, yet the tonnage output in the United States against total employment compares favorably with theirs. The power consumption curves I have seen in large Japanese shipyards indicate the same characteristics at the start and end of shifts as in our own. I am inclined to believe more the reports I read of the productivity of the West Germans, if only because most of the pertinent comment on their activities comes from competitive English builders. Certainly, the war proved the efficiency and effectiveness of free labor, even in the face of strikes and stoppages, over plodding slave labor. The American workman is subject to many psychological reactions, and there seems to be no question of his output once the proper incentive—and this is not always money—is offered.

In the matter of individual skill as craftsmen, I am inclined to believe that we actually have some advantage. It is true that the effectiveness of foreign industry is largely reliant on the aptitude of the individual craftsman as opposed to machine mass production in this country. Prolonged apprenticeships in our skilled trades are no longer so common as they were in the past. In their place, however, we find more stress on manual skills in our schools and the mechanical inclination of most of our youth, reflected in their amazing interest and skill in radio, model airplanes, hotrod cars, and similar hobbies.

In modern tools, I believe we have largely lost our one-time advantage. The use of electric power, pneumatic tools, modern welding and burning techniques, and specialized machine tools is now the common rule and not the exception abroad. Plants damaged during war years have been rebuilt, modernized, and reequipped. What plant manager would not welcome an opportunity to tear down parts of his plant and rebuild anew, particularly if the kindly Uncle in Washington footed much of the bill through ECA and Mutual Security aid?

Foreign shipyards have, by large, overtaken us in our war-gained lead in the development of the welded ship. The foreign inspection teams, under the auspices of the various economic recovery programs, gleaned much from their tours of American industrial plants and have obviously put the information to good use in modernizing their own plants and methods. Another more recent and perhaps far-reaching innovation in shipbuilding practice is European in origin. I refer to the use of the optical plate marking system wherein comparatively small-scale drawings, made very accurately, take the place of the oldtime full-scale loft layout, and are projected full size directly on the steel. Very considerable manpower savings are claimed and its adoption by leading yards throughout Europe is indicative. This development has not yet been accepted by the shipbuilding industry in this country, but it may be forced upon us by the lack of skilled loftsmen as well as its possibilities in labor saving.

Unquestionably, a most fertile field in this competitive day lies in the direction of cost reduction through simplification. The engineer's first answer to his problem is not always the best solution from the standpoint

of manufacture. Close liaison of drawing room and the shops can develop some amazing savings without detriment to the finished product and, in fact, frequently with improvement in function and maintenance. Special attention to this field is now being paid by some of our largest industrial corporations; it is one equally attractive to the shipbuilder and marine designer. This is not to be confused with another field in which the designer is vitally interested—constant research and improvement in structure, propulsion, fuel economy, better cargo handling, and so on. Through the research program of the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers, a united effort is being made to keep American design ahead of our foreign competition. The program has been primarily financed by the shipbuilders, but the program merits and has in large degree the financial support of all maritime industry.

Overriding all of the above avenues of attack on costs are the very simple but basic items of: (1) volume, (2) continuity. It has been through the development of mass production methods that American engineers have revolutionized industry and raised our standard of living. At the same time, mass production and a consistent reduction in the labor portion of the sales dollar has made it possible for America to undersell many a foreign product for years. The Old World concept of craftsmanship, of the custom-built article, the lack of enterprise to invest heavily in capital equipment, which could be justified only by volume production and mass selling, have been the salvation of the American manufacturer in many a foreign market. No less an authority than Business Week has pointed out in recent months that our foreign competitors are fast overhauling us in this field. An increasing use of mass production methods abroad, coupled with low wage rates, is making it harder for all American products to meet competition on the world market.

There has never been and, by the nature of ships, there simply cannot be mass production of ships in that same sense. Two world wars have led to the production of an extraordinary number of ships built from a single design. Such multiple ship production is only a small step toward the concept of mass production. True, these programs resulted in spectacular savings in successive ships. They made possible the dilution of trained shipbuilders, with the relatively quick training of green men to specialized jobs; intrinsic saving in engineering costs and through greater volume of purchases. The result, however, was not reduction of man-hours through mass production machine methods, but simply the opportunity to reduce man-hours through somewhat more efficient utilization of manual skills. Could Chevrolet or Ford, for example, tool up for an efficient run of 500 cars?

It is hardly necessary to point out here that in peacetime our domestic shipbuilding never has had neither the volume nor any degree of continuity that would supply stability to our industry. In bad times, the skilled shipbuilder seeks work in other and more stable industries. Once he is conversant with job stability, he is not likely to be drawn back into shipbuilding by sporadic programs. At the same time it would be an extraordinarily venturesome management who would invest the kind of money required for extensive facilities with such an indefinite and uncertain market ahead.

Summing up, I think we may fairly conclude that today's American shipyards measure up, on a productive basis, to foreign competition. As a matter of fact, a comparison of recent figures for tanker construction indicates quite clearly that at least a portion of the tremendous wage differential has been overcome, either through efficiency of some of our yards, or by drastic cuts in overhead and profit margins. The

great disparity here and abroad lies solely in the matter of wages, which reflect the relative standards of living here and overseas. This differential is so great that it seems improbable that it can be overcome by any possible effort on the part of our shipyards alone; in other words, some Government assistance in the form of subsidy must help to bridge the gap. It is more than justified by the value of our shipyards both in national defense and as an essential part of our national economy. It is not paying for inefficiency or lack of effort.

Our survival in the world market beyond the reach of subsidy, however, presents a challenge to the labor, management, and technical personnel to prove their right to the American standard of living in outproducing foreign competition by sheer ingenuity, diligence, and teamwork.

Deficit Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRICE DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Deficit Spending Is Leading Us to Dreadful Awakening," published in the Houston Chronicle.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

With America persisting in living off the cuff, we are heading for a dreadful awakening. Raymond Moley warned in a recent column in The Chronicle. He said that everyone is for economy in the abstract, but changes his tune when the economy affects him. He cited as examples an automobile executive who argued in favor of a large Federal expenditure for highways and a school-board member who wants more Federal aid for schools.

It is interesting to correlate the Moley article with an interview U. S. News & World Report had with Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, entitled "Inflation Is Still a Threat."

Two of the Humphrey quotes are especially apropos. In commenting on the danger of inflation, he said, "unnecessary Government spending, inadequate or improper taxation, or excessive credit expansion could again lead to inflationary pressures if we are not constantly alert." To avoid more inflation, he said, two things are needed, "First of all, we have to keep our fiscal operations on a sound basis and keep working toward a balanced budget at the lowest levels of taxation consistent with our defense needs. On top of that, we have to be sure that our monetary and debt-management policies continue to be directed along that narrow road between inflation and deflation."

Since Humphrey is a member of the Eisenhower administration, his warning takes on added significance.

When the Government sets the pace with deficit spending—we have already been told there is no hope of a balanced budget for the next fiscal year—we are bound to have "loose money." That means inflation. It means also that we are selling our children and grandchildren into economic bondage. It means that the time is not far off when we must have a "dreadful awakening."

A National Prosperity Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, we are today faced with a great amount of propaganda concerning the economic prosperity of our Nation. This propaganda does not stand up in view of reliable statistics on the subject. I therefore offer for the information of my colleagues, a positive, forward looking program for a continued, increasing prosperous economy by men of outstanding ability. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record the attached article by the Conference on Economic Progress:

A NATIONAL PROSPERITY BUDGET

At home and abroad, America is faced with mounting responsibilities. Despite the most effective economic system ever devised, an excessive number of breadwinners have long been without jobs. In a land capable of almost limitless plenty, more than 7 million families have incomes below \$1,000 a year, and millions of children lack adequate schools. And on the tense international front, America has become the central tower in the structure of freedom.

As we strive to fulfill our responsibilities, we should always remember this: We suffer from no poverty of resources. In some underdeveloped areas overseas which have become crucial to the future of freedom, hundreds of millions of people toll with scant means which make it hard to maintain a bare standard of living and to resist Communist encroachment. In sharp contrast, the United States now possesses an immense reservoir of idle men and other productive strength, pleading to be used to meet our needs. Between now and the end of this year, we can bring more than 2½ million unemployed and new workers—the most skilled and productive in the world—into the stream of usefulness. We can, without inflationary strain, expand our total output for 1955 at least 6 percent above 1954, and by the fourth quarter of this year lift it to about 8 percent, or about \$30 billion at an annual rate, above current levels. If we unsheathe fully the great nonsecret weapon of our economic strength, we can more adequately and more easily serve our domestic needs and world responsibilities—and also balance the Federal budget.

But our current national economic policies are not well adjusted to the full use of this great nonsecret weapon. These policies seem geared to the objectives, optimistically described, of advancing our total output this year by only about 3 percent above last year. This would be far short of the expansion needed to keep up with a growing productivity and labor force. With such limited growth, the true level of unemployment—which includes both full-time unemployment and its part-time equivalent—would be likely to rise from about 4 million in 1954 as a whole to about 5 million in 1955 as a whole, with a considerably higher level by the year's end. That would leave us, even at the end of the year, with an annual rate of output nearly \$20 billion below the full production level.

Moreover, it is doubtful whether under existing policies and programs we would register even a 3-percent rate of growth for this year. Farm personal income, so essential to national prosperity, is being pushed

further downward, despite a 20-percent reduction since 1951 and a per capita income for farmers averaging only about one-third that of other citizens. Auto production, the mainspring of the recent upturn, is scheduled to decline later this year. Business investment in plant and equipment is not expanding, small business is losing ground, and consumer incomes are not rising sufficiently. Public policies, instead of being adjusted upward to furnish the stimuli required for a full economy, are mainly being reduced downward to mesh with a stagnant or retarded economy.

National security and international economic assistance, already severely slashed, are being compressed further in the face of serious world difficulties. With the shortage in educational facilities already a national disgrace and becoming a national menace, the Federal Government which alone has the resources to meet most of this deficit has thus far proposed only a strikingly inadequate stopgap. Vast health needs are being countered by an assumption that some new way can be found to pay for better health without really spending money. Natural-resource developments, for conservation and power, highways and water supply, are being driven further downward, although they are already far below the requirements for national security, population growth, and private industrial development. Old-age insurance is being held to levels which furnish our senior citizens only about one-third of the cost of a decent standard of living, and unemployment insurance protection is so weak that close to 2 million of those unemployed in 1954 exhausted their benefits. Minimum wage proposals are not even keeping up with changes in living costs; much less with economic growth. With about one-third of all American families living in substandard housing, there is practically no rebuilding of slums, and without this the housing boom may be near the saturation point.

Efforts to give the financial account of the Government priority over the economic account of the country put second things first; in addition, they are self-defeating because the customary Federal budget is not and cannot be balanced in an unbalanced economy without taking domestic and international risks which quite properly no one should take. In calendar 1954, the Federal deficit was about \$4 billion; in this calendar year, the prospective deficit is estimated at about \$3.5 billion.

Instead of spiraling the servicing of our domestic and international needs downward in a resigned attitude toward high unemployment and slack production, this pamphlet proposes an alternative course. It advances for sober consideration by the American people and their leaders a set of programs and policies based upon legitimate hopefulness rather than unwarranted complacency; upon rising to what we can and must do, instead of crystallizing and perpetuating the failure to do our best. The practical goal of these programs is to bring forth, by the end of this year, the more than 2½ million new jobs and the almost \$30 billion (8 percent) increase in the annual rate of total output, needed for full employment and almost full production.

To expand consumption, which is at the core of prosperity in relative peacetime, the personal income tax exemptions should be raised by about \$200, furnishing about \$4½ billion of additional purchasing power. The minimum wage law should be raised to \$1.25 and coverage expanded, which by the end of this year might add another \$2½ billion to purchasing power. Further to stimulate production and jobs, the annual average level of Federal outlays for this calendar year, in the conventional budget, should be raised about \$3½ billion above those now contemplated, which in a much

expanded economy would still be \$6½ billion below the 1953 level. Gradual expansion, to achieve the higher average for the year as a whole than now contemplated, could by the fourth quarter of this year add about \$3 billion, stated at annual rates, to outlays for national security and international aid; about \$750 million toward the restoration of agriculture; about \$1 billion toward improved education and about \$300 million toward improved health; and about \$1 billion toward the protection and expansion of our natural resources base, including public works.

It is also proposed that old-age insurance benefit payments by the fourth quarter of this year be increased by about a billion dollars at annual rates, and that unemployment insurance be greatly strengthened. These changes would not result in higher Federal budget costs because of their method of financing, but they would add greatly to consumer buying by enlarging the receipts of low-income families, who spend a larger part of what they receive. And it is recommended that the Government undertake to lift the annual rate of slum clearance and low-rent housing to an annual rate of between 300,000 and 500,000 units by the end of this year. The subsidy cost of this to the Government would be only a few million dollars annually in the first year, but no other single measure would add so much toward reemployment and business stimulation through the channels of enterprise.

This program is entirely consistent with the purpose of the Employment Act of 1946 that maximum employment, production, and purchasing power be combined with the preservation of free competitive enterprise. The program deals with traditional programs, but expands them to match our needs and productive abilities. A rise in the annual rate of Federal spending above current levels by about \$6 billion by the fourth quarter of this year would be accompanied by a rise of almost \$30 billion in our total national product. Due to vast reemployment and appropriate wage increases, the annual rate of wage and salary income would rise by more than \$15 billion. The annual rate of consumer spending—and consequently of business sales to consumers—would rise by about \$13 billion. The annual rate of farm personal income, to make up for the gross disparity in farm income, would rise by about \$4 billion; and expanded consumption of food and clothing, plus exports to underdeveloped areas, would cut deeply into farm "surpluses." The annual rate of total business investment would rise by about \$6,500,000,000; exclusive of inventory change, it would rise by about \$2,500,000,000. Corporate profits would rise by at least \$2,500,000,000. The people of America would not only produce and consume more; they would also save about \$3½ billion more at annual rates.

With this balanced economic expansion on all fronts, Federal spending under the customary budget would drop from 20.2 percent of total national output in calendar 1953 to 17.7 percent in calendar 1955. With a base established for even more solid economic progress in 1956, a balanced Federal budget in a balanced economy would result by the end of that calendar year.

Up to now, and out of line with the purposes of the Employment Act of 1946, separate economic policies and programs have been viewed in isolation, without looking at their effect upon the progress and well-being of the economy and the people as a whole. The farmer, old people, the unemployed, the small-business man, the low-income family, are being inadequately dealt with under scattered policies which measure what we think we cannot afford in detail without examining what we need and can best afford when we look at the whole picture. This trends toward a pennywise and pound-foolish policy.

Instead, we should embrace the concept of a national prosperity budget, which would blend in just proportion our common needs and capabilities in a full employment and full production program for all. Aside from the benefits to our national economy and our national security, this would stress the great moral values which weigh most in a democracy. It would bring the American people to an appreciation of the great things which bind us together instead of the small things which divide us; it would place the things we can achieve above the things we should not fear; it would range the things we must afford above the things we have erroneously come to believe we cannot afford; it would substitute for a sword hanging above our heads the great nonsecret weapon of our productive genius and capacity for progress when we pull together in practical pursuit of common goals.

The National Committee of the Conference on Economic Progress, all of whom do not necessarily subscribe to all details of this study, but who join in the desirability of placing it before the public, is listed on the outside of the back cover of this pamphlet. The staff work on this study, directed by Leon H. Keyserling, has been done by: Joel Darmstadter, Peter G. Franck, Mary Dublin Keyserling, Philip M. Ritz, and Warren C. Robinson. Help has also been received from John A. Baker, Wallace J. Campbell, Roy F. Hendrickson, Carl Huhndorff, Donald E. Montgomery, Robert A. Rennie, Stanley H. Rutenberg, Elmer E. Walker, and Nat Weinberg.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner—Address by Hon. Samuel J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very fine address delivered by our colleague, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Richmond, Va., on Friday, March 4, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR HERITAGE: A BLESSING AND AN OBLIGATION
(Address by Senator SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.)

I am grateful to the Democratic State Central Committee of Virginia for inviting me to join the militant and untainted democracy of the Old Dominion in this Jefferson-Jackson Day gathering. The invitation affords me ample excuse for absenting myself for the time being from the babel of Washington, where the confusion engendered by the Republicans calls to my remembrance an event which occurred some years past in my home town of Morganton, N. C.

On that occasion my diplomatic colored friend, Jock Fleming, went automobile riding with two companions. The automobile was undoubtedly full of gasoline. Its occupants were allegedly full of moonshine. The automobile left the road and turned over, causing substantial injuries to Jock's two companions. Jock was unhurt. After extricating Jock's companions from the wreckage and sending them to the hospital for medical attention, Morganton's Chief of Police,

Fons Duckworth, undertook to ascertain by inquiry of Jock who was driving the automobile at the time of the accident. He received this reply from Jock: "Fore God, white folks, 'fore God, I don't know. The last thing I remember all three of us were riding on the back seat."

I trust you will pardon at this point an allusion rather personal in nature. I cannot come to the Old Dominion without experiencing emotions similar to those which prompted Moses to remove his sandals from his feet because he stood on Holy ground. Kindred of mine fought for the Confederacy in virtually every engagement on Virginia soil from Bethel to Appomattox. One of my great-uncles was killed in action at Seven Pines. Another fell in combat on the Darbytown Road.

In the words of Britain's heroic poet, Rupert Brooke:

"These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of work and joy, and that uphoped serene,
That men call age; and those who would
have been,
Their sons, they gave, their immortality."

—The Dead.

Since their dust is commingled forever with Virginia's good earth, Virginia to me is hallowed ground.

I wish to bear this testimony to the Democrats of Virginia: It is a great privilege to serve in the Congress with the able and devoted men sent by you to that body. Senators HARRY BYRD and WILLIS ROBERTSON and Congressmen WATKINS ABBITT, VAUGHN GARY, PORTER HARDY, BURR HARRISON, PAT JENNINGS, EDWARD ROBESON, HOWARD SMITH, and BILL TUCK bring to the performance of their legislative duties the high courage, intelligence, intellectual honesty, and patriotism which the Nation has long since become accustomed to expect of Virginians.

In my remarks on this occasion, I forego discussion of the transient issues of the hour. I prefer to consider with you fundamental principles which must be preserved if the America we know and love is to endure.

1. OUR HERITAGE

As Americans, each of us can assert with the psalmist of old: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage."

These words of the psalmist suggest the subject of my remarks: "Our Heritage: A Blessing and an Obligation."

We received our heritage in trust for ourselves and our children and our children's children from all those men and women, both great and small, whose blood, sweat, tears, and prayers made the America we know and love a living reality.

Our heritage is liberty. While liberty has blossomed in our land, love of liberty did not have its origin here. It was brought hither by courageous men and women from the British Isles, the vine-clad hills of France, and the Palatinate of Germany, who craved above all the things of earth the economic freedom, the political freedom, and the religious freedom denied to them by the tyrannical rulers of the Old World.

Since so many men now appear so anxious to swap the reality of human liberty for the mirage of economic security, it would be well if we would pause a moment, and ponder the choice our ancestors made when they forsook the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New. It was not without many pangs of regret that they turned their backs for all time upon the scenes of their childhood, the graves of their beloved dead, the comparative security of the then civilized world, and journeyed in tiny barks across a boisterous ocean to establish homes for themselves and their children and their children's children in what was then a

perilous wilderness in a new and strange land.

Why did they do this? Why did they exchange the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New? The answer is simply this, and nothing more: They believed that only the slave, who depends upon a master for the bread of bondage, is really secure; and they knew that only the self-reliant soul, who spurns security for opportunity, is truly free. For this reason, they chose liberty rather than security.

Liberty reveals herself in a threefold guise as economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. Let us consider her attributes in each of these aspects.

2. ECONOMIC LIBERTY

The brave men and women, who brought the love of liberty to these shores, did not learn economics sitting at the feet of those who promise "abundance for all by robbing 'Selected Peter to pay for Collective Paul.' They acquired their knowledge the hard way. Their teachers were despotic governments, which robbed them of the fruits of their labor by confiscatory taxation, and in that way reduced them to the status of economic slaves.

The valiant folk who made America great had the hardihood to accept the economic truths plainly visible to all persons who possess the capacity and willingness to meet reality face to face.

They knew that earth yields nothing to man except the products of his own labor. They knew that Adam's curse is an unchanging and unchangeable law of life: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." They knew that man has but one choice in respect to this immutable economic fact, and that such choice is simply this: Whether the bread which he must eat in the sweat of his face shall be the bread of freedom or the bread of bondage. They knew this unalterable decree of the Creator of the universe: Freedom cannot be induced to produce things of value unless they are permitted to retain a fair share of the fruits of their labor for themselves and their families.

They knew, moreover, that man can be free only if he is willing to accept the responsibility for his own life which is inseparable from liberty.

3. POLITICAL LIBERTY

The political philosophy of the Founding Fathers is readily understood if one bears in mind the historical fact that the Thirteen Original States—Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Virginia—became self-governing Commonwealths 12 years before the United States had its legal birth.

The representatives of the people of these States met in constitutional conventions, and framed State constitutions. These men were conversant with the story of the long and bitter struggle of the English-speaking race for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual. They loved liberty and loathed tyranny, and were convinced that government itself would have to be compelled by fundamental law to respect the inherent rights of the individual if freedom were to be preserved and oppression were to be prevented. In consequence, they inserted in the constitutions of the States declarations of rights designed to protect citizens from the States.

It was no accident that the first words incorporated in the constitutions of the original States were declarations to the effect "that all political power is vested in and derived from the people" and "that the people of . . . (the States) . . . ought to have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police

thereof." The writers of the organic laws of the States placed these declarations in first place in their constitutions because the political concepts embodied in such declarations occupied first place in their hearts and minds. They had much cause for assigning prime importance to their beliefs in the sovereignty of the people and the rights of the States to local self-rule. They had suffered many things at the hands of a government far removed from the people.

The consciousness of early Americans that liberty is inevitably imperiled by a government far removed from the people finds further example in their implacable insistence upon the insertion of the first 10 amendments in the Federal Constitution. These amendments guarantee the personal and property rights of the individual, and declare that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The ancient beliefs that all political power is vested in and derived from the people and that the States ought to have the right to regulate their internal affairs are as valid today as they were when the Declaration of Independence was signed and the Constitution of the United States was ratified.

4. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The most heart-rending story of history is that of man's struggle against civil and ecclesiastical tyranny for the simple privilege of bowing his own knees before his own God in his own way. As Chief Justice Walter P. Stacy of the North Carolina Supreme Court so well declared in one of the great judicial opinions of all time, "men contend more furiously over the road to Heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walks on earth," and history records "the tragic fact that men have gone to war and cut each others' throats because they could not agree as to what was to become of them after their throats were cut."

The men and women who gave liberty to America were devout souls. They had learned some of the sorrowful facts of the spiritual life of man in the bitter crucible of experience. Most of them dissented from the doctrines and usages of the churches established by law in the lands of their origins. They were denied the right to worship God in their own ways. They were compelled to pay tithes for the support and propagation of religious opinions which they disbelieved. They had their marriages annulled and their children adjudged illegitimate for daring to speak their marriage vows before ministers of their own faiths rather than before the clergymen of the established churches.

But these cruel oppressions merely steeled their convictions that religion is a private matter between man and his God; that no human authority should undertake to control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical."

For these reasons, our ancestors staked the very existence of America as a free Nation upon the principle that "all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences," and the corollary that this natural and unalienable right can be secured only by keeping the hands of the state out of religion and the hands of religion off the state.

5. A BLESSING AND A WARNING

Courageous men and women built America with strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands. They gave us a great country dedicated to the proposition that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, the enjoyment of the fruits

of their own labor, and the pursuit of happiness." They gave us this land with the knowledge, however, that God grants freedom only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it; and they left us the solemn warning that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty.

They bequeathed this warning to us because they had read the history of the long and bitter struggle of men for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual, and had found this shocking but everlasting truth inscribed upon each page of that history: Government itself is the deadliest foe of liberty.

This tragic truth was well expressed a third of a century ago by a great statesman and Virginian, Woodrow Wilson. He said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

6. OUR OBLIGATION

Let us ponder these words of Wilson. Let us recur with frequency to fundamental principles. Let us preserve for ourselves and our posterity our goodly heritage—economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. This is our obligation. We must perform it. As followers of Jefferson and Jackson, we cannot do otherwise.

Economic Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials published in the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, the Memphis Press-Scimitar, and the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Richmond, Va., dealing with the subject of economic disarmament.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph News-Press of March 3, 1955]

ECONOMIC DISARMAMENT

Senator STUART SYMINGTON presents a bold plan for curbing military production. At the same time each nation would increase its economic production and raise living standards. In a resolution presented in the Senate Tuesday, the Missourian calls on the President of the United States to present such a proposal to the United Nations.

The Senator's plan for peace would work as follows. Each nation's resources would be appraised. A limitation would be set on the amount that could be allotted to military production and the rest would have to go into civilian production. Look at this comparison of the use of steel. Last year the United States produced 5,500,000 automobiles. Russia produced 45,000. It is safe to surmise that the vast bulk of Russian steel went into heavy armaments.

Under the Symington plan only a prescribed portion could go toward tanks, planes, and other heavy armament. The rest would have to go for automobiles, factory machinery, farm equipment, and other

civilian goods. Nations would be subjected to periodic inspection to prevent any one of them from aborting the international agreement. There also would be a periodic review of the quotas and equitable revisions made. Both the review board and the inspection teams would be under the sanction of the United Nations.

Any nation that defied its quota immediately would tip its aggressive intent to the rest of the world. Such defiance would be a clanging alarm serving notice on the world that a war was brewing. Simultaneous with Senator SYMINGTON's speech, Prime Minister Churchill was addressing Parliament. The British statesman said that a system would have to be devised for disarmament if the world were to enjoy security and peace. Presently a secret conference of a U. N. subcommittee is in progress in London. The conferees are studying a plan for braking the armament race.

Some nations are rearming at the cost of their populace's living standards. Senator SYMINGTON cites poverty and low-living standards as breeders of communism. Our Nation's peaceful security therefore is jeopardized by substandard living conditions in other lands. Anything that we do to raise the living standards of others shores up our own continuance in peace.

The Senator has tackled the problem of war fear that taunts the world today. His answer is embodied in his plan for peace. Its import is of such magnitude it commands action.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) News-Scimitar of March 1, 1955]

THE GAGE OF RED INTENT

We can have no hope that any disarmament talk, whatever its form, ever will lead to actual disarmament so long as the rulers of Russia continue to pour the bulk of their nation's resources into war goods.

Unfortunately, Russian "peace" propaganda has been too much trusted, too little suspected, in too many parts of the world.

But the real test of the Kremlin's intentions can be measured by the treatment of Russia's civilian population. How much for human necessities and comforts? How much for war?

That is the purpose of the "butter over guns" disarmament proposal, which Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri, now recommends to the United Nations. Senator SYMINGTON proposes a Senate resolution calling on President Eisenhower to urge the U. N. to explore and consider this proposal.

The idea is simple: Whatever nation depresses the living standards of its people to build military power is an aggressor nation, and therefore a menace to the peace of the world.

"High living standards," said Senator SYMINGTON, "constitute a built-in deterrent against possible aggression."

It is a test any people can understand. It is a test from which the Kremlin bosses cannot hide. So long as they deprive their people of necessities and comforts in the interest of military power, so long must the free nations of the world judge them aggressors.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of March 5, 1955]

BUTTER OVER GUNS IS MAKING PROGRESS

The butter-over-guns proposal which we presented on this page last Monday for the consideration of the United Nations, is making headway in Washington. The plan, suggested by Sam Lubell and designed to stop the armaments race, has been given formal sponsorship of Democratic Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri, and has been publicly commended by Senator KNOWLAND, of California, Republican floor leader, although he is a vigorous critic of the United Nations.

Senator SYMINGTON has introduced a resolution calling on President Eisenhower to urge the U. N. to explore and consider the proposal. Senator KNOWLAND rose on the floor to declare that the matter is "worthy of the attention of the Senate," and he added:

"I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will consider them [articles and editorials on the subject from the Washington Daily News which had been read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 2], and that the agencies of the executive branch which are interested in foreign affairs may also have the opportunity to discuss with the committee the merits or demerits of the proposal, in case there should be some weaknesses in the plan."

Other sponsors are expected to be obtained shortly for the Symington resolution, which requests President Eisenhower to present to the U. N. the Lubell plan "to explore the possibilities of limiting the proportion of any nation's resources which can be devoted to military purposes so as to increase steadily the proportion of every nation's resources devoted to improving the living levels of the people."

Mr. Lubell—whose new book, the Revolution in World Trade, caused the Scripps-Howard newspapers to get him to write for that large chain the article we published setting forth his guns-or-butter plan—is a long time associate of Bernard Baruch. While Mr. Baruch has not said that he helped Mr. Lubell work out the plan, it is highly probable that Baruch saw it before publication, and gave Lubell the benefit of his profound knowledge and wisdom. There is no better informed man in the United States on war mobilization and all the ramifications thereof than Mr. Baruch.

Senator SYMINGTON, himself an authority in this field, by virtue of several high positions he has held in private industry and the Federal Government, points out that the resolution he is sponsoring is based on three principles:

1. The way a government divides the resources at its command is a revealing measure of its peaceful or aggressive intent.

2. High living standards constitute an automatic, built-in deterrent against possible aggression.

3. After a nation has committed its resources to peaceful uses, a significant length of time must elapse before they can be converted to war.

A keystone of this plan would, of course, be careful and unlimited inspection of industrial plants in all the participating countries. The Soviet Union has always refused to permit such inspection. Yet the internal crisis with which that country now is confronted, growing out of shortages of food, clothing, and other consumers' goods, may create such pressure on the Government as to force participation.

Such is the hope of Senator SYMINGTON. If, however, Russia refuses to go along, its refusal can be publicized all over the world, and especially to the badly pinched Russian people. At the very least, the Soviet Government will be thrown sharply on the defensive.

Give Armed Forces Their Due

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL J. KILDAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an

editorial appearing in the San Antonio Express of San Antonio, Tex., on March 7, 1955. This editorial has to do with the military pay bill under consideration in the House today.

GIVE ARMED FORCES THEIR DUE

For strengthening the Nation's defenses at a weak spot, President Eisenhower, in a special message, recommended that Congress raise the Armed Forces' pay all the way from private to commanding general.

To build and maintain the alert, effective, resourceful and constantly up-to-date Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps required for national security, the President then pointed out, the United States must have a solid background of career men. Today that essential foundation of the Armed Forces is being weakened because too many men leave the service at the end of their initial enlistment period.

For that reason the Nation faces a challenge: How make a career in the Armed Forces attractive to qualified young men? How persuade the youth who has made good in the service to reenlist?

One way to promote those vital objectives, the President considers, would be to raise the serviceman's pay. Were that done, both enlisted man and officer would be under stronger incentive than before to earn promotion and higher pay.

Traditionally, in the Armed Forces the door to advancement is kept always open. But nowadays, when the services are so largely mechanized, opportunities are multiplied. The youth who possesses the knack, intelligence and industry to acquire skill is certain of his chance to get ahead in the Armed Forces. But that young man is worthy of his hire.

By way of carrying out President Eisenhower's recommendations, a House Armed Services subcommittee, by unanimous vote, has approved the proposed 1955 Armed Forces pay bill. That measure, due to be reported to the House floor this week, would increase the servicemen's earnings by \$735 million a year all told.

As compared with the \$40 billion a year defense budget, that is a modest sum; but no expenditure on the Nation's armament will yield higher returns. The servicemen's pay raise will represent an investment in fair play for the Nation's defenders, and hence in their morale.

Will Controls Throttle Natural-Gas Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to introduce two editorials on the natural-gas controversy which I think should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress as well as the public.

I give credit to the Saturday Evening Post, March 5, 1955, issue for the following editorial entitled "Will Controls Throttle Natural-Gas Industry?"

WILL CONTROLS THROTTLE NATURAL-GAS INDUSTRY?

If any American citizen doesn't know the natural-gas story within the next few

months, it won't be the fault of the natural-gas producers. The Supreme Court's decision of last June, which gives the Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over the producing end of the gigantic natural-gas industry, has convinced the industry's leaders that, if Congress is to be persuaded to change the situation, the natural-gas story will have to be told to the public at large.

The Natural Gas Act of 1938 seemed to exempt from Federal regulation those engaged in the production or gathering of natural gas. This view was accepted by the Federal Power Commission, which on various occasions has denied that it had jurisdiction over gas producers. To remove all doubt of its meaning, Congress, in 1950, passed the Kerr bill, which was supposed to nail down the point for good and all. The Kerr bill was vetoed by former President Truman. The Supreme Court, in June 1954, decided that natural-gas producers are "natural-gas companies" as defined in the law and that, since the "gathering and production" took place before the sales of gas to the pipelines occurred, the producers are engaged in interstate commerce and are therefore subject to regulation.

What are the merits? The public, which burns the gas, is the real party in interest and is entitled to some nonhysterical reporting.

Pipeline companies which transport the gas from the production areas to the cities where it is consumed are subject to Federal regulation since they are engaged in interstate commerce. Distributing companies in the various cities and municipalities which use natural gas enjoy at least a partial monopoly and are properly subject to regulation by State public utilities commissions. The argument of those favoring regulation of natural gas producing companies and individuals, of whom there are more than 4,000, is that the producers are a basic factor in the whole industry and should be equally subject to public control. The Supreme Court took this view.

The natural gas producers, on the other hand, point out that they are engaged in a highly competitive business and that a continued supply of their product, natural gas, depends on the continuation of incentives offered to those who search for new supplies and invest large sums of money in doing so. Federal price fixing, along with the complicated and often contradictory bureaucratic rulings which accompany regulation, would, they insist, discourage such investment and exploration. Thus the consumer, in whose interest regulation is urged, might get less natural gas at higher prices, instead of vice versa.

In his dissent from the majority opinion, Justice Douglas declared that the decision on natural gas regulation should be made by Congress, not by the court, because "regulation of the business of producing and gathering natural gas involves considerations of which we know little and with which we are not competent to deal." At any rate, Congress will have to declare its intention once more, making it clear whether or not it wishes to maintain the distinction between interstate pipelines and distributors, on the one hand, and competitive natural gas producers, on the other. This distinction was recognized in the Natural Gas Act, but, despite the small part which the price of natural gas at the well plays in the amount which the domestic consumer pays on his monthly gas bill, the clamor that the Government should fix rates for the thousands of companies and individuals who dig for natural gas and find it has never ceased.

It is hard to believe that Congress will ignore the record of an industry which has increased its customers by millions within a single decade, while keeping the ultimate cost low during a period of inflationary prices. What more could be accomplished

by Federal regulation of this business is hard to imagine. The Supreme Court's decision of last year will certainly produce a new battle in Washington. It will be unfortunate if the debate becomes so intense that the basic principles involved are generally ignored. One of these certainly is that any move to impose regulation on an American industry should be supported by substantial evidence that a need for regulation exists and that the measures sought are consistent with the operation of a free economy.

The second editorial is accredited to March 7, 1955, issue of Time, and is quoted as follows:

NATURAL GAS PRICES—THE CASE AGAINST FEDERAL CONTROLS

As a fuel, natural gas heats 14 million United States homes and fires the stoves in 21 million kitchens. In politics, the booming young natural-gas industry, now seventh biggest in the United States, sets fires from coast to coast, and especially in Washington. This week angry gasmen are fighting no less than seven bitter court battles against the United States Government; in Congress three separate bills have been introduced by southern Democrats to remove Federal price controls from gas at the wellhead. This issue—whether or not gas prices should be controlled in the field—has been burning hot ever since 1950, when the famed Kerr bill, which exempted gas producers from controls, was vetoed by President Truman.

The gasmen, who are against control, got some potent help last week from a special commission appointed by President Eisenhower to study United States resources and power policy. Said the commission: "We believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line." The United States Supreme Court, on the other hand, ruled in favor of Federal control in the Phillips Petroleum case last June (Time, June 21). The court's argument was that controls in the field reduce prices to consumers. Though the producers may operate only within State limits and own no interstate pipelines, the prices they charge affect the ultimate cost to consumers thousands of miles away. Thus, while the 1938 Natural Gas Act specifically stated that its restrictions "shall not apply . . . to the production and gathering of gas," the Supreme Court held that producers come within the spirit if not the letter of interstate commerce.

The Federal Power Commission itself has never interpreted the Gas Act to include producers; in fact, it has argued against it. But it was quick to obey the court. It froze gas rates at the wellhead as of June 1954, regardless of the provisions already written into existing long-term contracts with the pipelines. The overall effect has been to invalidate virtually every contract throughout the industry—long-term contracts (20 years or more) between producers and pipelines written at the behest of the FPC to bring about stability. To protect themselves against increased costs, producers wrote in "escalator" clauses permitting gas price increases. Now all such adjustments are illegal.

Gasmen scoff at the court position that FPC control will mean saving to consumers. They point out that more than 90 percent of the costs occur after the gas leaves the field. Phillips Petroleum Co., for example, now sells gas from the Texas Panhandle for 9.5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet to Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. which delivers it to Milwaukee for 35 cents. The Milwaukee Gas Light Co. then charges the housewife a whopping \$2.13 the first 1,000 cubic feet.

Gasmen insist that FPC is simply not equipped to control gas production. Since June some 7,000 applications for rate in-

creases have been filed and FPC has not yet acted on most of them. The problem is not simply one of setting a gas rate for 5,000 producers. Each gas field is a distinct operation with separate problems; rates must be set for thousands of different wells. The industry is so closely bound up with oil that gas exploration, drilling, and production costs are inextricably mixed together. To regulate gas, FPC would also, indirectly, partially control oil prices. Moreover, costs of drilling wells are climbing so fast that even the current contracts lag behind the true expense of production.

Perhaps the strongest argument of all against FPC controls is that producers do not have a protected monopoly, like most public utilities, but are highly competitive. They compete not only among themselves but also with sellers of coal, electricity, and oil. Said Magnolia Lawyer Ross Madole: "If the FPC has to control gas production prices in order to control the price of gas as delivered to the customer, then why doesn't it control the price of coal in steam-generating electric plants and the price of copper in telephone wires?"

Some companies have threatened to shut down interstate gas operations rather than go under FPC control. American-Louisiana Pipe Line Co., Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., and Texas-Illinois Gas Co. have either slowed down their expansion or postponed plans for new pipelines since many of the big producers refuse to sign long-term contracts. In Texas, more and more producers are talking of selling to local markets exclusively to dodge Federal controls, use their gas in Texas towns and the State's burgeoning petrochemical industry.

If Congress does not pass new legislation exempting producers from FPC regulation, the gasmen see no end to the troubles. But if Congress recognizes gas as a competitive commodity, gasmen think the laws of supply and demand will peg prices at a fair and competitive level.

How One President Made Law Without Congressional Approval—It Must Not Happen Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, "The Yalta agreement is the blackest page in American diplomatic history," so said the Honorable George A. Finch, eminent constitutional authority in the National Republic for February 1955.

The Yalta Pact strengthened the hands of Red China and Soviet Russia. Today those aggressors are in a position to enslave millions of innocent people and our own country is trying to close the barn door after the horse has been stolen. It is a ridiculous and horrible situation and the cost to the American taxpayer cannot be estimated at this time—we know it will be in the billions of dollars.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article by Mr. Finch:

It would be futile to remove the doubts concerning limitations on treaties if the Constitution could be evaded by substituting executive agreements in lieu of treaties.

Executive agreements are not mentioned in the Constitution, but recent administrations invented the theory and adopted the practice that such agreements are interchangeable with treaties in the President's discretion. The flagrant abuse of this power by President Roosevelt at Yalta raised a storm of protest in Congress and was one of the reasons why so many Senators joined with Senator BRICKER in introducing resolutions for a constitutional amendment.

The Yalta agreement is the blackest page in American diplomatic history. The Nationalist Government of China under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, after years of patriotic defense against the devastating aggression of Japan, became our firm and loyal ally in World War II. At Cairo in November 1943, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill promised the Generalissimo that Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores "shall be restored to the Republic of China." That was to be a part of China's reward for her help against the Japanese after Pearl Harbor. At Yalta, on February 11, 1945, the same Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill, but with Stalin in place of Chiang Kai-shek, agreed, among other things, that to Russia should be restored "her former rights" in Manchuria. The phraseology of the agreement bears inherent evidence of its Communist origin. It is characteristic of Communist perversion of history. Russia had no more rights in Manchuria than had Japan. Both were regarded as alien invaders and oppressors by the people and Government of China. Every one familiar with the Far East knows that the power that controls Manchuria controls all China and most of Asia.

The Yalta agreement reversed our traditional policy of the "Open Door" and respect for the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China. That policy was initiated by John Hay at the turn of the century to stop the march of Czarist Russia into Manchuria. In 1919 the United States Senate refused to approve the Treaty of Versailles because, among other provisions, President Wilson agreed to transfer the important Chinese province of Shantung to Japan in consideration for the latter's acceptance of the Covenant of the League of Nations. That great injustice was rectified at the Washington Conference of 1922, called by President Wilson's successor. Our traditional policy of sincere friendship for China raised our people and Government to preeminence in the respect and regard of the Chinese people. They erected a monument in Peiping to the memory of President Harding in appreciation of his services at the Washington Conference. The Yalta Agreement has contributed to the sabotaging of 100 years of Christian advance and Western culture in Asia.

The occupation of Manchuria by the Soviet Army under that agreement provided the golden opportunity for them to turn over to the Chinese Communists the arms of the Japanese who had been forced to surrender by American arms without Russian aid. That consequence of the Yalta agreement was more responsible than any other cause for the loss of face with his people by Chiang Kai-shek and his eventual forced retreat to Formosa. With the Chinese Nationalists installed in Manchuria instead of the Communists, there would have been no Communist invasion of Korea. The United States would have been saved \$15 billion expenditure and 150,000 casualties, including 33,000 deaths, and our enemies would not now be in positions of such strength that they cannot be dislodged except at the risk of another world war.

In extenuation of the Yalta agreement it is said that the Soviets would have occupied Manchuria, agreement or no agreement with the United States. That statement is a mere hypothesis which would probably have

been untrue if the United States had honestly supported its Chinese allies—but there were other subversive influences at work in Washington working for the Communist cause. A few months after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Congress, on February 3, 1942, authorized a credit of \$500 million to the Chinese Nationalist Government. China was in such dire need at that time the State Department feared its government would collapse before Congress could act. Yet, according to Senator PORTER, the distribution of the money was delayed for 4 years by Harry Dexter White and his associates in the Treasury Department. These men, the Senator charged in the Senate July 30, 1954, "bear a major share, if not by far the largest share, of responsibility for the destruction of the Nationalist Government of China. The basic material is readily available for all to see. When interpreted against the background of other easily documented material . . . this story can only be termed as one of everlasting shame and disgrace in the record of our foreign relations."

"Supposing it were hypothetically true that the Soviets would have occupied Manchuria without the Yalta agreement, they would have done so without our approval in advance, and Chiang Kai-shek would not have been coerced to lend the color of legality to his betrayal by concurring in President Roosevelt's arrangements with Stalin.

Secretary of State Dulles told the Senate Judiciary Committee that the President could not properly make agreements like Yalta with long-range permanent effects unless made subject to ratification by the Senate as treaties. The text of the agreement makes no mention of the necessity of ratification, but President Roosevelt stated that he intended to submit the agreement to the Senate in the prepared text of his report on the Yalta Conference to the joint session of Congress after his return on March 1, 1945. For some unexplained reason, this sentence was omitted from the President's speech as delivered. The complete text of the secret agreement was not made public until nearly a year later, after President Roosevelt's death. When releasing the text on January 26, 1946, Secretary of State Byrnes stated that Mr. Roosevelt always held the view that as to the cessions of territory at Yalta "it was a matter that had to be settled in the peace treaty."

Why did President Roosevelt change his mind about submitting the Yalta agreement to the Senate? Did his advisers remind him of his supposed discretion to consider it a valid executive agreement in lieu of a treaty? Or perhaps he recalled the agreement he made in 1933 with Litvinov, the first Soviet Ambassador to the United States, which assigned to the Government of the United States the title to private property in the United States belonging to Russian subjects that had been confiscated without compensation by Soviet nationalization decrees. The validity of that assignment was challenged in the courts of the State of New York on the ground that it violated State law and policy and the fifth amendment of the Federal Constitution. On appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States that Court, in a decision known appropriately as the *Pink case* (315 U. S. 203) held that the fifth amendment did not stand in the way of giving full force and effect to the Litvinov assignment. The fifth amendment provides that no person, which means friendly aliens as well as citizens, "shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." The Supreme Court reasoned that, although the agreement was concluded by the President without the participation of the Senate, the same rule of supremacy of treaties over State law and policy results "in the case

of all international compacts and agreements from the very fact that complete power over international affairs is in the national Government and is not and cannot be subject to any curtailment or interference on the part of the several States." The Supreme Court concluded that "In respect of all international negotiations and compacts, and in respect of our foreign relations generally, State lines disappear."

When testifying in opposition to the Bricker amendment before the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Secretary of State Dulles stated that the widespread concern over the liability to abuse of the treaty-making power was a legitimate one. "Those who shared it were alert citizens," he said. "I believe they have performed a patriotic service in bringing their fears to the attention of the American public. But," he pointed out, "the arousing of that concern was a correction of the evil. There has been," he continued, "a reversal of the trend toward trying to use the treaty-making power to effect internal social changes. This administration is committed to the exercise of treaty-making power only within traditional limits. . . . I do not believe that treaties should, or lawfully can, be used as a device to circumvent the constitutional procedures established in relation to what are essentially matters of domestic concern."

While this administration has lived up to that promise, its assurances will not bind future administrations.

The American people are now being admonished that they must live in coexistence with communism. At the same time they are being told that the Kremlin has not changed its intention to dominate the world. We have witnessed the fatal results of following the slogan of the two previous administrations: "We must get along with the Russians."

If we must resign ourselves to a long period of coexistence with militant communism to avoid a third world war, it is our duty while there is time to protect our ramparts at home from insidious infiltration by destroying the Trojan horse now sheltered in the Constitution. Candid opponents all admit that there is now no limitation on the treaty-making power, but contend that a limitation is unnecessary and might be dangerous. Thomas Jefferson, however, foresaw that "if the grant of the treaty-making power were boundless then we have no Constitution. In questions of power," he added, "let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

Sir Winston's Deterrent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post on March 3, 1955. This editorial is, I believe, an excellent critique of the grave questions of nuclear weapons and disarmament.

SIR WINSTON'S DETERRENT

Sir Winston Churchill has posed soberly and eloquently the strategic challenge of our times. There will be gratification in this country that the British Government's estimate of the importance of nuclear weapons as a deterrent to global war coincides

with what has become accepted American policy. Sir Winston views the meaning of power in the historical sense, and his remarks climax the evolution of British strategic thinking disclosed in the defense white papers. He sees a significant British contribution in the expansion and maintenance of the nuclear deterrent—and he has some highly important words on civil defense in the hydrogen age and on the necessity for a strong posture in conventional weapons as a deterrent to limited wars.

In a sense it is a rebuke to the incomplete unity of the two great powers that Britain should have to build her own hydrogen bomb when the United States is acknowledged by Sir Winston to be supreme in the field. The Manchester Guardian, for example, criticizes the lack of close cooperation in secret research and goes on to argue that the main value of the separate British H-bomb program will be in its influence on American policy. But the defects of cooperation in the past are now academic. There will be at least some comfort that the responsibility for nuclear defense soon will be shared with another free world power. The advent of a British H-bomb certainly will give Britain more say, and to that extent it should have a steadying effect.

Sir Winston is persuasive in his critique of disarmament schemes that would ban nuclear weapons but leave the Soviet Union with a vast advantage in conventional arms. This has been the glaring flaw in Soviet proposals in the United Nations and in the attitude of some neutralists. Sir Winston also has a pointed warning against too great reliance on nuclear weapons; he calls for conventional forces in readiness to deal with local conflicts if they should arise. This has special relevance, not only because the H-bomb is no deterrent to subversion, but also because any war in which nuclear weapons were used, even tactically, would open a Pandora's box. Our tactical planning ought not to be so geared to atomic weapons that we would be trapped with no alternative to using them.

Reassuring as much of this is, the address does not grapple with the ultimate problem. What happens if by a process of sublime irony, in the rolling Churchillian phraseology, the world reaches a stage in the story when safety will be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation? What, indeed, can be done to avert the apocalyptic test, as Sir Winston so movingly puts it, if God wearied of mankind? There is room for disagreement whether the time of saturation in hydrogen weapons—when the Soviet Union will have the same power of destruction American arms now hold—is 3 years off, as Sir Winston believes, or has a less definable date, as President Eisenhower intimates. Very probably Sir Winston is right that Russia now lacks the means of delivering hydrogen weapons. But the day is surely coming when she will have both a full hydrogen arsenal and the means of delivery.

What then? Is it realistic to think that the world can long balance itself on the edge of a precipice? Is it enough for Britain and the United States to be content now with a disarmament formula in the United Nations which we know the Russians will reject? Sir Winston notes that the long history and tradition of Russia makes it repugnant to the Soviet Government to accept any practical system of international inspection. No doubt the present Soviet proposal at the meeting in London is as phony as its predecessors. But does this relieve us of the responsibility, while retaining our deterrent and the goal of workable inspection, to try for lesser accommodations, hoping that self-enforcing agreements on small points eventually may lead to agreement on the major objective? Precious little of this kind of thinking was reflected in the all-or-nothing mood reported before the Lon-

don conference. There would be less reason for the flinching, the wearying, and the despair which Sir Winston counsels against if free world diplomacy were as flexible in seeking new approaches as it is resolute in welding a deterrent.

The Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. J. A. Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, CIO, Washington, D. C., recommending that the Fair Labor Standards Act be amended to provide a \$1.25 per hour minimum wage.

Mr. Beirne's letter follows:

COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA,

Washington, March 4, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Failure of the American economy to expand above 1953 levels threatens our Nation with serious social consequences.

This failure is reflected both in current employment and unemployment figures: As of December 1954, the number of Americans gainfully employed was down to 60,680,000, lowest since 1950. Unemployment continues to hover near the 3 million mark.

Unless our economy expands more rapidly, about 700,000 young workers entering the job market this year will be faced with problems of idleness. Unless such expansion takes place, many additional workers may be thrown out of work because of increased man-hour output due to new types of automatic machinery and improved production methods. The American Federation of Labor, in fact, has just predicted unemployment of from 3,500,000 to 4 million in March, largely due to such factors.

America's ability to produce for a higher living standard and full employment has been proven abundantly. Our problem is one of increased purchasing power which will create effective consumer demand for the products of American industry.

It is the belief of the Communications Workers of America, CIO, that such consumer demand can best be created by increasing the purchasing power of the 30 percent of Americans who, together, receive only 9 percent of all money income.

This can best be done, in our view, by amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide a \$1.25 per hour minimum wage and the broadest possible coverage for America's industrial citizens.

In this connection, we would like to point out a situation in our own industry. In our industry, telephone operators have been singled out for special discrimination. Operators employed in exchanges having 750 or fewer subscriber stations are exempt from coverage of the law and, therefore, are the most exploited workers in the industry. How serious this is may be seen from the fact that telephone operators employed in 10,733 of the 11,502 non-Bell telephone company exchanges are not covered.

When the Fair Labor Standards Act was originally enacted, all operators were covered. The only amendment to the law between its original passage and its amendment in 1949 excluded exchanges of 500 or fewer stations. In 1949, when the minimum wage was increased to 75 cents, all operators in ex-

changes of 750 or fewer stations were exempted, subjecting these women telephone workers to even more gross discrimination. The fact that these workers alone in our industry have been declared second-class industrial citizens highlights the full measure of indignity.

In keeping with our view, we have prepared the enclosed pamphlet, entitled "The Case for the \$1.25 Minimum Wage." It is our hope that you will study this pamphlet and that you will see fit to support a minimum wage and coverage in keeping with the new age of electronics into which we are entering.

Our union represents over 320,000 workers in the communications industry who are employed in 46 States and the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. BEIRNE, President.

THE CASE FOR THE \$1.25 MINIMUM WAGE

During the past 2 years, America has dealt most generously with big business and with those of her citizens in the upper-income bracket.

Through changes in Federal tax laws, net income available for spending, saving, and investment has been redistributed in favor of those whose economic status was already highly favorable.

Even a cursory look at our cities and our countryside will show that it is not these upper-bracket-income citizens who should have priority in Government action designed to promote the welfare of her people.

Far too many Americans are still ill-housed.

Far too many Americans still lack adequate standards of living.

Far too many American children must forego educational opportunity to which all should be entitled.

Far too many Americans still lack adequate wages and purchasing power to participate as first-class citizens in this new golden age of production.

This is a matter of concern to all citizens of good will. It is of vital concern to American labor, many of whose members have suffered subnormal living conditions. It is a matter that cannot await any long-term economic process. It is a problem that cries out for immediate solution.

The Communications Workers of America, and its sister CIO unions, contend that such conditions need not exist in the America of 1955. They, together with organized labor generally, take the position that American productivity and industrial potential make such conditions needless cruelty. They contend that, in the light of present realities, no American doing useful labor need be condemned to a life of economic misery.

As a part of its program for a better America, the CWA and the CIO urge that Congress shall establish by law a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour—\$50 for a 40-hour workweek—to replace the present inadequate 75-cent statutory minimum. In the light of present conditions, this is a modest objective—a minimum wage only two-thirds the average prevailing for manufacturing workers.

A \$1.25 hourly wage minimum is far below that required for even a minimum American living standard. But it is one that will improve the lot of those millions of Americans whose need is greatest. At the same time, it will generate purchasing power needed to keep our factories at maximum production. It is a minimum wage that America can well afford. It is one in keeping with the great industrial potential being created by our new technology of electronics and atoms.

SAME OLD ARGUMENTS

The industrial recession of 1937 was aggravated by wage cutting and by a lengthening of the workweek without overtime pay,

as well as by layoffs. To prevent this process from feeding upon itself, Congress passed the original Fair Labor Standards Act, putting a floor of 40 cents per hour under wages and a 40-hour roof over the workweek. As Congress debated the issue, a storm of wrath descended from whole sections of big business, of the press, and from reactionary political forces.

A minimum wage of \$16 per week, it was argued, would bankrupt and drive whole industries out of business, cause prices to rise beyond the ability of the consumer to buy, make it impossible for the United States to engage in international trade, increase unemployment and create economic stagnation, cause the minimum wage to become the maximum throughout industry.

In 1949, in an effort to bolster declining purchasing power, Congress amended the Fair Labor Standards Act, putting a floor of 75 cents per hour beneath the wages of those employed in interstate commerce.

Again the prophets of doom raised their voices in agonized chorus, dragging out the same old arguments.

History has since rendered its verdict. The dire consequences predicted have not come to pass. Increased purchasing power for America's lowest paid workers has, instead, contributed to economic progress.

Every major industry affected by the minimum wage law has grown and prospered.

Consumer purchases have risen sharply to new highs.

The United States, bolstered by the high productivity of its workers has more than held its own in international trade.

America has enjoyed record prosperity, based upon higher purchasing power and rising productivity.

The minimum wage has helped to buoy up the general wage level.

As America once more faces national debate on an increase in the minimum wage, similar arguments once more will be raised, alleging that America cannot afford to increase the living standards of its lowest paid citizens. These arguments are variations on the same old theme. They are based upon economic conditions that have been banished from this land.

THE ECONOMY

In the second quarter of 1953, America produced goods and services at the rate of \$370 billion annually. A year later, the annual production rate was down to \$356 billion. Billions of dollars worth of goods and services were forever lost to the American people.

During this same period, industrial production dropped, even more sharply, down 9½ percent. Steel production, the heart of the American economy, was down 29 percent.

In some areas, factories shut down or ran only part time. Newspaper stories of distressed areas became common. Labor income dropped by \$6 billion and the decline would have been greater had it not been for unemployment compensation.

At the depths of this decline, 4 million Americans were jobless and many more were under-employed. For many Americans, this meant skimping and, in some cases, the decline in industrial activity caused actual want. In many cities relief loads soared as people felt the pinch of joblessness.

Although there has been a pickup in economic activity, 2,900,000 were jobless as 1955 began. Economists and business leaders, exuding optimism, predicted that 1955 would be a second-best year, with production below 1953. Despite this optimism, there were indications of a turn in the economy, from one of growth to one of contraction.

America cannot afford a contraction of her economy or even a decline in the rate of economic growth. For the longer pull, failure of the economy to grow must have serious, possibly tragic, results. Rapid changes in technology, bringing with them a signifi-

cant yearly increase in man-hour output, must create a rising living standard or America will be plagued with mass unemployment.

The achievement, in 1953, of a \$370 billion economy gives proof that the problem is not one of production. This rate, in fact, is only a sample of what can be achieved. Only recently, Dr. Gover W. Ensley, staff director for the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, declared that a 50 percent rise in the national output to \$535 billion is possible within a decade.

Within recent months, accounts of startling technological developments have been featured in leading newspapers. These developments are making possible an even more rapid rate of economic growth than that of the past decade.

The Ford engine plant in Cleveland symbolizes what lies ahead. In that plant, 3 machines and 9 men perform crankshaft hole-drilling operations that required 29 machines and 39 men before the introduction of new automatic devices.

In a recent speech before a gathering of insurance executives, Cleo Craig, president of the giant American Telephone & Telegraph Co., reported that the Bell System already is 83 percent dial and that this will increase to 95 percent within a few years. Craig also reported that customer dialing of toll calls, without the use of an operator, is increasing rapidly; this being made possible by the development of automatic billing devices.

The magazine Automation, devoted to discussion of automatic devices, has reported that electric light bulbs today are blown at the rate of 90,000 per hour in a plant employing 290 workers. Such production would have required 4,000 workers in 1934.

The new Fairless plant of United States Steel, employing 6,500 workers, will produce 2,100,000 tons of steel annually. In older operations, 11,000 workers are required for the same production. Output per man is up 55 percent in steel since 1937, just before passage of the original Fair Labor Standards Act.

America should produce \$400 billion in goods and services in 1955 to continue even the rate of growth indicated in 1953. Failure to achieve this will result in significant unemployment and only illusory prosperity for millions.

Population growth alone adds about 700,000 new workers annually to the labor force. Increased productivity, unless accompanied by expanded consumer demand, must create displacement of workers. In October of 1954, nearly a million fewer workers were employed in manufacturing than in the same month a year previous.

Failure of the United States economy to grow in 1954 and 1955 will prove costly. Estimates of 4 million unemployed in 1955 were common as the year started. Such unemployment will result in lost production worth billions.

America cannot long afford a large pool of permanently unemployed workers. It cannot afford to have in its midst permanently distressed cities and areas. It cannot afford this greatest waste of all—waste of human resources.

There is no reason for American workers to be unemployed. There is no need for America to lose billions in unproduced goods and services. The resources and facilities for increased production are at hand. Greater purchasing power in the hands of those who need it most will stimulate production, since it will be used quickly to improve living standards. A \$1.25 minimum wage, more than any other single thing, will provide such purchasing power where it is needed most.

THE NEED

The human needs of America's lowest paid can be seen at a glance in any industrial community. Substandard housing, broken-down housefurnishings, ill-dressed children,

inadequate diets, the use of dangerous jalopies on our roads—these are only some of the surface manifestations of the need. Beneath the surface lies a more tragic story of inadequate medical care, broken health, needless broken homes, improper child care, and of juvenile delinquency.

Available figures on income distribution, while necessarily impersonal, further highlight the needs of America's lowest paid citizens.

The highest tenth of America's income receivers had a total of 31 percent of all money income in 1953, and the highest 20 percent had a total of 46 percent. At the other extreme, the submerged tenth received but 1 percent of all money income, the lowest 20 percent but 4 percent, and the bottom 30 percent received a combined total of only 9 percent of all money income.

This bottom 30 percent lives in actual want or on its darker edges. This America includes factory workers, distributive workers, communications workers, clerical workers, transportation workers—workers in almost every industry.

This America, by and large, is without savings or reserves. It is condemned to fearful economic insecurity—forced to turn to public and private relief at the slightest shift of the economic winds. Its existence accounts for the greater part of the social-service load that must be borne by the community. It is the group that would benefit most from a \$1.25 minimum wage.

NOT ENOUGH

Although America has grown much stronger and wealthier since 1938, much of its thinking with regard to the minimum wage remains geared to that year.

The 40-cent minimum wage remained in effect through the war years and through the worst years of postwar inflation. When the minimum wage was increased to 75 cents in 1949, living costs had risen by 80 percent. The increase did little more than take the living cost rise into account.

Measured in 1953 dollars, total production of goods and services were worth \$171,800 million in 1938. In terms of these same dollars, total production in 1949 had risen to \$294,200 million; an increase of 70 percent.

America's lowest paid and neediest citizens were excluded from a proper share of this increase in national wealth. In 1949, organized labor called for a rise in the minimum wage to \$1 per hour, based upon increased national wealth and the living cost rise.

In his recent message to Congress, President Eisenhower called for enactment of a 90-cent minimum wage, basing his recommendation upon living cost increases since 1949. This recommendation once more would condemn millions of Americans to second-class economic citizenship, denying to them any participation in America's increased ability to create wealth. It would perpetuate present inequities and, for the longer pull, would cause even greater distortions in income distribution. President Eisenhower, in his Congress message, stated that his recommendation would affect only 1,300,000 workers, who would have their wages raised by an average of only nine cents per hour.

Based upon 1953 dollars, production of goods and services is presently running at the rate of \$356 billion annually; a rise of 110 percent over 1938. A proportionate increase for those wage earners most in need certainly is in order. It would be logical, in view of this, to establish a real wage at least double that of 1938 for these groups—a minimum wage in excess of \$1.50 per hour, in present-day dollars.

American labor is not seeking such a wage minimum, recognizing its sudden impact upon the national wage structure and upon some industries. It is, however, asking \$1.25 per hour to assure to America's most ex-

ploited industrial citizens a fairer share of the Nation's product.

LOW STANDARD DANGEROUS

A continued inadequate minimum wage must inevitably have a lopsided effect upon the Nation's growth and welfare. An inadequate statutory minimum contributes to establishment and continuation of a low wage economy in whole areas of the country. This must cause serious and debilitating repercussions throughout America's mass production economy.

Spurred primarily by a pledge of low wages, and with the added inducement of special tax privileges and locally-paid-for physical facilities, many large and small employers are locating plants in low-wage areas. Given the advantages of low-wage structures, these employers have small incentive to increase efficiency.

Movement of plants into low wage areas causes serious dislocations in the communities from which these plants have fled. The process, in feeding upon itself, becomes a matter of vicious throatcutting. Ultimately, it must endanger the whole national wage and price structure—a cost far too great for any specious advantage that might be alleged at a given moment.

Over any period of time, this process will endanger the very communities into which low-wage plants are being invited. Low-paid workers cannot assume the tax burden of community growth which inevitably follows. The result is inadequate schools, municipal services, and a neglected community with deteriorating homes.

Competition for low-wage plants must also spread, as it already is doing, among communities in each low wage area. Greater and greater incentives must be offered to employers who cause communities to outbid each other. This might well bring shambles instead of industrial development.

What can happen is well illustrated by a letter from the mayor of Pelahatchie, Miss., a community of 989, to a New England manufacturer:

"Then our wonderful labor, 98 percent native born, mostly high-school graduates, will lower average hourly industrial wage rates 6 cents to 49 cents below other Southern States, and from 50 cents to 95 cents below Northern States."

There it is in a nutshell—the mayor promised all this plus 99-year tax exemption and a free plant. Obviously, such standards, if permitted to spread, must become ruinous to the country.

All areas of America deserve maximum development. This can be achieved through proper use of area resources, programs of adequate and cheap power, valley development and through the natural growth of America. Lasting beneficial results cannot be achieved through any wage exploitation driving down living standards and causing more problems than it solves.

The average national wage in manufacturing is \$1.80 per hour. The average wage in manufacturing in North Carolina is \$1.26 per hour. Just as water runs downhill, such low wages must undermine the whole national structure. Establishment of a \$1.25 hourly minimum will remove unfair wage differentials now threatening the economy.

A realistic \$1.25 statutory minimum will establish fairer standards of competition between areas, permitting an enduring growth predicated upon the need and resources of each area. It will provide to each area the mass purchasing power required for lasting growth. It will make for better communities in each area now undergoing industrial development. With the \$1.25 wage minimum, operating efficiency and suitability of a plant to a given area, rather than exploited workers, will become the basis of industrial growth.

THE QUESTION OF COVERAGE

All Americans are entitled to equal protection of the law.

Nevertheless, Congress exempted millions of workers from protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act in passing the original law in 1938, despite its power to regulate by law the wages and conditions of employees in interstate commerce. In 1949, when Congress amended the law, it further narrowed the coverage of the law, instead of providing protection for a greater number of employees.

In the communications industry, for example, Congress exempted those employees most needful of legal protection. These are telephone operators employed in smaller exchanges. While the original law protected all operators employed in exchanges having 500 or more subscriber stations, the amended law narrowed this coverage to provide protection only for operators employed in exchanges having 750 or more stations. As a result of this exemption, telephone operators employed in 10,733 of the 11,502 non-Bell telephone company exchanges have no statutory protection on wages and hours.

Some 7 million workers employed in retail establishments are presently exempted from coverage of the law. Many of these are in jobs affecting or involving interstate commerce. Many more in service industries—laundries, cleaning establishments and the like—are also exempted. These groups are notoriously among the most exploited in America, needing the protection of law to obtain even minimal wage and hour standards.

Certain categories of railway employees, employees of weekly newspapers, certain workers in lumbering and forest industries, workers in agricultural processing, fishery employees, pipeline employees, and seasonal employees are among other significant groups of workers not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Many of these groups, because of the conditions of their work and the insecurity of their jobs, do not have the benefits of union organization. Low wage conditions afflicting them have a depressing effect upon wage levels generally. The sole recourse of many of these workers lies in the law. Failure of Congress to improve the conditions of these workers is a matter of gross discrimination and a social crime.

Big business lobbies such as the National Retail Dry Goods Association, the United States Independent Telephone Association, the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers can be counted upon to fight extension of coverage to workers not now enjoying the benefits of legal protection in wages and hours. These groups are almost certain to weep crocodile tears on behalf of the small-business man.

The arguments which are certain to be presented—and the Retail Association has already given forewarning—are as hypocritical as the lobbyists whose tears will flow so copiously. Behind the NRDGA, for example, there lie such small businesses as the multimillion dollar Allied Stores and Federated Stores. In the same fashion, the USITA provides a very convenient front for such small businesses as the General Telephone Corporation, second largest in the Nation's telephone systems.

TIME FOR ACTION

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of America's most respected newspapers, recently carried an editorial entitled "The Deficit in Jobs." This editorial noted that the total number of persons gainfully employed in December of 1954 had dropped to 60,688,000. This was the lowest December total since 1950. It was a million and one-half below August of 1954, which, in turn, was the lowest peak month since 1949.

Peak employment in August of 1954 should have been at least 64,643,000, according to

this same editorial. The editorial expressed extreme concern with this job deficit and urged national recognition of the dangers concerned.

At the present moment, the American economy is underemployed and the Nation is losing over \$30 billion of productive output at an annual rate.

We have the productive capacity at hand. The productivity of our working force is increasing and will rise even more rapidly with the increased use of automated devices in our workplaces.

Our productive machine can run at full capacity if we provide effective consumer demand. This can best be achieved by applying purchasing power where it will be used immediately in the mass production market—to the 30 percent of America most in need of an improved standard of living.

This 30 percent has not obtained its just share of America's increased productivity and wealth. Its wages have hardly kept pace with 1938 levels. It must have a 1955 wage level if our American economy is not to falter.

A \$1.25 minimum wage and broader Fair Labor coverage for our industrial citizens are realistic and sound in the light of the facts concerning our industrial potential. They will permit growth consistent with our new technology. We cannot afford not to establish such statutory regulations. A half-step is an invitation to continued subnormal standards and second-class economic citizenship for millions. It is an invitation to a continued job deficit, to underemployment of our productive capacity and, perhaps, to economic stagnation.

J. Edgar Hoover Warns of Red Boring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, there are still many in this country who feel that the problem of subversion and infiltration has been solved and that the tensions of the past 10 years have been fully relaxed. In my opinion, the greatest authority on the ramifications and consequences of this dangerous type of apathy and false understanding is Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

On January 2, 1955, the Baltimore Sunday American included an interview with Mr. Hoover in which he stressed the vital need for continued alertness. This interview has so impressed me that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOPER WARNS OF RED BORING—FBI HEAD, ON 60TH BIRTHDAY, SAYS HARD-CORE MEMBERS STILL ACTIVE

(By William K. Hutchinson)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover warned today that hard-core Communists are boring into such basic American industries as steel, automobile, chemical, electrical, and shipping.

The man who, in his more than 30 years as Director has built the Federal Bureau of Investigation into a massive bulwark of national security, sounded the warning in a question-and-answer exchange with International News Service.

Hoover's hard-hitting comments were made in an exclusive interview on the 60th birthday—New Year's Day.

America's top investigative official, who became Director of the FBI in 1924, has no intention of retiring in the foreseeable future. He is in vigorous good health and is wholly dedicated to his career of public service.

Here are the questions and answers which cover the highlights of Hoover's three decades as FBI Chief and which give eloquent expression to his faith in a better, safer, happier America:

Question. In your 30 years as Director of the FBI, what has given you your greatest satisfaction?

Answer. Three matters come to mind. In the first instance, I recall the concern which was manifested by leaders of Government in the early thirties over the rise in power of the lords of the underworld. In community after community these gangsters literally held the power of life over death.

An attitude of defeatism was sweeping the country. This attitude of defeat changed overnight when it was demonstrated that the FBI, with a comparatively small force of men, could secure evidence of their crimes and a determined prosecutive policy of the Department of Justice demonstrated that with this FBI evidence, gangster leaders could be sent to prison.

As a result, the underworld which they ruled was conquered.

Secondly, when the clouds of World War II were lowering, a wave of hysteria broke out of fear against fifth column and enemy assaults within the United States. Through alertness of law enforcement agencies, spearheaded by the FBI, no enemy-directed sabotage occurred and enemy espionage was controlled in World War II while civil rights were preserved in the American way.

Thirdly, the manner in which the work of the FBI has been supported and backed by presidents, attorneys general, the Congress and law-abiding people everywhere has contributed largely to making the FBI the career service that it is today recognized as nonpartisan, objective, and fair in all of its activities.

Question. What is your estimate of the present total strength of the internal Communist subversive force within the United States?

Answer. At the present time the Communist Party has a total membership of roughly 24,000.

These numbers may not seem large, but we must always remember that Communist power is not measured in numbers alone but in organized fanaticism, perverted reasoning and dedication to a cause.

These 24,000 members are hard-core Communists. The "faint hearted" have long ago been purged. The party is today recruiting members, but the most stringent security precautions are in effect.

Question. What is the present status of the internal security of the United States against the constant, insidious subversive activities of the Communists?

Answer. The Communist Party, United States of America, has been hit hard since 1948. To date, a total of 134 Communist leaders have been indicted under the Smith Act. Eighty-one have been convicted. The party has been kept on the defensive. This must be continued and never again should we drop our vigilance.

Question. Is the Communist Party still interested in the Nation's basic industries?

Answer. Most emphatically. The party today may be underground but all the time it keeps paramount the tactic of infiltrating basic industries, such as steel, automobile, chemical, electrical, shipping.

A program of "colonization" is being employed, whereby young party members are being told to secure jobs in industrial plants,

I consider this program one of the most dangerous being conducted by the party.

The party is now implementing a subtle program of trying to infiltrate its members into the well known anti-Communist unions where, in the future, they can exert influence. This program will fail if the truly dedicated American labor leaders remain alert as they have in the past.

Question. Have you any advice to law enforcement agencies, parents, school, authorities of community leaders for meeting the challenge of the present-day problems of juvenile delinquency?

Answer. There is no doubt as to the gravity of the problem. What is needed more than anything else is a determination to give youth a chance to be decent.

If our young people are taught the difference between right and wrong, the fundamentals of life, the virtues of hard work, thrift, integrity, self-reliance, and personal responsibility and, if they are given examples of decency on the part of their parents, adults, and all who come in contact with them, they themselves are more likely to be decent.

The many fine youth serving organizations, such as the Boys' Clubs, Girls' Clubs, 4-H Clubs, YMCA, YWCA, Catholic Youth Organization, the Boy and Girl Scouts, YMHA and the other fine agencies should have the fullest support of adults and youth should be encouraged to take part in these constructive and worthwhile programs.

Question. Can you give any advice on this same problem to the youngsters themselves?

Answer. Yes; first of all boys and girls, be decent and learn that you can make of your life what you will. Seek the guidance of your parents, ministers, teachers, and youth leaders.

They are concerned about you and know what is best for you.

Set your sights high and never be content with any activity until it is as nearly perfect as possible.

Freedom's Frontiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the recent Manila-Baguio Conference from which Secretary of State Dulles has just returned renews our hope for freedom in the Far East. More important than our military aid to threatened Asiatic countries, however, is our peaceful help in raising Asian standards of living and production to check the growth of communism. I think it is appropriate to call the attention of the Congress to the New York Times editorial position in this regard:

FREEDOM'S FRONTIERS

Secretary of State Dulles returned yesterday with a word of cheer after another one of those appointed rounds from which neither snow, nor rain, nor heat, nor gloom of night can stay his swift completion. This time he had been in such places as Burma, Indochina, the Philippines, and Formosa.

"I have seen at first hand," he said, as he got off the plane, "the forward positions of freedom—positions which the Chinese Communists are desperately trying to take. I found courage, and love of liberty, and hope." The hope, he thought, "stemmed

largely from the power of the United States and our dedication to the cause of freedom."

This position has the support of 15 chiefs of United States Far Eastern missions, who on Saturday ended a 4-day conference, held at Manila and in the lovely hill town of Baguio. These ambassadors held that, given a free choice, the peoples of the Far East will not be "seduced by gospels of hate designed to stir them up against each other and against other nations of the free world."

The Manila-Baguio Conference had of necessity discussed the question of military aid to threatened Asiatic countries, but it had also, as this newspaper's dispatch from Robert Alden stated, "considered multilateral and bilateral arrangements for cooperation in the achievement of this economic well-being of the people of the Far East."

Communism grows like a weed in the swamp of human misery—and even there it has never been accepted by the majority of any nation except under pressure of armed force. A year or so ago it seemed that this misery and the accompanying force might spread the Red regime through much of Southeast Asia. A few years before that it had seemed that much of Western Europe might succumb to the same evil circumstance. In Western Europe the growth was checked, though its dangerous miasma lingers.

Perhaps we can now hope for a corresponding development in the Far East, though it may be slower and more confused. It is not possible that the people of Asia, having been largely freed from the old-fashioned kind of colonialism, will now turn toward the slavery of Moscow. But to resist they will need our help—and, let us hope, especially our peaceful help in raising their standards of living and production.

Cities Like Worcester Make America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, a most informative article concerning the history and development of the great city of Worcester, in the heart of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, written by Mr. Howell Walker, appeared in the February issue of the National Geographic Magazine, and I am pleased to include it here for the information and edification of my fellow Members.

The article follows:

CITIES LIKE WORCESTER MAKE AMERICA—FROM THE VILLAGE BLACKSMITH TO NEW ENGLAND'S LARGEST INLAND METROPOLIS, THIS COMMUNITY HAS GROWN WITH INDUSTRY AND YANKEE INGENUITY

(By Howell Walker)

A white man sat down with a few Indians and smoked a pipe of peace. For 8 square miles of land he gave them 2 coats, 4 yards of cloth, a little money. The trade cradled the city of Worcester a century before the birth of the Nation.

But that bargain went up in smoke when red men burned the first huts. Wilderness regained its grip on Massachusetts' "Far West" frontier, 40 miles from Boston; over the ruins hung the silence of subsequent years. Then daring settlers tried again.

The lure of greener fields urged colonists to push inland from the crowded coastal strip. And Worcester, like so many other New Eng-

land towns, took root despite death and captivity at savage hands.

PERSISTENCE, RESISTANCE, AND SUCCESS

Hardy pioneers named the village for their English city where Cromwell fought and won the last battle against Charles II. Puritan determination developed it for "the better conveniency of attending God's worship, the better education of their children, and for the better accommodation of the tradespeople." To these precepts Worcester has always subscribed.

The city's background is the Nation's. A marker near the site of the earliest log cabins sums up chapter one: "The first settlement of this lonely region called Quinsigamond was attempted in 1673, but abandoned during King Philip's War. A second settlement, attempted in 1684, soon named Worcester, was also temporarily abandoned because of Indian hostility. Permanent occupation was effected in 1713."

In a pleasant valley among the gentle hills of central Massachusetts, the city today goes about life in much the same way as any other American community its size. As an industrial and educational center, the seat of Worcester County fairly represents New England.

For weeks I watched Worcester at work. Its impressive output of high-precision machine tools, steel and wire goods, forgings of aircraft and automobile parts, grinding wheels, and plastic whatnots amounts to an industrial revelation. But it was good to find a midcity smith hammering at an old-fashioned anvil.

Around the village blacksmith Worcester took shape as naturally as a house around its chimney. Some 700 manufacturing concerns have grown up within its municipal area. A population of 205,000 ranks the city third in New England, surpassed only by Boston and Providence, R. I.

Half the employed population works in factories. Nearly everyone goes to church. Thousands attend 109 schools and 6 colleges.

Sleek apartments are replacing outdated 3-decker tenements. Well back from elm-lined streets ramble handsome homes founded on steel, barbed wire, envelopes, looms, emery wheels, firearms, boots, brains—and honest, hard labor.

Worcester's strong tradition of craftsmanship—work expertly done by hand—has never let the Machine Age take the human touch out of its industry. This, plus a vigorous civic spirit and far more than idle interest in culture, makes Worcester tick evenly as the heart of the Commonwealth.

YANKEE INGENUITY FINDS A WAY

In 1685 the village began its industrial career with completion of the first gristmill. For the next century it lived quietly by agriculture and simple household crafts. During long winter months farmers tanned leather, made shoes, furniture, and other necessities. Much of their handiwork they traded at fairs.

Unable to obtain tools, machinery, and technical secrets from abroad, the colonial folk worked things out with Yankee ingenuity.

The town became a key center in a system of stagecoach lines covering the eastern part of the new Republic. But universally bad roads, often impassable in winter, discouraged movement of heavy goods.

In a bold and expensive project the inland community backed the digging of a canal to link Worcester with Providence, seaport of Rhode Island. Opened in 1828, the Blackstone Canal closed after a short but full life of 20 years. It introduced cheap transport of weighty freight and invited enterprising firms to settle in Worcester.

Railroads took over from the canal they killed; local trades gained momentum as steam heralded a new age of power.

INVENTORS CROWD CITY'S HALL OF FAME

Creative minds from the Worcester area revolutionized manufacturing around the world. As early as 1793 Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin; he also standardized parts of other products and opened the way for mass production in America. Elias Howe in 1846 patented the first lock-stitch sewing machine. In the 1850's a physician, Dr. Russell L. Hawes, designed machinery for folding paper into envelopes; Erastus Bigelow invented a power carpet loom; Thomas Blanchard turned out a new type of lathe for irregular forms and experimented with steam power.

The first piano wire made in America came from a Worcester mill. Here originated the steam calliope, the street lunch cart, and, some say, the first Valentine greeting card in the United States. In 1843 Charles Thurber improved the typewriter, effecting a letter-spacing principle still copied today. A graduate of Worcester Polytechnic Institute developed one of the first American gasoline-engined automobiles. And in 1926 a Clark University physics professor, Dr. Robert H. Goddard, first successfully projected a liquid-fuel rocket.

The city's hall of fame contains names of other notables. Here was the home of George Bancroft, eminent historian and father of the United States Naval Academy. Clara Barton, mother of the American National Red Cross and its first president, was born nearby in Oxford and closely identified with Worcester.

Immigrants—Swedish, Irish, French Canadians, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, and others—supplied much-needed skills and manpower. Eventually, elements of almost all nationalities that make up America's population added their flavor to this melting pot.

Big-business men built factory blocks and rented space and power to small concerns just getting started. This encouraged the little man. If he had an idea, he could begin a project without large outlay of capital.

Worcester still shows intrinsic respect for craftsmanship. Call it art in industry, personal pride in product, or what you will. Here it has endured from the pioneer days of Yankee ingenuity to the know-how of now.

"Worcester really is an industrial museum," the vice president of the Worcester Historical Society told me. "All our big works started here in a small way. It is rewarding to trace their progress from the first rough tools to our streamlined mass production."

Some individual factories have their own special museums. The Worcester Pressed Steel Co. contains the John Woodman Higgins Armory—a remarkable exhibit of man's metal products. It demonstrates the history of the metal craft.

In one long room duplicating the great hall of a Gothic castle in Austria I admired a fabulous assembly of arms and armor. An adjoining hall displays modern steel products: parts for airplanes, automobiles, typewriters, and torpedoes—all made on the premises.

Mr. John Woodman Higgins, chairman of the board of the Worcester Pressed Steel Co., traveled widely to collect and arrange his industrial museum. Its object, in his own words: "To inspire steelworkers, to attract superior craftsmen, to stimulate functional art in industry, to improve steel craftsmanship, to inform the public regarding the history of steel, and to preserve the best examples of steel craftsmanship for future generations."

SHINING ARMOR SHOWS EARLY STEEL CRAFT

Drawn by the glittering array of armor, I visited and revisited the varied collection. I saw the foot soldier's standard uniform of 500 years ago, the ornate protection worn by a reigning prince, and a group of 16th-century knights mounted on chargers.

In the up-to-date wing a metal airplane hangs above an auto chassis, which is 90 percent pressed steel. Exhibits show the company's successive operations in the manufacture of propeller domes for battle planes.

Ordnance Department experts studied this armor collection during World War I, and the plant produced thousands of steel helmets.

Here hangs Jan Brueghel's master panel, the Forge of Vulcan. It shows Venus and Cupid assisting Vulcan at his anvil and furnace; they make tools and products like those exhibited in the museum's cases. Walls of the 17th-century alcove carry portraits of kings in fancy parade armor, while the modern gallery has as many pictures of contemporary craftsmen at their machines and furnaces.

Adjoining the museum, the steel factory also invites visitors. Among the mass of machinery, I watched giant power rolls and presses accomplish in seconds what medieval armorers would have taken months to finish by hand.

Worcester's diverse industries are mostly home-owned, not uncommonly managed and manpowered by generations of the same families. They usually follow the old American custom of plowing back profits. With a generous civic spirit, many direct part of their earnings to local hospitals, art museums, and educational facilities.

WPI TRAINS INDUSTRY'S VIP'S

"Industry made Worcester Polytechnic Institute possible," said its late president, Rear Adm. Wat Tyler Cluverius. "And as long as the engineering college maintains its high standard, it will hold the interest of industry."

Established in 1865, WPI rates high among the Nation's engineering colleges. Its alumni have pioneered in steel, automobiles, aircraft, machine tools, railroading, shipbuilding, electrical communications, chemical research, oil, rubber, and abrasives. An annual enrollment of 900 represents every section of the globe.

The first instructor and superintendent of the institute's machine shops designed valves for an early plunger elevator and started several highly successful manufacturing plants. These include Worcester Pressed Steel and the Norton Co. He was Milton Prince Higgins, known as the father of the public trade school movement in America.

Entering the Worcester Boys' Trade High School, I paused by a bronze plaque. Under the Philosophy of Learning a Trade appeared this simple wisdom: "To make a good living; to have a happy family; to make preparation for hard times; to wear overalls in the shop with the same dignity as good clothes are worn on Sunday—this is the wholesome philosophy of learning a trade." —MILTON P. HIGGINS.

From what Higgins began in 1910 has materialized one of the best equipped training centers of its kind in America. Its courses lessen the need for factory apprenticeships. Its shops have trained hundreds of skilled mechanics for industries like Norton Co., Worcester's biggest industrial concern and the world's largest manufacturer of abrasive products.

In April 1953, Norton Co. added to its already enormous factory a \$6 million precision grinding machine plant spreading over 6½ acres. Two months later a tornado swept through Worcester, leaving the newly built division roofless and littered with debris; the repair bill ran to a million dollars.

"But machines were back in production within 69 hours," said Norton's public relations manager. "And by September 1953, the plant was as good as new."

That tornado, with twisting winds up to 350 miles an hour, left 90 persons dead, 10,000 homeless, and \$50 million worth of damage.

Norton Co. grew out of a potter's shop that successfully bonded natural emery with clay and fired the mixture in a kiln. So began the era of the emery wheel—an improved version of the age-old grindstone. Later the company pioneered grinding with diamond.

Norton now turns out enough grinding wheels to allow every man, woman, and child in Worcester a different type, size, or shape. They range from drills tiny as a dentist's to 10-ton pulpstone wheels 6 feet in diameter.

PULP WHEEL GRINDS 40 CORDS A DAY

"Most mechanically produced pulp for paper is ground with our stones," said a Norton research man. "A large one can grind 40 cords of wood a day."

Another Worcester manufacturer materially helps the paper industry. Rice Barton Corp., established 117 years ago, has probably built more machines for making newsprint than any other company in the paper machine manufacturing field. In fact, the firm forged, cast, and finished the machinery that makes and coats the pages of the very magazine you are reading.

"It takes from 9 to 18 months and about 400 workers to complete just one of the machines," said a representative. "Selling prices are as high as \$2,500,000 for a large machine."

Shortly before 1850 a local doctor, Russell L. Hawes, became so interested in mechanics that he abandoned his medical practice to work for Rice Barton Corp. (then known as Goddard & Rice). A few years later he patented a device for making envelopes. Thus began an industry new to Worcester and to the United States. Prior to Hawes' achievement, Americans usually just folded a letter and sealed it with wax.

Today several divisions of the United States Envelope Co. operate enormous plants in Worcester.

One of the city's oldest and largest industries is also one of the most ancient metal crafts.

"The basic process of wiremaking by pulling metal through a die dates back to the eighth century," an official of American Steel & Wire's Worcester division explained.

Not until 1831 did anyone better the process. Then Ichabod Washburn, a blacksmith by trade, developed a machine for drawing steel rods into wire and started a timely business. Instead of expensive whalebone, women's fashions absorbed wire for hoop skirts, bonnets, and hairpins. And the expanding young West needed barbed wire for fencing livestock on boundless plains.

By 1880 Washburn's concern had grown into the world's leading wiremaker. Nineteen years later it merged with the newly formed American Steel & Wire Co., which subsequently became a division of the United States Steel Corp.

Today the Worcester plant covers 140 acres, employing some 3,500 workers. Monthly output approximates 12,000 tons of steel and wire products.

HOT STEEL ROLLED AT 50 MILES AN HOUR

The magic of wiremaking fascinated me. Like a colossal clothes wringer, the rolling mill presses a 3-ton red-hot ingot the size of a bathtub into a 6-inch bar 90 feet long. The next set of rolls squeezes it thin as your wrist while a flying shear cuts it into 30-foot lengths. These billets gather speed as they pass through subsequent rolls. Out race hot rods at 50 miles an hour to coil up like snakes, no thicker than a pencil but three-fourths of a mile long.

Cleaned in acid, rinsed in water, and coated with lime, a rod is drawn cold through a die to a prescribed diameter. A successive set of dies can reduce it to four-one-thousandths of an inch.

Consider the myriad uses for wire in everyday life: kitchen utensils, nails, screws, and bolts; suspension bridges and needles; hoisting apparatus or typewriter parts;

springs for vehicles, guns, telephone dials, and watches; piano strings, overhead and submarine cables. Ours is a world of wire without end.

In another division of the plant, cold-rolling machines produce flat strip steel for the manufacture of such items as knives, saws, rules, gages, razor blades, and ribs for umbrellas.

The small but significant beginnings of some early industries encouraged others to settle at Worcester. So in the 1830's William Crompton arrived—all the way from Lancashire, England—to manufacture textiles with newly patented machinery.

His son improved power looms and eventually formed the firm of Crompton & Knowles Loom Works. In normal years the company has 2,500 employees on 25 acres of floor space. It yearly ships about 10,000 looms for domestic and foreign use. These machines weave fabric from half an inch to 50 feet wide and weigh from one-half to 60 tons.

"The loom has come a long, long way down the road of progress from the looms of ancient Egypt," a former president of the factory said. "In the benefits it has bestowed upon mankind it ranks with the plow, the printing press, and the locomotive."

FROM SHEEP'S BACK TO CARPET

M. J. Whittall Associates, Inc., weaves a million yards a year of fine Anglo-Persian rugs and modern carpeting.

"We've still got growing pains," said Manager Harry Inett, 50 years with the company.

"We buy our wool directly from the backs of sheep grazing in India, Iraq, South America, and New Zealand," Inett said, "and we process it right through to the finished carpet."

We followed the works from beginning to end: reception of raw wool, scouring, carding, yarn making, wool and worsted spinning, weaving, trimming, finishing, and rolling for shipment.

In 1883 the growing importance of textiles stepped up manufacture of loom parts. Entering the field, two WPI graduates started the Wyman-Gordon Co. They took over a photographer's tiny shop on the cheapest land in town.

Now the company employs more than 2,500 persons in its Worcester division and another 1,500 at its western plant in Harvey, Ill. Watching the operations in Worcester, we flinched from heavy bars of red-hot steel shifted by overhead cranes. Sturdy crews manhandled the fiery metal under steam-driven hammers to shape automobile crankshafts and important aircraft parts. The constant pounding deafened and bodily jolted me.

Imagine the buffeting endured by the actual task force, day after day. Some have stuck to this rugged labor for more than 30 years.

The Government selected Wyman-Gordon to develop a special project: wider use of light metals like magnesium and aluminum in aircraft forgings. England, Russia, and Germany already had facilities for similar ventures; America had to keep pace.

Accordingly, in 1946 Wyman-Gordon completed a new plant at nearby North Grafton. It included an 18,000-ton press, designed primarily for large magnesium forgings and those of aluminum alloys.

How big can a forging plant get? Under the United States Air Force's recent press expansion program, the light-metals forging plant has been increased more than 10 times its original size. Now housed in this massive factory are five presses ranging in size from 1,500 tons to 50,000 tons. Standing by the base of one of these towering presses, I had that feeling of smallness and wonder I have known at the bottom of the Grand Canyon.

I saw \$100,000 worth of jet engine impellers hot off the press, and one of the most intricate forgings ever produced in any metal—a brake-assembly unit of a plane wheel, looking like a birthday cake, candle and all. Here also were aircraft forgings bigger than any heretofore produced in the United States.

Wyman-Gordon, a leader in research work for the industry, has played an important role in the development of techniques for forging steel, high-temperature superalloys, aluminum, magnesium, and now titanium, that new wonder metal.

It's a relief to find in Worcester a place of business proud to produce the smallest something. As an experiment, Commonwealth Press, which prints anything from calling cards to complex catalogs, published a book it believes is the tiniest in existence. It is a translation of verses from the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, bound in leather. Somebody once fitted 24 of the works into a thimble.

FIRST AMERICAN NOVEL PUBLISHED

A printer was the city's first great citizen. Escaping enemy-held Boston, Isaiah Thomas smuggled his press to Worcester in 1775 and circulated its first newspaper. A successor to Benjamin Franklin in this field, he built up the foremost printing and publishing business in the young Republic.

Pioneering in mass-production methods of book publishing, Isaiah Thomas printed the first novel by an American author, *The Power of Sympathy*, by William Hill Brown; also the first medical and music volumes. One of the earliest copies of the Bible published in this country came from his press, as did spellers, primers, almanacs, and ballads of the day. When paper got scarce, he established Worcester's first mill to make it.

To compile his thorough history of printing in America, Thomas accumulated the best source material available. Anxiously he sought to found an institution which could preserve his library and build upon it.

As a result of his efforts, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts incorporated the American Antiquarian Society for "the collection and preservation of the antiquities of our country, and of curious and valuable productions in art and nature . . . to enlarge the sphere of human knowledge, aid in the progress of science, to perpetuate the history of moral and political events."

TWENTY SHELF-MILES OF HISTORY

The society was organized during the War of 1812. At Worcester it was safe from the guns of foreign fleets, and there the society's library and offices have stayed.

On more than 20 miles of continuous shelves rest well over a million books, pamphlets, newspapers, maps, prints, and manuscripts. Fittingly, one room of the building preserves Isaiah Thomas' original printing press.

The library contains copies of 75 percent of all recorded books and pamphlets printed in the United States before 1820. It has the Nation's most complete collection of American newspapers from 1704 to 1821, and for the years up to 1865 the newspaper files rank with those of the Library of Congress.

Distinguished American historians and 12 Presidents of the United States have been members of the society. Leading scholars, as well as the casually inquisitive, have turned often to this valuable storehouse for national knowledge.

In a conversation with Calvin Coolidge, not long out of the White House, someone referred to him as the ex-President.

"But I am still president," Coolidge replied sharply, "of the American Antiquarian Society."

"We get all sorts of queries," said the society's director, Clarence S. Brigham. "Once two elderly men came in to settle a dispute: Who played right field for Baltimore in 1898?"

"We found that very easily," Dr. Brigham said, "because of our immense newspaper files. It was Willie Keeler, who ended up in baseball's hall of fame."

And in the American Antiquarian Society.

In 1829 the Worcester Natural History Society began collecting and labeling wild flowers. Today this organization stresses the need for conservation of America's natural resources. In addition to educational exhibits, the society's museum conducts classes for children and adults in natural-history subjects.

"I don't know what we'd do without the National Geographic magazine," said Director Richard C. Potter. "It's an invaluable and constant source of reference in our studies."

Mr. Potter arranged for me to visit his society's nature-training school outside the city. Walking over some of the school's 40 acres bordering a pond, I found groups of children studying various forms of nature: Flowers, trees, and flowerless plants, astronomy and weather, reptiles and birds (page 201). Since Mr. Potter became director of the Natural History Society in 1940, membership has more than quadrupled.

Among the first in the United States to purchase land for a public park, Worcester has preserved hundreds of acres for recreational purposes. Lake Quinsigamond, 7 miles long, forms the city's eastern boundary; over its current-free course some of the country's topnotch oarsmen race in national regattas; here in 1952 were held United States Olympic rowing trials (page 208).

A minute's walk from a solid block of factories took me to the Worcester Art Museum. Its superb collection of masterpieces ranges from 2600 B. C. to modern times. I saw rare works of classical, medieval, and early American art in galleries that are among the Nation's best (page 198).

In the same area stands the Memorial Auditorium, where crowds swarm to hear unusually fine concerts or watch first-rate plays. For more than 90 years music lovers have annually thronged the week-long Worcester Music Festival, the country's oldest.

BIOLOGISTS STUDY BASIC MEDICAL PROBLEMS

On the city's outskirts, in the mansion of a once-private estate and in several additional buildings, the nonprofit Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology lives up to its name. Here, scientists strive to solve problems important to mental health, arthritis, cancer, and reproduction. This work is done primarily through studies of hormones produced by the adrenal and sex glands.

In only 10 years of existence the foundation has come up with some interesting findings. Workers discovered that cancer patients secrete an abnormal balance of sex hormones. The present research program involves a study of the chemistry of blood in persons suffering from the disease. Since cancer is a runaway growth of tissues, its causes depend on the intimate chemistry of the cells; and the relation of this chemistry to steroid substances is important to cancer research.

BIG INDUSTRIES FROM SMALL CRAFTS

Worcester's old crafts never die; they usually grow into something bigger. It happened with steel rolling and wire drawing, manufacture of railway carriages and trolley buses, fire extinguishers and firearms, and worsted materials for civilian and military clothing.

Besides the phenomenal growth of older industries, new ones are still springing up. Since World War II, 283 firms have started and stayed in business.

So Worcester grows with increasing industry. But the city's real strength, like that of the Nation, stems from the people. They started from scratch; inventive genius was their chief natural resource, and it still is.

Worcester is a city of industry made so by the character of its citizens. It began with a bargain between white man and Indians. Puritans laid the sound foundation. Then men faced hard work with strong hands, initiative, skill, and intelligence. They still do.

There are other places in the United States like Worcester. Its story is the story of the growth of industrial America. Such communities made this country what it is today.

Resolution Urging Amendment of the Sugar Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum by the State of Utah House of Representatives by Representatives Larsen, Hebertson, Gardner, and Kerr:

House Joint Memorial 1

An act memorializing the Congress of the United States urging the enactment of legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948 to enable the domestic sugar industry to have a fair and equitable share of sugar consumption in the United States

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended provides for a fixed quantity of sugar which can be marketed in the United States by processors producing sugar from beets or cane grown in the United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands; and

Whereas sugar consumption in the United States has increased from 7,500,000 tons in 1948 to 8,250,000 tons in 1954 due largely to an increase in population from 150 million to 163 million during that same period; and

Whereas sugar consumption in the United States may be expected to continue to increase at the rate of more than 100,000 tons per year; and

Whereas under the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended, no portion of the increased consumption is permitted to be produced or sold from beets or cane grown by domestic producers; and

Whereas the sugar industry is a vital part of the agricultural economy of Utah and the Nation, being an important source of income to producers and factory laborers; and

Whereas any national emergency would require the existence of a strong, vigorous domestic sugar industry capable of providing a major part of the Nation's sugar needs; and

Whereas the domestic sugar industry is capable of meeting the challenge of an expanding market and of possible requirements in case of a national emergency, if permitted to do so under the law; and

Whereas the Government has found it necessary to limit the acreage of many major crops because of overproduction, and many of these acres are adapted to sugar beet production which could be used to supply a larger proportion of the domestic sugar needs, and at the same time aid in the solution of the difficult problem of what to do with diverted acres: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Utah does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation amending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in such a manner as to enable the domestic sugar in-

dustry to be allowed to produce and sell a fair share of the sugar needed to meet the increased demands of consumers within the United States resulting from our Nation's growth, and to provide for the maintenance of a stable, vigorous domestic sugar industry which will make a sound practical use of farm land now restricted from other use, and to provide an adequate supply of a strategic material within the United States in case of a national emergency; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to Members of the United States Congress, and senators and representatives from the State of Utah.

The Navy and the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit the following enlightening address delivered by Adm. Robert B. Carney, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, before the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce in Cincinnati, Ohio, on Monday, February 21, 1955.

Time will prove that Admiral Carney will go down in history as one of our greatest officers of the United States Navy. His address is so full of hard commonsense and irrefutable argument, along with undeniable facts, that it should be read by our present generation and preserved for posterity. It is the product of a clear mind, clean heart, and noble character, born of innate ability, careful training, rugged discipline, and long and successful experience.

THE NAVY AND THE ATOMIC AGE

(Address by Adm. Robt. B. Carney, U. S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, before the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, the Cincinnati Chapter of the Navy League, and the Naval Reserve Advisory Council of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio)

The Navy is a composite of great weapons systems capable of discharging its job, both in wars that are hot and wars that are cold. But the word "Navy" represents more than the material components such as ships, guns, guided missiles, and aircraft; it represents a complex system of people who are not only trained in sea-fighting and all manner of technical specialties, but are molded in the fields of character and mentality to produce the utmost of intelligent dedication in the application of their knowledge.

Of the past, I will only say that regardless of their scope and temperature, had we not won the wars at sea, we would not have won the wars. So much for the past. The Navy is not living in the past and we have no intention of doing so. Nor are we merely living in the present. We are profoundly concerned with the tasks which we might be called upon to perform for any crisis in the atomic future. Perhaps I should say that we are concerned with a 3-dimensional projection of history in which we are adhering to the applicable things of the past, planning for the best utilization of what we now have in our locker should we be confronted with an emergency today, and planning a future

Navy that will have the greatest capability for furthering our own national aims and defeating the intentions of any enemy.

Prior to embarking on a discussion of the Navy in this atomic era, it might be useful to permit our informed imagination to contemplate what war in the future could be like.

In its most depraved and horrible form, it could involve the unrestricted use of nuclear weapons on both sides. Consequently, we must reckon on the possibility of the holocaust; but we must also consider that conflicts of lesser scope and magnitude are possible because of the deterrent effect of world-wide understanding of the ghastly consequences of atomic war.

Until nuclear weapons are brought under foolproof international control, they must be included in our security thinking. At the same time, we must not be blinded to other dangers; a single concept could be a trap. Strength in depth, strategic mobility, sensitivity to changing conditions, and versatility are essentials in the scheme of long-range security.

Recent history has taught us the stern lesson that our possession in 1945 of some very powerful weapons did not deter Red conquest of China, nor did it stop the Reds moving into Greece, nor did it stop the Red's march into South Korea, nor did it stop the Communist thrust against Indochina. Nor does it appear to stop them now.

Our mere possession of atomic weapons has not deterred the world's most skillful and persistent arsonists, although it has undoubtedly been an important factor in preventing their setting fire to the world. Perhaps the masters of the Kremlin do not desire a struggle that could bring self-destruction; nevertheless the world may yet see many relatively minor struggles. Minor though they be, they are of profound importance because the sum total of multiple little defeats could add up to a situation of great gravity.

First, we as a nation must be prepared to withstand the shock of the worst surprise blow that could be delivered against us. I, for one, do not subscribe to any idea that the spirit of our people would be whipped by the first blow and ready to surrender. Patrick Henry's words never had more meaning to our citizens than they have today.

The instigator of a war, large or small, always has the momentary advantage of surprise and can predetermine where, when, and how he plans to accomplish his initial objectives. Knowing precisely his own intentions, he can fashion plans and implementing tools which he thinks will be foolproof. But, commonsense would certainly counsel an aggressor that even he must have an assortment of alternative capabilities up his sleeve lest his opponent anticipate his scheme.

Obviously, the defender is in a less advantageous position than the aggressor for he can never be certain that he will be able to predict his opponent's moves, either politically or militarily. Therefore, it is imperative that the defender be prepared for various contingencies; preparation for only one rigid and unalterable course could be suicidal.

Our first and constant objective is to avert war, and the best preventive lies in convincing strength and convincing readiness. Sea-air power plays an important part in this picture with its mobile and flexible capability for contributing to America's power in the air, its elusive capacity for dispersal, its wide range of geographical potentiality, and its built-in defenses.

The Navy would be immediately involved in any atomic exchange—defensively, parrying the enemy's efforts whether they come from above, on, or beneath the sea's surface; and by lashing back with all the destructive force that our sea-based weapons can bring

to bear. For such a fight, the Navy is prepared to make a significant contribution, both with weapons systems already perfected and with others under development.

By its central location in the Eurasian land mass, international communism has the opportunity to radiate out in any direction. Conversely, he could be hit from many directions. From the standpoint of the maritime aspect of this fact, it is significant that beyond his littoral and coastal sea lanes lie vast expanses of ocean in which our forces can operate if we retain freedom of action—carriers, guided missile ships and submarines, or perhaps an elusive force of submarine-supported seaplanes. But these capabilities are not had just for the asking. The Soviets even now own the second largest Navy and are working feverishly to expand it. The prize of maritime supremacy is again being contested. Our national planning must allow for this lest we lose the necessary margin in one of the essential elements of our national security.

It should be noted that these American sea forces I have mentioned all have the built-in attributes of concealment and surprise. Nor do they require any permissive diplomatic arrangements.

With these thoughts for background consideration, let us train our glasses on the horizon for a glance at what could be the pattern of future naval wartime operations.

Should the Armageddon come, there will be the need to blunt and survive the initial attack of the enemy, no matter in what form or from where it may originate. This certainly will involve many of our ships and aircraft operating on vigilant ocean patrol, their electronic sensories probing the depths of both sky and sea to facilitate finding and destroying the enemy's transoceanic raiders. There will be the immediate necessity for sea-based aircraft and missiles to participate in massive attacks against the enemy's source of strength and power.

Presumably, massive blows would continue as long as either side retained the capability. With the passing of that initial phase, and if the issue is still unresolved, tough people would carry on across the radioactive ashes and waters, with what weapons are left. Nuclear explosions will certainly not eliminate the ageless problems which the oceans have presented to man. Even if an enemy gained temporary advantages from an atomic exchange, unless he gained sea control he could not invade our land and take control of our Government. Sea control will be an elemental consideration in accomplishing either the follow-through phase of an atomic war or the better appreciated chores of a prolonged nonatomic war.

To summarize, our Navy would be required to protect sea areas vital to our own and allied interests both before and, God forbid, after the atom; a Navy will be needed to support our national commitments overseas. We might be called upon to seize contested beachheads, to render active combat support to our sister services, to launch and intercept guided missiles—in short, to perform any military task within the realm of our own blue-water interests.

The kind and size of a navy needed to do all these things depends on the arms situation the world over. For naturally, our weapons and methods must change with changing conditions, including the changing nature of our competition. Modern war is ruthlessly competitive, and weakness in any one sector or segment of defense is merely to tempt and perhaps even invite aggression.

In this connection, we in the Navy have been carefully watching and soberly evaluating the Soviet Union's ability to translate her obvious desires for maritime preeminence into solid materials and hardware. They are utilizing their own shipyards to build new cruisers, destroyer-types, submarines and smaller vessels such as tor-

pedo boats and mincraft. They are buying and having built ever-increasing amounts of merchant tonnage from our allies and friends. They are strengthening their naval aviation.

We do not know all of the armament characteristics being built into these new Soviet naval vessels. We do not know exactly how they are progressing with nuclear propulsion, guided missiles and atomic ammunition. We can only assume that they are not overlooking those applications to naval problems. One must also logically assume that they are not building new ships and deliberately equipping them with obsolete armaments—deliberately building new ships to be sunk by more modern weapons, the existence of which is well known to them.

The probability of multiple tasks being involved in future control of the oceans calls for building into all our weapons systems the maximum mobility, flexibility, versatility and last mentioned, but by no means of least importance, economy. An undefeated navy would be of little consolation to a nation suffering from economic collapse.

The rise of the Soviet Navy in no way minimizes the military threat opposing us and our allies on land and in the air, but it does indicate determined Soviet effort to leave no loopholes in the master plan. And there is another point of no little significance. The fact that the Soviets have embarked on a vast naval building program is one of the most conclusive bits of evidence that they are not contemplating a short war.

Recent public discussion here in the United States of Soviet maritime growth has proven to be a rather sensitive matter in Moscow—so sensitive, in fact, that Soviet spokesmen have deplored American naval views concerning the supposed aggressiveness of the Soviet Navy.

I can only say in rebuttal that I can see no valid purpose of any nation going to the great expense of building in a short time the second largest navy in the world, and still expanding, unless it visualizes some need to change the status quo at sea.

There have been other critics from overseas who have sincerely proffered their help to us in determining the future strategy of the United States. Although obviously well intentioned, we must carefully consider the source of such advice which is not necessarily imbued with the American viewpoint nor with an understanding of the United States problems. Perhaps it would not be amiss to point out that they have been somewhat limited in their own experience in the conduct of war at sea.

In some respects the naval officer is a fortunate military man, because from his earliest days, he has not only made his home aboard ships at sea but also he has lived with the many weapons which operate from and with ships. Those who do not wear wings nevertheless live constantly in the shadow of the airplanes' wings for they are normal tools for the job that he is doing on and beneath the surface. The Navy man constantly absorbs through his pores a familiarity with such air weapons as fighters, attack bombers, seaplanes, blimps, helicopters, and more recently, with various types of missiles.

Also, curiously enough, the naval officer rubs shoulders continuously with ground troops—the Marines, than whom there are no finer. No matter what type of ship he is aboard, whether it is an attack transport or an LST in connection with amphibious problems, or whether it is a destroyer or a cruiser which must be trained for accurate gunfire in support of the troops, the naval officer must know something about the Marines' business. He must automatically acquire information that is needed to transition troops from water to land. Actually,

we have gone further than that and rendered support to troops deeply deployed in the hinterland, as was the case in Korea. These contacts with forces of the land, sea, and air have become a part of the United States Navy's business and perhaps entitles us to a measure of confidence in our own appraisal of the realities of sea warfare.

Here in our country we have come to accept argument and controversy as a fundamental method of finding out the truth. Argument is a characteristic of America that you find around the "cracker barrel" of the country store, and in the Security Council in Washington. Perhaps the cracker barrel is one of the finest security councils we have. An appreciation of any subject is always improved by debate. So I should like to digress for a moment and discuss a few points raised by those who are unimpressed by the importance of sea power.

Some have questioned whether the Navy can be depended on to provide safe conduct for sea transport. There are those who still say—in the face of all the fact to the contrary—that the carrier is a dead bird.

First, let us take a look at this sea transport business. I will say at the outset that it would be perfectly wonderful if our country could stand the cost of transporting everything by air.

It is true that certain items must be fast moving; the trend is in that direction, and our war machines, regardless of service and flag, will need the most rapid logistics support possible. This does not mean, however, that surface freighters, rail, road, and ocean are all passe. Far from it, in fact.

It would be perfectly wonderful if our country could stand the cost of sailing all military passengers and cargo aloft over the submarine menace. All the military services would appreciate the inherent advantages of some sort of invulnerable cargo carrier—invulnerable to submarine attack, air attack, and missile attack. But the cost of such an operation is something that must be taken into consideration by us taxpayers. We must consider the cost of cargo aircraft that would be relatively invulnerable, the cost of fuel, and the cost of both airborne and seaborne tankers, the cost of expanded air facilities and maintenance, the cost of operating personnel—all these airlift costs must be weighed against the cost of transporting by sea. Most of those cost differentials are here to stay.

Another consideration is the tonnage requirements of combat in these days. Suffice it to say that whether we are talking of rapidly dispersable armored ground forces or antiaircraft elements, tonnage estimates per man are going higher and higher. So it is with the airman. So it is with the services of our allies to whom we are committed all over the world. The ever-widening logistical demands are staggering. Our overseas airfields need thicker and ever-lengthening concrete runways, more vehicles, more repair facilities, more defensive measures. All the foregoing is not to say that air transport does not have its place; indeed, there are certain critical items that can and should be speedily air transported over great distance to all the services.

The Navy has always had, and will continue to have, an active and participating interest in improving our national airlift capacity, but we also know the bulk of overseas lift must for the foreseeable future be moved by sea and protected in transit.

Now, let us take a look at the carrier. There are millions of square miles of territory in the world from which air power could do a great job of work. But where the requisite of land-based air and its extensive bases either cannot be constructed because of national objections or could not be constructed in time to do us any good, how, then, is air power to be applied from these myriad points on the globe?

Obviously, many of these places can be reached by mobile sea-air power.

As to the reported vulnerability of the carrier, put yourself in the position of the enemy. Your first problem is to know where the carrier lurks. So, you must send out a snooper. The snooper will undoubtedly locate something on his radar, but he cannot be sure what the pip is telling him unless he takes a look. The carrier of course, has powerful, far-reaching radar of its own, as do the carrier planes, as do the supporting ships. And you should see what happens to an approaching aircraft when the modern surface-to-air guided missile sallies forth to extend its greeting. I can tell you that it is quite a thing.

But, for the sake of argument, let us suppose that the snooper gets off his report, "Enemy carrier group latitude so-and-so, longitude so-and-so"; enemy bombers are alerted, and shortly afterwards they take off for the geographical position indicated by the snooper's report. But the carrier force does not stay put. Unless it is kept under constant surveillance, the bombers—jets with a need to husband their fuel—will have to search for it again. Within a matter of hours, it will be hundreds of miles from the point of original contact. Meanwhile, the carriers have already been alerted; their fighters, with performance characteristics equal to anything that will oppose them, are already stationed aloft, their radars probing, their air-to-air missile switches alive. Ships' guided missiles are poised and ready. And do not forget that the atomic art is reaching the point where guided missiles could be tipped with atomic warheads. That kind of flak could make large segments of the sky untenable.

The aircraft carrier has the unique quality of giving us, in the same package, both a hot-war and a cold-war capability. For example, our 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean provides the primary heavy-air striking force for NATO's southern flank. Its primary mission today is to support the armies and tactical air bases located in Italy, Greece, and Turkey. Its presence has had a profound influence on the national attitudes and favorable political actions of our friends in the Mediterranean basin.

In Formosan waters today as the history of the cold war unfolds, another chapter is being written by our versatile, mobile aircraft carriers. They, with their hot-war capability, play an important cold-war role, keeping it cold—or at least cool. The Tachen operation was a shining example of the sort of situation in which American tactical air power could be invoked only by carriers.

The constant combat readiness of a global sea-air capability provides the United States with a military asset and a military advantage of priceless value. Within a few days, our fleets, which are already globally deployed, can be dispatched to troubled areas. Recently, within 4 hours of the time the decision was reached in Washington to cover the removal of troops and civilians from the Tachens, Seventh Fleet aircraft were on guard over the islands and cruisers and destroyers were soon patrolling nearby—ready for anything that might develop. That could only have been accomplished with a readily available sea-air power.

Nor does the carrier provide the Navy's only potential in projecting sea-air power. Seaplanes offer the possibility of providing a significant and flexible addition to our sea-air capability. New military applications of this weapons family are still in the making, but already we visualized a considerable potential.

But perhaps the most significant development is one of which you are already aware. I refer to nuclear propulsion. Nuclear ship propulsion, although still in its infancy, is beginning to expand; and, I predict that it will one day become commonplace in our Navy. Not only are various types of nuclear-

powered surface units surely approaching, but nuclear flight may not be as far away as first anticipated and looks to have attractive possibilities in the field of water-launched aircraft.

In this connection, it was interesting to read what a Soviet scientist has recently envisaged in the field of atom-powered transport. He stated that the installation of nuclear reactors will be particularly convenient in the case of large vessels. Thus, a seagoing vessel with a cargo capacity of several tens-of-thousands of tons will need a supply of nuclear fuel as large as the size of a cigarette case and this will be sufficient for a whole month's sea journey.

The nation that makes a major conversion from oil to atoms will have taken a long stride in the maintaining of sea supremacy.

Although I have spoken this afternoon primarily of the Navy, we are but one component of our total national armed strength and it takes more than a navy to win a war; we know that it takes more than any two of the services. It takes all three services mutually supporting in a common effort. We believe also that it could take more than any one nation to win a major struggle in this complicated age. We will need the combined resources and will of powerful allies and they will need a powerful, vibrant United States. The continued existence of our alliances can only be assured by retention of sea supremacy.

I would like to leave this thought with you. Long after you and I have ceased to participate in affairs mundane, the seas will be a vital highway both in peace and in war; and sea-air power will be needed to secure that highway. It is to be devoutly hoped that our country will never let go by default this great military advantage which we now hold in world where every advantage must be cherished and none needlessly relinquished.

Fine Highways Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner on February 24, 1955:

FINE HIGHWAYS MESSAGE

In his special message to Congress on highways, President Eisenhower took a conciliatory, cooperative attitude that brought the highway problem back into its proper focus.

It is exactly this attitude which has been lacking recently in the legislative branch of the Government where intemperate, irresponsible, and usually ill-informed statements have become the rule.

The President stated his suggested program and gave his reasons, but he was not dogmatic nor insistent. He opened wide the door to compromise.

In his words:

"Inescapably, the vastness of the highway enterprise fosters varieties of proposals which must be resolved into a national highway pattern."

The Hearst newspapers must agree with the President's recommendation that the Federal Government assume the principal responsibility for financing the national system of interstate highways.

This recommendation is essentially the Hearst plan for better roads published by this and other Hearst newspapers more than 2 years ago.

It was a good plan then, it is a good plan now, and in the past 2 years it has received the endorsement of almost all of those organizations whose purpose is to secure better roads for America.

And while the President was not insistent, Congress will do well to give this recommendation careful study before it decides to "compromise" the highway bill into something that will not really improve any system of roads anywhere.

We believe that the President's temperate message will settle a lot of unnecessary dust that has been kicked up in political scuffles.

The way is clear now for Congress to get down to work and produce a highway bill based on known needs and known needs only. The highways, as we have said so many times, are not political.

Let's All Be Thankful That We Are in Front of the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite attention to the following poem by Cleveland William Schneider which recently won a Freedom Foundation award:

LET'S ALL BE THANKFUL THAT WE ARE IN
FRONT OF THE IRON CURTAIN

(By William Schneider)

Looking out into a free world
What would those enslaved ones see?
Things they never dreamed of
Enjoyed each day by you and me.

Free schools for all our children
Jobs for all who would work
And at good living wages
Whether factory worker or clerk.

Most families own an auto
To roam this land and see
The wonders of our Nation
And just think—it's all for free!

The worker has his union
To bargain for his rights
He sits with his boss 'round the table
And peacefully avoids a fight.

Our laws are based on justice
That's why we are so free
No one can be wrongfully treated
By his municipality.

We worship in our churches
Whether Protestant, Catholic or Jew
Only God is our Supreme Ruler
No one else dictates to you.

Our homes and farms are many
Owned by those of every race
No one dares disturb them
Invasion they never face.

We strive to live a peaceful life
And give a helping hand
To others not so fortunate
Whether here or on foreign sand.

So look outside and see the truth
It's free so come and see
Why peaceful lives are best enjoyed
In lands of Liberty.

One Speaks Out, at Last, for the Little Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. L. PILCHER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose herewith the following editorial entitled "One Speaks Out, at Last, for the Little Man," which appeared in the Camilla Enterprise, Camilla, Ga., March 4, 1955: ONE SPEAKS OUT, AT LAST, FOR THE LITTLE MAN

It looked like in the last 2 weeks no one was going to speak out for the "little man," who makes up about 99 percent of the population in reference to the House passed, Republican opposed, tax cut of \$20 for every taxpayer.

For a good many years since the war the small taxpayer, the man who really makes up the bulk of the tax-paying numbers and pays the largest proportion of the taxes, has been promised some relief. Most of these tax payers have no write-offs, no depreciation, no deductions, no tricks or special accounts in which to gain a little breather from the heavy load of Federal taxation.

The microscopic reduction which automatically went into effect last year, having been stacked on top of the old rate to finance the Korean difficulty, was so small that it didn't make any appreciable difference in what this taxpayer was paying. Coupled with this was a rise in the social security rate which more than offset this tax reduction and the Nation's smallest taxpayer last year found himself paying more taxes in 1954 than in 1953.

The Democratic move, which would have saved each taxpayer \$20, would have been felt. It would have been felt weekly in the paychecks as the column of deductions was a little smaller.

The politically sensitive House passed the measure over strong protest. The President branded it folly, Republican leadership called it many things, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey said it was "inflationary" but it remained for an economic adviser to the President to speak out this week with words to the effect that the \$20 was just what was needed to perk up the country. It, as he termed it, would start buying again, would put money where incomes were pinched the hardest. It would do more to reduce unemployment, than reductions at the top.

It has long been a difference between Democratic leaders and Republican leaders as to what makes our economy tick. The Democratic concept is that a few extra dollars in the hand of the smaller wage earner starts the business machine to ticking, while Republican leadership has always maintained that business must be encouraged to make expansions, create more jobs, and the benefits will trickle down to the smaller wage earner.

Inducements since the war have favored the larger investor, the stockholder, the manufacturer, the corporation. The little man is still fighting a heavy load of taxes and higher prices for everything, plus higher interest rates when he borrows. The farmer has seen his income decline due to the same policy and there have been no stimulations for his prices or income.

The proposed tax cut would cost the country a little over \$2 billion. This \$2 billion would be put right into the trade channels in every part of the country and in every

line. Its effect would be very good on business in general. In the long run the Government would perhaps make this money back through increased business income and its corporation tax structure.

The single wage earner making \$50 per week pays Uncle Samuel each Friday or Saturday \$6.80 plus a \$1.00 more social security which makes \$7.80 every payday. That is mighty rough taxes in anybody's language when you measure it against his living expenses. Richer people pay more percentage-wise, but it doesn't cut into their day to day living.

Thirty-second Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the following resolution adopted by the Lithuanian American Council of New Haven, Conn., at the observance of the 37th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Lithuanian people.

I think we might all gain inspiration from the courage of these people who have lost their homeland to Communist aggressors, but not their determination to restore freedom to Lithuania, and uphold it in the United States.

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY VOTED BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF THE CITY OF NEW HAVEN, CONN., AT THE OBSERVANCE OF THE 37TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA, HELD UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE AMERICAN-LITHUANIAN COUNCIL, AT THE ST. CASIMIR HALL, ON THE 27TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 1955

Whereas in 1940, Soviet Russia, in vicious conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all the treaties and obligations solemnly underwritten by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and, against the will of the people, annexed her to the Soviet Union, and, in 1944, following the defeat of the German armies on the Eastern front, again took over that country in complete disregard of the wartime policies and obligations to which the Soviet Union was cosignatory with the United States and other allies of World War II;

Whereas for almost 15 years Lithuania, one of the Baltic nations, has borne the yoke of slavery, as a result of the brutal and unprovoked aggression by the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Kremlin conspirators are constantly trying to seduce the free nations to enter into agreements with the Soviet Union in hope of splitting their common defense efforts and gaining their tacit consent to the status quo of enslavement of millions of people under the heel of international communism: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this gathering of American citizens of Lithuanian descent of the city of New Haven pledge their wholehearted support of this great country's efforts to achieve lasting peace and justice in the world, and urge the Federal Government of the United States to respond to the demands of this crucial time in initiating a positive and dynamic political program against the international Communist conspiracy; be it finally

Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of New Haven, once again reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their wholehearted support of the administration and Congress of the United States in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world.

MATHEW VOKETARTIS,
President.
MARY JAKUBAITIS,
Secretary.

Loyalty and Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the many Americans in public and private life who have justifiably been deeply concerned over the operations of the Federal Government's employee security program can take little pleasure in the long overdue and elementary procedural reforms recently instituted by the administration. Although it is nice to know that the administration has finally become cognizant of the public record of gross injustices which the security program has worked against loyal and competent Federal workers, we are still far from having a just and adequate security program. I am in complete agreement with the editorial position of the New York Times of March 7, 1955, on this most serious subject. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the Appendix of the Record:

LOYALTY AND JUSTICE

The deep and growing disquiet felt by many Americans about the operations of the Federal Government's employee security program has finally impelled the Eisenhower administration to order some badly needed improvements. The latest changes represent a forward step which can be welcomed against the background of all too many public examples in which the security program has worked manifest injustices against loyal and competent Federal workers. This public record of injustices has tended to make Government employment unattractive to able people with alternative opportunities, with the result that at times our security has probably been reduced rather than enhanced.

How serious has been the defects in the security program until now may be realized by taking account of what the situation must have been before the new safeguards now introduced. Federal employees have been suspended without being told of the charges against them, and sometimes the charges have not been "specific enough to be meaningful to the employee." Meticulous care has not always been employed in suspending employees, and there has not always been "a personal interview with the employee prior to suspension." The top legal officers of departments concerned have not always been consulted nor their opinions "secured as to the sufficiency of the information justifying suspension." There has not always been a legal officer present at security hearings. Security boards have not always been composed of "persons possessing the highest degree of integrity, ability, and good judgment."

Heads of different agencies have not always consulted with each other when one agency proposed to make an adverse judgment on a person previously cleared by another.

The quotations given above are from Attorney General Brownell's statement on the substance of the latest changes. This is a late date indeed to introduce such elementary reforms, and it is chilling to reflect on what the situation may have been in individual cases up to now.

Does the latest set of changes go far enough and protect both the national security and the rights of the individual Federal worker? The answer would seem to be rather clearly in the negative. Federal employees still may not confront and cross-examine all their accusers when security officials believe that the production of a particular witness may jeopardize the national security. But by what criteria are such determinations made? Are there other misinformers like Harvey Matusow being protected from exposure under the guise of serving national security? This question must inevitably arise against recent history as background. Is our Government not sufficiently ingenious to protect the identity of particular informants while subjecting their testimony to outside check? The problem is not easy, but it would not seem to be insoluble.

There are other serious problems too. What safeguards now exist to prevent such flagrant miscarriage of justice as was suffered by Prof. Val Lorwin? Professor Lorwin was indicted by an officer of the Eisenhower Administration in December 1953 on the ground that he had lied in denying that he had ever been a Communist Party member and on two related matters. Six months later an Assistant Attorney General had to go into court and ask that the indictment be quashed because the Department of Justice attorney who secured the indictment had made two gross misstatements of fact to the grand jury. Such an outrage was possible, even though Professor Lorwin had earlier been suspended and cleared by the State Department.

The problem of fairness and justice in security procedures has long since become a major national question. Millions of Americans must have security clearances to work for the Government directly, or on Government production orders, or on Government-subsidized projects. To be labeled a security risk today is perhaps the most terrible of brands on a person who has been convicted of no crime and tried in no court of law.

There are those who deserve such stigma and such punishment. But none of us can rest easy in our minds or hearts when we know that innocent men and women may be placed in this most terrible of Coventrys because of the spiteful words of a vengeful neighbor or to satisfy the ambition of an unscrupulous security officer or Government attorney. The soundness of the foundations of our national tradition of freedom and justice are at stake. And if these are not sound, we have no security and can have none.

Natural Gas Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1955

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege granted me

to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present an editorial that appeared in the March 1, 1955, edition of the Shreveport Journal entitled "Threat to Gas Industry":

THREAT TO GAS INDUSTRY

Louisiana's producers and marketers of natural gas, as well as those of other States which depend upon this resource for much of their income, should applaud the action of President Eisenhower's top advisers in recommending that the individual States be allowed to retain control of the gas industry.

Specifically, the recommendation of the President's Cabinet members is that the States be allowed to control production, gathering, processing, and sale of natural gas prior to its entry into interstate transmission lines—this in the face of a Supreme Court ruling which has the opposite effect.

The President's stand may have a great bearing upon the manner in which Congress deals with the question during its current session.

Additional opposition to Federal regulation of natural gas production is contained in the March issue of the Guaranty Survey, a monthly publication of the Guaranty Trust Co., of New York. Following are excerpts from the Survey's discussion of the issue:

"Shall the competitive and hazardous business of natural gas production be regulated as a public utility, or shall it be allowed to operate under the rules of private competitive enterprise? The continued vitality and growth of this dynamic industry, and of others as well, may hinge upon the answer.

"The question arose suddenly last June as the result of a Supreme Court decision. By a vote of 5 to 3, the Court ruled that the Natural Gas Act of 1938, which gives the Federal Power Commission authority to regulate sales of gas for resale in interstate commerce, applies to sales by independent producers to interstate pipeline companies. Section 3b of the act reads: 'The provision of this act . . . shall not apply . . . to the production or gathering of natural gas.' For 16 years it had been generally supposed, and the Commission itself had repeatedly ruled, that this exemption covered sales by independent producers and gatherers, that is, producers and gatherers not affiliated with the interstate pipeline companies. The Court's decision, which reversed one of the Commission's rulings, upset this established belief and the practices based upon it.

"The strength of the opposition to Federal regulation of natural-gas production is based upon the belief that it is not only unnecessary but positively detrimental. Gas men are convinced that their industry cannot thrive in a public-utility environment. The cost of drilling dry holes cannot be capitalized and hence cannot be made the basis for rate regulation by conventional methods. Exceptional risks can be taken only when there is a reasonable prospect of corresponding rewards to the successful. Unless these risks are taken, new natural gas reserves in sufficient amounts cannot be found.

"Congress is being asked to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to establish beyond doubt the exemption of producers and gatherers from its provisions. (Such an amendment was passed in 1950 but was vetoed by President Truman.)

"The immediate loss and injustice to natural-gas producers are serious enough, but the questions involved in Federal regulation strike even deeper. An increasingly vital industry is threatened with creeping paralysis. A precious natural resource is exposed to the risk of artificially induced wastage. Consumers face the prospect of effects on price and supply exactly the opposite of those intended. Worst of all, the

whole concept of free competitive markets is under attack. If natural gas production is subject to Federal regulation, no segment of industry entering into interstate commerce is logically exempt. What Congress is being asked to do is not merely to rescue an important industry and its customers from the risk of grave injury, but to reaffirm a basic principle of American politico-economic philosophy."

National Support for Bolton Nursing Commission Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, my resolution to establish a National Commission on Nursing Services, House Joint Resolution 171, has received an outstanding response from key health leaders in all parts of the Nation.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I am inserting a press release which describes in some detail the public reaction to my legislation:

HEALTH LEADERS THROUGHOUT UNITED STATES STRONGLY ENDORSE MRS. BOLTON'S PROPOSAL FOR NATIONAL COMMISSION ON NURSING—EMPHASIZE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR THOROUGH STUDY—SAY NURSE SHORTAGE IS NATIONAL PROBLEM—COMMEND WISDOM OF LONG-TERM APPROACH

Outstanding groups and individuals representing the fields of public and private health, nurse associations, hospital administrators, State boards of nursing, university deans, State directors of vocational education, State health officers, hospital directors of nursing, community organizations, and other comparable groups, in statements released today by Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, pledge their wholehearted support of a congressional resolution to establish a National Commission on Nursing Services.

Mrs. BOLTON, Republican Representative of Ohio's 22d District, is noted for 15 years' leadership in the Congress on nursing, health, and welfare legislation. During World War II she authored the Bolton Act which created the United States Cadet Nurse Corps.

The Congresswoman introduced House Joint Resolution 171, to establish a National Commission on Nursing Services, on January 25, 1955. It has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Congresswoman BOLTON said she has had specific requests for more than 5,000 copies of her bill from hundreds of groups and individuals in the health fields, State governors, Members of Congress, and leaders in Government, industry, and education.

Leaders were united in their opinion that the nursing situation in the United States is at a critical state and that immediate steps should be taken to find out what the facts are so that remedial measures might be taken by private and public authorities.

Many agreed with Congresswoman BOLTON that the current rate of hospital construction, while vitally necessary, is outstripping the increase in the number of trained nurses. A representative statement was one from Bessie E. Oakes, director, nursing service, Central Michigan Community Hospital, Mount Pleasant, Mich., which said:

"I think the Commission would be a step in the right direction. While the need for more professional nurses is urgent, it is also national in scope and by the very nature of the problem, it must have the long-term approach.

"We have a great need to add at least 50 more beds to our hospital right now and I as a public-minded citizen, say, 'Let's get started.' But, as a nursing administrator, I say, 'Where, oh where, will we get the nurses?' We can build a hospital in a year or 2, but it takes 3 years to train a nurse."

Leaders in various health and community fields underscored Congresswoman BOLTON's emphasis of the need for better utilization of existing nurses and for relating their services to the great advances in the medical sciences. They felt that since the public welfare is the principal objective, Mrs. BOLTON's proposed Commission would go far toward informing the public of the need for a more and better trained nurse personnel. Many respondents said they discussed House Joint Resolution 171 within their professional groups, which then formally offered their services in any way they could be of assistance.

Following are excerpts from representative letters from all parts of the United States:

STATE OFFICIALS

Oregon: Harold M. Erickson, M. D., State health officer, Oregon State Board of Health, Portland: "After reviewing the bill and your remarks upon its presentation, we feel you should be commended for the comprehensive manner in which you have approached this problem of nursing services. We are particularly impressed with your comments regarding the necessity for the economic status of the nurse becoming more nearly commensurate with her skills and added responsibility. The more effective use of nursing skills for real nursing needs is another area we are happy to see that you have included. Our present limited nursing power could surely be expanded by better use of nursing time and at the same time give more satisfaction to the nurse than she now obtains."

Pennsylvania: Robert T. Stoner, State director of vocational education, department of public instruction, Harrisburg: "Your initiative in promoting this worthy endeavor should ultimately result in a unified program of nursing education which will key the education of nursing personnel to the needs of the Nation. I am sure that vocational education as authorized and supported by congressional action will be interested in adding its personnel and facilities to this effort."

UNIVERSITY OFFICIALS

Virginia: W. T. Sanger, president, Medical College of Virginia, Richmond: "If something aggressive is not soon done, I am confident that the public will wake up and find an almost tragic situation due to the shortage of well-prepared nurse personnel. There has been much emphasis of late on recruitment and glamorizing of nursing as a career, but not enough emphasis on developing understanding on the part of the public as to where our country stands now and even more so in the future with reference to nurse shortage. I have not been able to think of any solution except the development of more large schools of nursing supported by tax funds or philanthropy as we support teacher education, although not too adequately."

New York: Mrs. R. Louise McManus, director of nursing education, Columbia University: "Faculty of Nursing Education heartily endorses proposed legislation for the Commission on Nursing Services. We believe multidisciplinary approach to the problems of nursing will contribute to the solution of many related problems which present barriers to providing adequate health services to people of this country. Shortages of nurses prepared to fill key teaching and admini-

tive positions is critical. Training grants are urgently needed."

Florida: Vivian M. Duxbury, dean, School of Nursing, the Florida State University, Tallahassee: "It would certainly seem that the establishment of such a commission might help to interpret to the public our very great need in nursing today, particularly in that field of preparing nurses for teaching, supervisory, and administrative position, as well as for the care of the patient at the bedside."

Ohio: Howard R. Taylor, Jr., vice president, Penn College, Cleveland: "I think you should be commended for this proposal and I firmly believe that such a study will provide the basis for a more effective plan to alleviate the nursing shortage."

STATE BOARDS OF NURSING

Tennessee: Nina E. Wootton, R. N., secretary-consultant, Tennessee Board of Nursing, Nashville: "Be assured of our cooperation individually and collectively in your effort to have this resolution passed."

HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATORS

Connecticut: Hiram Sibley, director of program development, Yale-New Haven Medical Center, New Haven: "That our Federal Government should aim to provide a setting in which such thinking can be done is to me a positive and constructive approach to a complicated social problem. If the right people can be appointed your proposal offers many benefits to the future of the nursing program."

Kentucky: Dr. J. W. Armstrong, superintendent, Berea College Hospital, Berea: "I hope that favorable action will be taken and that results do not get tangled in a jungle of confusion and time. This study could well help solve our problem."

Pennsylvania: T. K. Leimbach, superintendent, Community General Hospital, Reading: "Your bill is a step in the right direction. We sincerely hope that it will become a law of the land."

New Jersey: Raymond W. Stem, administrator, Warren Hospital, Phillipsburg: "After a careful review of the bill, I am firmly convinced that this is the first firm approach to the question of nursing shortages."

Oklahoma: Bryce L. Twitty, administrator, Hillcrest Medical Center, Tulsa: "Your proposal seems to me to be logical and fair and I think it would be a good thing. We are all interested and appreciative of the very fine work you are doing."

Georgia: Dr. W. H. Lewis, director, Floyd Hospital, Rome: "I have read with interest and approval your comments upon the nursing service of the country. The situation warrants not merely study but action."

NURSES ASSOCIATIONS

New York: Hilda M. Torrop, executive director, National Association for Practical Nurse Education: "We are thoroughly in accord with your bill which provides for a Commission on Nursing Services. The NAPNE has long been aware of the need for the type of information the Commission will produce. Many of the points indicated for study are identical with those the NAPNE has outlined in a prospectus prepared for presentation to a foundation, in support of a request for funds to make essential studies."

Arizona: Vellamo Tikkala, R. N., chairman, committee on public relations and nursing education, Arizona State Nurses Association, District No. 12, Phoenix: "I have shared this information by reading the bill at a meeting of the house supervisors and head nurses at the Maricopa County General Hospital, and last night the bill was discussed at our monthly district meeting. Each of the nurses who discussed the bill were very much in favor of it, and agreed that such a commission was needed to find a solution to the present nursing situation."

New York: Ethel G. Prince, R. N., executive secretary, Nurses Association of the Counties of Long Island, Inc., district No. 14, the New York State Nurses Association, Brooklyn: "There is much need of the type of work a commission would accomplish since the building of hospitals has so far outdistanced the number of nurses being educated."

North Carolina: Marietta C. Raines, R. N., B. S., member of the legislative committee of district No. 3 of the North Carolina State Nurses Association, Winston-Salem: "I should like to commend you for your proposed National Commission on Nursing Services. It is something which is much needed in the nursing profession and should have a far-reaching effect in relation to the health and nursing care of the people of the Nation. As a member of the legislative committee of district No. 3 of the North Carolina State Nurses Association, I shall do all I can to see that your proposal is supported in this area."

New York: Joseph F. Munn, R. N., president, Nurses Alumni Association, Brooklyn State Hospital, Brooklyn: "Our praise and encouragement is sent wholeheartedly for your work and success to obtain your goal—and ours. I think this is the shot in the arm the nursing profession needs."

HOSPITAL DIRECTORS OF NURSING

Maryland: Anna D. Wolf, R. N., director, School of Nursing and Nursing Service, the Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore: "I have read your resolution to the Congress with considerable interest. Such a commission as you have proposed should bring before the public very forcibly the requirements for nursing services and the educational and recruitment needs to meet these obligations."

California: Delores J. Schemmel, director of nurses, Huntington Memorial Hospital, Pasadena: "Commission composed of the best appointees available dedicated to objective investigation and study would gain respect of the American people and lead to concerted public action."

Utah: Anna L. Vogt, director of nursing, St. Mark's Hospital, Salt Lake City: "I think your proposal is a sound and practical one, and I sincerely hope that it will be passed and put into effect soon. Your proposed bill is really a practical and sensible measure for providing some workable tools for development and progress in the nursing profession. I would like to express the appreciation of our nursing staff to you. Much success for the passage of this bill."

Maryland: Richard E. W. Bolin, R. N., director of nurses, Springfield State Hospital, Sykesville: "I have given the resolution careful study and as a nursing administrator on the 'firing line' as it were in the critical field of psychiatric nursing, I endorse your resolution completely. Your move, Mrs. Bolton, was inevitable and completely necessary in view of the many situations relating to the national health problem as they involve nursing and nurses. Your proposed commission, I am sure, has excellent possibilities in that it will be able to inject a larger degree of objectivity into its studies and evaluations than has hitherto been possible."

Pennsylvania: M. Naomi Houser, R. N., director of nursing, St. Luke's Hospital, Bethlehem: "I presented the bill to our faculty at conference Tuesday and there was a unanimous decision that I communicate with you to commend you on your fine vision and keen insight into the nursing situation combined with your efforts to further study our needs."

Congresswoman Bolton was asked whether she felt her proposal for a Commission on Nursing Services would preclude specific grants now before the Congress for improvement in practical nurse training programs, for traineeships for graduate training of professional nurses and professional public health nurses, and for research.

"Definitely not," said the Ohio Congresswoman. "The nurse shortage today is endangering the health of the Nation, and we must deal with it as an emergency situation. I strongly support the Eisenhower administration's health proposals. But I feel that emergency action alone will not solve the problem. A national Commission on Nursing Services would deal with the entire scope of nursing services, the effect of shortages on the health of the American public and the possibilities for future legislation which would be of maximum benefit to the public and the health professions."

Address of President Syngman Rhee, of Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to submit the text of an address by President Syngman Rhee, of the Republic of Korea, delivered in Seoul, March 1, 1955:

Today is the 36th anniversary of our Mance Independence Day and the 10th year since the liberation of our nation from Japanese aggression. We meet today to pay tribute to the patriots of 1919 who undertook to keep the ideal of freedom alive when all around them it seemed to be dead. They lived under the tyranny of one of the world's worst police states, and yet they dared to speak out for justice and liberty at the risk of their own lives.

The best tribute we can pay to them is to show by our own actions that their courage and faith are still alive in our own hearts. The darkness of our own times is like the darkness of the totalitarian terror under which they were enslaved. The dangers of our time may be even greater, but so are our opportunities and our responsibilities.

The patriots of 1919 had no government they could call their own and no soldiers to defend their cause. They had no allies upon whom they could call for help. They had very little to sustain them except their faith in freedom—and this faith proved to be enough.

We in our time see our nation devastated, divided, and threatened by the worst aggressor in all history. But we do have a government and an army of our own. And we do have allies who have proved their integrity and unselfishness in standing by us in our darkest days.

Korea has become a symbol in the eyes of the world. We were threatened but we refused to surrender. We were invaded when we had almost no army at all, but we fought back with endless devotion to our democratic liberties. The world has learned a great lesson from the spirit and courage of the entire population of Korea. Our people endured the worst suffering ever visited upon any nation in the disastrous winter of 1950. And despite everything that has happened to us, the determination of the people of Korea remains as a bright light to encourage all the free world in its struggle to beat back the dark and evil aggression of communism.

I do not mean to say very much about what we Koreans have done. You know what you have all had to endure, and you know that you would suffer as much again, and many times worse if necessary, rather than submit ever to the slavery of communism.

In this life and death struggle we count on the nations of the free world, and especially on the United States. In this time of tortured history, there is only one strong barrier that stands between the Communist tyrants and their dream of world conquest, and that barrier is the strength of the United States of America.

This strength of America is not alone military or industrial; it is largely moral and psychological. It is the same strength that prompted the fathers of the American Revolution to declare their independence in 1776 and it is the same strength which inspired our patriots to declare our independence in 1919. It is the strength of idealism which led the United States to take the lead in bringing the free world to our support when the Communists attacked us in 1950. It is this same unselfish spirit of brotherhood that leads America to help us with our economic reconstruction and that is attempting to build an alliance of anti-Communist strength in Asia.

There is an old saying that those who will not learn from history will be required to repeat it. I wish the Communist rulers would meditate long and deeply upon the role that the United States has played in all its history. America never has been a colonial power. When it came into the Philippine Islands and later into South Korea, it was with the aim of liberation and assistance, not aggression.

There is no more ridiculous charge ever made than the repeated propaganda of the Communists that the United States is building up military bases in Asia for purposes of colonialism and imperialism. Exactly the opposite is the case, as has repeatedly been proved; but they recite their lie in order to deceive the uneducated masses of peoples and line them up against America.

The United States entered South Korea with its armies when we had no government and no military strength of our own. It helped us to conduct elections and build our own democracy; and it has armed and trained for us an army for our own self-defense. Similarly, the United States has intervened in Chinese affairs solely to help defend the last outpost of Chinese independence, for the everlasting benefit of both the entire free world and the great masses of the Chinese people themselves. One of the greatest proofs of American generosity is the great helping hand it has extended to its defeated enemy, Japan.

I wish the people and the Government of the United States were not quite so quick to criticize and doubt themselves. When they hear the Communist propaganda charging that the people of Asia do not like their interference, they are fearful that there might be some truth in such charges, and they have a tendency to withdraw.

If I could deliver just one single message to the heart of all America, it would be this: Trust yourselves a little more. Have faith in your own ideals. For truly the American principles and the American ideal are the last great hope of the world.

The people of Asia know America, perhaps better in some ways than the Americans know themselves. It is too bad that American newspapers have so much to say about the supposed dislike and distrust of the peoples of Asia toward the United States. It is too bad there is so much discussion in America of the fact that the only atomic bombs ever used in warfare were those dropped by American aviators upon an Asian people. This kind of self-castigation has partially, at least, closed the eyes of the American people to the tremendous position of strength they hold in our hearts. Stories such as these are created by the Reds to win over the voting population of every land as part of their Communist revolution campaign. In this way the Soviets have suc-

ceeded in making many nations their satellites. All intelligent Americans should realize this and make it known to their fellow citizens.

No Asian will ever forget that at the time of the Boxer Rebellion the United States used its indemnity from China to educate Chinese students. No Asian will or can forget that the entry of the United States into the Philippines was for the purpose of educating and assisting the Philippine people to attain their independence. No Asian can overlook what the United States is doing for Korea and China.

The truth is that the United States is a giant only partly aware of its own strength. When that giant is awakened by some awful catastrophe, as it was at Pearl Harbor, its strength is shown to all the world—as is its generosity and forbearance after the fighting is ended.

Perhaps it is inherent in any democracy that its real power is concealed except in emergencies. In this period of half-war, half-peace—when every responsible statesman is doing his best to prevent a world disaster—the democracies reveal to everyone their own self-criticisms and their own tendencies to retreat as far as possible rather than to fight.

Under such circumstances, it is the totalitarian dictatorships that look powerful. While the democracies fear that any show of defensive force might precipitate a world war, the dictatorships launch huge air raids upon democratic areas. When conferences are held, the democracies do all they can to relieve tension—while the dictatorships seize that occasion to launch threatening military attacks—as they did at Dien Bien Phu during the Geneva Conference.

But while the dictatorships look, talk, and act fierce, the facts show that they are nothing but paper dragons. Red China has a large army, but the masses of Chinese hate their masters; and there is nowhere on the continent of China any industrial power to support a major war. Russia conducts a tremendous game of global bluff, but is weak in oil, coal, and steel—and has behind its Iron Curtain an uneasy collection of captive peoples who long for the opportunity to reassess their historical independence.

In 1919 the patriots who launched the Marseilles revolution had very little to uphold them except faith in themselves, in the decency of mankind, and in liberal democracy. Their greatest ally was courage, and with it they cast aside fear.

In this world of 1955 the democracies of the earth have no greater need than that same self-confidence and idealistic faith. What is it that causes some of our friends to be afraid?

Is it death that they fear? If so, they should remind themselves that all through human history brave men and women have had to risk their lives in order, slowly and painfully, to win the liberties that we enjoy today.

Are they afraid that in another world war civilization itself may be destroyed? If so, they should take note of the fact that democratic civilization already has been erased from more than half the population of the world. The rest of our civilized areas may also be lost unless we acquire the vision and the courage to defend the great heritage that has come to us from the past.

I do not wish on this occasion to issue only a simple restatement of democratic principles. If I emphasize them, it is not with any intention of avoiding the direct issue of what we should do to confront a very immediate and present threat of Communist aggression.

What I do deeply believe is that our greatest enemy is not the armed masses of Communist soldiers who confront us with one gun in their hands and another gun held at

their own backs. The greatest enemy of the free world is its own fearfulness and self-doubt. If this can be overcome in time, the Communist dictatorships can be stopped and the rot that lies behind the Iron Curtain can be exploited to cause its own collapse.

For 10 years, after the German and Italian and Japanese aggressors were soundly defeated, the free world has retreated time and again before the onward rush of the Communist imperialists. This retreat by the free world and the consequent advance by the Communist dictatorships has created an illusion of weakness on the part of the democracies and of strength on the part of the dictatorships.

The grave dangers that confront us all arise in large part from the existence of that illusion. It blinds the judgment of the allied statesmen as they seek for the means of self-defense. And it similarly blinds the Communists as they make increasingly grandiose plans for still faster advances.

Back in 1917 the intellectual Marxians still believed that they had no other choice than to wait and hope that Karl Marx was right when he promised them that the free world would fall of its own errors and thus pave the way for a nonviolent triumph of communism.

The success of the Communist revolutionists in seizing control of Russia led them to raise their hopes still higher. Then they began to plan actively for world conquest—and under Lenin's leadership they laid down the principle that the surest way to world conquest led through Asia.

During the past 10 years the ambitions of the Communists have constantly expanded. They no longer look to an indefinite and distant future, when the world will fall into their grasp through sheer decay. Now they believe they have built up a military power and a myth of invincibility that will carry them triumphantly through a succession of easy victories to a climactic war of annihilation.

The choices that lie open to the free world today are far more limited than they were 10 years ago. There is no easy road to salvation. There is no security to be won without risk. No one but a demagogue can promise peace and security for freedom except by the harsh and painful way of courage and sacrifice.

The role of Korea in world affairs is not one of primary leadership. We are not even a member of the United Nations. We cannot proclaim a program and expect to rally the free nations around us to achieve it.

Nevertheless, we do feel that our nation has a mission worthy of our great history. When the Communist aggressors struck against us, we fought back. Despite our grievous suffering, when even our allies thought the time had come for a compromise peace, our united voice was raised to ask for yet more sacrifice and suffering in order to gain a basic and essential victory.

And now, when new crises sweep across the world, our voice is still raised to counsel courage, and faith. We stand on the frontal battlefield of the global struggle, but we seek no fancied and false security in neutralism or in the compromise with aggression that all history teaches is only a shortcut to defeat.

We believe in victory. We know what communism is, and we do not think for an instant that it is possible to appease its ambitions. We do not try to coexist with cholera. And we do maintain our hope that this spirit of Korea will yet prove of genuine value to the free world.

We are not a big nation but we refuse to be a weak one. And we face the future with confidence, because we know that among our democratic allies there exists the only genuine reservoir of strength that is great enough to determine the future destinies of the world.

Civilian Distress From Army Camp Fluctuation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have had the privilege of addressing the House with respect to the problem being faced by the residents of Southside, Va., due to the Army's deactivation of Camp Pickett. It will be recalled that the Army abandoned Camp Pickett on June 30, 1954, following a stay of some 4 years. The camp is now in mothball status with a group of some 75 persons charged with caretaking the Army's investment covering an area of some 46,000 acres.

This is the third time within the past 9 years that this situation has been allowed to exist. Camp Pickett was opened in 1942, closed in 1946; reopened in 1948, and closed in 1949; reopened in 1950, and of course closed again last year.

The result has been a constant strangling of the economy of a large area of Southside, Va. It has been even more disastrous to the small town of Blackstone, Va., which is 3 miles from Camp Pickett.

During the course of the past 16 months, I have been actively engaged in a campaign with the Army and the other related agencies of the Department of Defense attempting to have them make clear what the future will be for this section of Virginia. The Army has taken the position that it does not need Camp Pickett at the present time but that it should be retained for some future use. The Air Force has declined to use it although it admittedly has one of the best airfields in our section of the country. The Army has moved various military units to other less desirable places rather than to utilize the vast facilities of Camp Pickett which are obviously superior.

With this in mind I have endeavored to have the Army declare Camp Pickett surplus in order that this vast acreage be put to some useful purpose and to eliminate this drag on the economy of our State.

A number of newspapers have commented most favorably upon our efforts, and I wish to insert editorials from three of our papers dealing with various aspects of this overall problem which I feel are pertinent to this question.

Editorial in the Daily Press Newport News-Hampton-Warwick, Va., Sunday morning, March 6, 1955:

CIVILIAN DISTRESS FROM ARMY CAMP
FLUCTUATION

Representative CARL VINSON's disagreement with the Southside, Va., effort to have Camp Pickett either disposed of as a surplus property, or used, calls sharp attention to just one of the many wastes incident to war. The most disheartening aspect is that such things seem to be completely unavoidable.

Mr. VINSON, who is chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said he agreed "that the Army should make use of Camp Pickett, but the camp may have to remain closed." The fortunes of the little town of Blackstone, of about 3,500 population, are intimately bound up in this reservation's use. During the Second World War it was used as an Army penal camp. It was made idle after hostilities ceased. It was reoccupied later, and since then has been closed again. When Pickett is active, Blackstone booms; when it is idle, Blackstone suffers.

This is of at least indirect interest on the peninsula. Take Fort Eustis. As Camp Eustis it was used for staging and training in the First World War; then it was closed. In the early 1930's the cavalry reopened it and did some tank development; then it was closed again. For a time it was used as a Federal penal camp. Then it became a Works Progress Administration camp to rehabilitate depression-hit transients. Again it lay idle, until the Army's transportation corps took it over and now has a large establishment.

Suppose Pickett was disposed of as surplus. If a new crisis arose the Government would have to obtain other land and develop a post. That evidently is why Mr. VINSON wants the Army to keep it on a caretaker basis, as the Army plan now is. Yet so long as it is so maintained it inflicts a boom-and-bust economy on Blackstone nearby. Camp Pickett affords a special example of seemingly unavoidable waste imposing harsh civilian hardships.

Editorial in the Portsmouth Star, Sunday, March 6, 1955:

CAMP PICKETT'S POTENTIALITIES

The congressional controversy stirred by the proposal to sell Camp Pickett near Blackstone, Va., was to be expected. Those Congressmen away from the Virginia situation have a hard time seeing the need for disposal of an abandoned Army camp, and raise the anguished cry that national defense must not suffer. Yet it is our contention that national defense now or in the future will not suffer if the Army disposes of Camp Pickett. However, we do know that Blackstone and, indirectly, Virginia economy will suffer if the camp is allowed to remain on its present standby basis.

The Virginia Jaycees have wisely adopted a resolution which calls for the Army to dispose of Camp Pickett. The resolution points out the fact that not only is an economic vacuum being created in southside Virginia, but the national taxpayer is losing out also. As long as the 46,000-acre tract is in Government hands, Nottoway County can collect no taxes, and while the camp is idle, the area cannot economically benefit from its inactivity. As the camp is 14 years old, it is depreciating rapidly, more so because its structures are not at present being utilized.

A proposal to declare the camp surplus was defeated in Congress last year and should get serious restudy and passage this year. As the camp has been opened and closed three times since its opening in 1942, it is evident the Army has no serious plans to make it a permanent base. With the current emphasis on airpower and atomic weapons, large numbers of infantrymen such as could be trained at Pickett, at great cost since the camp would have to be refurbished after years of inactivity, would not be needed.

Pickett is an exceptionally well-outfitted camp and is considered the best training and maneuver camp in the Second Army area. This alone is sufficient reason that it be opened on a permanent basis. However, as this does not seem to be the Army's desire, in the interests of both National and State economy, the pattern of Camp Butler in North Carolina should be followed.

Camp Butler posed a problem to our Tar Heel neighbors comparable to that which

Pickett presents to Virginia. The State of North Carolina was able to purchase this property at nominal price after it was declared surplus. At Butler, 15 miles from Durham, there were created 4 large State institutions with 760 on the payroll, and 5 industries with 450 on the payroll. There were established youth prison centers, training schools for subnormal mental students (in some instances patients), and a place for alcoholic rehabilitation.

If Virginia can acquire Camp Pickett, many problems besetting our Capital Outlay Study Commission could be more easily solved. State mental hospital facilities now greatly overcrowded could put branches there. Overflowing State colleges could set up temporary or permanent extensions on part of the property. Some prison facilities could be carved out of the area. At present some of the State prison facilities are so overcrowded the prisoners are being stacked like cordwood in firetrap buildings. Also, youth prison centers and training schools for the mentally handicapped could be established. Pickett's potentialities are virtually limitless in the area of industrial expansion.

Solution to the problem must come quickly because of continuing building depreciation from inactivity and because of State needs. The Pickett problem can be shelved no longer.

Editorial in the Progress-Index, Petersburg, Va., Monday, March 7, 1955:

AN EXCELLENT BILL'S GLOOMY PROSPECT

Representative CARL VINSON, Georgia Democrat, and chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, has said "it would be a fine thing" if the Army continued to use Camp Pickett, but the installation "may have to remain closed."

Fourth District Representative WATKINS M. ABBITT has submitted a bill calling for either utilization or disposal as surplus property of the Camp Pickett site. The measure will go to Representative VINSON's committee, which apparently is not a healthy place for it.

Representative VINSON told newsmen recently that Camp Pickett has been given a mobilization-day assignment, which means it would be used again if a defense emergency warranted. Meanwhile, under this condition, it would remain an unproductive piece of potentially productive land.

We have stated a number of times the reasons we believe Camp Pickett should be utilized by the Defense Department or awarded to some private or public source that would make good use of it.

As long as the camp remains as it is, the economy of a large section of southside Virginia will be affected by an unstable force. Representative ABBITT's bill is an excellent one, and we hope it travels past Chairman VINSON to success in House and Senate.

Resolution for Minimum Wage of \$1.25 an Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following resolution adopted by the Greater Lawrence CIO Industrial Union Council, urging Congress to enact legislation providing for the establishment of a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour:

Whereas the President of the United States has proposed, and Congress is now considering, legislation to increase the Federal minimum wage above the present inadequate figure of 75 cents an hour; and

Whereas a fair and reasonable minimum wage would raise the living standards of underpaid workers, increase the national income, stimulate business activity, minimize unfair industrial competition based upon sweatshop wages and help to solve the problem of runaway shops; and

Whereas a fair and adequate minimum wage is of particular concern to textile workers, whose earnings have been frozen and in many cases reduced because unscrupulous owners of unorganized mills have held wages down below the level of subsistence, who have for 4 years suffered unemployment and partial unemployment from the resulting chaos of liquidations and migrations, and who live in constant fear that some new sweatshop will steal their livelihood; and

Whereas the imposition of such conditions on more than a million workers is an intolerable abuse of economic justice and a threat to the Nation; and

Whereas the President's proposal of a 90 cent minimum falls far short of the need, and will not significantly remedy any of the problems we have cited; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Greater Lawrence Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, That we most strongly urge the Congress of the United States to raise the Federal minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour, and call upon our Senators and our Representatives to support such legislation and work diligently for its adoption.

Revision and Amendment of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and Revision of Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend and revise our present immigration and naturalization law. I am also introducing a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to \$1.25.

First, may I state that insofar as the present Immigration and Naturalization Act is concerned, I am in vigorous support of the chief objections to this law. At no time in the history of our Nation has there been a more desperate need, for the sake of preservation of civilization, to resolve misunderstandings, fears, and distrust among the peoples of the world. We are gripped by awareness that it is these tensions which have spurred nations in the race for military supremacy in atomic warfare.

Over and over again, in this critical period of world history, America has re-avowed its concepts of fairness and standards of decency; its faith in the dignity and worth of all men. We have reaffirmed our faith in the principles of our Declaration of Independence, and to uphold these principles are now, in

this Congress, considering the issue of maintenance of Reserve Armed Forces to protect our way of life, our Nation—homes and families—in their right to freedom and equality.

Yet these contentions, backed up by thousands and thousands of American dollars invested in programs of economic assistance to fellow-nations, in channels of communications—radio, press and goodwill ambassadorships—that we may make our American way of life and the basic concepts of our form of Government made known to propagandized and enslaved peoples of the world, are contradicted by one of the most important laws of a land which proclaims:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

I do not hesitate to say that there is an apparent keen bipartisan awareness of those contradictions. Former President Harry S. Truman saw them in his veto of present immigration legislation. The present administration's awareness of them was made known in campaign pledges promising remedial action.

The very title of title II, chapter I, of our present immigration law is a contradiction to American concepts in its statement "Annual Quota Based Upon National Origin." It is a provision which discriminates against certain peoples because of national origin, color, and religion. In addition, the quota is based upon statistics concerning the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920, notwithstanding the fact that well before November 11, 1941, concepts concerning unified relationships in foreign policy were revolutionized.

In its administrative features, its vestment of wide discretionary powers within the hands of one official, the present act withholds from its guests and those who proclaim their accord with the American concepts, equal protection of the law. It subjects them as has already been discovered to the possibility of imprisonment without charge of crime.

In addition, the act contains unnecessary restrictions and penalties against individuals. These are but the major objections to this plan.

The bill which I am sponsoring today is one originally introduced by the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER.

Through it the national origins quota system would be eliminated and in its stead our Nation would establish in its book of law its basic policy of acceptance of persons without regards to race, color, national origin, or religion. Preference groups would be established with regard to purpose—as family unification, occupational preference, national interest preference—rather than with regard to national origin and would establish a unified quota system based on 1950 census, with minimum and maximum percentages set equally for all countries.

The bill would eliminate insubstantial ground for revoking or denying citizen-

ship and arbitrary grounds for denying admission. It would make clear distinctions in requirements for entry between aliens seeking permanent residency and visitors coming for other purposes.

We, who form the Congress of the United States, that governmental body which is to represent, reflect, and uphold the principles of government under which our Nation found its freedom from oppression, under which it rose to its present status of world leadership must uphold our own integrity and exhibit openly our sense of moral responsibility by erasing from our books a law which is not in keeping with American faith. I urge this Congress to take swift action to demonstrate its bipartisan faith in the American way of life by working for and voting for the passage of the measure which I have presented.

The second bill which I am introducing would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to \$1.25. In our program of fostering economic security, we must give our attention to domestic affairs. The minimum wage under Federal law of 75 cents per hour was established in 1950. In the 5 years since that time there has been an acknowledged substantial increase in the cost of living and in the average hourly earnings in many of the Nation's industries. The increase of the minimum hourly wage, in keeping with the economic growth of our Nation, would assist those workers in areas where recognition has not been given to increasing costs. Such an increase in these areas would have, in increased spending, its beneficial effect upon the Nation's total economy.

I urge the Congress to adopt this measure for a minimum hourly wage of \$1.25 as that figure adequate to meet present economic standards.

The American Jewish Society's Statement on Soviet Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the American Jewish Committee has made a tremendous contribution to our understanding of conditions within the Soviet Union. On January 30, 1955, the committee adopted the following statement on present Soviet policy. I respectfully urge my colleagues to read this statement.

STATEMENT ON PRESENT SOVIET POLICY

Consideration of certain aspects of present Soviet policy has led some observers to the hope that there would be a genuine change, including a more equitable treatment of all religious and ethnic groups.

The Soviet Government has recently made some minor concessions to world public opinion, such as the relaxation of travel restrictions, the release of a few selected foreign prisoners, and the softening of hostile

propaganda. However, it has not taken any genuine forward step on the basic issues that separate the Soviet Union and the free world, and it continues to wage the cold war.

In the field of human rights, with which the American Jewish Committee is primarily concerned, there has been no significant change. Slave-labor camps are still maintained; the protests of 100,000 slave laborers in Vorkuta in 1953 were cruelly suppressed. The amnesty proclaimed after Stalin's death excluded most political prisoners, and a new wave of arrests of those suspected of sympathizing with the strikes in East Germany and the satellite countries has taken place.

The Soviet Union still fails to accord elemental human rights to its inhabitants: men are still jailed arbitrarily; the right to emigrate is still withheld; freedom of expression is still suppressed; religious education of youth is still forbidden; religious observance is still strictly limited; free development of religious communities is still blocked.

The Soviets have not modified their policy of suppressing Jewish communal and cultural life. The fate of the Yiddish writers deported in 1948 is still unknown. Jewish communal leaders in the satellite countries remain in jail. Although public anti-Semitic campaigns have been toned down, anti-Jewish propaganda in the disguise of anti-Zionism continues. In Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other satellite countries, hundreds of Jewish leaders, held in jail for years, have received harsh prison sentences for their Jewish communal activities.

The United States and the Western Powers have demanded that the Soviet Union prove by deeds and not mere words that its policies have really changed. Likewise, the American Jewish Committee, as an organization concerned with the fate of 2½ million Jews in the Soviet empire, points to the need for deeds, not words, with respect to human rights.

1. We deeply deplore the failure of the Soviet Union to accord elemental human rights to all within its borders, whatever their race, religion, or nationality.

2. Elementary justice demands that the Soviet Union release all Jewish leaders jailed because of their communal activities; return deported Jews to their homes; permit freedom of religious worship and education; allow Jewish religious communities and cultural institutions to administer their affairs freely; allow emigration to those Jews who wish to do so.

3. The American Jewish Committee is convinced that without the restoration of elementary human rights throughout the Soviet Union there is no reason to believe that the Soviet Government genuinely desires to become a peaceful member of the family of nations.

Adopted January 30, 1955, Hotel Roosevelt, New York, N. Y.

The Matusow Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Stewart Alsop which appeared in his column *Matter of Fact* in the New York Herald Tribune of March 6, 1955, is a graphic illustration of the need for revision of committee investigative procedures.

MATTER OF FACT (By Stewart Alsop) THE MATUSOW MESS

The hearings in the matter of Harvey Matusow, the self-confessed liar and former professional Government witness, have turned into a tedious farce.

This is sad, since the hearings could have served a most useful purpose. But no doubt it was inevitable, in view of the passionate bipartisan desire in the congressional committee's concern and in the Justice Department to conceal their own disgraceful role in the matter.

The Senators who have been grilling Matusow have been working hard to establish two propositions: (a) That Matusow is a liar, a fraud, and not to be trusted, and (b) that Matusow has come under Communist influence and sponsorship. No congressional committee has ever set itself an easier task.

On point (a) Matusow himself is an eager and effective witness. As for point (b), it is now quite clear that Matusow fell to the Communists by default.

He tried to peddle his story all over Washington and New York. But he was so obviously a slippery faker that no reputable publisher, newspaper, or reporter would touch him with a barge pole. In this vacuum, the pro-Communist publishers, Cameron & Kahn, with the backing of a left-wing union, placed a bet on Matusow in the form of a small advance.

The bet paid off lavishly with a detailed confession, which, of course, the Communists have been using to a fare-thee-well.

But if Matusow was so obvious a fraud, how did it happen that three congressional committees and the Justice Department, as well, used him repeatedly as an "expert witness?" And if the Communists are now using him, whose fault is it, if not the fault of the Senators and Representatives and Justice Department officials who built him up in the first place?

In all the barrage of questions in the current hearings, these indelicate queries are never asked. Yet they ought to be asked, and they ought to be answered.

For it is bad enough that Congress and the executive department should accept the word of a man like Matusow without making the slightest attempt to examine his credibility. What is really disgraceful is that from the very beginning, there has been ample and solid evidence that Matusow was a liar, evidence wholly available to the congressional committees and to the Justice Department.

Take two examples: Early in 1952, at the very beginning of his career as an informer, Matusow testified under oath before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that he "knew by sight probably 10,000 Communist Party members in New York * * *". This was inherently and obviously a lie. Yet Matusow was an anti-Communist witness, a "friendly" witness. So no questions were asked.

Or again, in the autumn of 1952, speaking in Montana as an "expert on communism," Matusow said on the record that "the Sunday section of the New York Times alone has 126 dues-paying Communists." This particular lie was spotted by these reporters, who pointed out that the entire staff of the Times' Sunday section numbered 87, including two part-time copy boys.

These are only examples of the kind of obvious untruths that should instantly have alerted the Justice Department and the congressional committees. The FBI, to its credit, apparently dropped Matusow early for just such reasons. But right through 1953, as long as Matusow said what was expected of him, the Justice Department went right on hiring him and putting him on the stand as an "expert witness."

In this same period, Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY was hailing Matusow as a "great

American." This might be expected of McCARTHY as long as Matusow played the game the McCARTHY way. But many other Senators, including those who have been falling all over each other to show how much they dislike and disapprove of Matusow, heard him respectfully when he testified as an "expert witness," and asked no inconvenient questions.

It once seemed at least conceivable that good might come out of this smelly mess. There is a crying need for an honest and straightforward inquiry by both Congress and the Justice Department, into the kind of practices which are sure to lead to more smelly messes—much to the delight of the Communists—if they are not corrected.

For example, a serious inquiry would determine why neither the committee staffs nor the Justice Department investigators apparently make any effective attempt to establish the credibility of such "expert" witnesses as Matusow. A serious inquiry would also examine most seriously the flatly contradictory and demonstrably untrue testimony of other professional witnesses.

But it was no doubt naive to expect any sober examination of the problem posed by Matusow and his kind. For then the Justice Department and the committees concerned would have to consider their own past practices, perhaps even to admit mistakes—and that, of course, would never do.

Denmark—The Better Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, each nation of the world realizes that the basis for its economy is agriculture; and, therefore, what other nations are doing to improve and strengthen their agricultural economy is of interest to us.

For this reason, I am pleased to place in the RECORD a very fine article written by Mr. Harlan Trott, of the Pacific News Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, concerning the agricultural program of our friend and ally, Denmark.

It is interesting to note that Denmark adopted the Koge resolution the same year the United States Congress enacted the Federal Reclamation Act, and both have had the effect of encouraging the development of family-size farms.

Mr. Trott's article, which appeared in the March 4 issue of the Monitor, follows:

DENMARK—THE BETTER WAY?

(By Harlan Trott)

COPENHAGEN.—In Denmark, of course, there are class distinctions just as everywhere else. Only the Danes have difficulty discovering where to apply them.

This augurs well for the popularity of the Scandinavian Airlines System's thrilling new polar route which makes Denmark and California overnight neighbors.

Any way you look at it, America's breezy westerners are sure to get along just fine with these friendly Danes. There's nothing standoffish about either and SAS will show the way.

It doesn't take visitors very long to detect the high and very even cultural level which the Danes have reached through their excel-

lent school system, including the extremely practical folk schools founded by the great Lutheran Bishop Grundtvig.

This and the quality of democracy out of which it has grown explains why university professors and bus drivers can converse with ease on any worthwhile subject, and usually do.

The only difference between them, according to Mogens Lind, is that bus drivers earn more than professors.

"Nobody looks down on a man who is a millionaire," one straight-faced Dane explained. "Besides, we know that the tax collector is not going to let him go on for very long, and anyway he is not happier than the rest of us."

Knud Tholstrup impressed me as a man no less happy than those who are blessed with more immunity from tax collectors. The Direktor of Kosangas lives in a beautiful new-glass house on the road to Kronborg Castle. He drives a new Ford car, and is a major distributor of bottled fuel gas in Denmark and other Balt countries.

At the same time, Mr. Tholstrup refuses to default to the tax collector. As a member of Parliament he favors the tax-reform program of Denmark's small but influential Justice Party.

Denmark after the war was a country without raw materials, a country badly robbed by the Nazis, a country where the Iron Curtain has cut off a great part of its shipping and trade in the Baltic. Even so, I am told the Danes have the highest living standard among the European nations involved in the last war.

Free trade and land value taxation are two inseparable planks in the Justice Party's platform, policies which helped to prevent the disintegration of little Denmark after the defeat by Prussia and Austria in 1864 reduced Denmark to half the size of Maine.

"What we have lost without we must win back within," Capt. Mylius Dalgas told his countrymen. He referred to the vast wasteland in the Jutland Peninsula. In 40 years this bleak tract was transformed into farms, gardens, and forests.

This will interest Californians. The Danes did it with the same tax principles the people of the Central Valley used to make Modesto and Turlock perhaps the richest farming areas in the world. They did it by taxing the value of benefited land and not the buildings, orchards, irrigation ditches, and other improvements.

The Danes adopted a public revenue system that made it unprofitable to hold land idle. They encouraged farmers to own and use the land and intensify production so as to get the most out of the soil. Just like in the Central Valley of California, the Danes taxed people into business instead of out of business.

Denmark's land reform program worked so well that today 94 percent of Denmark's 200,000 farmers own their own farms. The United States ranks second with 64 percent.

About the time the United States Reclamation Law came into being, the Danes were adopting their so-called Køge resolution. In essence it stated, "As the small-holders consider their form of husbandry to be the most advantageous for themselves and the community, their economy cannot be based on subsidies and contributions from the state or from other sections of the community. They seek no favor for themselves in the way of tax legislation, but on the contrary the earliest possible removal of all tariffs and taxes on consumption or earnings of capital and labor; and they demand instead that, for meeting the public needs, taxes be levied on the land value which is not due to any one person's individual work but arises from the growth and development of the community. Such charges will not weight upon labor but will make land cheaper and thereby make it

easier for every man to have a home of his own."

For anyone confused by the economics of farm subsidies—people paying more taxes in order to pay more for butter—the Køge resolution of 1902 offers food for thought. Denmark's example in trade and taxes implies that a people's wisdom is not necessarily measured by population or income.

The giants of this earth perhaps have something to learn from little Denmark.

Opposition Against Reduction in Tariff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass.:

TARIFFS, OPTICS, AND SECURITY

Recently, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, Henry S. Woodbridge, vice president of American Optical Co., spoke on pending legislation to change the Federal tariff structure. Points he raised were vital ones, particularly to people in communities where there are optical plants. Chelsea is such a community, with an American Optical Co. plant at 80 Heard Street.

Mr. Woodbridge opposed the proposed change in tariff regulations which would reduce import duties and thereby increase the flow of optical goods, particularly instruments at present, into this country from foreign sources. The proposal, basically, calls for a 3-year extension of the reciprocal agreements, with the President having the authority to reduce duties by 5 percent each year for 3 years.

Imported microscopes and other instruments already present a serious situation for American Optical Co. and all other instrument makers. West Germany, Italy, England, and Japan already are sending items to this country in ever-increasing numbers. For example: In 1947, imports represented 1 percent of the total microscope sales in this country. In 1954 the same figure was 44 percent. Because of the far lower wage scales and living standards in these countries, these imports far undersell domestic products. This, naturally, reduces the volume of the optical business, and the number of jobs in the industry.

The question Mr. Woodbridge raised was: If the optical industry in the United States is eliminated by foreign competition, who will make the necessary instrumentation in the event of a national emergency? If overseas sources of precision optical apparatus should be cut off—as they have been twice in recent history—where would the United States find the workers to make the lenses and prisms necessary for range-finders, bomb sights and fire-control equipment?

Skilled workers in these fields are not trained in weeks or months. It takes years. If there is no civilian industry—no place where these workers can earn a living at their trade—there will be no skills available if an emergency arises.

An amendment to the proposed bill has been submitted by the industry. It calls only for investigation by the Defense Mobilization Board of circumstances which might threaten national defense or public health with findings and recommendations to be sent to the President for suitable action.

Congress will, eventually, be influenced in this matter by the thinking of the people. Industry has expressed its opinion. People who do likewise may be helping to protect themselves—and their country.

Reviewing the Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, I introduced H. R. 2590, a bill for the establishment of a Commission on Internal Security. I wish permission to extend and revise my remarks to include an article by Mr. Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 2 supporting the proposal of a review of our security program by an individual commission:

REVIEWING THE SECURITY PROGRAM (By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The modest changes which the administration is gingerly making in the employee-security program constitute a useful beginning—but only a beginning.

To put the job of reviewing their own handiwork into the hands of the same officials who devised the security program, and who have been principally responsible for carrying it out and defending it, is not going to get you a very objective or a very bold review. It's like asking baseball pitchers to revise the pitching rules and the batters to revise the batting rules. Each has too great a vested interest in one side.

This is why neither the administration's own basically-everything-is-all-right review of the security program nor the Senate's probably-everything-is-all-wrong review is likely to be adequate.

It is not being unfair to organized Republicans to recognize that their tendency is to find that nearly everything is going perfectly and that all you need to do is to tighten up a bolt here and add a spot of oil there.

It is not being unfair to organized Democrats to recognize that their investigative tendency is to find that nearly everything is going to pieces and that the best solution is to scrap the works, including the Republicans, and start all over again.

The fact is we are not going to get a detached and searching reexamination of how the security program can be made to work better—both for the protection of the Government and for the protection of individuals—until such a reexamination is put unreservedly into nonpartisan hands.

President Eisenhower has acted upon this principle many times—and to good advantage. The several Hoover commissions, the Randall commission, the Highway Commission, the National Conference on Public Schools are all examples of how the administration has acted to take partisan politics out of the study of national problems. This doesn't mean diluting responsibility. The administration's responsibility is to decide what it shall accept or reject and to carry out the program once it is objectively reviewed.

The desirability of having the best possible security program—thorough and fair, just and strong—is as great as the desirability of having the best possible road-building program or the best possible review of veterans' benefits. If a commission study in such areas of public policy and procedure

is useful, it would seem reasonable to put as much care into improving the security program.

One independent investigation of the security program is being undertaken by the New York City Bar Association on a \$100,000 grant from the fund for the Republic.

A proposal for a commission type of inquiry is before the Senate Government Operations Committee this week on motion of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. I suspect that if the President does not take an initiative stronger than he has thus far, Congress will take the matter in its own hands. This itself is far from ideal, since the primary responsibility for policing the personnel of the executive branch of the Government belongs to the President.

Nearly every newspaperman in Washington knows of cases in which Government employees have been casually, cruelly, or cavalierly treated under the security program. Here is a recent instance:

"I was dismissed without a single direct statement from the Government to me. The news came by devious channels to my superior in my private work. (I worked for the Government in a consulting capacity.) I have never been told the basis of the decision; I have had no hearing, no opportunity to speak in my own defense; and there is no path of redress open to me so far as I can see now."

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., has just announced that from now on the employee must be fully acquainted with the specific charges against him and that he should be given a personal interview.

It will seem unreasonable to many that it has taken 2 years to establish such a minimum essential of justice—to know precisely what you are accused of and to have a chance to defend yourself to your chief—and this suggests that a bolder, more detached review would break new ground for the benefit of everybody.

Extending Universal Military Service and Training Act

SPEECH

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1955

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the Tydings amendment, so-called.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, it is possible I may be absent from the Chamber at the time the vote is taken on this bill. If so, and I could be present, I would vote for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the so-called Tydings amendment which the Congress wrote into the law when the draft act was earlier before us and again when the act was extended.

I understand an attempt was made to by the amendment which was accepted by the chairman of the committee, and which was adopted earlier today. But under the law as it is written even with that amendment there is doubt about what will happen to farm workers.

This amendment is offered because the armed services just does not pay proper attention to the laws which the Congress enacts; and I would like to make it clear to the departments if I may, that when we write a law we would like to have the executive department execute it.

To substantiate what I say I am reading a directive issued by General Hershey on the 3d day of January 1945. The directive follows:

EXHIBIT B

State Director Advice (No. 288) Issued: January 3, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18-25.

(Confirmation of telegram to all State directors within continental United States dated January 3, 1945.)

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust the eligibles in the 18-through 25-year-age group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 384,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have further advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, has advised me that although we still need all of the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18-through 25-year-age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator Tydings said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated, and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through 25-year-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions, agriculture like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and boards of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II-C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in class II-C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-through 25-year-age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II-C excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II-C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

That directive created so much criticism that the general issued another one on the 23d day of the same month.

The second directive follows:

EXHIBIT C

State Director Advice (No. 288-A) Issued: January 23, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of Registrants in Agriculture, Ages 18-25.

(Confirming telegram to all State directors within continental United States dated January 22, 1945.)

Questions of interpretations of State Director Advice 288 have been brought to my attention by Members of Congress and by others.

The directive of January 3, 1945, State Director Advice 288, did not change or modify in any manner the Tydings amendment. The opinions and findings contained in State Director Advice 288 were for the consideration of the local boards in determining the classifications of registrants in the age group 18 through 25.

Section 5k of the Selective Training and Service Act known as the Tydings amendment places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal, in the case of the individual registrant whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

Notify all local boards immediately.

HERSHEY.

(This telegram was dispatched only to State directors within the continental limits of the United States as it is not applicable in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.)

The result was that the State authorities instructed the local boards to disregard completely the Tydings amendment.

In support of that statement I cite the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1945, when this same issue was before us. Permit me to read a part of that debate.

At that time—February 1945—the Honorable Earl Michener—as capable, as industrious a Member as ever served in this House—addressed the House and

called attention to the disregard of the provisions of this amendment by local authorities interpreting and administering the act. Permit me to quote:

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the Congress to the alarming condition in agricultural sections because of the interpretation being placed by local draft boards on General Hershey's directive of January 3, requiring the reclassification and induction of boys 18 through 25 years of age who were deferred because of agricultural occupation.

Then, referring to a statement issued by the local board, our former colleague said:

The above statement by the board was published on January 29, and in the evening of the same day Maj. Nick A. Luscombe, representing the Michigan State director of selective service, addressed a meeting in Lenawee County and made it clear that all farm registrants 18 through 25, who were physically qualified, were to be inducted into the military service, the Tydings amendment and the statutory law of the land to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman then added:

We are asking that the local boards, whose members live in the community and know the facts, be permitted and required to draft or defer under the provisions of the law provided by the Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, pt. 10, 79th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 2, 1945, pp. A411-A412.)

On the same subject, from the Well of the House, on February 5, 1945—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 1, page 829, 79th Congress, 1st session—will be found a statement which, taken in connection with what happened at that time, shows clearly that the executive departments do not follow the law as it is written by Congress:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the confusion which has arisen over the drafting of agricultural workers, in my judgment, can be laid to the directive of General Hershey issued on the 3d day of January 1945, No. 288. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] inquired of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] where there was any reason to charge the drafting of these men to the President. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] will read Directive No. 288—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 761—sent out by General Hershey he will find there quoted the statements of Mr. Byrnes and Mr. Jones, and in the statement signed by General Hershey, quoting Mr. Byrnes, it is stated:

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18-to-25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interests of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men."

There is where the trouble started, and you cannot get away from it. The fact is that after that order went out the local draft boards throughout the country, acting on it, as the President must have expected they would, began to ignore the Tydings amendment. They began to put men who were in II-C directly over into I-A, and to send them into the Army without any review as to whether they fell under the Tydings amendment and should be deferred. When they did that they disregarded their duty.

In my judgment, they are not to be criticized, because the idea that the Commander in Chief can do no wrong, make no mistake, has been stressed so often and so strongly by some papers, by Members of Congress, by almost every columnist, that as a practical matter the local draft boards had no choice.

I know what has happened and so do you. A local draft board which deferred these agricultural workers would have been charged, just as you and I have been charged during past months, with being disloyal, with aiding the enemy, with exempting men who were not entitled to be exempted, with refusing to support the war effort. Who is there in a local community who wants to stand up to that kind of criticism from the daily press, from the administration, and the administration spokesmen?

There is more to the same effect to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Permit me to quote—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 2, page 2431, 79th Congress, 1st session, March 19, 1945:

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether, if the present policy of General Hershey in disregarding the Tydings amendment is followed there will be a shortage of food, I do not know. . . .

I do know that notwithstanding the so-called corrective of the directive sent out by General Hershey some local boards were advised by selective service officials under General Hershey to disregard that corrective.

Similar complaints were made in the Senate. On April 23, 1945, Senator Shipstead of Minnesota, among other things, said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 91, part 3, page 3634, 79th Congress, 1st session:

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a concurrent resolution which was adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of practically 4-to-1, dealing with the question of drafting farm help, and its effect upon the production of agricultural products, and asking for the appointment of a joint committee of the House and the Senate to investigate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in order that there may be no further misrepresentation of the will and the desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, section 305, title 50, United States Code, commonly known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant, observe subsection K and concern itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained."

The purpose of this amendment is to call attention to the fact that, as long as there is a provision in the law which permits the President to use his discretion as to deferments, the will of the Congress will not prevail.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made the statement that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] took care of the situation. In my humble judgment, it does not take care of the situation, because, under the law as it would read, the President still has authority to make the rules and regulations governing deferments. This situation is not new, nor is the disregard by the executive department of legislation enacted by Congress new.

Please note that the House, by the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 29, on March 19, 1945, recognized the necessity not only for the Tydings

amendment, but for a further directive to the executive department.

We are today putting through legislation which gives the armed services control for a period of 8 years over the lives of every physically and mentally fit American young man.

Why enact a draft or conscription act which carries a loophole which will enable the executive department to conscript into the service individuals that the legislative department—the Congress—declares shall be entitled to deferment or exemption?

The amendment which I have offered is the Tydings amendment. It was debated in both Houses. It was adopted by a substantial majority in both Houses. After its terms had been disregarded by the armed services, the House and the Senate found it necessary to call attention to this maladministration. There would seem to be no reason why today, extending the act for 4 years, that Congress should not, in unequivocal terms, express its will.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks and include extraneous matter, I would like to say that during the past 2 years I believe there have been some rather significant and heartening developments in our naval shipyards. A spirit of competition as between various public yards has resulted in cost consciousness by the respective labor-management area groups to the end of obtaining more defense for the taxpayer's dollar. A program looking toward elimination of peaks and valleys in employment levels has raised morale. So has a policy of incentive awards.

From close personal observation, I have found that the Bureau of Ships is making every effort to schedule work so as to combine economy and stabilization of employment which is a most difficult assignment.

I cannot praise too highly the personnel of the Department of the Navy from the Secretary on down for the effective way that the construction and modernization program is being handled.

In my congressional district is the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, which has been recognized because of its record of quality, efficiency and economy. This yard is the community project of Bremerton, where labor, management, and all segments of the population combine through an organization called the Puget Sound Naval Base Association to justify and maintain a stable workload.

The following resolution adopted March 7, 1955, by this association reveals its cooperative and forward-looking objectives:

Whereas a major objective of the Puget Sound Naval Base Association is the develop-

ment of various ways and means to help maintain a relatively steady workload for the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard; and

Whereas the achievement of this objective permits the shipyard to stabilize its employment, thus bringing about an efficient, businesslike utilization of its supply of highly skilled shipbuilding craftsmen, and thereby contributing to both the short-time and long-time total defense of the United States; and

Whereas the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard is demonstrating repeatedly that its productive team of management and labor is a leader in the field of aircraft-carrier conversions and is capable of performing low-cost quality repair work for ships of the fleet when called upon; and

Whereas the shipyard is located on a deep-water seaport in close proximity to the strategic North Pacific Ocean and is located in the Kitsap County community, which is keenly and vitally interested in the Navy and is pleased to have the men of the fleet as friends, neighbors, and visitors; and

Whereas the shipyard is manned by career craftsmen, artisans, professional engineers, many of whom have dedicated their lives to naval shipbuilding and who are teaching valuable knowledge and experience to the youth of the community; and

Whereas Adm. Robert B. Carney, Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy, in a recent address prepared for the Cincinnati Chapter of the Navy League, the Naval Reserve Advisory Council, and the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, said that atomic powerplants for aircraft are closer than had been anticipated and predicted that atomic propulsion will become commonplace in our Navy; and

Whereas Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, told the Senate Armed Services Committee that planes and ships are being equipped with guided missiles; and

Whereas the budget and workload schedules are being reviewed at the national level: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Puget Sound Naval Base Association, That the entire Washington State congressional delegation be encouraged to work actively toward these goals:

1. Construction of a new large drydock, capable of both the construction of and repair of underwater damage to the large aircraft carriers of the future.

2. Continued conversion work on aircraft carriers for all types of aircraft. This includes the U. S. S. *Coral Sea*.

3. A stepped-up program of repair and overhaul of live ships.

4. Construction of large *Forrestal*-type carriers whenever the decision is made for construction on the west coast.

5. Establishment at once of an atomic propulsion project with arrangements for selected project members to work with Hanford, Wash.; Arco, Idaho; and other atomic projects.

6. Construction of modern submarine repair facilities with at least one sub overhaul job per year so as to maintain essential skills. Proximity to Carr Inlet is to be noted.

7. Construction of small craft of one type or another to assure diversity of skills.

8. Conversion of vessels to fire guided missiles.

9. Continue to obtain work on submarine contracts from the Hanford plant and similar organizations; be it further

Resolved, That the Washington State congressional delegation be encouraged to make strong representations to the Navy Department for the strategic basing of an operation fleet in the Puget Sound area; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each member of the Washington State congressional delegation, the Honorable Secretary of the Navy, and the Honorable Governor of Washington State.

No Stone Unturned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest to all Members of Congress, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include an article from the *Christian Science Monitor* of March 2, 1955, entitled "No Stone Unturned":

NO STONE UNTURNED

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Twice before official Washington has taken a look at this subject—and filed it away for future reference. But the chances are that it will not be pigeonholed this time. That recent 40-by-220-mile H-bomb fallout picture was too graphic. The result is that both on Capitol Hill and in the hush-hush departments of the executive branch this subject is now coming into its own. The subject: Governmental continuity in case of an H-attack on Washington.

Both the Executive and Congress are beginning to see that this is a question that must be considered. The Founding Fathers faced the contingency of a President dying in office; and our Constitution provides for the unhappy event of both President and Vice President not surviving their terms. But the framers did not have to face the possibility—remote as it may be—of an entire administration being wiped out by an atomic attack. That is something the current successors have to tackle.

They took a quick look at it after the first A-bomb blast and felt that as long as the Soviet Union did not have the A-bomb there was no real worry. Then when the Soviet did explode its first A-bomb, several Congressmen both spoke and wrote on the need for arranging governmental continuity should the United States Capital be destroyed in a sneak atomic attack. But again the discussion died down. It is back again with the disclosure by the Atomic Energy Commission of the truly devastating potentialities of an H-bomb.

So again one hears on the Hill and around the Capitol talk of how to arrange for a Federal Government that could carry on if all of the Washington personnel happened to be wiped out.

A proposal that is being revived and discussed both openly and secretly here is that the only existing semblance of a governing body that represents the whole country should be officially delegated to step in and take over. That body is the Council of State Governors. They could step into the breach caused by the H-bomb and at least make a start of running things. Either their chairman or one of their members chosen by lot could become temporary President.

This proposal, based on the worst possible picture painted by the AEC, envisages almost total destruction for the Capitol and its occupants. That, of course, is a remote possibility considering early warning, tracking, intercepting, shelter, and evacuation preparations now underway. If indeed any Nation ever dares risk the retaliation such an H-bomb attack would bring.

The point is, however, as all talk about it emphasizes, that even the possibility should be faced and it be officially decided whether some proposal for such conditions should not be written into the Constitution or law of the land. This time, it is argued, the question should not be shelved for lack of dis-

cussion. Officials now know the potentialities and it is up to them to decide if the danger is real enough to do anything about it.

The Council of State Governors is admittedly a weak substitute for Federal executive power in an emergency. But it does exist now as an entity and could be developed into something stronger and more productive if desired. It has the one great advantage of being national—representing the entire Nation—not a section thereof. Also it is made up of experienced officials with political background and executive experience.

Presumably the chairman of the council—if he were to be President pro tempore—would pick his Cabinet from his colleagues. There would be lieutenant governors available in the 48 States, so that State government would not falter or collapse.

Finding a substitute for the Congress might be harder—but two proposals are generally brought forward whenever this subject comes up: a hastily called election in 3 months, or appointment of a certain number of State senators and representatives to seats in Washington—not necessarily a full Congress, but enough to transact business.

This subject of governmental continuity in the H-bomb age is admittedly too novel and tremendous to be resolved in a day or a month or possibly even a year. But it is a subject that those who know most about the power of new weapons discuss seriously. The problem is to get it out in the open and to keep the public informed.

S. 968

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the President's program for Federal aid for school construction, as embodied in S. 968, introduced by Senator SMITH of New Jersey, I would like to call the attention of the Congress to the following statements of Frederick Raubinger, New Jersey commissioner of education, and Archibald S. Alexander, New Jersey State treasurer. I am in complete agreement with Dr. Raubinger's analysis of S. 968 and join with State Treasurer Alexander in saying that the Federal program appears likely to be of very little help to New Jersey.

STATEMENT BY DR. FREDERICK RAUBINGER ON SENATE BILL 968, INTRODUCED BY SENATOR H. ALEXANDER SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY

This bill is designed to authorize Federal assistance to States and communities to enable them to increase public elementary and secondary school construction.

TITLE I

Title I is designed to authorize purchase by the Federal Government of obligations issued by local educational agencies to finance school construction where such obligations could not otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest. As we read this part of this bill, it seems designed to provide a Federal guaranty in New Jersey of 50 percent of a proposed bond issue of a local educational agency, at a reasonable rate, based on the prevailing rate of marketable obligations of the United States, plus one-half of 1 percent.

During the past 3 years, the following situation has prevailed with regard to rates paid for bonds issued by school districts in New Jersey:

The audit reports indicate that in the fiscal year 1952-53 the school districts of New Jersey issued bonds in the principal amount of \$47,138,300, representing 99 issues. Thirty-two issues in the amount of \$20,742,000 were sold at interest rates of 3.2 percent or higher.

In 1953-54 there were 67 issues in the principal amount of \$32,440,000.

Nineteen issues in the amount of \$10,374,000 were sold at interest rates exceeding 3.2 percent at an average rate of 3.4 percent.

From July 30, 1949, to June 30, 1954, only 13 New Jersey districts have issued bonds with interest rates exceeding 3.5 percent, most of them during the past 2 years. These issues totaled \$8,607,000 out of a State total of \$155,248,700 issued by school districts during this 5-year period.

It will be noted that the fluctuation in the municipal bond market has noticeable effect on interest rates paid by school districts. It should be further noted that the obligations of the State of New Jersey enjoy better rates than similar obligations of the United States. Illustrative of this is the teachers' college bond issue floated January 28, 1953, in the amount of \$15 million, on which the interest rate was 1.69 percent.

Thus, there are a number of New Jersey districts which could benefit by the support of the credit of either the State or the Federal Government. However, we note that as much as 15 percent of the Federal sums appropriated in this bill for any year might be available to a single State, and we note further that the eligibility of a district to participate in such a program is determined by the eligibility of the State, based on the per capita income of the State. Thus in periods of financial stress, unless more money were appropriated, it is probable that the subdivisions of a State with a financial standing of that of New Jersey, would be unable to qualify with high enough priorities for funds available under this title. In any case, there is no provision in this title which could not be carried out, at least as efficiently, by a State guaranty of reasonable interest rates for local bond issues, if the State legislature and the people so decided. In such an event, sections 106 and 107, providing for the administration and audit of such provisions, could be operated by the State independently of the Federal Government.

In general, we believe that this title is more applicable to States which have statutory debt limits for local districts which cannot be exceeded. In New Jersey under 18: 5-86 of New Jersey Statutes Annotated (title 18, Education), the commissioner of education and the local government board have the power of extending debt limits under certain conditions. We believe that this has served to operate in such a way as to help prevent excessive interest rates, and that this conclusion is substantiated by the record.

TITLE II

Title II would extend Federal support, together with that of the State, for "obligations issued by State school-building agencies to finance the construction of school facilities for rental to and eventual ownership by local educational agencies." In New Jersey no such State school-building agency exists. Such an agency may be compared in general with authorities such as the New Jersey Turnpike Authority or the Garden State Parkway Authority. However, section 202, paragraph B, providing for coordination between such a school-building authority and the State educational agency, eliminates the probability that a turnpike authority is analogous. Hence, we would suppose that such a school-building authority or agency would be created by the legislature subject

to approval by the voters, and would obligate the State to guarantee bonds in a given amount to finance the authority. After this had been done, the following situation would be a hypothetical illustration of its operation:

The State authority would provide \$100 of bonds for school building purposes.

New Jersey would guarantee \$2.50 of a \$5 assumed debt service rate, while the Federal Government would lend the remaining \$250 for 32 years without interest as an additional guarantee for the bonds.

The State authority would, under provisions required by the Federal Government, require that annual payments for rentals for such buildings would be sufficient to meet interest obligations, that one-fourth of 1 percent would be deposited as an insurance for such interest (similar to Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation), and that the cost of maintenance, repair, replacement, and insurance of such facilities would be provided for in the rental.

The Federal Government does not grant an indefinite and outright guarantee for interest payments, and even stipulates that any advance from the supplemental reserve which it provides be repaid with interest. The Federal Government, through the United States Commissioner of Education, may stipulate the investment of Federal funds advanced as part of the basic reserve fund guaranteeing principal and interest.

In reviewing title II, the following questions have been raised concerning its relationship to present New Jersey law, and even to the New Jersey Constitution. Can a State school building authority be established to provide such funds without the approval of the people? Can the State school building authority stipulate such items as maintenance, repair, and insurance, where present school law charges local boards of education with these responsibilities? Since New Jersey law provides that the board of education has no legal life beyond 1 year and cannot make rental agreements beyond that period, could a local school district enter into any long-term rental agreement with a State authority without a vote of the people, and perhaps without an amendment to the constitution?

Basic New Jersey thinking with regard to long-term obligations of the school district is the premise that the electorate or, in city districts, the board of school estimate, alone has the right to bond a district or commit a district to any capital expenditure. It is not likely that any legislation at a State level could change our present pattern without (a) reducing to some extent local control and initiative, and (b) materially affecting the credit of the school district.

TITLE III

Title III provides for "Federal grants to the States to assist them in helping local educational agencies, economically unable to qualify for the assistance described above, to obtain urgently needed school facilities." We estimate that in New Jersey perhaps only 15 or 20 small school districts would be able to qualify for such aid, if they could not qualify for the provisions of title I and title II. Such districts would be unable to sell their obligations at a reasonable rate, even if half of these obligations were guaranteed by the Federal and State governments, and would be unable to pay an annual rental or amortization payment adequate to finance their obligations. In other words, these districts would be those which we would consider eligible for outright State grant or Federal grant for the building of school facilities. This title provides that for such districts, the State of New Jersey would have to provide at least 60 percent of the grant, and that as much as 40 percent of the balance could be paid by Federal grant.

To qualify for such a grant, it would be necessary for the district to fail to qualify

under title I and title II, which presumes that there would be a State school building authority in New Jersey unable to provide for such districts. This title gives broad powers to the United States Commissioner of Education to review such applications and to establish restrictive conditions for both the State and local agencies in respect to qualifying for payment, the conditions under which payment would be granted, and the type and kind of construction which would be eligible. It would give to our State educational agency considerable powers which it does not presently possess, which would only be possible through the adoption of new legislation. It gives to both the State and Federal Governments jurisdiction over the financing of the project by the local district.

TITLE IV

Title IV, provides for "Federal grants to the States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing and initiating programs designed to overcome obstacles to local financing of school construction." It states specifically that such payments will not be made unless there is "a new program for the State" related to the development and initiation of programs for State assistance to local districts. New Jersey could not qualify in all likelihood for such assistance unless a State school building authority were established.

This title does not necessarily have to be related to the first three titles, if its purpose is to improve administrative provisions in the States for providing technical or other assistance to local school districts in their building problems. In the setting in which it is placed, it must be regarded as an adjunct to the first three titles, and as being only applicable in case of their adoption by a given State.

GENERAL STATEMENT

If the intent of this bill is to provide immediate, necessary relief for school districts and to facilitate immediate construction of buildings, it would not attain this purpose in New Jersey, since many of its provisions would require extensive revision of existing statutes and possibly referenda by the electorate. The amounts of money provided in title I and title III seem unrealistic in view of the total amount of school construction estimated as needed in the 48 States. Its main purposes seem to be to extend Federal guaranties of credit to State agencies or authorities created by the State, and in New Jersey such guaranties are not presently needed if the State itself provides such guaranties to local districts.

Any consideration of the bill must further consider the extent and amount of Federal control and State control which is desirable for imposition upon local districts. This bill would involve the Federal Government in thousands of decisions concerned with local districts, instead of granting money to States under certain terms and allowing the States to make the decisions.

Our past and present programs for school construction in the State have been almost universally engendered by local initiative, and we believe that this is a force which must be maintained. We believe further that the use of State guaranties of credit may be provided for local districts in other ways than by the establishment of State school building authorities. Acquisition of school buildings through a rental-purchase system should only be considered if local residents have the power to determine the nature of long-term obligations, and the effect of such obligations upon the fiscal soundness of their communities.

STATEMENT BY ARCHIBALD S. ALEXANDER

I agree completely with the conclusions of the Department of Education memorandum. I do not believe that any of the four titles will be of substantial assistance to New Jer-

sey. I believe that any assistance which will be furnished to New Jersey will have to be at the expense of increased Federal and State control over local school affairs. This is contrary to New Jersey's tradition and violates the sound general principle that remote control is inferior to local responsibility and control with respect to matters which are peculiarly local in impact and interest.

We requested the State Tax Policy Commission about a year ago to make recommendations for solutions of the pressing problem which many school districts have with regard to construction of facilities. This is the second aspect of the school-aid problem, the first aspect, with regard to operating expenses, having been dealt with during 1954. The Tax Policy Commission evolved a tentative plan and met to discuss it the evening of the day when the President's program was announced. It was impossible to consider the matter fully until the President's program had been analyzed.

The staff of the State Tax Policy Commission is completing this analysis and there will then have to be another meeting, now scheduled for March 7, 1955. At that meeting I intend to take the position stated earlier in this memorandum, and I would hope that it might be possible to persuade the Commission to do likewise.

**Speech by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr.,
Before National Rivers and Harbors
Congress**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I include the following interesting and informative address delivered by Maj. Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Jr., Chief of Engineers, United States Army, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress in Washington, D. C., on May 25, 1954:

Gentlemen, as earlier speakers have indicated, this is the first time in 4 years that this congress has come together. I believe that this meeting is most timely because there has been much progress in the field of water resources development in the United States during the past decade, and many changes in public approach to this important problem. Our whole country is alive as never before to the importance of our water resources. In fact, our water resources development policies and procedures of past years are, indeed, receiving a "new look" from the people of this country. Some of these looks are thoughtful; some of them are baleful; all of them are significant and need our attention either to improve our current policies or to preserve them against unsound and questionable proposals. At any rate it is a time that stirs the blood and calls for action.

What are the evidences of this renewed and expanded national interest in these questions? I should like to cite a few, as follows:

1. Certainly the farmers and agricultural organizations of the Nation are extending their interest in conservation of land and water resources, attempting to speed up the great work they are doing in soil conservation. But in extending their efforts to achieve a greater measure of flood protection in our upper watersheds, serious problems

are being introduced in overall valley planning.

2. In the general field of flood control there has been a steady growth of demand for protection as our population and industry has expanded. But there is a growing recognition that this job is far from complete, and that many of our main river valleys are still subject to the destructive impact of great floods, in some cases with no popular solution even in sight. There is also a growing concern that recurring flood losses are an economic drain which this country cannot afford.

3. Our deep-draft ocean harbors have been improved progressively since the days of sailing ships, but in some cases they are no longer adequate to handle the cargo vessels and tankers of today. Adequate improvement and maintenance of these essential facilities are a basic need of our shipping interests, and should not be neglected but are being neglected due to inadequate funds.

4. Traffic on our inland and intracoastal waterways has risen sharply during the past 25 years, from 9 billion ton-miles in 1929 to over 60 billion ton-miles in 1952. But many of the channels and structures which permit movement of this ever-increasing commerce have been in heavy and constant use for 30 to 50 years. We thus have an aging system striving to meet the needs of a revitalized and dynamic water-transportation industry. Basic industrial and heavy economic development have followed the course of these waterways and rely upon them. They must be modernized to encourage rather than throttle future development.

5. There is a new appreciation of the importance of our Great Lakes and their connecting channels as the basic transportation system of our industrial Midwest. The recently authorized St. Lawrence Seaway is only a part of the improvement needed to permit full use of the potentialities of this great system.

6. Reclamation of arid land and provision of supplemental water supplies is still an important factor in the economy of our Western States. Its importance to the future economic development of wide areas in the West is increased by population shifts of recent years.

7. Our experience with flood control has demonstrated the rather startling fact that the benefits from regulation of low water flows of rivers may equal or exceed the values of flood control and protection. Farmers everywhere are beginning to appreciate the attributes of moderate and larger dams in this respect. Increasing use of our rivers for water supply, as outlets for industrial and municipal wastes and for recreation, have emphasized the necessity for maintaining and augmenting the normal year-by-year flow of our rivers.

8. In certain areas of our country where fuels are scarce there is almost a frantic demand for hydroelectric power to maintain industrial growth and ever lessen the burdens of farm and home. At the same time, there is a distinctly growing feeling upon the part of people as a whole at the justification of greater participation by local groups and private industry in this field. We have heard the term "partnership" used in this connection to denote a real cooperation between the Federal Government and non-Federal interests in the development of this major resource.

9. Drought conditions such as now afflict the five-State area of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, and New Mexico show clearly that we must conserve and use wisely all available waters. Even in the normally humid East, there is growing use of irrigation. Eastern States legislators are, even now, studying water-rights legislation, which is an old story to the West.

These are by no means the only fields of expanding interest in and public reexami-

nation of problems connected with water-resources development, but they will serve to indicate the widespread nature and complexity of differences upon these problems. As the President of the United States has indicated to you, the enlightened settlement of these matters are vital to our national strength and progress. Under the lash of necessity, however, we must approach their solutions within the limits imposed by the hard necessity of maintaining our strength for national defense and, at the same time, a sound fiscal policy.

Citizens frequently tell us that they are concerned because we cannot undertake all of the improvements which are so vitally needed and at the same time meet our national and international commitments without risking collapse of an overloaded economic structure. This is a very real problem which people have difficulty in applying if it restricts their personal interests in any particular Federal activity. But it applies perforce to the field of water resources, too. It deserves the best thought of all our people; and the public spirited services of organizations such as yours which can crystallize and make known the priority needs of important regions interested in water resource development.

How can this challenge be met? What is the Corps of Engineers doing about it? These questions cannot be fully discussed in the time available here today. But I can and will present some measures and ideas to stimulate your interest and for you to think further about. There is, for example, a growing feeling that there should be a greater local participation in flood control and other aspects of water resources development. Such action holds the possibility of greater accomplishment even with reduced Federal appropriations at a time when the Federal Government has many more places to put its dollars than it has money to spend or invest. The Corps of Engineers supports this basically sound policy; but considers that application must be practicable and not so restrictive as to throttle development which requires the impetus of substantial Federal participation.

We in the corps feel that development of our water and land resources cannot, in the face of present necessities, proceed on a hit-or-miss basis. Back in 1927, over 25 years ago, we initiated the so-called 308 surveys which were the first attempt at comprehensive water resources planning for all of our major river basins on a nationwide basis. All that has happened since then, and our present dilemma, merely emphasizes the fact that our planning must be coordinated; that improvement and development must recognize the interrelationship of our water needs and problems; and that solutions of one phase of the work must complement rather than conflict with the needs of others. In our studies and construction we have constantly in mind the ideal of comprehensive and coordinated development.

We have in the past and are now consistently advocating sound methods of project evaluation; fair and equitable allocations of cost of multiple-purpose developments; recognition of the rights of States and non-Federal interests in water resources; greater Federal activity in securing needed basic scientific data; and the clarification of Federal water resource policy in areas where it is deficient and productive of conflicts and inefficiency.

In brief, I think that, without immodesty, I can say that the Corps of Engineers, which has served as a pioneer in Federal water resources development, is keenly aware of the new national interest in this field and it striving to keep ahead of public needs and contribute from its fund of experience to solutions of the problems.

Finally, what is this Congress contributing to "further a sound and coordinated develop-

ment of the Nation's water and land resources," which I quote from your brochure setting forth the purpose of your organization? What can you do to further this purpose at this critical time?

I think it is quite plain that old methods and procedures will no longer suffice. An interest in individual proposals or projects is understandable and useful but is necessarily a limited interest at a time of new appraisal and transition.

For example, I have noted with interest the constructive governmental concern with this problem which has drawn the ablest men in the water-resources field into service with task forces of the Commission which is now restudying the relationships between the Federal Government, the States, local organizations, and private enterprise in water-resources development.

These practical experts, however, require and have asked for information and advice from Federal agencies, including the Corps of Engineers. We have gone "all out," I assure you, in cooperating with these gentlemen. They must also have information as to the ideas and needs of the people who are directly affected by policies and projects and who, in the final analysis, pay for them. Is it not a function of a public organization such as yours to aid such study groups by presenting sound ideas and views for their consideration?

This is a time when, in water-resource development, we stand between the "upper and nether millstones" of maintaining our military strength and preserving our economic structure. It is, therefore, bound to be a time when limitations on Federal activity will generate competing demands for Federal participation. It is unavoidable that interests will conflict; that strong groups may advance their particular needs at the expense of others; and that the overall public interest may be ignored. Your organization provides a meeting ground for the diverse but related aspects of water-resource development. Is it not, therefore, eminently situated to reconcile conflicts and generate strong public support for a soundly coordinated water-resource activity?

In 1950, the President, on behalf of the entire Nation, attempted to make a reappraisal of Federal water resources policy. Possibly a few people recognized the ramifications of that task. This useful approach has not yet been carried to a conclusion; but the need for clarification and establishment of sound water policy is greater than ever. Impetus for such a policy must come not only from the Federal Government and its agencies; primarily it must stem directly from the people. Such a policy cannot be evolved in the ivory tower of the past because water, in its varied uses and problems, intimately affects every citizen and every citizen has become far more aware of that fact than 10 years ago. Here, finally, I see one of the greatest opportunities of your organization—to recognize intelligently and realistically the situation which faces us in the development of this basic resource and to aid in making known the views and needs of the citizens of this country.

Thus, the new nationwide concern—the "new look" at water resource development—demands that such organizations as yours as well as the Federal agencies, provide real leadership. You must become effective instruments in crystallizing the ideas and needs of interested citizens in the correct direction. Antiquated methods must give way to a highly scientific approach, and coordinated action; and these must serve an awakened and enlightened public interest.

Gentlemen, there is the problem and I cannot overemphasize it. I do not doubt you can make progress here and there by the old methods of pressure and mutual cooperation. But with the world situation as it is and with the new, broad and highly

thoughtful interest of the awakened American people the employment of such methods of themselves will end in your defeat in detail. Worse than that, the Nation's water resource program will fall far behind the development of the rest of our economy.

In my opinion a more realistic approach will be for you to recognize clearly these popular forces, harness them and guide them to national objectives in the water resource field as delimited by the President. To do this your various organizations and groups may have to hire competent engineers and economists for advice. To do this you personally may have to study continuously all sides of the economics and engineering of the issues involved. To do this you must adopt those concepts and policies that will benefit the Nation as a whole—not for tomorrow but for decades to come. To do this may require local sacrifices of projects and proposals that are unsound. But in the end such a statesmanlike course will redound to the individual good as well as that of the Nation. More than that it will assure a strong and prosperous America because water resource development will have grown in step with a healthy economy.

Iron Curtain Captives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the peoples of two European nations this week have special occasion to lift their minds and hearts to the remembrance of freedom, even though they now find themselves bowed under the relentless hand of communism.

March 7 was the 105th birthday anniversary of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, founder of the Czechoslovak Republic and on March 15 the Hungarian people will mark the 106th anniversary of Hungarian independence from Hapsburg rule.

It is our hope that the people of Hungary and Czechoslovakia will look back to the origins of their freedom, now lost, and renew their resolve to once more attain independence and a rightful place among the free nation of the world.

I have great faith in the spirit and resolve of these captive peoples. During my work with Radio Free Europe I saw, over and over again, evidences of it. And I saw, too, how these courageous people look to the United States for help and encouragement.

It is not enough that we voice pious tributes and bold promises to the liberty-loving people behind the Iron Curtain. Only by our continuing fight against communism at home and abroad can we set the pace for others who would be free. Only by our unwavering insistence in the councils of nations and on the very doorstep of the Kremlin itself can we keep the spark of hope alive.

We must give concrete evidence of our genuine concern for these oppressed peoples. Let us liberalize our immigration laws and welcome to our shores their homeless. Let us redouble our efforts, through such agencies as the Voice of

America, to pierce the Iron Curtain, and let us make sure that our military strength matches our urgent demands for a free world.

Rev. Paul A. McNally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the passing of a renowned scientist represents a distinct loss to society, particularly when the pursuits of the individual have been devoted to the advancement of civilization through the acquisition of knowledge hitherto hidden from man's eyes. Such a great loss has recently occurred at Georgetown University, here in the Nation's Capital, in the death of the Reverend Paul A. McNally, S. J., vice president of the university and one of the outstanding astronomer-mathematicians of our day.

We mourn this sad event, and extend expressions of sincere sympathy to the president and faculty of Georgetown and also to the alumni and student body.

Such well-deserved encomiums have just been published editorially in the Washington Post and Times Herald and by the Washington Evening Star of March 7, 1955, that I ask unanimous consent to have them reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 7, 1955]

THE REVEREND PAUL A. McNALLY

The Reverend Paul A. McNally, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University who died Friday, probably was best known as one of the Nation's eminent astronomer-mathematicians. As director of the Astronomical Observatory at Georgetown he participated in a number of internationally famous expeditions to study solar eclipses. Father McNally was widely honored by scientific societies, and the attention his work received helped make Georgetown, which has operated an observatory since 1841, known throughout the world as an astronomical center. A man of many parts, Father McNally also had taught mathematics, had served as regent and dean of the university's medical school, and was chairman of the physics department at the time of his death. His administrative talents were recognized in the broad responsibilities he bore. We extend our condolences to Georgetown on his death.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 7, 1955]

FATHER McNALLY

Georgetown University has lost a devoted leader and servant in the sudden death of the Rev. Paul A. McNally. Born on the same day with President Eisenhower, he came from his native Philadelphia to Woodstock College, Maryland, pledged to the Society of Jesus in 1908, and was graduated with the A. M. degree in 1917. Later he was at Innsbruck in Austria, Fordham University, the Gregorian

University in Rome and the University of California. Before beginning his Washington career in 1925 he taught mathematics at Boston College and at Fordham. His assignment at Georgetown Observatory commenced when the Rev. Edward C. Phillips was promoted to be provincial of the Maryland-New York province of the Jesuit order.

The aspect of astronomy which interested Father McNally most was that of solar eclipses. He joined forces with the National Geographic Society in expeditions to watch them in Soviet Siberia, Canton Island, and Brazil. But his ability as an administrator resulted in his being drafted away from his studies of the sky. He was made vice president of Georgetown University in 1942, directed the campaign for funds for the new Georgetown University Medical Center and then was appointed executive officer of the activities of the institution thus created, serving until a heart condition forced him to relinquish the task in 1953. Since that date most of his effort had been devoted to the Georgetown University physics department, for the development of which he formulated great plans.

A tireless and completely selfless worker, Father McNally was an inspiring example to scores of younger men. He insisted upon the highest standards, yet his popularity was a legend wherever he served.

A New Industrial Magazine Is Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the past few months a new magazine has put in its appearance in the field of American industrial journalism. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome and to extend best wishes to *Plastics Technology*. The plastics industry is one of the fastest growing in the United States and it is happy omen for its future that a magazine of the obvious caliber of this one has been established to meet the needs of intercommunication within the industry.

In this connection, I include an editorial appearing in the first issue which sets forth the aims and purposes of the new publication. The editorial follows:

A NEW INDUSTRIAL MAGAZINE IS BORN

This is the first issue of *Plastics Technology*—a new publication concerned primarily with the technical aspects of the plastics industry, and edited for the technical men in production, research, development, sales, service, and management.

It is a logical outgrowth of the plastics section of *Rubber World*, another Bill Brothers publication, and is timed to meet the needs for a publication which will report and review the technological advance of the industry.

This issue, volume 1, No. 1, presents a physical sample of the editorial formula we have developed out of the thoughtful suggestions of hundreds of plastics technologists who have given freely of their time and effort because of their realization of the need for such a publication. Here, all material will be carefully selected and edited for value to the reader, and presented in an honest, factual and comprehensive manner. Of necessity, some of our editorial aims are

long-range in nature, but we expect to achieve them in due course of time.

Certainly, in presenting *Plastics Technology* we do not assume to infringe upon the well-earned franchises of other established publications. Rather, we expect to carve out our individual niche and by intelligence and integrity thus serve those responsible for the extraordinary and rapid development of their industry. As the magazine of applied engineering it will be our special mission to chronicle and interpret the industry's advance and direction in a lively and interesting, but always accurate and unbiased fashion.

The plastics industry is now coming of age after an infancy associated with inflammable collar buttons and an adolescence of many misapplications. In maturity, plastics must take their place as recognized engineering materials that will contribute more and more to the advance of our industrial civilization. It is in this forward march that *Plastics Technology* undertakes to play an important part.

We could not conclude this brief expression of our editorial philosophy without thanking those who have helped so enthusiastically in the production of this first issue—our contributors, the men of the industry who make up our editorial advisory board, and our editorial staff. And being human, we shall be most happy to receive your comments—the brickbats as well as the bouquets—and your studied suggestions for making *Plastics Technology* progressively more useful to a vital and dynamic industry.

ARTHUR M. MERRILL,

Editor.

Detroit's Choir-Singing Congressman Rabaut: "Voice of the People"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, a most fitting tribute was paid to Representative LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT, of Michigan, in an article written by Reporter James M. Haswell, which appeared in the Sunday, March 6, 1955, issue of the *Detroit Free Press*. It is a pleasure and privilege to include this article in the RECORD:

DETROIT'S CHOIR-SINGING CONGRESSMAN KEEPS HIMSELF TUNED TO THE TIMES—RABAUT: "VOICE OF THE PEOPLE"

(By James M. Haswell)

WASHINGTON.—Detroit's East Side Congressman, LOUIS CHARLES RABAUT, 69, has a great human touch. With him, truly, politics is people. For 20 years LOUIS has called more Congressmen by their first names than any other man in Washington.

RABAUT came to Congress because of a protest against the machine age. He objected to industry's practice of firing men past 40.

"You are wrecking home life," he told Detroit efficiency engineers. "You are glorifying the young kid over his father by paying youth the big wages. You are putting the old man behind the stove in the family kitchen. It's no good, I tell you."

SINGS AVE MARIA AT RITES IN HOUSE

RABAUT was a marked Democrat from the day he entered the House as 14th District Representative. He could sing as well as talk. He had social poise, and made friends quickly.

Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, Democrat, Tennessee, almost at once put him on the Appropriations Committee, where now he has served longer than any man except Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, Missouri.

Within a few months Byrns died and RABAUT sang at funeral services held in the House. As his silvery tenor soared into the lovely melody of Ave Maria, official Washington recognized that a new personality had arrived.

Thereafter RABAUT sang in the White House, at political gatherings, in Washington churches, everywhere. He became the sweet singer of the New Deal, the choirboy who had come to Congress.

During two decades here RABAUT has supervised the spending of billions. He once saved taxpayers \$535 million by inserting 13 words in an appropriation bill.

"Not many Americans," says RABAUT, "ever get a chance to save half a billion dollars."

Once he drove a pork-barrel bill through the House with a single wisecrack. It was an economy year and the barrel wasn't full. RABAUT's job was to turn back hungry Congressmen who were proposing amendments to spend just a little more money.

"This Chamber rings with economy," RABAUT said sarcastically. "These walls echo the words, 'I am for economy—but not in my district.'" That stopped 'em. Not a man added a dollar to that bill that day.

RABAUT says the high spot of his committee service came the year he had charge of one big bill adding together all regular money bills of the session. The experiment wasn't repeated, but RABAUT still likes the idea.

"It is one way to impress on all the people," he says, "how much money the Federal Government spends."

During two decades of lawmaking RABAUT has voted with the New Deal, with labor, against drifting into war, for national defense, for the seaway, and for reciprocal trade. Labor once called him its 100 percent Congressman.

"PACK YOUR BAG," CONSUL IS TOLD

In the 1930's he was a globetrotter. "The people in my district," he says, "were very understanding. They knew that a Congressman must travel to learn his job."

In going about the world, RABAUT often was appalled by the length of time State Department officials lived abroad and how closely they identified themselves with foreign life.

Finally he ran across a consul in Scotland who hadn't been back to the United States in 19 years because his wife (Scotch) didn't like America.

"Pack your bag, brother," said RABAUT indignantly, "and get ready to travel."

RABAUT hustled back to the Secretary of State, the late Cordell Hull. Between them they drafted a rule that every State Department employee must revisit this country each 2 or 3 years.

It also was RABAUT's duty to supervise the Department of Justice budget. He worked closely with Attorneys General Homer Cummings, Frank Murphy, Francis Biddle, Robert Jackson, and Tom Clark.

RABAUT looks with pride on his service on the Commission which rebuilt the White House. His name is among those engraved on a marble memorial in the reconstructed building.

The latest accomplishment which pleases him is his part in revising the pledge of allegiance to the Flag. Congress inserted the words, "under God," so that it now reads, "one Nation under God." He also has induced the Postmaster General to place the words In God We Trust on stamps carrying letters abroad.

One year RABAUT entered wholeheartedly into a campaign to persuade Italians to vote against the Communist Party in Italy.

Afterward he was horrified to discover that many Italians holding United States citizenship had gone to the polls.

Their impulsive actions had cost them their United States standing. RABAUT spent several sessions lobbying through Congress a bill excusing these too-enthusiastic voters and restoring them to United States citizenship.

Not all of his causes succeed. When he wanted to protest against lifting meat price controls too soon after World War II, RABAUT wrote a song, "The Old Gray Mare," he sang to a delighted House, "will be a blue-plate special soon."

It was no use. Democrats laughed about the "horsemeat Congress," but the price controls came off anyway.

For several years RABAUT lobbied in vain for a bill to stop the galloping papas. What RABAUT had in mind was a measure permitting local welfare authorities to pursue deserting fathers across State boundaries.

"Uncle Sam helps support abandoned children," he says. "The bill is a big one. I thought runaway fathers ought to be caught and made to pay."

Like Speaker SAM RAYBURN and many other Democrats who brought the New Deal to town, RABAUT strongly resents current Republican talk about 20 years of treason. He considers that President Eisenhower's so-called security regulations may be used unfairly against individuals.

RABAUT's way of protesting was typically dramatic. He got up in the House on Lincoln's birthday, a year ago, and interrupted a Republican flood of oratory on the subject of liberty and freedom.

DEMANDS OUSTER OF GOP CHAIRMAN

RABAUT abruptly called on President Eisenhower to fire Leonard Hall, chairman of the GOP National Committee. He said that Hall is masterminding a plot to brand millions of Americans as traitors.

Coming to Congress in 1935 was an afterthought for RABAUT. He might have gone on the stage and become a singing star. As a boy he sang in the famed choir of Saints Peter and Paul Catholic Church in Detroit.

Gregory Freitag, the choirmaster, coached his solo parts, which he performed before more than 5,000 worshippers some Sundays. The Shubert brothers, big time theatrical producers, offered him a professional career.

"But father was against that," RABAUT recalls. "I could sing half a note above high C, and used several of Caruso's endings. But father wanted me to be a speaker, not a singer."

So young Louis stayed in the family wholesale business and went to Detroit College and later the Detroit College of Law. He won five gold medals for speaking. When he began practicing law, real estate was booming in Detroit and RABAUT became a landowner and home builder. He was well-to-do until the depression.

The Rabaut family are old Detroit merchants. Charles C. Rabaut and his wife, Madame Rabaut, came from Belgium to Detroit in the middle of the 1800's. Madame Rabaut opened a store on Woodward, where the J. L. Hudson Co. Downtown now stands. She and her husband sold French and Belgian laces. The shop was well-known in its day because the Rabauts kept a skilled lacemaker working in the store.

Later Madame Rabaut sold the retail lace business to J. L. Hudson, and with her son, Louis, moved the wholesale business to 208 E. Jefferson Avenue, opposite the present City-County Building. There it gradually became a wholesale notion supply house, with fireworks as a side line.

This was the business in which Choir Boy Rabaut grew up. Today, at 19565 Mack, Grosse Pointe Woods, Vincent Rabaut, a great-grandson of Madame Rabaut, is making a success of Rabaut's Fabric Mart, specializing in home draperies. A great-granddaughter, Mrs. August Amato, also makes draperies.

specializing in home draperies. A great-granddaughter, Mrs. August Amato, also makes draperies.

"We Rabauts always have a flair for color and decoration," the Congressman says, proudly.

RABAUT says there are more than 50 Rabauts in Detroit, descendants of the original lace merchants. He has 9 children and 19 grandchildren. His father had a family of 11.

Religious devotion has been a Rabaut family trait. RABAUT has a sister who is a nun. Another sister, who was also a nun, is now dead.

The Congressman has three daughters in church orders.

Sister Mary Palmyre, IHM, is a librarian at Marygrove College, Detroit; Sister Stella Maris, IHM, teaches in the Girls Academy at Monroe, Mich., and Sister Martha Marie, IHM, teaches at the Holy Rosary School, Detroit.

His oldest son, Father Francis Dermott Rabaut, S. J., serves on the faculty of Loyola University in Chicago.

Another son, Louis, is a Detroit lawyer. Three of his daughters have married. They are Mrs. Amato, Mrs. Jules DePore, and Mrs. John Barrett, all of Detroit.

DAUGHTERS WORK IN DAD'S OFFICE

Several of the girls worked in father's office in Washington at times. It's an old congressional custom to put relative on the office payroll. Many of them just draw pay. But with the Rabauts it was different. These girls worked, and made the office hum. Louis bragged about how much he paid them, and swore the family couldn't get along without their money.

Unlike other Detroit Democrats in Congress, RABAUT has had strong Republican opposition to meet in his district. He has met, through the years, Carl Weideman, now a judge; Fred M. Alger, later Secretary of State and now Ambassador to Belgium; O. Z. Ide, now a judge; Miles Culehan, now a judge; Joseph Moynihan, Jr., son of the Detroit judge; Harold Youngblood, and Richard Durant.

He lost to Weideman in 1932, and to Youngblood in 1946. "But I beat them both later," he says.

Request From Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the committee investigating Communist aggression, in the 83d Congress, has been receiving a great number of requests from nations all over the world for reports on its findings and recorded testimony.

I am herewith submitting a typical letter which was received from Rev. Lloyd I. Glass, M. M., a former prisoner of the Chinese Communists:

CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO, March 4, 1955.
SPECIAL PROJECT ON COMMUNISM,
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I wish to express my deepest admiration for the public service you have done in making available the reports on Communist aggression.

If possible I should like to procure five additional copies of the "summary report of

the Select Committee on Communist Aggression," and also if it is available a copy of the report on "Communist Aggression in China." I was a prisoner of the Chinese Reds for 19 months and I find your reports the most authentic and valuable of any in print in America.

Sincerely and gratefully,

REV. LLOYD I. GLASS, M. M.

Labor-Management Relations at Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., Boise, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN WELKER

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the State of Idaho, which I have the honor in part, to represent is indeed proud of the world's largest construction engineering firm, namely, the Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., and its subsidiary corporations, which have done great work not only in the United States but also, I dare say, in almost every country on the face of the globe.

In these days, when we hear so much criticism of those who have made free enterprise work, when we hear them called materialists and industrialists and haters of labor, when we hear it said that management cannot get along with labor, I am moved by an article which I read in the March 1955, issue of The EM-Kayan, official publication of Morrison-Knudson Co. This company, incidentally, has the finest labor-management relationship that it has been my privilege ever to have observed. If more persons would pay attention to the profound remarks made by the president of the Morrison-Knudson Co., Mr. Harry W. Morrison, I feel certain there would be less bickering between labor and management.

It was my privilege as a young boy to have seen the beginning of what is now a giant corporation. I saw it grow from humble beginnings to be the largest company of its kind in the world.

Listen now, Mr. President, to the words of the president of Morrison-Knudson Co., when he speaks not only to the laboring man, but also to supervisors and other persons.

I read from his statement in the March issue of the company's magazine:

The company's continuing investment in accident insurance, safety supervision, and safety equipment is substantial; but no amount of mere money can be measured against the life of a man carelessly lost—as any widow will testify. Time lost in a hospital bed is never recovered by the employee or the company.

Mr. Morrison closes with this exhortation:

Keep alert to keep alive. Safety is no accident.

I have never heard more profound or finer words addressed to labor or management.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire message of President Harry W. Morrison, of the Morrison-Knudson Co., Inc., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S MEMO—SUBJECT: PASTE THESE SLOGANS IN YOUR HARD HAT

No more important advice that I know of can be constantly urged upon the construction men of M-K than is expressed in the blunt but realistic catch phrase: "Keep alert to keep alive."

Through the years, each month's back cover of this magazine (except our annual New Year's covers) has illustrated an actual situation on an M-K job, portrayed by our own cartoonist as an example of unsafe performance that has caused a serious accident. Please read and absorb these messages, gentlemen, and remember especially the ones that apply to your own work or the work of men under your supervision.

The management is proud of the fact that for several years our safety records have progressively improved and are generally better than the the national averages for comparable operations. We are delighted with frequent reports printed in the *En-Kayan* safety column of awards made by Government engineers to M-K jobs for outstanding safety performance. These Government agencies and, likewise, private owners for whom we work are increasingly conscious of the good or bad safety reputations of the construction jobs they authorize.

The company's continuing investment in accident insurance, safety supervision, and safety equipment is substantial; but no amount of mere money can be measured against the life of a man carelessly lost—as any widow will testify. Time lost in a hospital bed is never recovered by the employee or the company.

Our earnest appeal to every thinking man of M-K—and I trust we have no others—is to memorize these two easy slogans and keep them in mind until you are ready for retirement at a ripe old age: "Keep alert to keep alive," and "Safety is no accident."

H. W. MORRISON.

Westinghouse Annual Science Talent Search

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there was held in the Nation's Capital the award dinner of the Annual Science Talent Search conducted by Science Service throughout the Nation as a means of encouraging the interest of young people in a scientific career.

Naturally, I was particularly pleased to note that a fine young lady from my own State, Miss Kathleen Hable, aged 18, of Loyal, Wis., was awarded the second highest honor.

But, irrespective of that, I pay tribute to the great job which is being done by the Science Clubs of America, an activity of Science Service, whose noted director is Mr. Watson Davis.

Officers of Science Service are: Dr. Leonard Carmichael, president, secretary of Smithsonian Institute; Mr. Charles Scripps, vice president, chairman of board of E. W. Scripps Co.; Mr. O. W. Riegel, treasurer, director, Washington and Lee School of Journalism.

Science Service itself is a nonprofit corporation with trustees nominated by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the E. W. Scripps estate, and the journalistic profession.

By means of the science clubs, which it sponsors—15,000 clubs in the United States and abroad, including more than one-third of a million boys and girls—we are getting our youngsters to start in high school on the adventuresome paths of physics, chemistry, astronomy, biology, geology, and all the innumerable other phases of modern science.

Also, by means in particular of the science fairs, 70 of which are affiliated, including the one in my own science-minded State, Americans can participate at the grassroots.

On April 15, 16, and 17, there will occur at Brooks Memorial Union, Marquette University, the Southeast Wisconsin Science Fair, sponsored by Marquette and the Milwaukee Journal. Director of the fair is Father L. W. Friedrich, and working with him is an outstanding group of civic, industrial, educational, labor, engineering, and other leaders who are going to make this fair a grand success, I am sure. The National Science Fair winners will be selected at the nationwide competition taking place in Cleveland on May 12 to 14.

I am sure, too, that next year there will be still more science fairs affiliated in the national competition, and I am wishing every success for the continued flourishing of this grand concept.

Increasingly, our Nation is aware of the dangerous shortage of scientists and of the necessity of expanding their ranks. The Westinghouse talent search is one vital means of achieving this fine objective.

In the March 1, 1955, issue of the *New York Times* magazine there appeared an article describing the meeting by the young science talent winners with the President, and referring to the fine address which was delivered at the award dinner by Assistant Secretary of Defense, Donald A. Quarles. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask a question. Is it not true that a North Dakota girl received the first prize?

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator is correct. I am glad the Senator is on his toes today, and recognizes that while the folks in North Dakota may not obtain ambassadorships, occasionally they win first prize.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLENTOWN BOY IS SCIENCE VICTOR—CHOSEN FROM FINAL LIST OF 40 FOR \$2,800 SCHOLARSHIP IN WESTINGHOUSE CONTEST

WASHINGTON, February 23.—A 17-year-old physicist-mathematician-chemist, Frederick P. Greenleaf, of Allentown, Pa., received tonight the \$2,800 Westinghouse grand science scholarship.

He was chosen from a field of 40 high-school seniors for his method of separating metals by distillation. The method is regarded as widely useful in such processes as refining and atomic fuel production.

Second honor, a \$2,000 Westinghouse science scholarship, was won by Kathleen A. Hable, 18, of Loyal, Wis., who submitted "an exacting study in heredity." She traced a widow's peak in a Wisconsin family for 4 generations which included 65 individuals. She found frequency of more than 50 percent in the fourth generation.

Next was Vaughan A. Aandahl, 17, of Denver, a biologist, who brought here a collection of butterflies and moths. He was 1 of 8 contestants who won \$400 scholarships.

OTHER \$400 WINNERS

The others were Thomas S. Briggs, 16, of San Francisco; Charles Jetter Eichman, 17, of Audubon, N. J.; Roald Hoffman, 17, of Woodside, Queens, N. Y.; W. Stanley Marshall, 18, of Nashville, Tenn.; David K. Hergaard, 18, of Princeton, N. J.; James E. Potter, 17, of Rockford, Ill.; and Daniel H. Wilson, 17, of Kansas City, Kans.

The 40 contestants, 32 boys and 8 girls, visited President Eisenhower at the White House during the day.

Instead of making a speech to them he asked them questions about their projects. In his informal chat he said that he thought there should be more junior colleges in the country.

Tonight's awards in the Westinghouse Annual Science Talent Search were made at a banquet. Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense, said in an address that the talent search touches on the security of all of us.

"Like it or not," he declared, "we are in a race for technological supremacy with Communist world and this science talent search has a direct bearing on the outcome of this race."

INCENTIVES IN UNITED STATES STRESSED

He asserted that the Soviet Union was now "graduating well-trained scientists and engineers at more than twice the rate we are in this country." But, he added, because of our freedom and incentives "their pool would have to be considerably larger before it equalled the effectiveness of our own."

"Nevertheless, these statistics must give us pause," he continued. "We certainly can no longer take our superiority and military technology for granted."

He noted that the President had sent to Congress a plan to modify and expand the Selective Service Act and to revamp the National Reserve System. He declared that the training and use of scientists and engineers was an important part of the President's plan and that it included research grants and special scholarships.

He told the young scientists that work like theirs stimulated the interest of young people in professional careers in the physical sciences and engineering.

He closed by asserting that success against communism would depend on moral fiber as well as scientific skills.

Intrigue in the Arab World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article written by J. Benari, appeared in the February 1955 issue of Jewish World.

Is this the way we will stop Communist aggression in the Middle East?

INTRIGUE IN THE ARAB WORLD

(By J. Benari)

Two very important conferences have just taken place in the Middle East: The meeting in Damascus of United States envoys to the Arab countries and Israel, and the Cairo session of the Arab League, attended by the foreign ministers of the league countries and by the personal representative of the King of Saudi Arabia.

The Cairo meeting was arranged with the view of forging the future policy of the Arab world, whereas the purpose of the Damascus gathering was to give Mr. George Allen, newly appointed Assistant Secretary of State in Washington, an opportunity to explore the political scene in the Middle East.

The Cairo Conference had a touch of unreality. The foreign ministers or at least some of the Arab countries realized that they represented unstable regimes, regimes to which the people concerned not only failed to give their support but even registered their violent opposition. The meeting only demonstrated the chimera of a united Arab world.

The conference reached an agreement in principle—defense of the Arab countries through the League Security Pact. Each Arab country would, however, have the right to decide independently on the acceptance of financial or military aid from a foreign power.

ROOTS OF DISSENSION

It is known that Saudi Arabia and Egypt violently opposed Iraq's decision to the agreement with the United States regarding the delivery of arms to that country. The decision of the league typifies the defeat of both Saudi Arabia and Egypt and leads itself to one interpretation only: the league was unable to reach a decision on this vital issue. The schism in the Arab League is now greater than ever since the creation of the league by Great Britain. The Damascus conference of the American ambassadors attempted a realistic evaluation of the Arab scene, and was faced with a gloomy picture of instability, brutal oppression, dissension, and potential danger prevailing in the Arab world.

General elections were held recently in Iraq, Syria, and Jordan. In Iraq and Jordan the Parliaments were dissolved; new elections were held with the specific purpose of impressing the State Department and Whitehall with "stable" governments and thus facilitating negotiations for agreements on military aid. The Syrian elections were held in order to give the country a representative government and lead Syria into the Fertile Crescent Federation. How the elections in Iraq and Jordan were conducted and how "stable" governments were established is told by the Arab press itself.

The independent Lebanese daily Al Hayat, an old and faithful friend of Iraq, published the following account of the elections in Iraq:

"Nuri es-Said's policy, his contempt for his country's government and his fallacies, have brought discontent in Iraq to a new

peak. The last elections were a farce which made not only Iraq but the whole world laugh at this travesty. Nuri es-Said assembled a Parliament composed of his relatives and of servants to his policy. For the first time in history a premier appoints all his relatives to sit in the chamber of deputies. He has not one single relative left outside the chamber unless it be one whom he appointed to the Senate. The people of Iraq boycotted the elections. The withdrawal of the two Istiqlal deputies from the chamber makes this boycott complete. It cannot be said that Iraq has a Parliament since 80 percent of its deputies have been thrust on the constituencies by a government order and without due elections."

And the Lebanese daily concluded:

"We fail to see how the Premier proposes to set about such important matters as talks with Britain with that type of Parliament. For if Nuri ignores the people and the remains of its representatives in the chamber of deputies, the people will, as a result, disassociate themselves from Nuri's decisions."

No wonder that a prominent Baghdad diplomat commented in London:

"Only one heartbeat of the aging Nuri stands between Iraq and grave disorder."

The government has already, anticipating some public manifestations, banned all political parties and has dissolved all religious affiliations, measures which dealt the severest blow to the national and religious minorities.

ELECTIONS IN JORDAN

The elections in Jordan did not exactly follow the pattern set by Nuri in Baghdad. There were violent and bloody incidents. We will again quote an Arab source. Nasser ed-Din Nashashibi, one time master ceremonies to the King, and Jordan's Director General of Broadcasting, describes the elections in the Cairo weekly Ashker Saa as follows:

"I watched the electoral battle in Amman and had a hearty laugh. I laughed at the government officials, who issued bulletins every hour, claiming that the country was calm, whilst the legion's and the demonstrators' machine guns rattled in almost every town and village. I laughed at the candidates who shouted themselves hoarse speechmaking and who wasted their money on an election, since they knew full well that the result was a foregone conclusion."

Nashashibi, a shrewd political observer endowed with a sense of humor, continues:

"The theory of political science has it that democracy calls for the free interplay of political parties. The Jordanian elections, however, like the elections in Iraq, Lebanon, and Yemen, were conducted in an atmosphere hostile to parties. Parties appointed by the Government were unable to convince the voters, whereas non-Government parties were unable to convince the Government of their integrity. Thus, the sole arbiter of the contest was—the candidate's relationship to the Government. If he was its friend—he won. If he was its enemy—well, there was always the army and the army's bloc vote to stand in his way. I say that 27,000 of the electors' vote remained a secret known only to Allah and General Glub Pasha. The people voiced openly," concludes Nashashibi, "that the elections were fraudulent. Opposition supporters went into the streets. The legion went after them with guns and armor. The people rose in Amman and the victims fell. After Amman the turn came for Es-Salt, Nablus, Ramallah, Irbid and Jenin. Arrests began. Censorship was clamped down and the farcical elections were over."

Palestinian Arabs in Jordan outnumber Jordanians by 3 to 1, but in politics, in administration, in the Government, in Parliament, commerce, and business the Palestinian Arabs are not trusted. The country

is governed by martial law and by Glub Pasha's bayonets.

Syria emerged after the elections more divided than ever, with an unstable Government supported by an "independent" plurality of 67 out of 142 deputies. The Shaab Party, champion of a federation with Iraq, has lost its majority and received only 27 seats in spite of the open and generous support it received from the Iraqi Government. Never before was the position in Syria so unstable as after the elections, and the separation between the Government and the nation, especially the national and religious minorities, is complete. Everybody agrees that the situation is tense and may lead at any time to a violent explosion.

From Libya and Yemen, the American Ambassadors can only bring reports of disorder, political assassinations and dark conspiracies of underground movements. Ibrahim al-Shalhi, the power behind the throne in of underground movements. Ibrahim al-Shalhi, the power behind the throne in Libya, was assassinated by a member of the Royal Senoussi family. The popular underground movements in Cyrenaica and Tripoli work independently. The People's Party there is supported by the majority of young officers of the army and police and by Government officials, and has a political program which openly proclaims political assassination as its cardinal principle.

Libya is on the verge of revolution and anarchy. The King refuses to live in his capital and prefers to live in Tobruk, not far from the Egyptian border.

TROUBLE IN YEMEN

Not less disquieting are the reports which reach the free world from closely guarded Yemen. The Imam of Yemen—Yahya, established his rule over the country after the assassination of his father in 1948, and then only at the price of handing over his capital, Sana'a, to the hungry and savage tribes of the desert who supported him. The tribesmen looted the capital, captured the womenfolk and the Imam did not dare to set foot in his capital until 1954. As in Libya, the ruler is subservient to pressure from members of the royal family, from vested commercial interests, and from tribal families. A strong opposition is, however, making itself felt in the ranks of the younger generation, many of whom have been educated in Egypt. A revolutionary movement is now being organized by Yemenite students and military cadets in Cairo under the title "Young Yemenite Party." The party expects to receive a loan from Egypt, and has proclaimed its intention to depose the present Imam, having already agreed on his successor, who, it appears, has accepted the principle of a parliamentary monarchy. Among their adherents the party claims the majority of the Imam's brothers as well as the 300 Egyptian-trained army officers. They realize, of course, that they will encounter armed opposition on the part of the tribes, but believe that the army will gain the upper hand.

The Egyptian political scene is well known to American diplomats. Everyone concerned in Egypt, as well as in Washington, seeks an answer to the classical question: "The rebels are all conquered, but are they all exterminated?" The gallows may be an effective measure for an oriental government—but even in the Levant they are not a substitute for a policy.

Iraq and Syria, Libya and Yemen, Egypt and Jordan, are breeding disorder and anarchy. American arms may save the present regimes in those countries for a certain period of time. No one can, however, guarantee that the arms will not eventually pass into the hands of the conspirators and potential rebels of tomorrow, as was the case in China with the American arms supplied to Chiang Kai-shek.

A Bill To Authorize Issuance of a Stamp To Honor Amelia Earhart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressman from the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts, I today introduced a bill in Congress which authorizes the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of, and bearing the likeness of, Medford's own Amelia Earhart.

While it may be truthfully said that Amelia Earhart was not born in Medford but rather in Kansas on July 24, 1898, still we citizens of Massachusetts and particularly those proud citizens of Medford have as great a claim to Miss Earhart not only because she made her home here for many years but, as a matter of fact, we are further proud of the fact that her mother and her sister still reside in our district in the city of Medford.

Amelia Earhart is recognized as the most outstanding of all aviatrix. From the time of her first flight in 1920 until the cruel Pacific wave tops reached for her gallant spirit on July 7, 1937, there was never for her any music quite like the cadence of the skies with its unbounded mysteries to be discovered. Miss Earhart was the first woman to fly the great expanses of both the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. She was the first woman to reach the height of 14,000 feet, and one of the first American fliers of either sex to experiment with air-cooled engines, which later proved so valuable in our Nation's hour of need. In fact, Amelia Earhart is rightfully acknowledged as the supersaleswoman of our great aviation industry. She slogged out distance records, pioneered the autogiro, tested experimental planes and engines, gave hundreds of young enthusiasts their air instruction, boosted air travel with learned articles and thousands of lectures.

All men admired her for her femininity and good sportsmanship. All women warmed to her modesty, her championship of careers for their daughters. She was showered with honors and decorations, was feted by royalty, mobbed whenever and wherever she appeared in public. She was the best known woman of her day, and with it all her head remained unturned and she was the sweet epitome of gentle womanhood that we all look up to and admire.

Few women have been able to contribute so much to their country in such a short time as Amelia Earhart. Every day we see more clearly the outstanding contributions that she made to the happiness, the progress, and the welfare of the American people and to the strength and security of our Nation. Men and women everywhere cling in their sorrow to her unconquerable courage and selfless devotion in building American aviation. There is now no question that

she, too, gave her life in our Nation's and humanity's war for freedom of all people. It is to be hoped that the commemorative stamp will be issued as it will pay tribute to Amelia Earhart, a truly remarkable woman and a real American, and keep immemorial the services she so unselfishly gave our country, thereby encouraging thousands of American young women in their efforts to make this country even a greater place in which to live.

A Major Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith an editorial written by one of the foremost editors of Kansas.

The gentleman writing this is Mr. Rollo Clymer, of El Dorado, Kans. He is "listened to" by the people of Kansas. His editorial speaks for itself:

A MAJOR MISTAKE

Congress gets blamed for a lot of matters—some justly, some unfairly.

But Congress will have none but itself to blame if the salary grab it has engineered for itself sets off another hectic round of wage-raising in this country, together with a myriad of labor-management disputes and a new kink in the inflationary spiral.

Something of the sort seems bound to happen as the result of Congress' deep dip into the Treasury for the benefit of its own Members. Congress may well set a model or pattern in this respect for those who want more money for their services—and thus Congress bears a heavy responsibility for its actions to date.

This newspaper is not in sympathy with the view expressed in some quarters that the pay for Congressmen is too low and should be raised on a 50- or 100-percent basis. If Congress had cut itself a 10-percent slice of cake, it might have been viewed as within the limits of reason, and passed over without serious objection. But for Congress to move into the guarded precincts of the Treasury and help itself to a lion's hunk of the wherewithal there amassed does not seem to be justified by the circumstances.

After all Congressmen are paid well, judging by the circumstances of most of the humpbacked taxpayers the Nation over. And while the market in Wall Street may be soaring to giddy heights and silver-tongued economists predict that the present business boom will roll along indefinitely, lots of businesses and lots of citizens out here in the hinterlands have a difficult time in making both ends meet. If another wave in the inflationary spiral is touched off, many of them simply don't know how they will manage—people with little homes they are trying to pay for, with children to educate, and with ungodly taxes of all sorts to pay.

The rank-and-file folk of this country ought to be able to look to Congress with some confidence that this body will help to hold material affairs in line until we all can adjust ourselves to the changes of a rapidly developing peacetime economy. But when Congress acts the hog regarding its own personal emolument, then such guidance is distressingly absent.

If Congressmen don't like their present pay, they should get out and go to work at some private occupation like the rest of us. Nobody asked them to run for office in the first place. Nobody certainly had in mind that they would demand top-flight pay for what—on many occasions—is only second-class performance and matter.

(NOTE.—This editorial will not be republished in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

North Dakota Legislature Asks President's Commission To Reject Transfer of Certain Soil Conservation Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I submit this resolution by the North Dakota Legislature detailing objections to proposals of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture which would transfer the function of soil conservation technical assistance to the various States. The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the President of the United States and his Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture relative to transfer of the function of soil-conservation technical assistance to the various States

Whereas the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, a subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, has reportedly recommended to the Commission the transfer of the function of soil-conservation technical assistance to the various States; and

Whereas the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing more than 2,600 soil-conservation districts in the United States, and the North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts, representing 79 soil-conservation districts in this State, along with other individuals, groups, and organizations who are vitally interested in the program, are opposed to the reported recommendation; and

Whereas if the reported recommendation is approved it would place an inordinately heavy financial burden upon the State of North Dakota, since the contemplated State appropriation each biennium could amount to a sum in excess of \$1 million if assistance to local soil-conservation districts is to be maintained at current levels; and

Whereas such program would greatly retard, if not eventually destroy, the national program of soil and water conservation now being carried on, and since the problem is national in scope, it should be dealt with accordingly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the President of the United States and the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations are hereby respectfully memorialized and urged not to approve the reported recommendations of the Committee on Federal Aid to Agriculture, relative to gradual transfer of soil-conservation technical assistance functions from the national authority to the various States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the Chairman of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Nation's Capital.

K. WELCH,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. R. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENS,
Secretary of the Senate.

North Dakota Legislature Condemns Proposal To Close State's Two Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following resolution of the North Dakota Legislature pertaining to recommendations by the Hoover Commission task force.

The resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Concurrent resolution relating to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the closing of the Minot and Fargo veterans' hospitals

Whereas a recent report of the Hoover Commission after a study of the Veterans' Administration has recommended that the veterans' hospitals at Fargo and Minot be closed; and

Whereas adoption of the report of the Hoover Commission would mean that veterans of the State of North Dakota would have to travel for medical treatment between 250 and 650 miles to Minneapolis where the nearest veterans hospital would be located; and

Whereas such action would result in unfair discrimination and hardship to the veterans of the State of North Dakota who are in need of medical treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the President and Congress of the United States are hereby urged and requested to allow the veterans' hospitals in the cities of Fargo and Minot in the State of North Dakota to remain open in order to provide adequate and accessible medical treatment to the veterans of this State; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to the President of the United States, the chairmen of the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees of the United States Congress, the Commissioner of Veterans' Affairs, and to all Members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.
K. A. FITCH,
Speaker of the House.
KENNETH L. MORGAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Address of Department Commander Charles N. Collatos, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Department Commander Charles N. Collatos, Department of Massachusetts, the American Legion, at the recent testimonial extended to him. Over 11,000 Legionnaires attended his testimonial and I greatly enjoyed his address. I hope many others may have an opportunity to read it:

American opinion is far from clear upon the tangled problems of fact, law, policy, and morality which Communist-inspired situations involve.

There are people of intelligence, standing, patriotism, and high courage who, now and later, will differ from the prevailing opinion touching the proper method for dealing with international bandits and murderers.

The foreign policy of our Nation, until recently, has been distinguished by strong leading traits, patience, good judgment, and a forbearance scarcely paralleled in our history.

The spirit manifested toward other nations has been frank, conciliatory and consistent. The policy, of necessity, has been defensive for we are, basically, a peace-loving people.

We have negotiated important agreements and made substantial material contributions as we constantly pursue our chief objective of warding off international mischief and eventual chaos.

Persuasion, earnest and constant, has been employed, to no avail, to make Russia and her satellites respect the law of nations.

It is no new thing for governments to ally, confederate, or even consolidate in the common cause of justice.

Nor is disagreement between nations anything new or novel either.

But the recollection of the Korean war, its exchange of war prisoners, and the recent disclosure from Peiping with reference to Americans now held by the Chinese Reds on trumped-up charges, rankles in the American mind as disbelief, dismay, and indignation quickly succeed each other.

The argument most violently advanced today, Collatos declared, is that no clear avenue exists by which we can escape the consequences of a showdown save the dishonorable and humiliating one of leaving our fellow Americans to their fate at the hands of these international butchers.

Subscription to such an alternative is cowardly, useless, foolhardy, and a shameful retreat from the principles that have bound Americans from Valley Forge to Iwo Jima.

The spirit of 1776 still dominates the loyal American mind.

Public opinion moves onward relentlessly. This majority conscience is convinced that, if our way of life is to endure; if we are to preserve our heritage as free men, we must recognize the fatal antagonism, born of the murderous red heart, that now exists between us and the bandit governments bent on world enslavement, declared Collatos who is a labor relations commissioner for Massachusetts.

To consider this intolerable situation in any other light manifests a narrowness of vision which marked the early division of other peoples and the ultimate domination of their lands by those whose sole resources are force and cruelty.

The Communist grows more insufferably insolent with each passing day.

Too long have they been pampered by civilized nations as they continue to extort, again and again, an ignoble ransom of concession for each new outrage.

In sheer ugliness of despotism; in wholesale systematic barbarism; in irredeemable corruption and clumsy circumvention, the Chinese Communist out does even his Kremlin masters in their defiance of international law and contempt for the legitimate.

The farther we recede from the truth; the farther we recede from the rock of manliness and honor, the sooner will the curtain drop upon this lurid prisoner drama which must, of necessity, sicken every American heart.

Despondency, like the black clouds above, must be made to disappear before the sunshine of justice.

We are Americans. That means much to me.

It means much to you.

It means so very much to our fellow-Americans now in Communist hands.

We must face the facts.

Our forefathers resented the pretense of ruling them from across the seas—and Britain lost her most precious territorial possession.

The Barbary Pirates demanded tribute for American freedom of the seas and received an abundance of shellfire in response which committed their Corsair fleet to the bottom of Tripoli's waters.

Our English brothers of 1812 sought to impress American sailors into their naval service and our infant Navy soon dispelled their illusion of unassailable supremacy of the waves.

Spain learned that excuses could not raise the battleship *Maine* nor return our heroic dead.

Kaiser Wilhelm, Mussolini, Hitler, and Tojo, each of them, had the lesson driven home that the flag of these United States, though soft in texture, represents the combined strength, power, and fury of the just under God.

Reprisal instead of ransom and concession must be the rule against those who recognize no law of man or God.

Our enemies know that peace is our interest—and peace we always seek. But, if we are forced from our position, reason and passion, will, as in the past, prompt a firmness on our part that no power can long ignore.

This our Government knows—this our Government should never forget.

America is still the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Correct an Injustice of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act. This bill provides that a widow who loses her widow's benefits by remarriage may again be-

come entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage.

Recently my attention was called to a situation in my home of Everett, Wash., which pointed up very sharply the need for the legislation I have proposed. A widow became entitled to widow's benefits under the Social Security Act. Shortly thereafter she married a second time. Within 9 months her second husband died. Upon her remarriage the widow's benefits from her first husband were, of course, terminated. Under the present wording of the Social Security Act, the widow received no benefits from the second husband following his death as the statute stipulates that the parties must have been married for a full year. So, at the age of 67, this woman finds herself twice widowed and unable to receive any widow's benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that such a situation was ever intended and my amendment to the Social Security Act would correct it. While the requirement of 1 full year of marriage is perhaps, under ordinary circumstances, a justifiable standard to prevent fraud, such a standard has no application in these special conditions. Furthermore, under my bill the benefits to which the widow will be entitled upon the death of her second husband are those of her former husband. Thus, there is no chance that a remarriage would be arranged on the chance of receiving higher benefits from the death of a second husband of less than 1 year.

The situation which my bill seeks to correct is unjust. I believe it is incumbent upon Congress to make sure that social security benefits are not kept from the deserving by unnecessary technicalities of the law.

Bricker's Hope a Must—There Is Great Need for This Constitutional Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing demand throughout the country that the 84th Congress adopt a constitutional amendment as proposed by Senator JOHN BRICKER. Treaties and executive agreements that can override domestic law and constitutional rights are a dangerous threat to our liberties.

The Milwaukee Sentinel on March 9 has a timely editorial on this subject and I offer it at this point in the RECORD:

BRICKER'S HOPE

Commenting on the chances that the present Congress will approve his constitutional amendment calling for control of the Executive treaty-making power, Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, says he hopes President Eisenhower will no longer oppose it.

Last year, the measure failed to pass the Senate by just one vote short of the required

two-thirds majority. It was reintroduced January 6 this year.

"I hope that the President is for it," said BRICKER, "and I am confident he wants to protect the rights of the American people."

We share that confidence and hope.

We also believe that the amendment should pass without regard to any one President's desire, intention or determination to protect the rights of the American people.

Mr. Eisenhower has shown he can be depended on not to conclude treaties or agreements with other nations without the approval of Congress.

But there is no guaranty whatever, as the Constitution is now worded, against a future President committing the Nation to unwise foreign treaties.

A glance at the immediate past provides dire warnings against giving our Executive a blank check in international relations.

The Bricker amendment is designed to curb a power that Mr. Eisenhower obviously and properly does not care to exercise.

Nevertheless it is a power clearly abused by predecessors and open to abuse by successors.

According to the Constitution today, treaties are the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Treaties or executive agreements, in short, can override the laws Americans make for themselves.

The Bricker amendment provides that no foreign pact shall become effective, nor become domestic law, without valid legislation. That's all it calls for.

But it's more than enough to make its passage a vital need.

In Favor of Bill H. R. 4720 To Provide Incentives for Members of Armed Services by Increasing Certain Pay and Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly pleased that the House Committee on Armed Services has reported favorably H. R. 4720, a bill to provide incentives for members of the Armed Forces by increasing certain pays and allowances.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage continued service so as to avoid the tremendous turnover of personnel that now prevails in the armed services.

The President, in a message to Congress on January 13, 1955, set forth with convincing and cogent reasons the necessity and advisability of passing legislation that would encourage officers and enlisted men to continue in the service on a career basis in order to obtain maximum usefulness from the skills and leadership which are achieved after long and costly training.

When the type of service that is now required of our men, whether they serve on land, sea, or in the air, is considered it becomes readily apparent that increasing mechanization and complexity of defense forces as stated by the President in his message make technical skills

and a wide background of experiences vastly more important than ever before.

All of this is sufficient in itself to justify the passage of the bill now before us. But in addition thereto is the fact that during 1954 the armed services experienced one of the lowest reenlistment rates in the history of the Nation. This applies to every branch of our services.

The situation with regard to officers is equally alarming. The report submitted by the Armed Services Committee of the House in support of this legislation has given the detailed figures. It confirms the general statement that I have made that the situation is alarming.

Not only does the lack of reenlistments in sufficient numbers justify the passage of legislation of this character as a means, we hope, of correcting that situation, but the cost involved in training service personnel reaches such proportions as to make it necessary to adopt some means of making the services appealing enough to incline men to remain in service and thereby diminish the cost of training programs for additional men. It is known, as the report sets forth, that each man who enters the armed services and undergoes basic training and up to the time of assignment to his first unit, involves approximately 6 months, costs the Government \$3,200 in pay, allowances, subsistence, clothing, and overhead directly chargeable to the trainee together with the costs chargeable to the trainers. Thus, if the reenlistment rate could be increased by only 100,000 individuals in the year 1955, the savings cost alone for replacements would be tremendous and most worthwhile.

To increase the number of reenlistments the present legislation limits the pay increases to officers with 3 years and over of service, and enlisted personnel with 2 years and over of service. Thus it can be seen that the objective is solely and entirely to encourage officers and men to continue in the service. However, I am personally of the opinion that it would have been proper under existing circumstances to allow some increase for enlisted men and their dependents. We are all familiar with the financial hardships that are created when a father, or a son supporting his aged parents, is called into service. While I would have liked to see the bill grant some help to these whom I have just mentioned, yet I am aware of the necessity of the bill as presented and, accordingly, it has my approval and support.

Interest Grows in Copyright Factfinding Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I introduced on January 20 a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws

and to make recommendations for their revision," and set forth the background of this proposal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. On March 2, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, WILLIAM LANGER, introduced a companion measure, S. 1254, in the Senate.

There has been a growing interest in this proposal for a study commission, and I am pleased to be able to include here the following items as evidence of that interest:

[From Billboard magazine of March 12, 1955]

FACTFINDING HEATS UP

Although the habits of Congress are a bit difficult to understand—as when a Senator and Congressman introduce one another's conflicting bills—the pattern of events during the past 2 weeks indicates factfinding is gaining strength.

The original advantage enjoyed by the licensing agencies, an advantage derived from the almost unprecedented organized strength behind the Kilgore bill, is slowly being dissipated. The gap is narrowing not so much because of defensive measures on the part of the jukebox industry, but because the legislators are becoming more aware of the tremendous complications involved. They are learning that a lot of missing facts must be amassed before conclusions can be drawn.

That such an awareness should crystallize is inevitable. It develops as more and more people become cognizant of the opinions of unbiased copyright experts, such as Prof. Walter J. Derenberg, professor of law at New York University and a member of Attorney General Herbert Brownell's antitrust committee, and Prof. Benjamin Kaplan, of the Harvard University School of Law.

There is no black or white, right or wrong to the copyright problem. It is not as simple as that. Congress, for over 30 years, has unsuccessfully tried to come up with the answer. The Kilgore bill is exactly the same as those which stymied previous legislatures.

Let's be done with the time-consuming, misguided effort. Let's get into the basic economics of the problem, the basic economics of the music business. Let factfinding go beyond the licensing agencies, beyond the Music Operators of America, to the people who are directly involved—the operators, writers, and publishers.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
New York, N. Y., February 23, 1955.
The Honorable FRANK J. THOMPSON, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON: As you may know, our law school has done some pioneer work in the field of copyright and we are currently conducting a seminar in advanced problems on literary and artistic property which is attended by some 40 graduate students. Your bill, H. R. 2677, proposing a Federal fact-finding commission to study revision of the copyright law, has stimulated a great deal of discussion here and I am taking the liberty of suggesting to you some thoughts that have occurred to me in this connection.

I have been a member of the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws, which is about to submit its report to the Attorney General within the next 2 or 3 weeks. This committee consists of some 60 experts in antitrust law representing both private and public points of view, who were appointed by the Attorney General upon recommendations made by the co-chairmen of the committee, the Honorable

Stanley N. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General and head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, of the University of Michigan Law School. No congressional action preceded the appointment of the committee and its work was financed by the appropriation available to the Department of Justice. The committee came into existence simply upon a suggestion by the Attorney General to President Eisenhower.

Some of us believe that a similarly constituted committee to revise our copyright law might best serve to bring about a much needed revision of our entire statute. In view of the many technical aspects of this field of the law, it may be more advantageous to have a committee appointed under the auspices of the Librarian of Congress which would not consist primarily of Congressmen or Senators but of copyright experts on both our domestic and international copyright law. Such a national committee might well lay the necessary groundwork for subsequent congressional action.

Similar committees of experts have handled similar assignments in Great Britain and Canada with outstanding success as evidenced by the Report of the Copyright Committee (Board of Trade), London (October 1952). Since I have gained the impression from reading some articles in the trade papers, Billboard, etc., that you are interested in getting reactions to the bill which you have proposed, I am taking the liberty of offering these thoughts to you.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER J. DERENBERG,
Professor of Law.

P. S.: I am enclosing, as a matter of possible interest and information, a notice of the current seminar and an outline of the cases and materials used in my course on copyright at New York University School of Law.

MARCH 8, 1955.

Prof. WALTER J. DERENBERG,
School of Law, New York
University, New York, N. Y.

DEAR PROFESSOR DERENBERG: Thank you very much for your very kind letter regarding the bill I have introduced to establish a commission to study the copyright law. You were quite correct in assuming that I would like to have comments on the bill from interested and qualified persons such as yourself.

I have been giving your suggestion that we set up the Commission under the Librarian of Congress considerable thought. It would seem to me that the bill as it stands at present would accomplish the ends you state in your letter. This bill would empower the President to appoint 7 of the 13 members of the Commission. He would thus be able to appoint men with outstanding reputations in the field of copyright law either from the Copyright Office and other branches of the Government and/or eminent members of the bar. In addition, the Commission would be composed of 3 Senators and 3 Representatives. These members would be taken from the membership of the respective Judiciary Committees of the two Houses. Since any revision of the copyright law would necessarily have to be passed by the Congress, it seems desirable to have some Members represented on the Commission.

This, at any rate, is the way the matter appears to me at the present time. If you have any further thoughts on the matter, I would greatly appreciate hearing from you. In any case thank you again for your interest.

Cordially,

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

[From Billboard magazine of March 12, 1955]
GETS IN COPYRIGHT ACT—NYU PROFESSOR
SUGGESTS FACT-FINDING GROUP SIMILAR TO
ANTITRUST ORG

(By Ben Atlas)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—A new wrinkle in the copyright fact-finding issue on Capitol Hill was added this week when Walter J. Derenberg, professor of law at New York University and a member of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.'s, antitrust committee, in a letter to Representative FRANK J. THOMPSON (Democrat of New Jersey) suggested that possibly a fact-finding group similar to the Attorney General's antitrust committee might perform the task specified by THOMPSON in his bill for a Federal Commission to study revision of the copyright law.

Professor Derenberg informed THOMPSON that proposed legislation for creation of a Federal factfinding commission "has stimulated a great deal of discussion at New York University's Law School which," Professor Derenberg said, "has done some pioneer work in the field of copyright" and is currently holding a seminar on advanced problems on literary and artistic property.

DERENBERG'S LETTER

Derenberg's letter went on to state:

"I have been a member of the Attorney General's national committee to study the antitrust laws, which is about to submit its report to the Attorney General within the next two or three weeks. This committee consists of some 60 experts in antitrust law, representing both private and public points of view, who were appointed by the Attorney General on recommendations made by the cochairman of the committee, the Honorable Stanley M. Barnes, Assistant Attorney General and head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and Prof. S. Chesterfield Oppenheim, of the University of Michigan Law School. No congressional action preceded the appointment of the committee and its work was financed by the appropriation available to the Department of Justice. The committee came into existence simply upon a suggestion by the Attorney General to President Eisenhower.

"Some of us believe that a similarly constituted committee to revise our copyright law might best serve to bring about a much-needed revision of our entire statute. In view of the many technical aspects of this field of the law, it may be more advantageous to have a committee appointed under the auspices of the Librarian of Congress which would not consist primarily of Congressmen or Senators but of copyright experts on both our domestic and international copyright law. Such a national committee might well lay the necessary groundwork for subsequent congressional action.

"Similar committees of experts have handled similar assignments in Great Britain and Canada with outstanding success, as evidenced by the report of the Copyright Committee (Board of Trade), London, October 1952. Since I have gained the impression from reading some articles in . . . Billboard, etc., that you are interested in getting reactions to the bill which you have proposed, I am taking the liberty of offering these thoughts to you."

CONSIDERATION UNLIKELY

It appears unlikely at this time that Professor Derenberg's suggestion for a Library of Congress committee on copyright will get serious consideration in Washington. Nevertheless, the suggestion was indicative of the awakening of interest, particularly on law campuses, in the fact-finding proposal. Previously, Prof. Benjamin Kaplan, of the Harvard University Law School, in a communication to Representative THOMPSON, voiced interest and indicated that the subject would

be taken up by the Harvard Law School faculty (the Billboard, February 26).

Professor Derenberg enclosed with his letter a schedule of New York University Law School's copyright seminar. The seminar course is directed by Professor Derenberg "with the cooperation," he explained, "of outstanding experts in various specialized branches of copyright law." These experts include the following, several of whom are familiar figures on Capitol Hill as supporters of legislation in previous Congresses to end the copyright law's exemption of jukebox royalty payments.

The seminar roster of experts includes:

Arthur Fisher, registrar of copyrights, Library of Congress; Herman Finkelstein, general attorney, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; John Schulman, general counsel, Authors' League of America; Edward E. Colton, negotiator for the Dramatists' Guild; Edward A. Sargoy, former chairman, copyright committee, American Bar Association; Morris Ebenstein, legal department, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.; Samuel W. Tannenbaum, of Johnson & Tannenbaum; Robert J. Burton, vice president and resident counsel, Broadcast Music, Inc.; Charles B. Seton, of the New York Bar; Philip Wittenberg, author of the Marketing of Literary Property; Prof. Harry G. Henn, of Cornell University Law School; Joseph A. McDonald, treasurer, National Broadcasting Co., and former general attorney, American Broadcasting Co.; and John P. Allison, formerly editor, Tax Barometer.

Community Action: A Key to Rural Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture:

A great and latent force is being remobilized in America.

It was present at the birth of civilization. It brought mankind out of roving in wildernesses. It was the strength of mutual effort in the American Colonies and in the founding and formative years of our great Nation.

This force is the community spirit.

But somehow in many places this spirit seemed to have receded in our new age of invention, of bigger and glittering cities, of fast travel, of movies, radio, television, gadgets, in the myriad of other devices for entertainment and diversion—and in a kind of snobbery for many simple virtues.

The results have become plain to all of us, in the shapes of an alarming growth in juvenile delinquency, of crime, of rotting little towns, of neglect of community loyalties and pride, and a lack of the full satisfactions of a free trade in friendship and common purpose that community effort nourishes.

But now I believe one of the best signs of our time is that more people feel a need to reexamine the old virtues of neighborliness, of mutual concern, and of community action.

We can tell as we travel across our own great State where the community spirit has been revived or was never lost. We see it in the beautiful farms, well-kept church and school buildings, in evidences of work and pride all around. We can tell, too, where the spirit has withered.

The story of the Rabbit and Cat Creeks community in western North Carolina should be an inspiration to all of us. In 1936 a survey showed that the land there was eroded, crop yields small, homes were poor, the standard of living was low, and the church and school needed attention. The people decided to do something about this. And today that community is a symbol of the progress that comes of community action. There are other models in our State for us to work by.

I believe a great new ground swell in community action awaits only upon leadership and organization.

Someone has said that a community is the image of the people who live in it and I think a good start can be made by each citizen asking himself or herself a few questions: Am I proud of my community?

Do I boast about it to other people?

What are the good points of my community? Also, what are its needs, and how can those needs be met?

Could better living result if more of my neighbors and I worked together in a community program?

What can we do to start such a program or to move it forward?

I was impressed recently by a news story from Butler, Mo., that started off by saying, "You'd be surprised to see what they are doing here in Bates County to those old, abandoned rural schoolhouses." The story then told how the people there were putting pretty drapes at the windows and bright linoleum on the floors—making them into cheerful clubhouses where they meet to discuss community affairs, eat home-cooked food and have loads of fun.

That a revival of community action is about to take hold in a big way is demonstrated in a motion picture I recently saw. It was produced by one of the big automobile manufacturing companies and bore the title "The Town That Came Back." The theme of the picture is that it always takes people to make anything happen. It is the true story of a group of people who breathed new life into the almost-dead community spirit of a small Midwestern town.

Neighbors in this town hardly knew each other any more and there was not much left to hold young people in the community.

Then somebody got the idea of reactivating a 4-H Club, and things began to happen. Where there was disinterest and defeat, a new community now thrives.

It is a story that could be repeated a thousand times over across this broad and good land of ours.

One of our great Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, always stressed the importance of the community, and he once had this to say:

"When I look back on the processes of history, when I survey the genesis of America, I see this written on every page, that the nations are renewed from the bottom, and not from the top; that the genius which springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the growth and energy of the people."

I am impressed, too, by a statement that comes from the Committee for Economic Development, an organization of the Nation's top business leaders, as follows:

"America came to greatness from her grass-roots, and it is from life in small communities that strength must continue to flow and nourish our country toward greater accomplishment which can be shared by all. The hope of America is not that our huge cities shall become more vast—it is rather that the small communities shall consolidate their opportunities to grow and become better, more interesting places for our people to live in and prosper. In the final analysis, our Nation is just one community added to another until the splendid total makes us what we are."

What needs to be done is clear. How to do it provides the problem—and the challenge.

"If," said the shrewd Portia, "to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches and poor men's cottages princes' palaces."

First, in considering community action, it must be remembered that to get anywhere, it is necessary to start from where you are, and that nothing will run itself except when it is going downhill.

A few public-spirited citizens can start a community-betterment program. I believe that all that's needed is a sincere interest in the community and a willingness to assume initial leadership in arousing general interest and enthusiasm in community self-improvement.

The University of Illinois, after considerable study, has published a bulletin on how a betterment program can work in the community. This suggests steps in organization, as follows:

1. A public mass meeting at which everyone could speak his mind, where experiences of other communities with improvement programs can be discussed, and where specific needs of the community can be reviewed.

2. A community council should be organized at the public mass meeting. This council would serve as the overall planning and directing force of the betterment program. The council should be a broadly representative group, its members coming from the various occupations and interests of the community, including youth organizations. It would formulate general policies as guides in developing action programs.

3. An executive committee, drawn from the members of the community council, should be named as the first step in setting up action machinery to transform general policies into definite projects.

4. Action subcommittees should function to follow through on specific action programs.

While the program will not change a community overnight, the payoff in a more satisfying community life can be expected within a short time after it is started. Better streets, better recreational programs, community beautification, new business and industries—these may be some of the first signs that the program is beginning to work.

Then it will be known that the spirit of neighborliness and mutual concerns and efforts that sustained our forefathers in conquering the wildernesses has returned. This will be a happy day.

The community spirit simply is friendship in action.

Praise for Our Secretary of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 18, 1955

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enclose the letter of thanks forwarded to the Honorable John Foster Dulles on behalf of the Worcester Zionist district, the Worcester Lodge B'nai B'rith and the Hadassah groups, by Judge Joseph Goldberg, of Worcester, Mass.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1955.

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
United States Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES: I know that very often you receive letters of criticism and it must be nice to receive a letter of appreciation.

On behalf of 1,000 members of the Worcester Zionist district and thousands of

members of the Worcester Lodge B'nai B'rith and the Hadassah groups, I wish to express to you the gratefulness of all of us, for your intercession and the intercession of our Government, on behalf of two Jews that were hung by the Egyptian Government. Certainly, there was no such urgency, as to require this speedy execution.

The whole trial was shocking and the hanging was both brutal and unjustified.

I just want you to know that your act of friendship in this tragedy, is characteristic of the humane attitude of our Government in all such instances.

Most respectfully yours,

Judge JOSEPH GOLDBERG.

Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, today all freedom-loving people throughout the world are observing the 105th anniversary of the birth of the founder and liberator of the Czechoslovak Republic. Speaking of Thomas Masaryk, as one of the greatest statesmen, politicians, philosophers, and above all a real democrat of the 19th and 20th centuries, one cannot forget how deeply rooted were the principles of true Americanism that were embodied in this great man. Emil Ludwig, considered to be a great German biographer, once put this question to Bernard Shaw: "Who could be President of the United States of Europe?" to which the distinguished British playwright answered: "I know of only one man—he is Masaryk."

And it was Masaryk who believed so strongly in the idea of uniting all Europe, despite the fact that first he began by uniting his own beloved country. He knew, however, that "federation without freedom is impossible" and if any of our statesmen of the past had followed the political line of thinking that Masaryk had laid down and preached many years ago, they never would have made the mistakes for which millions of human beings have had to pay so dearly. The man who had founded one of the greatest democracies existing between the two world wars had this to say on democracy:

Democracy is a fight for humanly free and unfolding world order with no dictatorial and repressive prerogatives for any.

Can these words be quoted today by those who rule that unfortunate country? It therefore is no surprise to us that the Communists do not claim him. What is more, his works have been criticized by them. His simple room, which even the brutal Nazis respected during the occupation, has been entirely changed by Gottwald, the man who calls himself President of the Czechoslovak Republic. Thomas Masaryk's modesty and simplicity were not only expressed by his teachings, but also through his actions. It followed him throughout his entire life. His humility and modesty

were born with him and did not leave him until he died.

Thomas Masaryk was born on this day in 1850, 2 years after the manifesto of socialism was announced in Germany. His father was an ordinary coachman and his mother a former household servant. Yet he received the best education one could get in those days. He spoke German, French, and English very fluently, and was well versed in Latin and Greek. In his early years he had a passion for the theater, and throughout his life he adored poetry. In fact, Preston Warren, Masaryk's biographer recalls that Masaryk, speaking for Paderewski against those who believed the latter should keep to his music rather than to get mixed up in politics said:

The bearing of poetry upon politics, and to reveal the artist Paderewski as a true political awakener of his people. Poetry educates imagination, a vision of the future, a penetration into the souls of others.

For us Americans, it is important to recall one major aspect of Masaryk's life, which was that he was devoted to the same principles laid down by the Fathers of our Country. I refer here to the wife of Thomas Masaryk, Charlotte Garriague, a young American who had been a pupil of Liszt. She was his whole inspiration, both in his domestic and political life. The love for the American principles, which he imbedded in his own country can only be explained through the wonderful relationship between Thomas Masaryk and his wife.

When Thomas Masaryk died in 1937, it was Eduard Benes, his greatest friend and follower, who spoke these words at the great Czech's grave:

How can we be other than calm, clear, and firm when we look upon the clear and straight path which that life shows us? How beautiful and how exalting it is to see that this great warrior, who never shirked a fight, leaves us in harmony with himself, with his faith in Divine Providence, in harmony with his environment, with his faith in man, faith in the ultimate triumph of man, in the triumph of justice and truth, in the triumph of humanity here against us, in Europe, and throughout the world.

This was Thomas Masaryk who had gone already into history with the greatest men mankind has known.

Mental Health Study Prepared for Hoover Commission by Dr. Francis J. Braceland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Health and Science of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been holding hearings for the last 3 days on legislation pending before the committee designed to strengthen the program of the Federal Government in the field of mental

health and to assist the States and voluntary groups in their efforts in this field. It has been called to the committee's attention that a study has been prepared by Dr. Francis J. Braceland, chief psychiatrist of the Institute of Living, at Hartford, Conn., for the Hoover Commission Task Force on Federal Medical Services. A summary of Dr. Braceland's findings has been released by the Hoover Commission. The information contained in this release is of great interest to the Members of the House and to the American people in general. The release reads as follows:

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

WASHINGTON, March 7.—With more than half of the hospital beds in this country devoted to care of the mentally ill, about 250,000 new patients will have their first admission to such hospitals this year, according to figures made public today by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

At the present rate of illness, 1 in every 12 children born in this country will spend some time in a mental institution and the number of prolonged-care patients is steadily increasing at the rate of 10,000 a year.

These figures are contained in a special report on mental illness prepared under the direction of Dr. Francis J. Braceland, of Hartford, Conn., a member of the Commission's Task Force on Medical Services. Dr. Braceland is psychiatrist in chief of the Institute of Living at Hartford, clinical professor of psychiatry at Yale University, and former president of the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology.

The report was the basis of the recommendation for additional attention to this phase of health care made to the Congress last week by the Commission through its chairman, former President Herbert Hoover, as part of its recommendations for more efficient medical services in Government.

In line with Dr. Braceland's findings, the Commission urged that the Advisory Council of Health, which it proposed, study means of establishing cooperative planning among Federal agencies providing psychiatric care, and that the military services and the Veterans' Administration give greater emphasis to preventive psychiatric services. It also recommended that the Federal Government, through the Public Health Service, encourage wider research and training of psychiatrists and workers in allied fields.

The growing needs in this field are cited in the special study, and are reported to be largely the result of population growth and the larger proportion of older people rather than any upsurge in the rate of ailments of the mind. The survey stresses the need of recruitment and training of psychiatric specialists to cope with a problem which already is costing the taxpayers \$1 billion a year, without counting the incalculable losses in manpower.

It points out that most of the 650,000 prolonged-care psychiatric patients are being treated in State and Federal tax-supported mental institutions. It calls mental illness the greatest single problem in the Nation's health picture.

Although the study explains that exact figures cannot be compiled, it says that medical health surveys suggest that as many as 9 million persons, almost 6 percent of the population, suffer from some form of mental disorder. About 10 percent of these, or slightly less than 900,000, are considered in need of hospital care.

The most serious bottleneck in the way of proper care for all these cases, according to Dr. Braceland and his aides, is the lack of trained personnel—physicians, nurses, and

other properly equipped professional and auxiliary workers.

The study cites a statistical survey by the National Institute of Mental Health which shows that in 1950 the need for full-time physicians in State mental institutions of the country was only "about half met," with one State having no psychiatrists at all. These State institutions, it says, also had fewer than 24 percent of the needed number of graduate nurses, 23 percent of the desired number of psychiatric social workers, and fewer than 74 percent of the required number of attendants.

Although the medical health personnel situation has improved somewhat in recent years, it adds, shortages in this field continue "not only to hamper efforts to improve general conditions, but also to restrict efforts to discover new methods of treatment and even to prevent the wide application of known therapeutic procedures."

It is only within the past quarter of a century that an appreciable number of psychiatrists has entered private practice, the survey says. More than 4,000 now are active in this work privately. The chief need for private practitioners in this specialized field today exists in cities of fewer than 100,000 population.

State care accounts for about 85 percent of the patient load in mental hospitals, and about 70 percent of expenditures nationally. Second largest share of the burden is being carried by the Veterans' Administration, which at the end of the fiscal year 1953 had 35 predominantly psychiatric hospitals with 51,000 operating beds and 5,600 additional beds for psychiatric patients in its general and surgical hospitals.

Dr. Braceland indicates the main reasons for the personnel shortage. Lengthy and expensive training is one of the causes. A physician now must serve 2 years in the armed services, and the addition of 5 years of training and experience for psychiatric practice to his already long general medical preparation delays his advent into practice until he is in his middle thirties. Because of overcrowding in the hospitals, the workload is unusually heavy, he says, the pay often is inadequate, and job location frequently is in an isolated area, and the whole picture is overwhelming.

"Although it is evident that the personnel situation is bad now," his report comments, "it has been kept from becoming even more serious by reason of the farsighted training program of the Veterans' Administration and the training stipends made possible under the National Mental Health Act."

The report notes that gratifying progress has been made, largely through basic and clinical research, in the handling of certain types of mental disease. Paresis, an organic disease of the brain due to syphilis, is being conquered. Formerly, 10 percent of all persons with syphilis became victims of paresis; today, as a result of new therapeutic methods, fewer than 3 percent of patients who are adequately treated develop this illness, and the investigators make the happy prediction that it is not unlikely that this disease can be wiped out in this generation.

Research also has conquered pellagra, with its attendant mental ills. At one time it was estimated that 10 percent of patients in mental hospitals in the southern part of the country were there as a result of pellagra. With the discovery that this was a vitamin-deficiency disease caused by lack of nicotinic acid in the diet, it became responsive to treatment and is now readily preventable, the report points out.

Medical gains also are noted in other directions. The agitated depressions of middle life have responded dramatically to electric shock therapy, as have depressive illnesses in general. As late as the 1930's, schizophrenia had a "spontaneous recovery" rate of only

15 to 20 percent; today, 40 to 60 percent of such patients can be helped by modern treatment.

New methods also are bringing epilepsy under control. That illness a few decades ago contributed a number of patients to mental institutions.

The studies give recognition to the fact that senility often is accompanied by mental infirmities and disorders.

"There is an urgent need for research in the prevention and treatment of the mental diseases of elderly persons," the report explains. "It avails us little if the miracles of modern medicine spare the population for a longer life span if we are to end ingloriously with senile psychoses."

"It is becoming increasingly evident that the psychoses of the older-age groups have psychological and social components which may be of as much or even more importance than the physiological and pathological factors."

"Loss of status and position, economic and emotional dependence, lack of useful occupation, and a feeling of being no longer worth while, all take their toll in persons who are dependent in later years."

"Research directed at these various components of the illness, and treatment aimed at the alleviation of distressing conditions will not only bear fruit from a humanitarian standpoint but will salvage a number of people who otherwise would become wards of the Government."

A survey covering resident mental patients in 6 States showed that while in 1939 only 14 percent were 65 years of age, or older, by 1950 the number in this upper-age bracket had risen to 25 percent.

Dr. Braceland's report shows that although there is little difference regionally in the incidence of mental disease, the ratio of mental hospital patients to population varies widely in the States, from about 2 per 1,000 in New Mexico to 6 per 1,000 in New York. Although marked strides have been made, it says, in the rate at which patients are discharged, this gain has been more than offset by the higher number of admissions and the fact that mental cases now have longer life spans.

The rolls of the mental hospitals, the study found, give only a partial picture of the problem. The figures do not include the large number of persons suffering from mental disorders and kept at home or in sanatoria, nursing homes and general hospitals whose patients are not included in the psychiatric hospital statistics.

Research also has brought progress in the field of psychosomatic medicine and has inspired a new recognition of the importance of emotional factors in many diseases formerly considered to be of obscure origin.

Asthma, colitis, gastric and duodenal ulcers, hypertension and other ailments, some of which have become associated with the pace of life today, Dr. Braceland asserts, now are clearly recognized as having emotional components which must be recognized and treated if the illness itself is to be overcome.

The importance of this factor is emphasized by the report, which cites estimates that between 50 and 70 percent of the patients coming to physicians' offices today have sicknesses with emotional angles.

"It is only by means of continued research," Dr. Braceland concludes, "that any one of these serious psychiatric problems will be met, and research requires trained personnel and sufficient funds with which to accomplish it."

Community health services have been found to have a vital responsibility for recognition of mental illness at its inception and by "scientific vigilance" to get or give treatment for the patient "before commitment is necessary or before tragedy occurs."

Hawaiian-Alaskan Statehood?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include my statement before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on February 14 in relation to Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood.

The statement follows:

HAWAIIAN-ALASKAN STATEHOOD?

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, the controversial problem of statehood for the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska continues to challenge the wisdom of this Congress. My remarks shall pertain to bill H. R. 2535, which proposes to grant statehood to both Territories and is now under consideration by this committee.

THE IMPORTANCE AND THE FINALITY OF STATEHOOD

This momentous issue of statehood compels us to give our most serious attention to its consequences. We are confronted with a measure that has vast implications relating to the internal affairs of this Union. We must also concern ourselves with the finality of whatever decision we may make.

No other problem will, as vitally, affect and shape our future as statehood. The seriousness of this subject is transcended only by our struggle to survive the Communist holocaust.

The various domestic and foreign problems of this Congress which relate to finance, defense, health, and foreign aid, are of extreme importance. Yet, if we find ourselves in error, our mistakes can readily be rectified by congressional action or by the flexibility of executive power. With one exception, even our Constitution and its amendments may be amended to conform with changing conditions or attitudes. The most recent example of this change is the repeal of the 18th amendment.

The one exception to the right to change our Constitution applies to the present proposal. Article V of our Constitution provides that no amendment may be made to this clause "and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The principle that no State can secede from this Union is established. The corollary principle that this Nation cannot divorce any State from this Union or restore it to the status of a Territory is equally accepted. Thus, the grant of statehood becomes an irrevocable act.

The finality of our decision as to statehood gives us cause to approach this matter, not with a lighthearted generosity, but rather with a somber realization and precaution that any mistake will burden us for the life of this Republic.

THE EMOTIONAL, IRRELEVANT, AND MINOR ISSUES

There have been so many issues injected into this debate that it has become difficult to see the forest for the trees. Almost every conceivable argument has been presented pro and con to a degree that has confused and confounded rather than enlightened those who may be interested.

It appears a suitable time to attempt to clarify and place the arguments into their true political perspective. The leading arguments in favor of statehood which are

grouped together here as being either emotional, irrelevant, or of minor consequence are:

- (a) Americanism and military service.
- (b) The psychological impact of statehood upon the Asiatic peoples.
- (c) The references to precedent in favor of statehood.
- (d) Partisan political considerations.

THE EMOTIONAL APPEAL OF AMERICANISM AND MILITARY SERVICE

Every informed person will acknowledge the courage and the sacrifices of the Hawaiian veterans in both World War II and the Korean conflict. This Nation is eternally indebted to them and in an equal degree to all other American veterans who fought so gloriously in those wars.

The proponents of statehood have cited individual cases of heroism on the part of Hawaiian soldiers. They have made comparisons of the Hawaiian casualties and the numbers in military service as against the casualties and the number of servicemen from the United States as a whole.

The Alaska Statehood Committee has published this claim:

"In two world wars and in Korea they have fought—in number exceeding the national per capita average—and by so doing have written a war record second to none in the Nation."

The Library of Congress has furnished the following table of inductees for World War II:

State	Population, 1945	Draftees in World War II
New Hampshire.....	450,000	32,430
Montana.....	477,000	38,453
Idaho.....	507,000	38,612
Hawaii.....	460,000	28,008
Alaska.....	79,000	3,452

(Hawaii had 8,769 additional enlistees. No figures are available for other States.)

These figures do not substantiate claims of superiority in the number of citizens from Hawaii and Alaska who served in World War II.

The statements regarding casualties and bravery cannot support the inference that these soldiers were more loyal and more brave than the veterans from the other areas of this country. I defend all segments of this country from the innuendo that any group or area of our people have a monopoly upon patriotism or bravery. There is no scientific thermometer that can measure the warmth of devotion for this great country.

The sacrifices on the battlefield do not constitute legitimate political, economic, or social premises for the admission of these territories to statehood. These highly emotional appeals could have been, most properly, left out of this debate.

THE IRRELEVANCE OF FOREIGN PSYCHOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The proponents of statehood claim that statehood would create good will for the United States in the Pacific area and would avoid for us the stigma of colonialism.

The question of statehood is solely and wholly a domestic problem of our internal affairs. It is a strange theory that would permit foreign opinion to influence or decide the conduct of our domestic affairs. The Communist line of charging us with colonialism cannot be increased in volume nor will it be softened by any act of compliance.

We should not fear to disappoint those enemies. Our foreign friends need no explanations.

The psychological impact of statehood upon foreign peoples is irrelevant and deserves no consideration here.

The height of irrelevancy was attained by a former governor of one of the Territories.

He advanced as an argument in favor of statehood, "the delectation of visitors, the sweetness of Hawaiian music, and the rhythm of its dance." Certainly, the muscular gyrations of the Hula dance is far afield from the crux of the statehood problem. This sentimentality borders upon the frivolous.

THE PRECEDENTS FOR STATEHOOD

The proponents of statehood rely extensively upon the use of precedent to lend validity to their claims.

The Northwest Ordinance was adopted under the Articles of Confederation in 1787. This Act, providing for the admission of that Territory to statehood, is cited as precedent and as the source of the inherent right of every Territory to become a State. This precedent is invalid for the following reasons:

1. The Articles of Confederation has been superseded completely by the Constitutional provisions relating to the admission of new States.
2. The Northwest Ordinance was limited in its application to the Northwest Territory.
3. The framework of the Confederacy, the division of powers and the scheme of representation was totally different from our present constitutional Government.

References by the Supreme Court to incorporate Territories as "inchoate" and "embryo" States are mere dicta and an attempted intrusion into the field of Congressional legislative authority and responsibility.

The admission of other States is referred to as precedent for the admission of Hawaii and Alaska upon the basis of equal representation in the United States Senate. The last State to be admitted was Arizona on February 14, 1912.

Following the admission of this 48th State, the 17th Amendment was adopted by final ratification on April 8, 1913. The mode of selection of Senators was altered from that of choice by the State legislatures to that of election by popular suffrage. This change of election of Senators has resulted in representation by the Senators of the people of the States as individuals in substitution for representation by the Senators of their respective States collectively and in their corporate capacities.

The 17th Amendment created a new concept of Senatorial representation. No State has been admitted under these fundamentally altered conditions.

Thus, the admission of other States furnishes no valid precedent for the admission, today, of Territories upon the same basis of representation in the United States Senate.

PARTISAN POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS

The Democratic National Party platform contains a plank favoring immediate statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. The Republican National Party platform favors immediate statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska under an equitable enabling act. However, no responsible Republican Party spokesman has, as yet, given us an adequate detail explanation of the meaning of the term "equitable enabling act."

In the 1952 elections, the Republican Party retained control of the Hawaiian Territorial Legislature by the election of 8 Republican Senators to 7 Democrats. In the House there were 19 Republicans elected to 11 Democrats.

In the same year, Alaskan Republicans won the Alaskan Senate by seating 11 Republicans and 5 Democrats. In the House, there were 20 Republicans elected to 4 Democrats.

Based upon these returns, it was predicted that in the event of statehood, Hawaii would elect 2 Republican Senators and that Alaska would possibly elect 1 or 2 Republican Senators.

Two years ago the Republican administration attempted to pass the bill giving statehood to Hawaii and kill the Alaskan statehood bill. This writer opposed the immediate admission of these States either sev-

erally or jointly. The Republican Party subjected itself to the charge of attempting to gain partisan political advantage in its attempt to support the Hawaiian statehood bill alone.

In 1954 the political picture reversed itself. The Hawaiian Legislature was won by the Democratic Party for the first time in the history of that Territory. The Democratic Party swept both Houses overwhelmingly. The Democrats won a 9 to 6 majority in the Senate and a 22 to 8 majority in the House.

A similar sweep was gained by the Democrats in the Alaskan Territorial Legislature. There, the Democrats gained control of the Senate by winning 12 seats to 4, and in the House 21 seats to 3.

Another political factor is the successive drop in the plurality of the Republican Delegate from Hawaii. The Republican pluralities for that office are as follows:

Year:	Republican plurality
1948.....	53,000
1950.....	31,000
1952.....	9,000
1954.....	890

¹ Approximate.

² Official.

Based on the 1954 election returns, it appears that, in the event of statehood, Alaska would surely elect 2 Democrat Senators and Hawaii would be likely to elect 2 Democrat Senators.

It is most obvious that the passage of the joint Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood bill by the Congress would place the Republican Party in a difficult position. The President would be placed in a political dilemma. By approving statehood for both Territories, he would risk the probability that these two Territories would return 4 Democrat Senators. If he vetoes statehood, he assumes the political onus of defeating a measure of popular favor.

Partisan politics is a transitory consideration. This issue ought to be decided upon American principles having a true political validity. The solution should pass the test of what will be permanently just for the peoples of both majority and minority parties of the whole Nation.

GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE REJECTS STATEHOOD

At the hearing before this committee on February 4, 1955, the impression was left that the Governor's Conference endorses statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. This is not so.

Resolutions were adopted by the Governors' Conferences, for 6 years from 1947 to 1952, favoring statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

On March 2, 1953, the writer addressed communications to each of the 48 governors indicating the prospective loss of voting power for the people of each State in the senatorial and presidential elections upon the grant of statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. No claim is made that the subsequent failure to endorse statehood is due to these communications.

At the 1953 governors' conference, a resolution favoring Hawaiian statehood was presented. This resolution failed to receive a favorable report. No resolution for either Hawaiian or Alaskan statehood was presented at the 1954 conference. The governors, perhaps, perceived the prospective loss of representation to the peoples of their respective States. Failure to approve statehood resolutions, under these circumstances can be fairly construed to constitute rejection.

COMMUNISM, A MAJOR CONSIDERATION IN HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The extensive communistic influences in Hawaii continue to present an alarming condition for both Hawaii and the United States. A careful study of the facts does not give

hope that communistic power is on the wane. Communism remains a potent force permeating the economic, political, and social structures of this Territory.

The New York Herald Tribune of June 23, 1953, reported a labor strike by the ILWU on June 22, 1953, in Hawaii. The facts, as reported there, are as follows:

Twenty-four thousand employees on the island went on strike in a mass protest against the conviction of Jack Hall and six other conspirators convicted of plotting to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government.

Two thousand of these employees are stevedores, members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU), who refused to load military cargo for Korea. Eighteen thousand out of 19,000 ILWU union workers on the sugar plantations joined in this strike. One thousand of these men refused to strike. Four thousand out of 5,000 pineapple workers also joined the strike. One thousand of these men refused to strike.

Now, these men went on strike, not because of any legitimate labor dispute, but in protest against the conviction of these Communists for the advocacy of treason and revolution.

The fact that 1,000 men in the sugar industry and 1,000 men in the pineapple industry refused to join this strike is proof that it was possible to refuse to join in this dastardly demonstration of Communist close-order drill.

Those who refused, a pitiful minority of 2,000, demonstrated their courage and Americanism. The same cannot be said for the other 24,000. The refusal to load military cargo for Korea borders upon sabotage.

If these men went on strike because of threats or pressures, then a condition exists in Hawaii so dangerous that Hawaii should not be granted statehood at this time. If they went on strike willingly because of their sympathy for the Communist convicts and the Communist movement, then this type of citizen does not deserve statehood. This country can do well without their voice and their vote in Congress.

This same union, ILWU, called another strike as recently as last December 1954, while members of this Territorial subcommittee were attending hearings in Hawaii.

The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU) has a membership of 25,000 and dominates unionism in that territory. Its president is Harry Bridges, who is 1 of the top 3 Communist leaders in this country. Jack Hall is the Hawaiian spokesman for Harry Bridges and the leader of that union there.

The unions in Hawaii controlled or infiltrated by Communists have a membership of about 30,000. The names of the Communists and those persons closely related to the Communist Party who occupy positions of power in the unions, union locals and the top organization of the ILWU are contained in the hearings of the House Un-American Activities Committee for the year 1950.

These hearings regarding Communist activities in Hawaii are contained in three volumes and contain a startling revelation of the infiltration of communism into both the ranks of unionized labor and in the political parties. These volumes are proof that the Communist Party controls the ILWU, lock, stock, and barrel.

By means of union devices such as closed shops, union stewards, and grievance committees, it is possible for the Communists to control the employment, lay-offs, firings, and hiring of labor. This control, and the use of cadres of union officials and Communist stooges to propagandize, persuade, and coerce, gives the Communists a tight control over the ideology and political action of its members. The individual laborer doesn't have a chance to earn a living or to keep

from being maimed by a premeditated "industrial accident" unless he complies.

It is a political axiom that each employee can be counted upon to deliver three votes in a political election. If the ILWU can order 24,000 men to go out on a Communist sympathy strike sabotaging United States military transport, can there be any doubt that they can deliver 50,000 votes to their political choice?

The political objectives of the Communist Party are reported in these hearings. They are:

1. Communists support statehood (p. 1559, pt. 2 of the hearings).

2. Development of a following in the Democratic Party to back Communist causes (p. 1570, pt. 2 of the hearings).

3. Establish legislative caucus to act as pressure group on Democratic Party for Communist objectives (p. 1570, pt. 2 of the hearings).

The fact that statehood for Hawaii is supported by the Communist Party and the ILWU does not per se make this cause wrong or undesirable. However, one can be sure that their support for statehood is not actuated by the same motives for good government as those who sincerely believe that statehood is a just cause. The support of the Communists is based upon their self-interest in advancing the Communist cause and that cause alone.

Can there be any doubt that the Communist Party and the ILWU would not make an all-powerful drive to elect 2 United States Senators in the event of statehood? And it makes no difference to them whether they bear the Republican or Democratic label. By statehood, we not only open the door for 2 Communist-influenced United States Senators, but we actually invite 2 Soviet agents to take seats in the United States Senate.

On June 19, 1953, Jack Hall, ILWU regional director and Communist Party leader was convicted of violation of the Smith Act along with 6 other defendants. A 1954 publication of the Hawaii Statehood Commission cited these convictions as proof of "unalterable and aggressive opposition" of the people of Hawaii to communism. The record of the 1954 election completely refutes this statement.

In the race for the office of mayor of the city of Honolulu, Frank F. Fasi, the Democratic candidate was opposed by Neal Blaisdell, the Republican candidate. During the campaign Frank Fasi charged that Blaisdell was courting ILWU support.

On October 15, 1954, the leading newspapers carried the charge by Frank Fasi, the Democratic candidate, that "The big issue of this campaign is whether a candidate for mayor can be elected without the support of the Communist leaders in Hawaii."

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin, which is an outstanding newspaper of the highest standards, reported on November 1, 1954:

"He (Fasi) has struck out at Governor King and the ILWU leadership."

On November 3, this same newspaper carried the following front page headline:

"ILWU sample ballot supports Blaisdell."

During this campaign, the Republican candidate did not once deny these charges or repudiate and reject ILWU support. The following legal maxim certainly applies to this situation, "When one owes a duty to speak, silence implies consent."

The electorate of Hawaii answered Mr. Fasi's issue by proving that a mayor cannot be elected without the support of Communist leaders. Perhaps, the ILWU support was unsolicited. However, there can be no question that the ILWU support was given with Mayor Blaisdell's knowledge and was accepted without repudiation by him of the ILWU leaders or the Communist principles.

The Honolulu Star-Bulletin made a survey of the Hawaiian election of November

1954 and reported its findings as follows:

"The ILWU endorsed 71 candidates. Of these, 58 won, a batting average of 81 percent."

"In the Senate, 5 ILWU candidates won out of 6 candidates endorsed in contests for 7 seats. There are a total of 15 seats in the Senate."

"In the House, 22 ILWU supported candidates won out of 28 endorsed. There are 30 seats in the House."

"In the county, 32 ILWU supported candidates won out of 38 contests which includes Neal Blaisdell, Republican mayor of Honolulu."

The 1954 election was a complete victory for the ILWU and the Communist Party. They can now exercise either control or a considerable influence over both Houses of the Legislature and the Mayor of Honolulu. This victory is made more impressive by the fact that the ILWU political influence can be exerted in both Republican and Democratic parties.

Mr. Jack Hall not only directed the ILWU political activities but also claimed full credit for the victories of the Republican Mayor of Honolulu and the Democratic victory in both Houses of the Hawaii Legislature. Mr. Hall even offered his advice for the full use of the political power gained by that election.

The secretary of the former mayor made a practice of greeting Harry Bridges at the Honolulu airport when that distinguished Communist arrived there. He sent the Honolulu municipal band to money-raising affairs held to defray the legal defense of the Communists.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission claims that statehood would enable Hawaii to deal more effectively with Communism and the ILWU. On the contrary, statehood would free the Communists and the ILWU from United States control and jurisdiction. They now have the power and could immediately proceed without Federal interference to Socialize and Communize that State.

The atmosphere in Hawaii is one of tolerance, appeasement and encouragement for communism. The burden of proof that it can eradicate communism properly rests with the people of Hawaii. The proof has not been presented. If there is a reasonable doubt as to an extensive communistic economic and political control in Hawaii, then the party to suffer thereby is the United States. The people of the 48 States are entitled to the benefit of possible doubt. Statehood should be rejected now and deferred for an appropriate time when Communism no longer threatens the well-being of either Hawaii or the United States.

The 1954 election issues, the political maneuverings and the election results serve as a "Stop, Look, and Listen" warning to us.

THE POLITICAL POWERS OF STATEHOOD

Man's struggle for liberty never stops. That goal is gained in the degree of acceptance of the proposition that all sovereign power rests with the people. Constitutional government is an instrumentality for carrying out this concept of freedom.

Under our system of constitutional representative government, sovereign power can be placed into three broad categories. First, the power inherent to the people. This power can be generally described as all sovereign power that remains after constitutionally conferring such political powers to the States and the Nation as are needed for the attainment of their purposes. Second, the power granted to the Federal Government. In a broad sense, this power is limited to the enumerated political powers granted to the Federal Government under our United States Constitution. The third category is the power reserved to the States. This consists of all the residual political power constitutionally conferred by the people and not granted to the Nation.

In the present discussion, we are concerned with the second and third categories of political power. An analysis of statehood reveals a dual concept.

First: Statehood would grant to the territories the same sovereign and political powers as possessed by other States to conduct the affairs of these areas without Federal supervision or control.

Second: Statehood would grant to the proposed States the power of representation in the Federal Government.

THE POLITICAL POWER TO CONDUCT THE AFFAIRS OF THE STATE

Statehood is not essential for the grant of power to the Territories to enact laws relating to its property, affairs, and government. Congress has entire dominion, national and local, over Territories. It may transfer full legislative powers with respect to local affairs to legislatures elected by the Territories.

Both Alaska and Hawaii now possess general legislative power for these purposes. The major exception in Alaska is the power to legislate over public lands, fisheries, and subsurface resources. Although Congress has reserved the right to disapprove territorial legislation, no law passed by either territory has ever been disapproved by Congress.

The executive power could very well be transferred to the Territories. There could be no serious objection to any necessary extension of judicial powers for these Territories.

However, neither of these Territories appears to seriously want these powers. No reasonable proposal or request has been made to Congress for the reorganization or an extension of the jurisdiction of the Territorial courts.

There appears to be no sincere desire upon the part of the Territories to elect their own governors and to assume executive power.

While this committee has, over the course of years, considered many bills relating to the control of fisheries, minerals, and public lands, it has not yet approved any overall proposal to grant such power to Alaska. On the other hand, neither Territory has ever presented to Congress a comprehensive bill of particulars for an extension of legislative power to enable it to govern its own affairs.

The complaints made by these Territories of a lack of power to administer Territorial matters can be interpreted in either of two ways. Either this committee has failed to give adequate consideration to their needs for additional power or the Territories have failed to present and press for a comprehensive program designed to obtain for them the necessary power to govern. This writer believes that the latter alternative prevails.

It would appear that the concern of the proponents of statehood lies not in their desire or need for additional power to conduct the affairs of the Territories but rather in their drive for representation in Congress and in the election of a President.

THE POLITICAL POWER OF REPRESENTATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The history of Government is, in essence, a recital of the distributions of power. We are concerned here with an equitable apportionment of legislative and executive power. Statehood would transfer a share of these powers to the proposed States. Their participation in the Federal Government would consist of:

(a) The right to be represented in the United States Senate by two Senators.

(b) The right to participate in the election of a United States President.

(c) The right to be represented in the United States House of Representatives.

ORIGINAL BASIS FOR SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION

The problem of equitable representation in the United States Senate continues to

plague this country since May 1787, when the Constitutional Convention convened.

The historical struggle has been between the smaller States desiring representation on a basis of equality for States (as corporate sovereign entities) and the larger States seeking representation in proportion to population. The plan of giving each State two Senators conform to the pattern of a federation of States while representation in proportion to population conforms to the framework of a national government.

We are concerned today with the question of the political justice and wisdom of equality of representation for newly admitted States in the United States Senate. The plan of equality of senatorial representation by States was adopted for the protection of the States from encroachment by the Federal Government. In furtherance of this purpose, the provision that the Members of the United States Senate be chosen by State legislatures was enacted.

I cite the following statement made in the Constitutional Convention by Delegate Wilson of Pennsylvania:

"The leading argument of those who contend for equality of votes among the States is that the States as such being equal, and being represented not as districts of individuals, but in their political and corporate capacities, are entitled to equal suffrage."

Alexander Hamilton, supporting the adoption of the Constitution, stated in the Federalist, Paper No. 62:

"It (referring to appointment of Senators by State legislatures) is recommended by the double advantage: of giving to the State governments such an agency in the formation of the Federal Government as must secure the authority of the former and may form a convenient link between the two systems."

It seems clear that the plan of representation in the United States Senate was implemented by the provision that the States in their corporate capacities as States and as an organic whole be secured in that right of equality by the grant to them as States to choose their Senators by vote of the State legislatures. The provision for election of Senators by the State legislatures was an integral part of the compromise by which two Senators were provided to the States. The convention would never have agreed upon this principle of Senate representation if that right had not been secured by this mode of selection, that of choice by legislatures.

The 17th amendment of our Constitution, ratified on April 8, 1913, destroyed the reason for the provision that each State shall be entitled to 2 seats in the United States Senate.

STATEHOOD BASICALLY SHIFTS SENATORIAL AND PRESIDENTIAL REPRESENTATION FROM THE 48 STATES TO HAWAII AND ALASKA

Reduced to fundamental terms, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska grants representation in the United States Senate and in the election of the President. In the Senate they would be represented by 4 Senators out of a prospective total of 100 Members. In the electoral college they would be represented by 7 votes out of a prospective total of 535 votes.

The representation proposed for these Territories will be taken from the present representation possessed by the people of the 48 States and shifted to the people of these 2 Territories. This transfer of sovereign power seriously and correspondingly reduces the right of suffrage of the peoples of the 48 States in the United States Senate and in the election of the President.

REDUCTION IN THE SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION OF THE 48 STATES

The admission of Hawaii and Alaska under the present constitutional provision will entitle their residents—628,437 combined—to

4 seats in the United States Senate. The average representation would be 1 Senator for each 157,000 inhabitants. The people of the 48 States, having a population of 152,572,000, represented by 96 Senators, today enjoy the average representation of 1 Senator for each 1,589,000 persons. Thus, Hawaii and Alaska would become entitled to representation in the United States Senate 10 times greater than the average representation of the people of the 48 States. Each voter will have approximately 33 times the power of the vote of the people of California in the United States Senate, 27 times the power of the vote of the people of Illinois, 32 times the power of the vote of the people of Pennsylvania, and 47 times the vote of the people of New York.

A comparison of the voting power of the voters of Hawaii and Alaska (combined) with that of the people of the 48 States in the election of United States Senators is contained in schedule A of the accompanying table:

Tables comparing the prospective voting power of the average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter in the election of United States Senators and a United States President with the voting power of the voters of the 48 States

METHOD OF COMPUTATION

Schedule (A): Population of Hawaii and Alaska (combined) is 628,437 with 4 Senators. 1 Senator for 157,000 residents. Population of Alabama is 3,061,000. 1 Senator for 1,537,500 residents. 1,537,500 divided by 157,000 equals 9.8 representing the average voting rights of the residents of Hawaii and Alaska as compared to 1 vote for voter in Alabama in the election of the United States Senate.

Schedule (B): Presidential electors for Hawaii and Alaska (combined) will be 7 or 1 for each 89,700 residents. Presidential electors for Alabama is 11 or 1 for each 278,000 residents. 278,000 divided by 89,700 equals 3.1 representing the average voting rights of residents of Hawaii and Alaska as compared to 1 vote for the voter of Alabama in the election of a United States President.

State and Territory	Population (1950 census)	Number of presidential electors	Voting power of average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter versus 1 vote for voters of other States for—	
			(A) United States Senate	(B) United States President
Alaska.....	128,643	3		
Alabama.....	3,061,743	11	9.8	3.1
Arizona.....	742,587	4	2.4	2.1
Arkansas.....	1,909,511	8	6.1	2.6
California.....	10,586,223	32	33.7	3.6
Colorado.....	1,325,089	6	4.2	2.4
Connecticut.....	2,007,280	8	6.4	2.8
Delaware.....	318,085	3	1.0	1.2
Florida.....	2,771,305	10	8.8	3.0
Georgia.....	3,444,578	12	10.9	3.2
Hawaii.....	499,794	4		
Idaho.....	588,637	4	1.9	1.6
Illinois.....	8,712,176	27	27.8	3.6
Indiana.....	3,934,224	13	12.5	3.4
Iowa.....	2,621,073	10	8.3	2.9
Kansas.....	1,905,299	8	6.1	2.6
Kentucky.....	2,944,806	10	9.4	3.3
Louisiana.....	2,683,516	10	8.5	3.0
Maine.....	913,744	5	2.9	2.0
Maryland.....	2,343,011	9	7.8	2.9
Massachusetts.....	4,690,514	16	15.4	3.2
Michigan.....	6,371,766	20	20.3	3.5
Minnesota.....	2,982,483	11	9.5	3.0
Mississippi.....	2,178,914	8	6.6	3.0
Missouri.....	3,954,653	13	11.3	3.4
Montana.....	591,024	4	1.9	1.6
Nebraska.....	1,325,510	6	4.2	2.4
Nevada.....	100,083	3	.5	.6
New Hampshire.....	533,242	4	1.1	1.5
New Jersey.....	4,835,329	16	15.6	3.3
New Mexico.....	681,187	4	2.2	1.9
New York.....	14,830,192	45	47.2	3.6
North Carolina.....	4,061,929	14	12.9	3.2
North Dakota.....	691,636	4	2.2	1.9
Ohio.....	7,946,627	25	25.2	3.5
Oklahoma.....	2,233,351	8	7.1	3.1
Oregon.....	1,521,341	6	4.9	2.8
Pennsylvania.....	10,498,012	32	32.8	3.6
Rhode Island.....	791,896	4	2.5	2.2

Tables comparing the prospective voting power of the average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter in the election of United States Senators and a United States President with the voting power of the voters of the 48 States—Continued

State and Territory	Population (1950 census)	Number of presidential electors	Voting power of average Hawaiian-Alaskan voter versus 1 vote for voters of other States for—	
			(A) United States Senate	(B) United States President
South Carolina.....	2,117,027	8	6.7	2.9
South Dakota.....	652,740	4	2.0	1.3
Tennessee.....	3,291,718	11	10.5	3.3
Texas.....	7,711,194	24	24.5	3.5
Utah.....	688,862	4	2.2	1.9
Vermont.....	377,747	3	1.2	1.4
Virginia.....	3,318,680	12	10.5	3.0
Washington.....	2,378,963	9	7.6	2.9
West Virginia.....	2,005,552	8	6.3	2.8
Wisconsin.....	3,434,575	12	10.9	3.1
Wyoming.....	290,529	3	.9	1.1

The representation in the United States Senate for Hawaii and Alaska is acquired by a corresponding reduction of the present power of representation of the people of the 48 States in that body, today. The right of suffrage equal to that of 6,356,000 persons is taken from the 152,572,000 residents of the 48 States in varying percentage amounts and is transferred to the 628,437 residents of Hawaii and Alaska.

Statehood will give Hawaii and Alaska 4 votes in a Senate of 100 Members or one twenty-fifths of the membership. Although their combined population is only one two-hundred-and-forty-two-seconds of the population of the 48 States. This grant of one twenty-fifths of the membership in the United States Senate dilutes and diminishes by that fraction the representation in that body of the people of the 48 States.

POLITICAL POWER IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, A MAJOR CONSIDERATION

The disproportionate advantage of Alaska and Hawaii would also apply in the presidential elections. Upon admission, these States would have a total of 7 electoral votes, an average of 1 electoral vote for each 89,776 inhabitants. The 152,572,000 people of the 48 States, with a total of 531 electoral votes, are entitled to 1 electoral vote each for an average population of 287,300. Thus, the voter in Hawaii and Alaska would have an average voting power in the election of a United States President 3.2 times greater than the average vote of the voter in the 48 States.

The comparison of the voting rights of the voters of Hawaii and Alaska—combined—with that of the people of the 48 States in presidential elections is contained in schedule B of the accompanying table, page 16a.

The electoral vote of 2,011,100—7 electoral x 287,300 average population for 1 electoral vote—persons will be taken from the 152,572,000 residents of the 48 States and transferred to the 628,437 residents of Hawaii and Alaska. The disfranchisement of the residents of the 48 States applies not only to the executive branch but also applies to the judicial branch of our Government because the appointing power to the judiciary lies with the President.

The total electoral vote will be temporarily increased to 538 by the 7 electoral votes of Hawaii and Alaska. After the 1960 census, the House of Representatives would be reapportioned to reduce the temporary membership of 438 to 435. With the Senate increased to 100 Members, the electoral

college would be permanently increased to 535 members.

Although the combined population is only one two-hundred-and-forty-seconds of the population of the 48 States, Hawaii and Alaska (combined) would enjoy one seventy-sixth (or seven five-hundred-thirty-fifths) of the total voting strength of the 48 States in the election of a President. The right of suffrage of the 48 States in this respect is diminished by that fraction.

THE DILEMMA OF STATEHOOD

Congress is confronted with the unpleasant alternatives of continuing to withhold statehood and Federal representation for the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii or to grant statehood under terms that would unduly reduce the Federal representation of the people of the 48 States. Under present provision of the Constitution, a difficult choice must be made between the following alternatives:

A. By the denial of statehood:

1. Shall 499,794 citizens of Hawaii and 128,643 citizens of Alaska continue to be denied representation in the United States Senate and be limited to representation in the United States House of Representatives by a nonvoting delegate? and

2. Shall these citizens continue to be denied representation in the executive and judicial branches of the Federal Government by the lack of suffrage in the election of a President? or

B. By the grant of statehood:

1. Shall the citizens of the 48 States be disfranchised to the extent of one twenty-fifth of their representation in the United States Senate and shall that share of representation (possessed on an average by 6,357,168 citizens of the 48 States) be transferred to the 628,437 citizens of Hawaii and Alaska? and

2. Shall the citizens of the 48 States be disfranchised to the extent of one seventy-sixth of their electoral college voting rights in the election of a President and his appointment of the judiciary and shall that share of representation (possessed on an average by 2,011,100 citizens of the 48 States) be transferred to the 628,437 citizens of Hawaii and Alaska?

It is my conviction that neither alternative can wisely and justly solve this subverting dilemma.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS IN PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

There have been a number of joint resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives proposing constitutional amendments to deal with the problem of statehood.

One group proposes to empower Congress to determine whether the newly admitted State shall have either no representation in the United States Senate, or 1 Senator or 2 Senators. While the intent of this resolution is laudible, the political pressures upon Congress would probably prevent a non-partisan consideration of this determination.

The second group would provide for the admission of States by the same procedure that is required for an amendment to the United States Constitution. This proposal appears to be a procedural and not a substantive amendment. It would serve to erect an almost insurmountable barrier to statehood. The proposal has the advantage of placing the final decision of statehood in the State legislatures which represent the people affected more closely than either House of Congress. It offers no cure for the weakness of disproportionate representation.

The third, a resolution, House Joint Resolution 208, introduced by this writer, proposes a limitation upon representation in the United States Senate for newly admitted States. It would establish an inflexible standard of representation in the United States Senate on a basis proportionate to

population. By its provisions, any State hereafter admitted, upon attaining a population of one-half of the average population represented by each Senator (1950 Census: 794,646), would become entitled to 1 United States Senator. Upon attaining a population of $1\frac{1}{2}$ of the average population represented by each Senator (1950 Census: 2,383,938) it would become entitled to 2 United States Senators.

JUSTIFICATION FOR HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 208, PROPORTIONATE POPULATION REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES SENATE FOR NEWLY ADMITTED STATES

The Senate today, in terms of power derivations, accountability, and representation, constitutes another House of Representatives. Since the reason for equality of senatorial representation no longer exists, there is no further need for this constitutional provision. The only other tenable apportionment for the exercise of senatorial power is that of representation proportionate to population.

The proponents for statehood contend that Hawaii has a larger population than a number of States. They contend that it would be unfair to limit their senatorial representation as a condition to statehood. An adequate answer to this contention is that while article V of the Constitution prohibits depriving any State of its equal suffrage in the Senate, this protection does not apply to Hawaii and Alaska since they are not States and cannot be deprived of a power they do not now possess. It has been suggested that the present senatorial representation be rearranged. This is neither practicable nor constitutionally possible, since this protection of Senate suffrage is not amendable.

The farsighted statesmen who drew our Constitution were very careful to make this Constitution flexible enough to allow an amendment for the admission of States without the representation of two Senators.

The clause of article V of the Constitution, "that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate," carries a double connotation.

First: The Constitution cannot be amended to deprive any State of equal suffrage in the Senate without its consent.

Second: The Constitution cannot be amended to deprive a State of its power to consent to be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The farsighted vision of a possible gross inequality of representation in the Senate is confirmed by a study of the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention. In the considerations of the provisions of article IV, section 3, "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union;" the Convention deleted, by a 9-to-2 vote, a proposal to the effect that "new States be admitted on the same terms with the original States."

The Constitution affords ample authority to justify an amendment to equalize, per population, senatorial representation for States to be admitted.

STATEHOOD POSSIBILITIES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PUERTO RICO, GUAM, VIRGIN ISLANDS, SAMOA

No one can accurately foretell what lands and peoples may seek statehood in future decades. The holdings of the United States, in addition to the trusteeship of the trust islands in the Pacific, are the incorporated Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, the vague commonwealth status of Puerto Rico, the unincorporated but organized territories of the Virgin Islands and Guam, and the unincorporated and unorganized possession of American Samoa.

The residents of these Territories all enjoy United States citizenship excepting those in Samoa, who are classified as "nationals."

The people of each of these possessions, and the people of the District of Columbia

aspire for statehood. The Virgin Islands hints for a delegate to the House of Representatives. Delegates to both Houses of Congress have been proposed for the District of Columbia.

Each of these political entities are edging toward statehood. In the coming half century, Congress will be called upon to decide their fate without any principle to guide it in relation to representation in the Senate and the electoral college. Certainly, the determination should not rest upon the political expedients that may exist at that time.

House Joint Resolution 208 would provide Congress with an equitable basis for the consideration of statehood and remove the problem of representation from the strains of party politics. It would establish a just and inflexible standard of equal application to all States hereafter admitted. It would lessen the clamor for statehood where it is sought primarily for the political powers inherent in two seats in the United States Senate.

OTHER ASPECTS OF STATEHOOD: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The proponents of Alaskan statehood claim that statehood would advance the economic development of Alaska. This hope does not conform to historical fact.

Hawaii and Alaska have had territorial status for about the same length of time. Yet, Hawaii has progressed at a far more rapid pace, economically, than has Alaska. Hawaii's economy compares quite favorably with that of the States. It is not the political status that accounts for the differential in the rate of their economic growth. The growth of Hawaii can be principally ascribed to favorable physical characteristics, the temperate climate, and her arable lands.

THE VOTE IN ALASKA

The office of Delegate is the highest elective

office in Alaska. The total vote cast for that office in the 1954 election was 26,999. This compares with the latest estimated civilian population of 132,000. No attempt will be made to analyze the reason for the meager ratio of vote to that of population.

When compared to congressional districts which cast from 150,000 to 200,000 votes, the voting differential is startling. This vote sharply and clearly shows up the fantastically excessive disproportionment of allowing 2 Senators to be elected by the choice of 27,000 voters.

LOSS OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES—THE GROWTH OF NATIONAL POLITICAL POWER—THE REDUCTION OF STATES RIGHTS

The past 25 years, can be noted for the vast and alarming growth and concentration of power in the National Government. A parallel concentration continues to take place in the executive branch of our Government. These increasing concentrations of power coincide with a reduction of powers of the States, the loss of sovereign rights and liberties of the people, and the deprivations of the legislative powers and responsibilities of Congress.

Statehood for these Territories would accentuate the inequalities of senatorial representation. It would tend to strengthen the national concept and weaken States rights. It would increase the pace of nationalization of local government services and concentrate power in the Federal Government and in the executive branch.

There is no standard of measurement of political power. There is however a standard for the measurement of the exercise of power. This standard is the percentage of the national product siphoned off by our Government. The following table illustrates the increase in the Federal absorption of our national production:

Government expenditures and gross national product

Calendar year	Gross national product	Government expenditures					
		Amount			As a percentage of gross national product		
		Total expenditures	Federal expenditures	State, local expenditures	Total expenditures	Federal expenditures	State, local expenditures
	Billion	Billion	Billion	Billion	Percent	Percent	Percent
1929.....	\$104.4	\$10.2	\$2.6	\$7.5	9.8	2.5	7.3
1930.....	91.1	11.02	2.7	8.2	12.1	3.0	9.1
1940.....	100.6	18.4	10.08	8.3	18.4	10.0	8.3
1950.....	285.06	61.2	40.9	20.2	21.5	14.4	7.1
1953.....	364.8	102.5	78.05	24.4	28.1	21.4	6.7

The above table indicates that Federal spending of our national production increased from 2.5 percent in 1929 to 21.4 percent in 1953. An increase of more than eightfold. In the same period, the spending by States decreased from 7.3 percent to 6.7 percent of our national production.

The founders of our Constitution envisioned a government of limited national power. The residuary power of the States was conceived to be far greater quantitatively than the powers granted to the Federal Government. The grant of two Senators to each State was based upon these assumptions. Appointment by legislatures was devised to safeguard this objective.

The above table proves that the exercise of Federal power, 21.4 percent of production, is more than 3 times the exercise of State power, 6.7 percent. This shift from State power to Federal power coincides with the alteration of our mode of selection of Senators from that of legislatures to that of popular suffrage.

The equitable measure of representation for a dominant national government is that of representation in proportion to popula-

tion. That is the only possible protection of the majority of the people against the preponderant power of a minority of the people.

Statehood, by increasing the power of the minority, will tend to break down our two party system. It leads to blocs and coalitions based on sectional and popular interests. The function of party organization to compromise between sectional and national interests is bypassed.

Instead of considering legislation in accordance with sound principle, excessive power encourages the consideration of legislation by political expediency and the pressures of the electorate. Theories are evolved afterward to accommodate acts of political expediency.

The senatorial powers to be assigned by H. R. 2535 will not lie dormant. The powers of senatorial representation granted to these two Territories invite their abuse by reason of the fact that these powers are not coupled with corresponding and balancing accountability and responsibility.

For example; Alaska, with 2 Senators, would possess one-fiftieth of the power to determine the expenditure of more than \$60

billion per year. That share of power to spend is \$1.2 billion. Yet Alaska's responsibility for the collection of the amount to be spent, \$60 billion, as represented by her Federal taxes, is only \$48 million, or more than 1,000 times less than the total national expenditure. Alaska's 2 Senators would be accountable to a population of 132,000 (27,000 votes) although her 2 Senators would enjoy the senatorial power possessed on the average by about 3 million people of the Nation.

REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This problem poses a number of unpleasant alternatives. The present bill would increase the Members of the House by three seats allotted to the Territories. The membership of the House is increased from 435 to 438 Members. Although the membership of the House is to be increased, the increase is made not because of any advantages or need to increase the size. In fact, the present limitation of 435 Members was a careful decision as to the maximum desirable membership. The proposed increase by three seats is provided in this bill for the purpose of accommodating the proposed new Members. It is intended to anticipate the necessity for reducing the Representatives from other States if the membership is permanently limited to 435 Members.

Hawaii bases her claim to 2 Representatives upon the United States census population figure of 499,794. The latest estimate of her population would indicate that after 1960 her representation would probably be reduced to one Representative. Yet, the membership of the House is being permanently increased by 2 seats to accommodate Hawaii's proposed Representatives and 1 seat to accommodate Alaska's Representative. Although, as of today, Hawaii is only entitled to one Representative.

If H. R. 2535 is amended so that the increase of membership in the House is temporary and will be reduced to 435 after the 1960 census, then the additional representation from Hawaii and Alaska will be included at the expense of representation from some other State. That reduction will probably be at the expense of those States who have failed to increase their population in pace with the national rate. The States that have shown a loss of population between the 1950 census and the July 1, 1952, estimates are:

Loss in population

State:	
Maine.....	22,000
New Hampshire.....	1,000
Vermont.....	7,000
Iowa.....	13,000
North Dakota.....	17,000
West Virginia.....	36,000
Tennessee.....	32,000
Mississippi.....	15,000
Arkansas.....	65,000
Oklahoma.....	9,000

If the membership of the House is retained at 435 by an amendment in the House or Senate, then we commit ourselves to reducing the representation of other States by either 2 or 3 seats to be allotted to these Territories.

The Federalist, Paper No. 58, warns us against a multitudinous representative assembly. Excessive numbers lead not to democratic processes but, on the contrary, to government by the few.

The latest United States Census population estimates (1954) for these Territories are:

Alaska:	
Civilian.....	132,000
Military.....	50,000
Total.....	182,000

Hawaii:	
Civilian	467,000
Military	55,000
Total	522,000

Due to our military bases, the ratio of military personnel to the civilian population is far greater in these Territories than exists in the other States. The military personnel consists of citizens and inhabitants of the 48 States. Yet the census makes no differentiation but adds the military population to the civilian in computing their entitlement to representation. This method violates the intent of amendment 14, section 2, of our Constitution.

Article II, section 2 of the proposed Hawaiian constitution provides:

"No person shall be deemed to have gained or lost residence simply because of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States."

Thus we find that both Federal civilian and military personnel are excluded from the right of suffrage by this section. Yet, their numbers are added to establish a base for Hawaii's entitlement to representation in the United States House of Representatives.

This section would appear to constitute an abridgement and denial of the right to vote. If so, then amendment 14, section 2 provides that the basis of representation shall be reduced in proportion. This writer suggests the desirability of congressional action to conform the apportionment of representation in Hawaii and Alaska with the requirements of amendment 14, section 2 of the United States Constitution.

The Alaska Statehood Committee reports that Alaska is politically impotent in Washington because it has no voting representative in either House of Congress.

During this writer's short tenure here, both Hawaii and Alaska have had the benefit of the finest, most capable and diligent delegates. They would bring honor to any constituency. They have distinguished themselves by outstanding service to this Nation and to the territories they represent.

Most Representatives are limited to serving on one standing committee of the House. These committees vary considerably in the volume and importance of the legislation referred to them. The distinguished delegates from Hawaii and Alaska enjoy the unique advantage of membership on three major committees: Agriculture, Armed Services and Interior and Insular Affairs. The delegate from Alaska, in addition, serves on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Their service on these committees gives them the advantage of an association with fellow committee members which no other Representative enjoys. This opportunity enhances their influence and power.

The great mass of decisions made by Congress are made without a vote. The influence upon legislation in Congress can not be measured by the right to vote. It is not a pleasant task to vote in opposition to measures which have adverse political repercussions for a fellow member of the House. It is not conducive to political good-fellowship. This distinguished delegates are saved from this necessity. When balanced out, the disadvantages of the lack of a vote are far outweighed by the advantages accruing to the delegates.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Chairman, the following conclusions and recommendations are respectfully submitted to this committee as an equitable disposition of this problem:

1. Statehood for Hawaii ought to be deferred until she has unquestionably eliminated communistic influences in her political, economic, and social structures.

2. Statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska should be deferred pending the adoption of an appropriate constitutional amendment to provide for representation in the United States Senate on a basis proportionate to population.

3. If statehood is to be granted upon the basis of equal representation in the Senate, then admission should be approved by three-fourths of the States pursuant to a constitutional amendment providing for the admission of States by the same procedure that is now required to amend our Constitution.

4. Congress should immediately grant to each Territory the autonomy of statehood with full power of self-government in such form as may be recommended by the Territories.

The autonomy would include:

(a) Complete executive power with the right of election of Governor.

(b) Full legislative power over all Territorial affairs, including public lands, fisheries, and subsurface resources.

(c) Exclusive judicial jurisdiction.

5. The enactment into Federal statute of such reasonable restrictions, comparable to limitations in their proposed constitutions, as may be recommended by the Territories to safeguard individual liberties and to insure a republican form of government.

6. The immediate and outright grant to Alaska of specifically described public lands to be selected by the Territory from vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved lands, not to exceed 20 million acres.

7. Grants of \$7 million each year for a period of 5 years to defray the cost of governmental services assumed from the Federal Government.

This solution would strengthen and unify this Nation in the years to come. It would help preserve the rights of the States and the liberties of our people. The cause of justice and freedom would be advanced.

JOHN R. PILLION,
Member, United States House of
Representatives.

FEBRUARY 14, 1955.

Sol Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in many of the charitable programs conducted in Chicago in recent years, and in activities directed toward achieving better understanding and better feeling among peoples of different national and religious backgrounds, the name of Mr. Sol Polk has appeared. This young man, whose phenomenal success in the retail business has been accomplished by arduous, unrelenting labor, has never been too busy to participate in efforts to provide guidance and wholesome recreation for the children and young people of the Chicago area, to aid all groups working toward this end, the small community drives as well as the large, well-publicized efforts.

It is very pleasant and satisfies our sense of justice when one who is so willing to serve selflessly attains material success as well. On Sunday, March 13, 1955, the Chicago Stadium will be the scene of "the world's largest birthday

party," the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the opening of the first Polk Bros. store, complete with party favors, hats, refreshments, and so forth. The guests, employees, and friends of Polk Bros., will view the entire performance of the Ice Capades of 1955 and Ed Sullivan's Toast of the Town, which will originate in the Chicago Stadium in honor of the occasion.

A birthday celebration of this magnitude is typical of the way Sol Polk does business. In the past 20 years, he has made merchandising history in Chicago as a retail dealer in home appliances. So outstanding has his success been that his stores were the topic of an address delivered by S. R. Bernstein, editor of Advertising Age, at the 45th annual meeting of the Association of National Advertisers. The address was printed in full in the February 7, 1955, issue of Advertising Age, and I should like to reproduce at this point a portion of Mr. Bernstein's address:

I should like to show you an ad. It is a full page that appeared in the Chicago American.

I want to show it to you because, better than any single example I have run across lately, it demonstrates some of the problems we meet in that little drama entitled "Tumult in the Marketplace"—or "Who's on Which Side, and What the Hell Kind of a Game Are They Playing, Anyhow?"

Let me explain that this is the introductory ad for a new store—the third in the Polk Bros. chain. Unless you are in the appliance business, or happen to live in Chicago, you probably never heard of this amazingly successful discount house.

For that's what Polk Bros. is—a discount house. Or at least that's what it was a few months ago. In this era of turmoil in the marketplace, it is apparently already changing into something else. Anyhow, to everyone in Chicago, Polk Bros. is a "discount house." It is also far and away the most important retailer of nationally advertised radios, TV sets, and major appliances in the Chicago area.

Think for a minute of great Chicago stores like Marshall Field & Co. and Carson Pirie Scott & Co. Then ponder this startling fact:

Every time Marshall Field sells 1 appliance, Polk Bros. sells 10 appliances. Every time Carson's sells a single appliance, Polk Bros. sells 16. So, in cold, hard terms of moving merchandise, this discount house is worth 10 accounts like Marshall Field, and 16 like Carson's. That's the background for this ad.

What made Polk Bros. decide to open a new store on Chicago's South Side? Here's what the ad says:

"Two things. First there was you (the customer). You and your friends helped us decide. And then there were the people who make the things that we have to offer you. The national manufacturers . . . the people we Polk brothers look on as a family within our family."

And there's more. "After shopping a while you'd tell how you liked what we had for you—the big selection of famous national brands that manufacturers have spent millions developing, our common sensible prices, the way we made it fun to do family shopping. . . ."

And still more:

"What did we bring with us, when we moved in?"

"We brought the biggest selection of nationally advertised brands ever sold in one store. By anybody. For example, take television. We offer you not just 1 or 2 famous brands, but more than 15. Take washers,

over 66 different models * * * "You see, we believe that when you're spending your hard-earned money you have a right to choose from among the very best brands. Here at Polk Bros. you can compare them. All in one store."

And again:

"The most guaranteed merchandise in America * * * We stand behind it. The famous manufacturers stand behind it."

And finally there is, in the ad, a listing of 91 brands—most of them as well-known as the name of the President of the United States.

Now, let's try to imagine, for a moment that there is a merchandising man from Mars in the audience, with no preconceived notions about how marketing ought to be done on this earth of ours.

If we told this visitor from Mars that we were deeply concerned about the development and growth of discount houses like Polk Bros., I suspect he would think we were crazy.

"It seems to me," he would probably say, "that these discount houses you are talking about personify the ultimate in national advertising success stories. They literally exist on national brands—on brands which have, through the years, built a consumer franchise and done it well. These are the kinds of brands you fellows make. You built an active demand for these national brands of major appliances, and the discount house makes that demand effective by offering these wanted goods at prices that are—or seem to be—lower than they are elsewhere."

"Furthermore, I understand that these discount houses did this without getting any concessions from you manufacturers in the way of price, or terms, or advertising allowances, or anything else. In fact, when they started, many of you wouldn't even sell to them."

"In spite of this, they are apparently selling vast quantities of merchandise, delivering a service which the public seems to want, making money themselves, and saving money for the consumer. So here, I would say, we have the finest flowering of the advertising tree; first the development through advertising of consumer brand acceptance, and then the activation of that acceptance by a type of retailer who is riding the nationally advertised brand's coattails all the way. Why are you worried about them?"

And then you would probably explain that they have caused you a great deal of trouble, because they have "disturbed the retail price structure," and because they have upset your "normal distribution channels."

To which the man from Mars might say:

"In my opinion, your job is to move the goods you make, as quickly and as effectively as possible. It is not your job to maintain 'normal distribution channels.' It is not your job to protect lazy or inefficient retailers. And it is certainly not your job to see to it that the consumer pays a higher price for your goods, if he can get them at a lower price, and still have everybody in the distribution chain make a reasonable profit."

Well, I admit that I have oversimplified the situation greatly, and that there is plenty of room for several hours of discussion on this point. I do think it is important, however, to realize that turmoil in the market place is not necessarily and inevitably bad for the manufacturer of branded merchandise.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Sol Polk's story is one which illustrates well the qualities which have brought about the tremendous wealth of this Nation and its fine standard of living. I take pleasure in calling it to the attention of my colleagues.

Discriminatory Practices in Marine Transportation Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, I offer for the information of Members of this body explanatory material prepared by the world trade division of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, together with a resolution adopted by its board of trustees March 1, 1955, both with regard to discriminatory practices in marine transportation insurance:

In recent years, many foreign governments have adopted discriminatory practices in the field of marine transportation insurance which adversely affect both the American exporter and the American insurance market.

Through the issuance of exchange regulations, restrictive laws and action by governmental purchasing agencies and quasi-governmental corporations, these governments have required marine insurance on their international trade shipments to be placed in their own market. As a result, American exporters and importers are denied the traditional right to secure the best coverage at the most favorable rate obtainable in the highly competitive world market. In many instances, our traders have found it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain adequate insurance necessary for their own protection, and at best, must rely upon the insurance judgment of the foreign purchaser or supplier.

Unfortunately, certain agencies of our own Government, such as the Foreign Operations Administration, which, among other things, is responsible for the foreign economic aid financed exports, has also adopted a policy which allows the recipient nations to dictate that marine insurance on such shipments be placed in their own markets. Condoning such discrimination against the American insurance market unquestionably encourages many countries to adopt similar practices on all their international transactions.

Numerous congressional committees have repeatedly stressed that a strong independent marine insurance institution is necessary for the development of this country's merchant marine and foreign commerce. In a free worldwide competitive insurance market, the American insurance market has been able to achieve this position. However, it must be recognized that when faced with the discriminatory practices of foreign countries as well as those of our own making, the security and further development of our insurance market is seriously periled.

Governmental restrictions in the field of marine transportation insurance has been recognized by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations as a trade barrier hindering international commerce and is contrary to the Council's request that member governments adopt a policy of nondiscrimination in this field.

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce therefore urges our State Department to continue its efforts to include nondiscrimination clauses in all our treaties of commerce, navigation, and friendship, and to vigorously seek the elimination of those discriminatory regulations currently enforced by many foreign governments.

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce urges the United States Department of State to seek elimination of the discriminatory practices of many foreign governments requiring firms engaged in international trade to place marine transport insurance in companies of any particular nation.

Also opposed is the policy of the United States Government which allows foreign nations to dictate that marine transport insurance covering American exports financed by foreign economic aid funds, be placed in the insurance market of the recipient nation.

It is recommended further that the United States Government should continue to make every effort to include a clause in the treaties of commerce, navigation, and friendship, whereby neither nation shall impose any measure of a discriminatory nature which restricts the freedom of choice of the international trader of either country in the placement of marine transport insurance.

The Ohio River Flood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Ohio Valley has suffered, and is now suffering from the results of a terrific flood. The damage resulting from these widespread floods can hardly be estimated. Every house in some of the villages has been reached by the flood, and the people have been driven from their homes, leaving their furniture behind them. Likewise, many stores and business houses have been flooded, the water reaching to the ceiling and destroying valuable stocks of goods. Plants have been flooded and many thousands of persons have lost many days employment at their places of employment. I would say that the damage on the Ohio side of the river from Marietta to Cincinnati would amount to tens of millions of dollars.

While these Ohio River floods are terrifically disastrous to properties, it is a very consoling fact to know that very few lives are lost in any of these Ohio River floods. This is due to the fact that the river rises slowly and the people have a chance to get out of the way of the water and they generally have a chance to take with them their livestock and some of their other possessions.

As is generally known, the Federal Government has control over the navigable rivers of the country. This control is exercised through a very competent Government agency known as the Army engineers. In these flood seasons the Army engineers are always busy in their efforts to minimize the effects of the floods where they possibly can.

The Congress of the United States has taken an interest in the destructive floods which affect our country. This is especially true of the Ohio Valley. While it has not been expected that the Government would restore property destroyed in floods, the Government has, through the

Congress on a number of occasions, passed legislation that was greatly to the benefit of those who might suffer from the results of disastrous floods. The two most disastrous floods that afflicted the Ohio Valley occurred in 1913 and 1937. Of these two floods, the 1937 was the most disastrous.

Following the 1937 flood former Congressman William M. Whittington and I decided to attempt to secure the passage of legislation that would relieve against future floods, especially those of gigantic proportions. We were successful in our efforts because the Members of Congress appreciated the destructive effects of big floods. Our legislation provided, in effect, first that the Army engineers should find that the location was such that flood defenses would be practical. If it was found that the construction of a flood wall was feasible, then the community would be required to purchase the rights-of-way that would be necessary upon which to construct the proposed flood walls. If the Army engineers found that the construction of a flood wall would be feasible, then it would be necessary for the city to issue bonds or to find the funds in some other way to purchase the rights-of-way. The law further provided that if and when the rights-of-way had been purchased, the Government would have the power to provide the other funds necessary to construct the walls and would proceed to construct them. This construction would then be done under the direction of the Army engineers and to the full approval of the engineers and the officials of the city or village which was being protected.

Having been familiar with the provisions of the law I naturally proceeded immediately to secure the benefits of the law for my home city of Ironton, Ohio, and for her people. We had no doubt that the Army engineers would find that our beautiful city of about 35,000 population, with many fine dwellings and business houses, and many large factories and mills would qualify for the construction of protective flood walls.

The Army engineers did find Ironton, as a city, meeting the physical qualifications.

It was then up to our people to secure the rights-of-way. They did this, promptly, by voting a bond issue of \$750,000, which was used to purchase the rights-of-way. Because of our alertness and our desire to comply with the law and secure flood protection for our city and our people we soon had the Army engineers at work drawing the plans for adequate flood protection. Soon, thereafter, the Government arranged to contribute about \$4 million, which was the amount required to do the work and to meet the amount provided by the city of Ironton and her people.

With the financing and the plans all arranged bids were asked for and a contract was soon entered into and in due course our beautiful city of Ironton was secure behind large, adequate walls.

Our city of Ironton was the first city in the whole United States to get a flood wall under the law that Mr. Whittington and I were responsible for its passage.

Naturally, we are all proud of this, and still more proud because we are protected against any more destructive floods, that previously put 15 feet of water in the First National Bank Building, and all the downtown buildings in our fair city, and which also put most of our people out of their homes.

While we, the people of Ironton, were getting our flood wall, the people of Huntington, W. Va., which is a large city located about 15 miles up the river from Ironton, were working diligently to secure a flood wall—they were successful and since that time this large city, with a population of at least 100,000 people, is completely protected.

I was glad and proud that while we were all pushing the development of these flood walls, I was able to render some help to the city of Portsmouth, Ohio, which is located about 25 miles from Ironton, and has a population of about 50,000. It was largely through my efforts that we got a million and a half dollars with which the last of six units of the Portsmouth wall was built.

While Ironton, Huntington, and Portsmouth rest complacently behind flood walls which have cost them and the Government millions of dollars, still I am saddened with the thought that thousands of fine citizens on both sides of the majestic Ohio River living in villages and in the rural sections are still subjected to the scourage of these periodical floods. I surely hope that we can develop many water conservation projects similar to the big dam which bears my name, and which impounds a lake 10 miles long above Glouster, Athens County, Ohio; and which holds back a great quantity of water from rushing down to the Ohio to augment the raging floods already pouring down the Ohio. There are a number of conservation projects in the Muskingum River in Ohio which have held back great quantities of water and thereby have reduced the amount of water flowing into the Ohio. I hope we can construct many more of these in our country.

Mr. Speaker, floods are terrific, but ours is a great country and I think we can and will control the floods for the protection of all our people.

Rubber Plant Disposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement made by me before the House Armed Services Committee, Thursday, March 10, 1955, in opposition to proposed disposal of Government-owned synthetic rubber facilities, in pursuance of Public Law 205 of the 83d Congress:

There are some antitrust and small-business facets in the rubber producing fa-

cilities disposal program which I should like to comment upon.

When we passed Public Law 205 in the 83d Congress, the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry was stressed by section 3 (c) which reads as follows:

SEC. 3 (c). From the time of its appointment and throughout the course of the performance of its duties, the Commission shall consult and advise with the Attorney General in order (1) to secure guidance as to the type of disposal program which would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry, and (2) to supply the Attorney General with such information as he may deem requisite to enable him to provide the advice contemplated by this section and sections 9 (a) (4) and 9 (f) of this act."

Section 17 of the act reads as follows: "SEC. 17. The following criteria, together with such other criteria as the Commission deems necessary or desirable to best effectuate the purposes of this act, shall be used by the Commission in arriving at its recommendations for disposal:

"(3) That the recommended sales shall provide for the development within the United States of a free, competitive, synthetic rubber industry, and do not permit any person to possess unreasonable control over the manufacture of synthetic rubber or its component materials."

Most of these plants are scheduled for transfer to companies and entities which, to say the least, have a very bad antitrust record. That augurs little if any expectation for free and open competition in the synthetic-rubber industry. The prospective plant purchasers include rubber and oil companies whose records raise serious doubt that their operations will make for a competitive synthetic-rubber industry. Each of the big four rubber companies, Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, United States Rubber, among the successful bidders, has lost 4 to 6 antitrust suits in this country and Canada since World War II. Several of the other rubber companies and chemical companies participating in the proposed purchase also have been branded as offenders in one or more antitrust suits in recent years. Significantly all but 1 of the oil companies involved in the purchase are even currently defendants in a Federal antitrust suit or a State of Texas antitrust suit or both, and several of the oil companies in addition have lost 1 or 2 other such suits in the past 20 years. In effect, the present disposal program would transfer almost the entire synthetic-rubber industry to corporations which in the past have taken active steps to limit competition, to fix prices, to establish quotas—all to the detriment of a free-enterprise system and to the detriment of small business and with a "consumer be damned" attitude.

One cannot easily swallow the Attorney General's opinion in approval of the disposal program that these companies will best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic-rubber industry.

Let me point out specifically some of the cases brought by our Government against these companies which indicate that they have actively combined and conspired to restrict competition and to fix prices in rubber products and petroleum products and chemicals, and in such minor items as storage batteries, brake lining and peach-pitting machinery. One of the parent companies of the lesser participants stands accused in a pending suit monopolizing air transportation.

Here are some of the cases:

1. In *United States v. Rubber Manufacturers Association et al.*, the Big Four, Firestone, Goodrich, Goodyear, and United States Rubber Co., plus Dayton, Seiberling, and others, were charged with combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade in tires and

tubes, from 1935 to 1947. They pleaded nolo contendere, and were fined \$5,000 each.

2. In *United States v. The Metropolitan Leather & Findings Association, Inc.*, in 1948, Goodyear and others were charged with price fixing in rubber heels and soles, and were fined.

3. In *United States v. United States Rubber Co. et al.*, United States Rubber and Dunlop Rubber Co., Ltd., were charged in 1948 with illegal cartel arrangements in latex; they took a consent decree in 1954.

4. In *United States v. Sears, Roebuck & Co. et al.*, filed in 1952, Sears and Goodrich were held to be in violation of the Clayton Act by having a common director; he later resigned from the Board of Sears.

5. In 2 1950 cases, 1 civil, 1 criminal, both known as *United States v. Association of American Battery Manufacturers*, Sears, Firestone, Goodrich, Goodyear, and others, were charged with price fixing and exercise of monopoly power to exclude competitors, among other things. They pleaded nolo contendere to one count in the criminal case, and took a consent decree in the civil case.

6. In *United States v. National City Lines, Inc. et al.*, also two cases filed in 1947, Firestone, Phillips, Standard Oil of California, and others, were charged with conspiracy, restraint, and monopolization of trade in the sale of buses, petroleum products, and tires and tubes. The charges went back to 1937. In the criminal case, the jury found them guilty on one count in 1949. The civil suit, involving injunctions against future violators, was still unsettled in 1954. Regulation of trade by law suit is sometimes a slow business.

7. Three Canadian antitrust cases are very enlightening. These are *Regina v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. of Canada, Ltd. et al.* (mechanical goods); *Regina v. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. of Canada, Ltd. et al.* (tires); and *Regina v. Dominion Rubber Co., Ltd. et al.* (rubber footwear).

In the first case, Goodyear, Goodrich, Dominion (the Canadian subsidiary of United States Rubber), Dunlop, and one other, pleaded guilty to conspiring to prevent or lessen competition from 1936 to 1952, and were fined \$10,000 each. In the tire case, Firestone, Goodrich, Goodyear, Dominion, Dunlop and others, pleaded guilty to charges covering the period 1937 to 1952. They were fined \$10,000, the then maximum fine, which the judge noted was wholly inadequate. The prosecutor estimated the companies had "illegally extracted" \$1,300,000 a year for the 15 years they admitted operating the tire combine. The companies are reported to have replied that they were forced to band together for mutual protection during the depression. Banding together for mutual protection could be much more profitable in the United States, particularly if they own the GR-S plants which they now seek.

Dominion and Goodrich, and others, pleaded guilty in the footwear case, and were fined \$10,000. The charges included identical product specifications and identical prices.

Canada has now removed the top limit on antitrust fines, permitting the court to assess such fines as the cases warrant. This should be a much greater deterrent than our \$5,000 maximum fine.

In the *Regina v. Firestone* case, the Canadian High Court said as follows:

"Between the 1st day of January 1937, and the 31st day of October 1952, within the jurisdiction of this Honourable Court, they" (the defendants) "did unlawfully conspire, combine, agree or arrange together and with one another to unduly prevent or lessen competition in the production, manufacture, purchase, barter, sale, transportation or supply in . . . the Province of Ontario, . . . and elsewhere in Canada . . . of . . . rubber tires (casings) and rubber tubes for

passenger vehicles, trucks and buses, agricultural and road implements and tractors and related products including tire and tube accessories, automotive accessories and tire repair and retread materials, and did thereby commit an indictable offence contrary to the provisions of the Criminal Code, section 498, subsection 1 (d)."

"Each of the accused corporations entered a plea of guilty and thereupon evidence was presented by the Crown to establish in a general way the nature and extent of the operations of these companies which resulted in this prosecution.

"In the view I entertain the maximum penalty of \$10,000 provided by the code is wholly inadequate to meet the ends of justice, even as a punishment to the least of these offenders. This law has been in force for over 50 years and its provisions are, or should be, well known to the businessmen of this country. Their actions were cold-blooded, calculated, and deliberate violations of the law of the land and call for as severe a penalty as can be imposed within legal limits, both to mark the court's condemnation of the enormity of the offense from the standpoint of punishment, and for its deterrent effect upon other potential offenders. It is the sentence of this court that each of the accused shall pay a fine of \$10,000 and that they be condemned to pay the costs incurred in and about the prosecution and conviction for the offenses of which they have been convicted, forthwith after taxation thereof."

In the case of *Regina v. Dominion Rubber Company, Ltd., et al.* the High Court of Ontario said:

"There were countless meetings and agreements among representatives of the accused and their coconspirators at which an elaborate system of classifying their commodities was arranged, identifying them by common number. . . . A casual study of the analysis of common prices which resulted from these agreements, filed as exhibit A-3, will reveal how well they succeeded in maintaining an identical price level."

Now, let us take some of the cases against the oil companies who were successful bidders.

Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), which controls both Esso Standard Oil Co. and Humble, was charged in 1942 with conspiracy with I. G. Farbenindustrie in two cases involving synthetic rubber. They pleaded nolo contendere in one case and took a consent decree in the other.

Several oil companies involved in the bidding for the synthetic rubber plants were also involved in losing two cases filed in 1938. *United States v. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana)*, a price-fixing case, was appealed to the Supreme Court under the name of *United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co. et al.*, and conviction was sustained as to Phillips, Continental, Shell Petroleum Corp., and Empire (the predecessor of Cities Service). Continental and Cities Service make up Petroleum Chemicals, Inc.

The other 1938 case, also called *United States v. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc.*, concerned fixing jobber margins. In 1941 nolo pleas were entered by Cities Service, and an officer each of Empire, Shell, and Continental.

Among the 38 defendants pleading nolo contendere in *United States v. General Petroleum Corp. of California et al.*, a 1939 case charging illegal price raising and price maintenance, were Shell Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of California, and the Texas Co. Fines were \$4,000 for Texas, \$4,500 for the other two.

Still pending is a suit brought by the present Attorney General, *United States v. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) et al.* Standard, Gulf, the Texas Co., Standard of California, and one other, are charged with attempting to secure and exercise control

over foreign production and supplies of petroleum and petroleum products, to regulate imports in order to maintain a level of domestic and world prices agreed upon by the defendants, and to divide world foreign producing and marketing territories.

The State of Texas has an antitrust suit in the State courts against 10 major oil companies, including Cities Service, Continental, Gulf, the Texas Co., Humble, Phillips, and Standard Oil Co. of Texas (a subsidiary of Standard of California). This case was brought by PRICE DANIEL, then attorney general of Texas, now a Member of the Senate.

United States v. Food Machinery and Chemical Corp. et al., involving monopoly of peach-pitting machinery, was settled by a consent decree last August.

Several of the companies which make up American Synthetic Rubber Corp. appear among the antitrust case losers. American Cyanamid Co., the largest stockholder in American Synthetic and scheduled to be its exclusive selling agent, has been in three cases. *United States v. Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.*, filed in 1942, and ended by nolo pleas in 1946, charged price fixing at exorbitant levels in dyestuffs. Cyanamid and one of its officers were each fined. A subsidiary, American Cyanamid & Chemical Corp., was a party to some chemical antitrust cases filed in 1942, and settled in 1945, by nolo pleas. The cases all charged price fixing. Cyanamid & Chemical was fined \$7,500. In *United States v. Standard Ultramarine and Color Co. et al.*, American Cyanamid took a consent decree in October 1954, on charges of fixing and maintaining prices and allocating sales of ultramarine blue and laundry blue.

Anaconda Wire & Cable Co., a stockholder in American Synthetic, is a subsidiary of Anaconda Copper Mining Co. Two other Anaconda subsidiaries, Anaconda Sales Co. and Greene Cananea Copper Co., were named in *United States v. Climax Molybdenum Co., et al.*, in 1942, a price-fixing and competition-control case, which ended in a consent decree.

General Cable Co. and Phelps Dodge Copper Products Corp. are stockholders in American Synthetic, and have been together before; they took a consent decree in 1948 in *United States v. General Cable Corp., et al.*, a cartel, price-fixing, and development-suppression case.

Dewey & Almy Chemical Co. is a part of American Synthetic, and has recently been acquired by W. R. Grace & Co.; Grace, Pan American World Airways, Inc., and Pan American-Grace Airways, Inc., are defendants in a Sherman Act case filed in 1954, charging combination restricting competition and monopolizing air transportation between the United States and Latin American countries.

Raybestos-Manhattan, Inc., and Thermoid Co., both stockholders in American Synthetic, were also previously associated as nolo-pleaders in 1948 in *United States v. Brake Lining Manufacturers Ass'n, Inc.* They were fined \$5,000 each on price-fixing charges.

Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co. is in American Synthetic; it is controlled by the British Dunlop, which was involved in the latex cartel case with United States Rubber.

It is only fair to add that some of the stockholders in American Synthetic Rubber Corp. have not been involved in antitrust suits.

The only plant, however, that would be sold to a company with no antitrust history is the Koppers Co. alcohol butadiene plant at Kobuta, Pa. Koppers Co., Inc., apparently didn't want the whole plant, but took it just to get the powerplant and utilities.

The list of antitrust cases is long, and perhaps boring. It could be extended by referring to Federal Trade Commission cease-and-desist orders covering such rubber items as golf balls, rubber soles and heels, canvas and

rubber footwear, bicycle accessories, as well as tires and tubes.

The conclusion to be drawn is that competition in the future is no more likely than in the past. Banding together for mutual protection can be highly profitable in the case of synthetic rubber and its component raw materials.

The Attorney General, in his formal statement approving the pattern of disposal, completely ignored the antitrust history of the successful bidders. This is the more surprising, since he settled 3 and brought 2 of these suits in the past 2 years. With this record in his own files, it is extremely difficult to understand how he can make a positive finding that the proposed sales of the plants "will best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic rubber industry."

Indeed, throughout his statement, the Attorney General stressed the lack of competing bids for the several plants. For 10 out of 11 GR-S plants (GR-S is Government rubber styrene, mainly used for rubber in tires) for both the Butyl plants (rubber used for tubes) for 3 out of the 4 petroleum butadiene plants including the largest, and for the alcohol butadiene plant, only one bid was received. The Attorney General seems to consider this paucity of bids as conducive to future competition. To a Congressman such limited bidding might well suggest a lack of competition, that indeed, competition in the synthetic rubber industry is doomed from the start.

The cases that I have cited are mostly settled and thus legally dead. But for purposes of considering the disposal of these plants these cited cases are not dead, morally. Many of these successful bidders are self-confessed law violators or have been found guilty before a judicial tribunal. They thus come before this tribunal with unclean hands. They are malefactors and should be treated as such. This Congress should not reward them by turning over to them valuable plants, no matter how convenient it might be to the Government or to the members of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. These prospective purchasers have snapped their fingers at the laws we made. They have used inordinate power to ride roughshod over competitors. They even tried to cheat the Government by conspiring to present identical bids in their dealings with the Government. I refer to the case of United States against Cooper Corp., Civil Action No. 2-396, Southern District of New York, complaint filed February 20, 1939. The defendants in the case included the Dayton Rubber Manufacturing Co., the Dunlop Tire & Rubber Corp., the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., the B. F. Goodrich Co., the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the Seiberling Rubber Co., United States Rubber Products, Inc. This was a triple damage suit for conspiracy, brought by the Government, to fix the prices of tires on sales to the United States Government. The case was dismissed on technical grounds because the United States was not a "person" within the meaning of section 7 of the Sherman Act. The complaint, however, showed identical bids for tires submitted to the United States Government to three decimal points.

One would be naive, if not foolish, to believe that disposal of these plants to these companies would satisfy the sine qua non we laid down in section 3 (c) of the Disposal Act; namely, to secure a program that would best foster the development of a free competitive synthetic-rubber industry.

Have these companies reformed? I see no signs of regeneration. They have habitually repeated their sins not only in the United States but in Canada. A leopard does not change its spots. Suppose you were a businessman and your supplier attempted to cheat you. You caught him redhanded. You'd be rather foolish to deal with him

again. Frankly, you would boot him out. Well, these companies were guilty of wrongdoing against the United States. Shall the United States now reward them for their wrongdoing? The sales to any or all of these defendants in these antitrust suits should be canceled out. Otherwise we are guilty of double talk. We speak out of both sides of our mouths. If we at one and the same time say we want free, open, competition and at the same time we say turn over these plants to antitrust violators.

Section 17, subsection (1) reads as follows:

"That the disposal program be designed best to afford small-business enterprises and users, other than the purchaser of a facility, the opportunity to obtain a fair share of the end products of the facilities sold and at fair prices."

Does anyone in his right senses say that these companies, if possessed of these plants, will help small-business enterprises? Their record proves to the contrary. Take a look at the list of the successful bidders, on pages 8 and 9 of the report to Congress by the Rubber-Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. With rare exceptions they are all huge companies. They are also huge users of synthetic rubber. They are going to supply themselves. They are not unselfishly going to cater to small-business enterprises; that is, small rubber fabricators. If rubber gets scarce they are going to husband unto themselves all the rubber they can produce. They are going to feather their own nests. All manner and kinds of subterfuges will be used to deprive the small fellows of a fair share of rubber. The little fabricators and manufacturers will die on the vine.

As far as I can see, there is no implementation of the declaration contained in section 17, subdivision (1). It is simply a pontifical declaration, with no sanctions for violation. There is no method of enforcement; it is simply a moral obligation. Antitrust violators do not usually abide by moral declarations. Take another look at the list of prospective purchasers. You will see that KYS Corp. is the only purchaser that really contains small operators. All the others are large or monolithic operators. None of these conditions make for fair dealing with small business and small fabricators of rubber.

For these reasons I think this committee should ponder long and well before granting any approval to the sale of these plants to antitrust-law violators. Conversely, as the law requires, such sales should be balked. In this respect I hope that this committee will negate the action of the Rubber-Producing Facilities Disposal Commission.

Loyalty and Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the New York Times of March 7 that deals with a subject that is of gravest importance to our country if we are to maintain our tradition and reputation as a land concerned with justice:

LOYALTY AND JUSTICE

The deep and growing disquiet felt by many Americans about the operations of

the Federal Government's employee security program has finally impelled the Eisenhower administration to order some badly needed improvements. The latest changes represent a forward step which can be welcomed against the background of all too many public examples in which the security program has worked manifest injustices against loyal and competent Federal workers. This public record of injustices has tended to make Government employment unattractive to able people with alternative opportunities, with the result that at times our security has probably been reduced rather than enhanced.

How serious have been the defects in the security program until now may be realized by taking account of what the situation must have been before the new safeguards now introduced. Federal employees have been suspended without being told of the charges against them, and sometimes the charges have not been "specific enough to be meaningful to the employee." Meticulous care has not always been employed in suspending employees, and there has not always been "a personal interview with the employee prior to suspension. The top legal officers of departments concerned have not always been consulted nor their opinions "secured as to the sufficiency of the information justifying suspension." There has not always been a legal officer present at security hearings. Security board have not always been composed of "persons possessing the highest degree of integrity, ability, and good judgment." Heads of different agencies have not always consulted with each other when one agency proposed to make an adverse judgment on a person previously cleared by another.

The quotations given above are from Attorney General Brownell's statement on the substance of the latest changes. This is a late date, indeed, to introduce such elementary reforms and it is chilling to reflect on what the situation may have been in individual cases up to now.

Does the latest set of changes go far enough and protect both the national security and the rights of the individual Federal worker? The answer would seem to be rather clearly in the negative. Federal employees still may not confront and cross-examine all their accusers when security officials believe that the production of a particular witness may jeopardize the national security. But by what criteria are such determinations made? Are there other misinformers like Harvey Matusow being protected from exposure under the guise of serving national security? This question must inevitably arise against recent history as background. Is our Government not sufficiently ingenious to protect the identity of particular informants while subjecting their testimony to outside check? The problem is not easy, but it would not seem to be insoluble.

There are other serious problems too. What safeguards now exist to prevent such flagrant miscarriage of justice as was suffered by Prof. Val Lorwin? Professor Lorwin was indicted by an officer of the Eisenhower administration in December 1953 on the ground that he had lied in denying that he had ever been a Communist Party member and on two related matters. Six months later an Assistant Attorney General had to go into court and ask that the indictment be quashed because the Department of Justice attorney who secured the indictment had made two gross misstatements of fact to the grand jury. Such an outrage was possible, even though Professor Lorwin had earlier been suspended and cleared by the State Department.

The problem of fairness and justice in security procedures has long since become a major national question. Millions of Americans must have security clearances to

work for the Government directly, or on Government production orders, or on Government-subsidized projects. To be labeled a security risk today is perhaps the most terrible of brands on a person who has been convicted of no crime and tried in no court of law.

There are those who deserve such stigma and such punishment. But none of us can rest easy in our minds or hearts when we know that innocent men and women may be placed in this most terrible of Coventrys because of the spiteful words of a vengeful neighbor or to satisfy the ambition of an unscrupulous security officer or Government attorney. The soundness of the foundations of our national tradition of freedom and justice are at stake. And if these are not sound, we have no security and can have none.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semi-monthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]
Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thos. G., Miss.-----6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----3971 Langley Ct.,
Apt. 596-B
Addonizio, Hugh J., N. J.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----
Alexander, Hugh Q., N. C.-----
Alger, Bruce, Tex.-----
Allen, John J., Jr., Calif.-----
Allen, Leo E., Ill.-----University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, Minn.-----4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., Minn.-----
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., N. Y.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio.-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S. C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----Arlington Towers,
Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., N. J.-----113 S. Lee St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., Kans.-----
Ayres, William H., Ohio.-----
Bailey, Cleveland M., W. Va.-----
Baker, Howard H., Tenn.-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Barden, Graham A., N. C.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Bass, Perkins, N. H.-----
Bass, Ross, Tenn.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., Ohio.-----
Beamer, John V., Ind.-----110 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., N. Y.-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bell, John J., Tex.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1530 36th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., Mich.-----7304 Bradley Blvd.,
Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., Mich.-----
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----2720 Terrace
Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio.-----
Biatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, Ga.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----
Bolton, Frances P., Ohio.-----2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., Ohio.-----
Bonner, Herbert C., N. C.-----The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., N. Y.-----
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., Ill.-----
Boykin, Frank W., Ala.-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., Ill.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Brooks, Jack B., Tex.-----
Brooks, Overton, La.-----4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio.-----Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, Ga.-----Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., Ind.-----
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buchanan, Vera, Pa.-----
Buckley, Charles A., N. Y.-----
Budge, Hamer H., Idaho.-----
Burdick, Usher L., N. Dak.-----
Burlison, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Burnside, M. G., W. Va.-----
Bush, Alvin R., Pa.-----
Byrd, Robert C., W. Va.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. So.,
Arlington, Va.
Canfield, Gordon, N. J.-----
Cannon, Clarence, Mo.-----
Carlyle, F. Ertel, N. C.-----The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., Mo.-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., Pa.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., Nebr.-----
Chatham, Thurmond, N. C.-----
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, Colo.-----

Chiperfield, Robert B., Ill.-----1713 House Office
Building
Christopher, George H.,
Mo.-----
Chudoff, Earl, Pa.-----
Church, Marguerite Stitt, 2122 Mass. Ave.
Ill.-----
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----
Clevenger, Cliff, Ohio.-----The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, N. Y.-----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Cooley, Harold D., N. C.-----The Dorchester
Coon, Sam, Oreg.-----
Cooper, Jore, Tenn.-----The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., N. Y.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----4454 Tindall St.
Cretella, Albert W., Conn.-----
Crumpacker, Shepard J.,
Jr., Ind.-----
Cunningham, Paul, Iowa.-----
Curtis, Laurence, Mass.-----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Davidson, Irwin D., N. Y.-----
Davis, Clifford, Tenn.-----4611 Butter-
worth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., Wis.-----2550 South Joyce,
Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., Ga.-----
Dawson, William A., Utah.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
Deane, Charles B., N. C.-----
Delaney, James J., N. Y.-----
Dempsey, John J., N. Mex.-----2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derounian, Steven B., N. Y.-----
Devereux, James P. S., Md.-----
Dies, Martin, Tex.-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----The Congressional
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, Utah.-----
Dodd, Thomas J., Conn.-----
Dollinger, Isidore, N. Y.-----
Dolliver, James I., Iowa.-----3753 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., Mich.-----The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Donovan, James G., N. Y.-----
Dorn, Francis E., N. Y.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S. C.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Doyle, Clyde, Calif.-----3877 30th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., N. C.-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., Pa.-----3101 4th St. N.,
Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Elliott, Carl, Ala.-----
Ellsworth, Harris, Oreg.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, Calif.-----3840 Lorcom Lane,
Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Kilgine St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Felghan, Michael A., Ohio.-----
Fenton, Ivor D., Pa.-----3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., N. Mex.-----200 C St. SE.
Fine, Sidney A., N. Y.-----
Fino, Paul A., N. Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., Mont.-----
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R. I.-----3627 Chesapeake
St.
Forand, Aime J., R. I.-----4108 Dresden St.,
Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., Mich.-----1521 Mount Eagle
Pl., Alexandria,
Va.
Forrester, E. L., Ga.-----
Fountain, L. H., N. C.-----3251 Q St.
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., Tenn.-----Fairfax Hotel
Frellinghuysen, Peter, Jr., 3014 N St.
N. J.-----
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Gamble, Ralph A., N. Y.-----
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gary, J. Vaughan, Va.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., Pa.-----
Gentry, Brady, Tex.-----
George, Myron V., Kans.-----3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., Ill.-----

Granahan, William T., Pa.-----
Grant, George M., Ala.-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith, Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Jr., Pa.-----
Gregory, Noble J., Ky.-----2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., Mich.-----
Gross, H. R., Iowa.-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Gwinn, Ralph W., N. Y.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Hale, Robert, Maine.-----2722 N St.
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, N. J.-----
Harden, Cecil M., Ind.-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., Va.-----4519 So. 34th St.,
Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., Nebr.-----
Harvey, Ralph, Ind.-----110 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, Ark.-----314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, Mich.-----
Hebert, F. Edward, La.-----104 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., Ohio.-----125 Marthas Rd.,
Alexandria, Va.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Heseltun, John W., Mass.-----
Hess, William E., Ohio.-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., Calif.-----
Hill, William S., Colo.-----110 Maryland
Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., Calif.-----
Hinshaw, Carl, Calif.-----
Hoeven, Charles B., Iowa.-----2108 Suitland
Terrace SE.
Hoffman, Clare E., Mich.-----Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., Ill.-----
Hollfield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holmes, Hal, Wash.-----
Holt, Joe, Calif.-----
Holtzman, Lester, N. Y.-----
Hope, Clifford R., Kans.-----3541 Brandywine
St.
Horan, Walt, Wash.-----
Hoamer, Craig, Calif.-----
Huddleston, George, Jr.,
Ala.-----
Hull, W. R., Jr., Mo.-----
Hyde, DeWitt S., Md.-----
Ikard, Frank, Tex.-----
Jackson, Donald L., Calif.-----
James, Benjamin F., Pa.-----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jenkins, Thomas A., Ohio.-----The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Jensen, Ben F., Iowa.-----The Washing-
ton House
Johansen, August E., Mich.-----
Johnson, Leroy, Calif.-----630 North Caro-
lina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., Wis.-----215 Constitution
Ave. NE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, N. C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----3613 Greenway
Pl., Alexandria,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., Ala.-----
Jones, Woodrow W., N. C.-----
Judd, Walter H., Minn.-----3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Kean, Robert W., N. J.-----2435 Kalorama
Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), N. Y.-----
Kearns, Carroll D., Pa.-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., N. Y.-----1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, W. Va.-----
Kelley, Augustine B., Pa.-----
Kelly, Edna F., N. Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N. Y.-----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., N. Y.-----The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., Tex.-----3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., Tex.-----
King, Cecil E., Calif.-----
King, Karl C., Pa.-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio.-----
Klein, Arthur G., N. Y.-----
Kluczyński, John C., Ill.-----
Knox, Victor A., Mich.-----
Knutson, Coya, Minn.-----
Krueger, Otto, N. Dak.-----The Coronet

Appendix

Military Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, each year since 1948 it has been my pleasure to cooperate with the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States in furtherance of National Defense Week, and, in particular, with the splendid ROA in my own State.

Through the courtesy of Maj. MacArthur H. Manchester, I have prepared annual articles published in the ROA magazine which he capably edits.

This year, my article appeared as usual, in the February issue. I am glad to say that on the front cover of that particular issue is a picture of the President of the United States talking things over with our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], who is president of the ROA and a brigadier general of the United States Army Reserve. With him was Major Manchester.

I think it is appropriate that this article be reprinted, especially in view of yesterday's most welcome action by the House of Representatives in providing for an annual pay increase for members of the military and related services.

This is but the first step in strengthening the position of those who serve in the honored uniform of our country, and of those who have been so frequently recalled to the colors. Career soldier and citizen soldier, 30-year man and Reservist—all are entitled to fairness and justice.

I may say that our big job affecting the Reserve still lies ahead, however, in order to eliminate numerous unfortunate and almost chronic inequities which have arisen and in order to give our men the best possible training and equipment.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article in the ROA magazine entitled "America's Future: Great Opportunity, Great Peril," be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMERICA'S FUTURE: GREAT OPPORTUNITY, GREAT PERIL

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, former chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

What does the future hold? Peace or war? A golden age of prosperity for mankind? A nuclear Armageddon—with civilization blasted into radioactive rubble and with mankind plunging back into the Dark Ages?

These are the great question marks of our time.

You, the reader, and your family and friends and associates, along with millions more like you hold, in part, the answer to this great riddle.

Upon you and me and upon our countrymen will depend basically the future course of mankind. Modern science will be our obedient servant or our impersonal destroyer. It is indeed strange irony that this great miracle force of science may jet-propel us into an age of unparalleled high standards of living, of wonderful conveniences and comforts—or it may explode us into an orgy of destruction more frightful than man has ever conceived.

I believe that science will provide man's greater fulfillments.

I believe that we today are but touching the "hem of the garment" of the mysteries of the new age. Man will unlock heretofore-undreamed-of secrets of the tiniest atom and of the vast reaches of starry outer space. I believe that our children and children's children will be a part of the most exciting, most rewarding eras of history. All this is possible. Peace is definitely possible—with honor, but only through vigorous, continuous preparedness. I believe that science will be man's continued servant.

And in this National Defense Week, we are given a precious opportunity to think, to plan, to rededicate ourselves to the goal of entering this golden age—the era of abundance for the common man.

But, to achieve this, we are now called upon to attain and maintain a level of preparedness more complete, more effective than we have ever found it necessary to reach in our history.

Why?

Because you, the sovereign people of the United States, and we, your elected and appointed officials, are living in an age of total peril. It is the age of aggressive, conspiratorial, international communism—a force contrary to its occasional peaceful co-existence lullabies, is aimed at our violent destruction.

Never before in our history have we faced such a terrible danger to our very survival—a danger so vast, so all-present, so hideous in its proven record, a danger so powerful.

THE MANYFOLD PERIL

The peril which it represents is a total peril for two reasons:

1. It is total in its possibility of total annihilation of its enemies through lightning-like nuclear attack. I emphasize "lightning-like;" we will not have months and years to recover from a Pearl Harbor like blow the next time—if we are hit unprepared and unalert.

Listen to the words of 4-star Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, chief of our Air Materiel Command at Dayton:

"With . . . modern weapons, the next war could be decided in a matter of hours or days. We must never lose sight of this in all our thinking and planning.

"We cannot put a price tag on those hours or days because they are a precious natural resource beyond price."

2. Second, our peril is total in that communism assaults every segment of our society.

The Communist assault on the free world is always a combined operation; military, diplomatic, political, economic, social, and psychological.

As the attack is total, so our defense must be total.

RIGHT CITIZEN THINKING

Thus, never before has it been more important that the average citizen understand and contribute to the overall defense of our beloved country.

He must remember always that the most basic aspect of our defense is, of course, our military defense—by air, ground, and sea. But, it is by no means the only area of defense. Our society within must be strong and healthy. Every American community, every trade union, every factory, business, mine, home, must be a center of strength in American society; a center of reason and understanding, a center in which the peril to our society is recognized and combatted—logically, carefully.

So, the responsibility is great upon every citizen—for right thinking, right action. It is particularly great upon you, my readers, the dedicated men and women who comprise America's reserve officers. You are our minute men and women—ready at all times to spring to arms to lead us in any emergency.

STRONG RESERVE INDISPENSABLE

Your vital role must and could be appreciated by your fellow citizens. Every non-reservist must understand that it is upon our Reserve Forces that we indispensably depend in our eternal vigilance against future dangers. A strong Reserve with deep pride in its traditions, with firm confidence in its future, with undimmed faith in fair dealing by its Government, a Reserve with modern equipment, with streamlined training, with highest morale—these have become not luxuries but absolute necessities for the United States.

Reservists and nonreservists alike must understand that to be adequate against the total Communist peril, we must marshal and strengthen our forces—tangible and intangible—our own and our allies—internal and external—to defend ourselves and our way of life.

NEW PRINCIPLES IN THE AGE OF TOTAL PERIL

Ours is an era of change. From the new factors on the world scene stem new principles which will determine America's survival in the age of total peril.

First, is the vital principle that there must be correct and fearless policy formulation. Why? Because an error in policy may prove irreversible—uncorrectable—fatal. In the past, America's errors in defense, its delay in accepting automatic weapons over the muzzle-loader, mechanized cavalry over the horse, airplane over the dirigible, carrier task force over the battle fleet, resulted in unnecessary military losses but did not jeopardize completely our national survival.

Today, a single failure—for example, failure to accept the obligation for all-out development of an intercontinental guided rocket—a failure which could result in Soviet Russia's prior development of such a missile, might mean utter disaster for us.

Second, closely connected with the new importance of right policy is the principle of policy interdependence. Never before have foreign and domestic policies become so closely intertwined. Our price level, productivity, civil liberties, security practices, road system—these and a hundred other phases interact and vitally affect United States defense.

In the present age, we are conducting a continuous and complex cold war against the continuous and complex pressure of world communism. So, policy weakness or failure

in almost any area of national or international life—may lead to Communist misinterpretation and Communist aggression.

Thus, if America gives the impression of, or if in actuality it experiences, economic depression, domestic isolation, endless partisan discord, or worst of all, military weakness, then America stands to lose its allies. It thereby encourages piecemeal aggression and its own possible ultimate destruction by its Communist foe.

Hence, it becomes increasingly apparent that America can survive and maintain peace only through maintaining a healthy society and continuous and proven military superiority over world communism. This means adequate forces-in-being, capable of devastating, instantaneous retaliation. This in turn requires optimum weapons research development and appropriate production.

America's military superiority coupled with America's unwillingness to use this superiority, except in self-defense, must be made absolutely clear to the world at large and to the Communist leaders in particular. No short-sighted considerations here at home—penny-pinching or partisanship should be allowed to impair the applying of this fundamental principle of overall preparedness upon which hinges America's survival.

AMERICAN LEADERSHIP VITAL

Finally, in the age of total peril, America must accept the absolute necessity of membership and of leadership for the indefinite future in the global free world coalition.

This free world coalition—a coalition which must be hardened in fact and not merely in lofty words—remains the key to America's future. It is the key for broadening our base of manpower and our mineral resources base; for dispersal of our strategic air forces and increased capability of massive retaliation; for local land forces to halt local aggression and to flank Communist global aggression; for the maintenance of world economic prosperity and well-being. It is the key to American survival no less than to the preservation of the most cherished rights amongst free men of all races and creeds.

Likewise, America itself is an absolute necessity to the global coalition. Without our predominant power base, virtually no other free nation could prove adequate to withstand the continuous pressure of Communist aggression or subversion.

MILITARY STRENGTH OF RUSSIA

Against the background of these principles, it would be well to bear in mind certain facts with regard to the tremendous military capabilities of the Soviet Union. No sensible person reviewing even this brief list of 10 factors which I shall present could fail to appreciate the enormous significance of the Soviet threat.

I will not attempt to compare Soviet with United States and allied military assets. Obviously, a detailed comparison—division compared to division, fleet unit to unit, air wing to wing, atom stockpile to stockpile—is a highly technical, classified, and complex matter. And clearly it is within the province of our military leaders rather than of those of us who are concerned primarily with diplomatic policies.

But, here are a few of the ingredients of the Soviet menace, as reported in the public print.

1. First and most obvious are the massive Soviet and satellite armed forces in the West. They consist of a reported 175 Russian and 80 satellite divisions, considerably mechanized and highly standardized. An immense air umbrella of 20,000 operational aircraft could cover a Soviet offensive with 20,000 planes in reserve.

2. In the East there exists the most powerful military force in Asia—the battle-tested, fanatically indoctrinated Chinese Communist Army of 100 divisions comprising 3 mil-

lion trained men. It is backed by an additional 13 million homeguard of Chinese militia which could step into uniform overnight and also by a reported 7,000 Chinese Red military aircraft.

3. The Soviet sea arm now constitutes the second strongest naval power in the world. It includes a U-boat fleet seven times as large as the number with which Nazi Germany entered World War II. Among them are perhaps 100 oceangoing snorkel-equipped vessels with a radius of action of 20,000 miles. Some of these modern U-boats would be capable of raining a hail of atomic rockets on coastal areas of the United States.

4. Another Red asset is the reported massive Soviet preparation in the field of bacteriological warfare. This includes intensive efforts in the field of nerve gas—GB—an odorless, colorless, inexpensive weapon of mass destruction—regarded as constituting, under the right conditions, almost as great a threat to mass population as the A-bomb.

RED ATOMIC STOCKPILE

(5) Generally regarded as the grimmest threat of all is the mounting stockpile of A-bombs and Russia's intensive development of thermonuclear weapons—with all their terrible capacity of obliterating whole areas of an enemy nation.

A noted military observer wrote recently: "The quantitative tally of the world's atomic tests indicates that we have entered the age of atomic plenty and that stockpiles of operational, deliverable weapons are steadily increasing. These stockpiles probably are numbered in a very sizable 4 figures in the United States, in a sizable 3 figures in the Soviet Union, and in 2 figures in Britain."

"But the nuclear race is qualitative as well as quantitative. The meaning of the current Soviet tests is that the Soviet Union is acquiring a whole family of atomic weapons, comparable to (though not yet as varied as or as qualitatively equal to) the family of weapons possessed by the United States."

6. The Kremlin has the capacity to deliver these instruments of mass obliteration. Her modern long-range bombers include the TU-39, with the size and characteristics of America's B-52, but powered by 4 immense-thrust engines instead of our 8. The revelation of these new-type engines and planes was described by our Air Chief of Staff, Nathan Twining, as a more important milestone than the knowledge of the first Soviet atomic-bomb explosion.

7. Another factor is the all-out Soviet effort to develop an intercontinental guided missile—a weapon against which there is no known defense today.

8. Another consideration is that the Soviet Union is graduating three times as many engineers as the United States and is giving other evidences of intensive scientific effort in expansion of her weapons systems.

9. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union is constantly expanding its mighty industrial bases, obviously not for civilian production, but for production of the elements of war.

Already the Communist bloc produces around 60 percent as much coal as the rest of the world and around one-third as much pig iron and steel; 20 percent as much electric power, and 11 percent as much petroleum. But these resources are used for military purposes basically, rather than for civilian convertible cars, deep freezers, TV sets, or air conditioners.

MILITARY AND NONMILITARY WEAKNESSES

The basic fact of the matter is that there are enormous stresses and strains within the Soviet slave empire. The world of communism is a vicious jungle in which cannibal devours cannibal, in which leaders and underlings at home and abroad are purged ruthlessly. It is a world in which fear, suspicion is an ever-present factor.

From this side of the Iron Curtain it is hard to assess the degree to which the non-

military weaknesses of the Soviet Union impair her admitted military prowess. But the Soviet Union definitely does have grave nonmilitary weaknesses in addition to certain flaws in her military system of which competent military observers are aware.

Nevertheless, neither her nonmilitary nor her military limitations should becloud the fact that she possesses today and will possess increasingly in time to come the capabilities of total annihilation of her enemies.

OTHER RED NONMILITARY ASSETS

For the ledger to be more complete, certain additional nonmilitary Red assets should not be listed. Among them are the following:

1. Outstanding is the economic bait which she is offering in her renewed trade offensive throughout the world. To countries hungry for expanded foreign markets, from England in the West to Japan in the East, the Soviet Union offers the fake but alluring possibility of tremendous exchanging of goods with the Iron Curtain. With the trade emissaries will, of course, come the usual Red spies, propagandists, intriguers to undermine societies.

2. A second key advantage of the Soviet Union is the widespread repugnance among the underdeveloped peoples for the Western so-called imperialist powers. The fact that generally the United States is the ally of Great Britain, France, Belgium, and Holland, for example, has tended to cause the colonial and ex-colonial peoples in their thinking to lump us in with the present and former imperial powers. The colonial and ex-colonial areas forget that the United States itself was once a group of 13 weak colonies, and that no nation in the world has stronger tradition than we of friendship for peoples striving for sovereignty. We are, however, rightly wary lest nonself-governing peoples achieve independence sooner than they are in a position to exercise it soundly: We are wary lest such peoples become easy prey for the Soviets.

3. A third factor is the widespread anti-white feeling which is sweeping the non-white areas of the earth. Eurasian communism is eager to fan the flames of racialism as directed against the white American, Englishman, Frenchman, Belgian, or others. Everything which weakens the Western Powers is regarded as an asset to the Soviet cause.

4. A fourth factor is the worldwide hunger for peace. This is particularly true among the nations which were devastated during World War II, like France and Italy. It is true also of the ex-colonial areas which are confronted by so many domestic problems of widespread illiteracy, disease, malnutrition, that any thought of war or even of costly defense against war is often repugnant.

This hunger for peace blinds many people to the fact that only adequate preparedness will assure peace.

Thus, the Soviet propaganda theme of peaceful coexistence falls on eager ears—war-weary and economy-minded ears—throughout much of the globe.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has tried to smear us from one end of the world to the other as an alleged "warmongering power, recklessly experimenting with A-bomb and H-bomb explosions."

To some extent, we have counteracted this propaganda; nevertheless, widespread neutralism and pacifism are strings on which the Soviet Union continues effectively to play.

It is odd that the Kremlin, dripping with the blood of its own and its satellite victims and of the Korean and Indochinese people should pretend to be peaceful and should be able even partly to get away with it. It is odd that we who prize peace more than anyone should be vilified as warmongers. But, these are the facts and we must realistically combat these conditions by a

strengthened program of truth dissemination.

WHAT AMERICA MUST DO

We must act now. Time is of the essence. We must strengthen further the Voice of America and our overseas exchange program, our book, release, pamphlet, motion picture and television programs. Citizens must contribute further to Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia.

No one perceives more clearly that we are in this battle for men's minds than the great Chief Executive of our country, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Fortunately, we have in this distinguished statesman, too, a military leader of proven genius who is determined that we shall be adequate against whatever future military crises may hold.

President Eisenhower and his distinguished associates know that to counteract the Soviet military threat will take a strengthened program of United States preparedness. We do not want to bankrupt ourselves in the process, but neither do we want to pinch-pennies when the survival of our country is at stake.

Simultaneously, under our able Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, we must and will further strengthen the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We will press for the carrying out of the Western European Union, including the setting up of the new West German Army. We will strengthen our bilateral alliances and such vital groupings as the Organization of American States. We will expand the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, which at present has too few component powers and too little defensive firepower available to it.

We will implement the President's famous "atoms-for-peace" plan—one of the most dramatic and constructive international programs ever offered. We will widen our splendid program of technical point 4 assistance. We will encourage more private investment overseas and will seek a favorable climate for such investment.

And we will continue our efforts everywhere to combat the Communist termites who are at work night and day in subversion, sabotage, sedition, treason, undermining the foundation of our own and other countries.

THREE MORE MILITARY FACTORS

But, we return at last to the ultimate determinant of our fate—our military strength.

We must and will prepare for the war of the future, not the war of yesteryear. The war of the future may be another "brush-fire" war like Korea, a so-called limited war. We must be prepared against it.

But, it may be the big war—the intercontinental war—the war of intercontinental ballistic missile.

So, time is important in our development of an intercontinental guided missile. The race for the perfection of this weapon is probably one of the most critical in the world today.

Observers say that the prospect is by 1960, both the United States and the Soviet Union will have guided missiles that can carry hydrogen payloads at 10,000 miles per hour with a range of some 5,000 miles.

We of the United States have made great strides in the rocket field. Each of the three branches of the service has contributed important developments.

I am inclined to feel, however, that the needs of our country require that we far more closely approximate the type of more centralized wartime Manhattan district project, which produced the A-bomb on "a crash basis," than the present more leisurely, more scattered basis of our efforts toward an intercontinental guided missile. We all know that there have been strong criticisms of our rocket development—criticisms of division of authority, a certain conservatism in ap-

proach, of overly stringent fiscal considerations.

One writeup of the guided missile race recently read:

"For several years, the United States, complacent of its ability to stay ahead of Russia in all things technological, has been daintily fingering missile projects. Its smugness was roughly shattered last year by intelligence reports of a Soviet breakthrough: the development of a rocket engine with a thrust of at least 240,000 pounds which could be used as part of the power plant for a multistage intercontinental missile."

Hand in glove with this missile problem, is the challenge of possible development of a man-made satellite for the earth or even colonization of a nearby planet with a few key experts. These are possibilities opening almost unlimited fields for both civilian and military application.

A second military problem is our continued United States industrial and population overcentralization. I have warned in previous statements in the Reserve Officer that the United States cannot afford the continued overconcentration of prime industrial targets in a few major areas.

Right now, there are 10 areas in the United States, each 25 miles in radius, that account for 77 percent of our coke products; 82 percent of iron production; 73 percent of steel ingot capacity. Over half of America's foreign commerce is carried on in 6 port cities. Our 32 largest metropolitan areas cover only 55 square miles, out of our total 3 million square miles, and in these 55 square miles are jammed 32 million people. These and other statistics underline the importance of far-seeing steps to encourage dispersal and decentralization to the most feasible extent, particularly in view of our admitted vulnerability to enemy attack and the low killrate which we now expect against an attacking enemy force.

Lastly, we turn to our Armed Forces themselves—the men and women and their families. The fact is that the present low-renewal rate among specialists in our Armed Forces is a particularly deep cause for national concern. Each year, for example, our country's Air Defense Command suffers a personnel loss—a blow so heavy that it would cost an enemy dearly to inflict it. But, it is a blow which we, ourselves, cause in that we fail to provide conditions attractive enough to stimulate reenlistment by our highly trained officers and enlisted personnel.

In 1954, it was estimated that the Air Force lost a quarter of a million men. One survey showed that only 8½ percent of the eligible Defense Command airmen planned to reenlist when their 4-year period was up.

It is fantastic that we spend near-fortunes to train these men to peak skilled efficiency, and then look on relatively complacently while they resign in disgust and resume their civilian clothes.

The civilian and military chiefs of our Armed Forces are keenly aware of this problem, and fortunately steps are being taken to correct it. But remedial action must come promptly and thoroughly.

CONCLUSION

Let us end on a note of well-justified faith. The future lies, to a great extent, within our own hands for molding. While we are not the complete masters of our destiny, neither is the Soviet Union. Nor, for that matter, is any one power or group of powers.

The possibilities of peace are tremendous, and they are bright. A golden age of peaceful prosperity is attainable. A rough equilibrium—uneasy but continuing—between East and West is achievable.

But, it will never be achieved if we ignore the fact that the nature of communism is conquest. The Communist, by habit, by dogma, by discipline, is a creature geared to attack. He thrives upon assault. He lives

for assault. He may die in assault. But by our overwhelming power, military, and spiritual, we can deter him from starting a chain reaction which could lead to disaster for the world.

This must be the key to American thinking, the key to every Reservist's thinking.

World war III is not imminent. It is not probable. It is always possible—by accident or Red design. But, by exercising our God-given ingenuity and imagination, world war III will never come. America will fulfill the great peaceful opportunity which rests before it.

The Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address delivered by Congressman H. R. Gross, of Iowa, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in Atlantic City, N. J., on February 16, 1955. I hope that every Member of the Senate will take time to read this speech. Congressman GROSS is a real friend of the farmer, and knows farm programs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and guests, I am honored to be invited to speak to you who are assembled here today on the eastern seaboard from every nook and corner of our broad and good land. You have come from the South, the Far West, the Pacific Northwest, from New England, and from the heartland of America, of which my own State of Iowa is a part.

Let me say that we in Iowa are mighty proud of our rural electrification program and it is a real pleasure for me to have this opportunity to visit with delegates from the tall corn State, as well as other delegates.

I want to say a few words about Clyde Ellis and his staff in Washington. They have been cooperative at all times and may I say that they are on the job at all times, as you are on the job at this convention at all times. I have never seen harder working conventions than the conventions that you hold.

What brings about these tremendous annual meetings of farm people? The common purpose that brings you together is the advancement of the farmer's standard of living, a better way of life for you, your families; your neighbor and his family. Though your homes may be hundreds of miles apart, you are joined again by thousands upon thousands of miles of cooperative transmission lines that thread their way throughout the land.

And this great organization, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, is the spontaneous outgrowth of your need for unity and public expression on a nationwide level.

A quick look at the past clearly reveals why you have formed together to accomplish your purpose of bringing power to the farms of America, and unfortunately, that quick look reveals it has not been many years ago that you were unable to acquire this

powerful and silent servant of man—electricity.

Less than a quarter of a century ago, only about 1 farmer in 10 had central station service. This meant that most farmers, their wives and children were committed to long and ceaseless hours of toil in doing household and farm tasks that are now accomplished by the flick of a switch. This meant, among other things, that if the youth of rural America wanted a standard of living similar to that of their city cousins, they had to leave the farms.

Permit me to say at this point that Mrs. Gross and I were born and raised on Iowa farms in the days of coal oil lamps and lanterns. Life on the farm in those days was not without its good points, but kerosene lamps and lanterns were not two of them. And by coincidence, although we were raised on farms as distantly separated as the north and south borders of Iowa, we each lived within a stone's throw of a town and had the doubtful pleasure of studying our school lessons and doing our chores by the light of lamp and lantern while less than a mile away twinkled those wonderful electric lights. How we envied those youngsters in town.

And why didn't we on the farms, who needed it most, have this great blessing of electricity that was readily conceded to others? Because what then amounted to a monopoly decreed that our parents must pay an exorbitant price—a price they could not afford—for installation and service. The monopoly was interested only in skimming the cream of profit as represented by service in towns in the rural area.

Well do I remember working a pump handle in a sweltering August sun, when there wasn't enough breeze to turn a windmill, pumping the last 10 feet of water out of a 30-foot dug well for a herd of thirsty cattle—and begrudging them every gulp. That's why I still can't find it in my heart to quite forgive those who made it impossible for us to operate even one small electric motor, although the power transmission line ran along the road and past our front gate.

To overcome these difficulties, to bring electricity to the farms when the power companies said it was not good business to serve most farmers, you joined together and went into the utility business for yourselves—the cooperative way. How the skeptics laughed and gave you but a brief time to bankrupt yourselves. They predicted that in a short time the farms of America would again be dark from sunset to sunrise.

In the first place, the smart boys were wrong, because they failed to understand that the farmer for generations has had to be a practical man—a realist who, although endowed with extreme patience, can be driven, abused, and victimized only so far. Then invoking the law of self-preservation, he can become, individually and collectively, the most resolute and determined of our citizens.

Why is this true? Because he constantly faces the trials and perils of drought, flood, storm, wind, insects, and livestock diseases. He has faced prices so low he could scarcely afford to take his products to market. He has been confronted with discriminatory freight rates, monopoly, and speculation in the marketing of his crops, animals, and dairy products. He has planted with faith, cultivated with hope and sometimes reaped a harvest of charity.

He has been held up to ridicule and worse. Remember the Vice President of the United States who asserted from the public platform that farmers were "too damned dumb to understand"?

Out of the forge of these experiences, the steel of the farmer has been tempered. Not for capricious reasons will the farmers of America now surrender their much improved living conditions and those who may think otherwise will do well to remember that a

short quarter of a century ago, peaceful, industrious farmers, driven to despair by forces beyond their control took action that brought the attention of the Nation to their desperate plight. We pray this will never happen again, but let it ever stand as a warning to those who may have the notion that American farmers will accept the status of peasants.

Out of the mire of the depression, and in the face of what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles, the farmer went to work to bring electricity to his darkened farmland, and he succeeded.

The second thing the skeptics overlooked was that the farmer would be able to enlist the aid of his Government. But he did—and the REA program was the result. He did not ask for a handout. He asked for a helping hand in the form of loans which he has been repaying with interest and in many, many cases far ahead of schedule.

It is this second aspect, the helping hand of the Government, to which I want to direct some attention today.

The rural electrification program has succeeded because it is basically a partnership relation between you—the farmer-cooperative members—and your Federal Government.

At the outset of our consideration of this partnership I wish to make one thing very clear—this program must be kept above and beyond political considerations. We must especially beware of those elements in both major political parties who would like to make the rural electrification program a rudderless ship to be tossed about upon the stormy seas of political controversy, and eventually wrecked.

Rural electrification has had strong support from both political parties and let it be kept that way. At the same time, you who are in charge of this program must not be driven off course by those who would cry partisan politics simply to dissuade you from raising your voices in protest when you see the ship headed for the rocks.

You must beware of a siren song from either quarter—the one trying to make your every need a partisan issue; the other trying to accuse you of partisanship when speaking out for or against those matters vitally affecting your program.

History shows the power program of this nation has been the result of bipartisan support. President Theodore Roosevelt was one of the early and strong proponents of public resources development. And he made it plain he thought such development should be for the common good. Out of his resources philosophy grew the reclamation program that resulted in development of the West. Out of his philosophy of river development grew the tremendous public power projects of the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest.

His was a sound view of conservation and utilization of river resources for the common good and, speaking as a Republican, but one who refuses to have a ring in his nose, it would be well for the leaders of the Republican Party to read these pages from our history and consider resources development in the light of Theodore Roosevelt's philosophy.

It was left to such Republican leaders as Senators Norris and McNary, together with their counterparts in the Democrat Party, to bring about a practical working relationship between the Federal Government, public bodies and cooperatives.

The first and most important result of this bipartisan action was the REA program in which the Government became the banker-partner and you, in organizing your cooperatives, became the operating partner. This partnership has paid tremendous tangible and intangible dividends in raising rural standards of living, increasing production and opening new markets. For example, for every dollar that was loaned by the REA to

build lines to a farm, the farmer himself has spent some \$4 to \$5 in the market place for wiring, electrical tools, and appliances.

Another result of this partnership was to make hydroelectric power available on the wholesale level to cooperatives. This cheaper power made it possible and economical to serve widely scattered farms and, in addition, brought an element of competition to the power industry with the result that wholesale rates to cooperatives came down.

Another reason why this partnership paid big dividends was the preference clause. Here again, a page was taken from Theodore Roosevelt's reclamation philosophy and applied in the power field. Preference was written into the law in order that public bodies and nonprofit cooperative organizations would have first call upon Federal power. Without the preference clause, coupled with necessary transmission facilities, Federal power could and would have been put under long-term contracts by private utilities. Even with the preference clause, rural electric cooperatives were obtaining only about 6 percent of all Federal power generated compared to about 18 percent going to private utilities.

In this connection, it will be recalled that not too long ago Assistant Secretary of the Interior Aandahl attempted to change this marketing arrangement. Cooperatives in the Missouri Basin learned that a plan was afoot whereby it would be virtually impossible for them to recapture power flowing from Federal dams on the Missouri River to meet their growing loads once it was sold to the private power companies. We in Congress were amazed at this attempt to change, strictly by administrative procedure, the traditional concept of the preference clause for rural cooperatives. The House Interior Committee immediately investigated. It has always been my position that the preference clause means exactly what it says—that cooperatives shall have the first call upon available Federal power.

As you know, because of prompt committee action and by individual Members of Congress we were able to prevent the proposed knifing of the preference clause and as far as I am concerned, Congress will continue to safeguard this vital policy in the marketing of Federal power, regardless of who sits in the seat of authority in the Department of Interior or anywhere else in Government.

Now a report is current in Washington that a Hoover Commission task force may recommend that the interest rate on REA loans be raised to 4½ percent. Since this is only an unconfirmed report, I will not dwell on the implications of such a move except to say that it would represent the second of a two-pronged insidious attack on the industry of agriculture. With farm income already seriously impaired, and Secretary of Agriculture Benson apparently determined upon a policy of cheap food for consumers, an increased interest rate of 4½ percent would only increase the squeeze now being worked upon farmers.

Secretary Benson ought to know there is no such thing as cheap food unless it is literally taken out of the hides of the farmer producers. And the Hoover Commission task force ought to know that a doubling of interest rates to farmers could only mean dire consequences for the REA program as a whole.

I can assure you that any such move will get a hot reception in Congress.

I would like now to turn to a discussion of the struggle over atomic energy legislation in the last session of Congress. I shall try to be brief, for I am sure Senators GORE, who is from the area most directly affected and who has been in the forefront of the fight in opposition to the legislation that was enacted, will have much to say on this specific issue.

While this battle centers around TVA, it is of vital importance to everyone here and to every citizen of the land for all of us have a \$12-billion-plus investment in the development of this new source of energy and the legislation charts new policy in the field of production and use. Since the people—all of them—have paid the price, the benefits should be shared accordingly.

Under the Cole-Hickenlooper bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, this principle would have been scrapped for all practical purposes. It would have been possible for a few large companies, operating on the inside track, to have effectively gained a monopoly in the field of atomic power for commercial use because of the patent provisions. That was one of the important reasons why I voted against the House version of this legislation, one of the few Republicans to do so.

Fortunately, before final action on the part of the Senate and House, this provision for completely private patents was changed. The Atomic Energy Commission has the authority to declare these patents affected with a public interest, and it is my hope the act will be further amended to provide that rural electric cooperatives may have a fair opportunity in this field. Along with that, the AEC should provide for a power reactor program that is designed to fit the needs of rural cooperatives as well as the large power companies. This we must all work for.

Much of the fight in Congress on the atomic energy bill was precipitated by the now well-published Dixon-Yates amendment. This gave legislative sanction to what had been considered legally questionable up to that time for it legalized the AEC as a power broker—a function entirely beyond its major purpose, which is the production of nuclear military weapons essential to the defense of this Nation. Certainly nothing should be allowed to hinder or delay the AEC from that primary objective.

Its secondary function is to develop the peacetime uses of atomic energy, including power. But what is the result that has been brought about by the so-called Dixon-Yates-AEC agreement? We find the AEC diverted from its primary and secondary functions in order that two power combines in the South can take over TVA's market. In effect, we have here another governmental agency engaged in the field of policymaking—a field and a responsibility that properly belongs to those you elect to office—your Representatives and Senators.

Important as is the fact that the Dixon-Yates-AEC deal is some \$100 million more expensive in the life of the contract than if TVA supplied its own needs, it is of equal importance to understand that the Atomic Energy Commission is now cast in a role it is not equipped to carry out, and not intended by Congress.

If there be any doubt that the AEC has become embroiled in issues in which it has no business, the testimony of AEC Commissioner Murray before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy should erase that doubt. Let me quote from Mr. Murray's statement made on January 31, 1955, to the joint committee: "There is one fact regarding industrial atomic power which I feel should be especially emphasized. Industrial atomic power will come quickly or slowly depending on the importance attached to the program, and on the men assigned responsibility for carrying it out. It also hinges on the teamwork between your committee and the Commission. . . . It is for this reason that I draw your attention to issues that have been giving me special concern."

"One issue, more than any other, in my opinion," continued Commissioner Murray, "has contributed to this unhappy situation. I refer, of course, to the Dixon-Yates controversy. . . . So damaging has been its

effect that something must be done to free the Commission from any connection with this cause for so much discord. . . . Unless the Commission is so freed, untold hours will continue to be devoted by the Commissioners and their key staff to a matter which will not contribute one iota to our program for improved weapons, for military and industrial reactors, or to any of the infinite number of tasks needing our attention."

"And, as I have so often said, anything that diverts the attention of the Commission and its staff from the development and production of weapons, along with the gigantic task of bringing into being peacetime applications of atomic energy, is not in the public interest. . . . To the exclusion of all other interests it (the Commission) must focus its attention solely—and in the public interest—on the development and exploitation of atomic energy for defense and for peace."

If for no other reasons than those so recently expressed by AEC Commissioner Murray, it is my opinion that the sooner the Dixon-Yates-AEC contract is given a quiet burial the better it will be for the public interest. And far be it for me to mourn its timely passing.

Another reason why some of us in the House of Representatives found this legislation highly unpalatable was the manner in which it was rammed down our throats. On July 23, 1954, with the Senate still debating the bill and with Congress still nearly a month from final adjournment, the House was called into session at 10 o'clock in the morning and remained in constant session until 3:13 o'clock on the morning of July 24—a total of more than 17 hours, with all action completed except the final vote.

In the first place, it is almost unprecedented that the House should take up legislation, still under debate in the Senate, unless it be of an extreme emergency nature. Not by the wildest flight of the imagination did an emergency exist in connection with this measure. There was nothing pressing in the legislative schedule before the House, and the leadership should have awaited final action by the Senate and then allotted at least 4 days to this complicated and far-reaching legislation. The answer is that the leadership was determined to use the House as a lever.

Interesting, too, is the fact that when debate opened on amendments in the House, sponsors of the bill made a point of order, which was quickly sustained, that opponents could not refer in any way to statements that had been and were being made in the Senate. Rules of the House prohibit the use of a Senator's name but never before, in the 6 years I have spent in the House, had there been strict enforcement of the rule that there could be no reference, even without attribution, to a statement made in the other body. I mention these sidelights to show the lengths to which advocates of the Atomic Energy Act carried their roughshod campaign in the House.

Let me say that there was much in connection with this legislation that had a very peculiar and unhealthy aroma—the kind that lingers in your nostrils.

Turning now to financial assistance for the REA, and speaking as both a Republican and one who has always supported an adequate rural electrification program, I was shocked by President Eisenhower's request last year for only \$55 million in new electrification loan funds. However, a Republican Congress recognized that this figure was dangerously low, overrode the President's budget, and made available \$135 million for this fiscal year.

Better treatment for the REA is accorded in the President's budget for the next fiscal year with a request for \$160 million, almost triple the amount he recommended last year.

This represents at least a temporary victory over those interests within the administration which have been attempting to put the rural power program on a starvation diet.

Strange, indeed, is the fact that these same interests in the administration endorsed legislation which victimizes American taxpayers for money to be thrown around all over the world. Approximately \$13 billion was made available for giveaway purposes to foreigners in this fiscal year, and it is always interesting to make comparisons in dealing with our own citizens.

For example, let's compare expenditures of American tax dollars for reclamation projects in foreign countries and in the United States. For some strange reason, it is difficult to obtain specific information from the Foreign Operations Administration concerning handouts abroad. Instead of the item-by-item breakdown employed in budgeting and spending for our own Federal reclamation program, FOA officials admitted they have no such information readily available; that to obtain it requires much time, much paperwork, and the circularizing of desks of officials of each of the so-called free countries which participate in the Foreign Operations Administration program.

From various sources, including the Library of Congress, is pieced together the information that for 5 fiscal years only, from July 1, 1948, to July 30, 1953, and for power facilities in Europe only, this country handed out a minimum of \$1,084,000,000. This compares with spending for our own public-power program of \$2,400,000,000 from 1902 to 1953. Included in this are such dams as Hoover, Shasta, Grand Coulee, and Hungry Horse as well as the Central Valley and Columbia Basin projects.

The Foreign Operations Administration admits that under the heading of "Water Resources and Power Assistance Rendered Foreign Countries, July 1, 1948, to June 30, 1953," there was expended \$1,729,123,000 in Europe and the Far East. During the same period, by comparison, Congress appropriated, under the reclamation law, for all Bureau of Reclamation construction in this country, \$1,200,000,000—a half billion less than was handed foreigners.

And it should be kept in mind that hundreds of millions of dollars advanced by the Government for power and other projects in this country will be repaid. Is anyone rash enough to predict that we will get back anything on the enormous gifts we have made to foreigners? In every showdown thus far we have been denied even moral support from most of the nations which have been the beneficiaries of our squandering.

It is estimated that since the end of World War II, the total bill for foreign aid is \$60 billion. It is estimated that taxpayers of the 17 principal reclamation States contributed \$13,300,000,000 of that amount—enough to build 109 Shasta dams, or 77 Hoover dams, or 93 Grand Coulee dams, or 27 each of Shasta, Grand Coulee, Hoover, and Hungry Horse dams.

During 5 years (1948-53) only, and for power and irrigation development in Italy alone, American taxpayers coughed up \$63,900,000. This compares with a grand total of \$52,700,000 in Federal reclamation funds spent in the 3 States of North Dakota, Kansas, and Oklahoma during the last 50 years—not just 5 years.

France and Greece got \$45,800,000 of our money during the same 5-year period for power and irrigation projects. Compare this with Oregon's \$49 million for reclamation in 50 years, Utah's \$45,100,000 in 50 years, and New Mexico's \$43,700,000 in 50 years. To this can be added air-conditioned apartment buildings in the Belgian Congo. And we also sent a cornshucker to Italy to show them how to do it. We sent a track coach to India to teach the Indians to run—when

their legs are the chief source of motor power in that country. We helped build a plush railroad station in Rome that would make Grand Central look like a tank-line facility on a branch line. So all you have to do is change the name of your cooperative to Italy or the Belgian Congo or some place else and you'll get your money.

Thus runs the fantastic story of American handouts to foreigners while our own citizens clamor for Federal assistance in the building of schools, roads, dams, and other necessary public improvements, bitterly protesting at the same time steadily mounting State and local taxes.

We can't continue to strew hundreds of millions and billions of dollars throughout the world each year unless we are prepared to accept further deficits, debt, inflation, and eventual bankruptcy. Foreign spending must be limited to whatever money is available within the limits of a balanced budget and after provision has been made for the economic, educational, and social needs of the people of the United States of America.

You are concerned—and rightly so—in your rural power program, but let me warn you that no issue is more important to you and every citizen of this Nation than what this Government does as a matter of foreign policy and commitment. This is true because the demand for military manpower and money to implement these commitments reach into and become a levy upon the lives and fortunes of those in every home in America.

Inherent in this program of attempting to police and finance the world upon which we are embarked today is increasing centralization of power in Washington. Our great and free institutions—political, economic, religious, social, and cultural—the foundation upon which this form of government and way of life rests, can only be perpetuated under a diffusion of power.

Through all the ages, concentration of governmental authority has eroded and then destroyed free men and free institutions.

Our first President, George Washington, the anniversary of whose birth we will observe next Tuesday, warned that this Nation must remain independent and steer a clear and sure course away from foreign intrigues and quarrels.

In his famous Farewell Address, in which he warned repeatedly of the pitfalls ahead, President Washington said:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence a free people ought to be constantly awake since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of a republican government."

The words of our revered first President are as rich in wisdom today as they were then.

We must readjust our foreign commitments to bring them within the ability of the American people to honor and support. We cannot go on indefinitely policing and financing the world, dissipating our resources, and piling up burdens of debt and taxation which the children of the tomorrows to come cannot possibly discharge or endure.

The hour is late but there is still time to make the light of freedom burn more brightly on our own shores and the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

We not only can but we must reaffirm the wisdom of our forefathers if we are to save this great constitutional Republic as we know it and as we cherish it.

I wish you well in your deliberations during this 13th annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. You will have my support in every reasonable undertaking.

Withholding Information From the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Behind Ike's Back," published in the Indianapolis Star of March 5, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND IKE'S BACK

Responsibility for the suppression of an official report denying the need for Federal aid to education has been narrowed down by President Eisenhower's answer to a question by the Star's Washington correspondent, Ben Cole. The question cited a report from a subcommittee of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It said, "We have been unable to find a State which cannot make more money available to its schools or which is economically unable to support an adequate school program." President Eisenhower was asked whether this report had been brought to his attention, and whether, if true, it would change his views on the Federal-aid question.

The President's reply was that he had not heard about the report. He said he doubted that it was true, in detail, in view of information coming to him from many different sources.

This direct statement clarifies a shocking state of affairs in the White House and the top level of the administration. Bear in mind that this report constituted an official finding by one of the President's own advisory groups. It had a direct and significant bearing on a question on which he was known to be preparing a special message to Congress; it contained information which might have caused him to look more searchingly at other information provided to him. But by his own words he had never seen it. Almost a week after the existence and nature of the suppressed report had been disclosed, he still had not heard about it. It still has not been officially released.

Far more than the question of Federal aid to education is involved. This incident has demonstrated that information reaching the President, to provide the basis for his planning and his decisions, is being carefully filtered by subordinates. They prevent him from seeing material which might cause him to veer from the direction in which they want him to go.

This process of filtration effectively prevents the President from actually making his own decisions, based on all available knowledge about a situation or problem. Instead his decisions are guided by a group of aides behind the scenes, by the simple process of censoring his lines of communication, and apparently he does not perceive that it is being done.

President Eisenhower's personal future is at stake, for the course of his administration is being steered by those who decide what he should and should not know. But that is not all. Also at stake is the future of the Republican Party, which could well hinge on the record of this first Republican administration in 20 years. What this ad-

ministration does may affect the course of the Nation, even of other nations, for a long time to come.

We fervently hope that President Eisenhower will now, for his own sake as well as for the good of the Nation, start asking why all the available report material matter of aid to education was not called to his attention. We hope he will start asking how much pertinent information in other matters has been withheld from him. And we hope he will do something to assure that in the future he gets the full and accurate story on matters of national concern.

A Policy for Skilled Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on numerous occasions I have commented on the floor of the Senate regarding the need for strengthened utilization of the specialized manpower of our country.

We have a civilian working population of 64 million. It consists of 8 or 9 million skilled workers and less than half a million technicians. This great labor force produces half the world's goods.

It is obvious that in the present life and death competitive struggle between the slave world and the free world, it is essential that we voluntarily coordinate our human resources so that free Americans, young and old, can individually and collectively make their fullest contribution to national defense prosperity and well-being.

I read with interest, therefore, a recent comprehensive report by the National Manpower Council entitled "A Policy for Skilled Manpower."

This broad-gaged report, which for the first time integrated many scattered viewpoints, was sent to me by one of America's distinguished citizens, Mr. James D. Zellerbach.

I believe the recommendations by the council will be of deep interest to my colleagues. I send to the desk, therefore, a summary of those recommendations, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, to be preceded by a list of the noted Americans who serve on the National Manpower Council, and by the text of Mr. Zellerbach's letter to me.

There being no objection, the letter, list of names, and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MANPOWER COUNCIL,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
New York, N. Y.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Because you have a special concern as a Member of the Congress with the Nation's most precious resources—its men, women, and youth—I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of the Statement and Recommendations of the National Man-

power Council reprinted from its latest study, *A Policy for Skilled Manpower*, published December 20, 1954.

This study provides the first full-scale evaluation of the vital role played in our economy by the Nation's skilled workers and technicians. It deals with a range of subjects of key importance to the Federal Government as well as to local and State governments, educational institutions, employers, trade unions, and the individual citizen. Among these subjects are general and vocational secondary education, vocational guidance, Armed Forces training, on-the-job training, apprenticeship, and the opportunities and incentives for and the barriers to the acquisition of skill.

The National Manpower Council was established in 1951 under a Ford Foundation grant by President Eisenhower, when he was president of Columbia University, to study significant manpower problems and to contribute to the improved development and utilization of our human resources. Its previous publications are *Student Deferment and National Manpower Policy* (1952), *A Policy for Scientific and Professional Manpower* (1953), and *Proceedings of a Conference on the Utilization of Scientific and Professional Manpower* (1954).

The members of the council look forward to your reactions to our recommendations in *A Policy for Skilled Manpower*.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. ZELLERBACH,

MEMBERSHIP OF THE NATIONAL MANPOWER COUNCIL

Chairman: James D. Zellerbach, president, Crown Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

Deputy Chairman: Courtney C. Brown, dean of the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Hon. Robert B. Anderson, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Leo Bartemeier, medical director, the Seton Institute, Baltimore, Md.

Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief, the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.

Lee A. DuBridge, president, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

William H. Harrison, president, International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., New York, N. Y.

A. J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C.

Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.

Robert M. MacIver, Lieber professor emeritus of political philosophy and sociology, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

Wilbur C. Munnecke, business manager, Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago, Ill.

Frank W. Pierce, former director, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, New York, N. Y.

Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York, N. Y.

Roland R. Renne, president, Montana State College, Bozeman, Mont.

Sara E. Southall, personnel management consultant, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Charles P. Taft, Headley, Sibbald & Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Director of Research: Eli Ginzberg, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University.

Executive Secretary: Henry David, Graduate School of Business, Columbia University.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE NATIONAL MANPOWER COUNCIL

Our future progress and strength depend upon a conscious and deliberate concern with our manpower resources. Recognition that our most precious single resource consists of the skills, capacities, and creativeness of our people is not enough. For the

sake of contributing to the greater well-being of each individual and strengthening the Nation as a whole, it is also necessary for us to assure the further development of our manpower resources and their more effective utilization. To take such action we must view our human resources as a whole, and not only as they now are, but as they can be developed.

In the past we have acted as if each manpower problem exists in isolation—whether it be the waste of potential ability and talent, shortages of teachers and nurses, or the adequacy of a community's facilities for training technicians. Consequently, we are easily diverted from a search for sound solutions for complex and difficult problems and tend to rely upon simple and short-sighted answers.

Five major long-range objectives must be pursued if we are to strengthen the Nation's resources of skilled workers and technicians. These are:

To strengthen the contributions made by secondary education to the acquisition of skill.

To develop a more effective program for vocational guidance.

To provide more equal opportunities for all individuals to acquire skill.

SKILLED MANPOWER

To improve the facilities and methods used to train skilled and technical manpower.

To increase knowledge about our manpower resources.

These objectives can be achieved only through a continuing and many-sided effort sustained by an informed public opinion and requiring the cooperation of the schools, employers, labor organizations, voluntary groups, the armed services, and local, State, and Federal Government.

With respect to strengthening the contributions made by secondary education to the acquisition of skill, the National Manpower Council recommends that:

1. Local and State governments encourage men and women of ability to enter and remain in the teaching profession by establishing more desirable conditions of employment, including salaries commensurate with their training and responsibilities.

2. Boards of education and school officials concentrate on achieving the key purposes of secondary education—to prepare the individual for citizenship, for a worthwhile life and for work—by insuring that all students, excepting the small minority unable to profit from it, pursue a common program at least through the second year of high school which concentrates on teaching them to communicate effectively in writing and speech, to handle elementary mathematical operations, and to apply their knowledge to solving the problems they will encounter in life and work.

3. Boards of education and school officials insure that students are permitted to specialize intensively in vocational subjects only after they have completed 2 years of high school, and that able and interested vocational students also are provided with the opportunity to qualify for college entrance.

4. Local and State educational officials, in cooperation with special advisory committees comprising employer and labor representatives, critically reappraise existing vocational education programs in order to insure their effectiveness in the light of current changes in technology, employment standards, and on-the-job training practices; the growth of junior and community colleges and technical institutes; and the training programs of the armed services.

5. The Congress review existing Federal legislation providing grants-in-aid for vocational-education purposes in order to ascertain whether the objectives, scale, and methods of allocation of funds are enabling the Federal Government to make the most effective contribution to the development of

the Nation's resources of skilled manpower.

With respect to developing a more effective program for vocational guidance, the National Manpower Council recommends that:

1. State and local governments and boards of education recognize that the provision of essential educational and vocational guidance services is a major responsibility of secondary education by increasing substantially and rapidly the funds and staff available for guidance and counseling purposes.

2. School officials use their guidance and counseling staff primarily for vocational-guidance purposes and, when expanded resources of staff and funds permit, also for counseling students with personal adjustment problems.

3. School officials make vocational guidance available no later than the 9th year and have it continue throughout the high-school course, and that they assign to the classroom teacher major responsibility for helping the student to make sound educational and occupational decisions.

4. School officials take the lead in their communities to assure a vigorous cooperative effort, in which industry, business, labor, government, the armed services, and civic groups participate, to provide occupational information and other types of assistance essential for effective vocational guidance.

With respect to providing more equal opportunities for all individuals to acquire skill, the National Manpower Council recommends that:

1. All employers hire and promote employees and all unions admit individuals to membership without regard to their race, creed, color, national origin, or sex.

2. Employers and unions and the joint apprenticeship councils and committees eliminate the practice, wherever it exists, of barring individuals from admission to apprenticeship programs because of their race or national origin.

3. The President insure that the heads of Federal departments and agencies eliminate discrimination based on race, creed, color, national origin, or sex wherever it remains in Federal employment, and that the full authority of the Federal Government be used to prevent such discrimination in all work performed for it under contract.

With respect to improving the facilities and methods used to train skilled and technical manpower, the National Manpower Council recommends that:

1. Unions and employers and the joint apprenticeship councils and committees review regularly the content and length of training time of apprenticeship programs in order to insure their efficiency and effectiveness.

2. Employers seek to provide greater opportunities for their employees to acquire increased skills through a planned system of varied job assignments, broader training on and off the job, and increasing the training competence of their supervisory staffs.

3. State and city governments undertake comprehensive surveys to determine whether existing training facilities are adequate to meet the requirements for skilled and technical manpower.

4. The Congress, by adjusting pay and other service benefits, enable the Armed Forces to reduce excessive turnover and to encourage reenlistment so as to retain a larger core group of qualified technicians, specialists, and noncommissioned officers.

5. The Secretary of Defense direct the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to utilize, wherever appropriate, the facilities and personnel available in the civilian community in meeting the training requirements of the services.

With respect to increasing knowledge about our manpower resources, the National Manpower Council recommends that:

1. The universities and foundations encourage and support research to increase our

¹ Currently not participating in the work of the National Manpower Council because of government service.

knowledge about manpower resources with particular reference to the complex process of occupational choice; the types of information essential for effective vocational guidance; the role of skilled and technical manpower in economic development; the impact of governmental policies upon the supply of skilled manpower resources; and the relation between how people are trained and their subsequent work performance.

2. The Secretary of Defense direct the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to evaluate the varied experiences of the services with training and make their significant findings and their new methods available for civilian use.

3. The President direct the appropriate agencies of the Government to provide periodic and comprehensive appraisals of the country's available resources of skilled and technical workers and to seek improvements in the methods of estimating future manpower requirements.

Ike's Security Rules Changes Don't Go to Root of Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Reading Times of March 8, 1955:

IKE'S SECURITY RULES CHANGES DON'T GO TO ROOT OF TROUBLE

Although President Eisenhower has approved Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr.'s seven suggestions for shoring up the Federal Government's internal security program among its own employees, it is highly improbable that Mr. Brownell's remedies will, in the end, be the ones that are applied; and perhaps, in view of the fact that they bear principally upon interdepartmental handling of security cases, it is well that these be not the final answer, for they are all procedural, not substantive, rejiggerings of the old system.

One of the changes Mr. Eisenhower has approved will require departmental heads to consult each other in cases where one department or agency refuses to clear a Federal employee who already has been cleared by another department or agency. This doesn't get to the root of anything at all except the kind of interdepartmental squabbling, with great embarrassment to the administration, that occurred in the case of Wolf Ladejinsky, who worked for the State Department for 20 years as an agriculture expert, was denied clearance when he was shifted to the Department of Agriculture, and finally was cleared—and hired—by the Foreign Operations Administration.

It would also seem to us that a basic flaw in the new regulations lies in the fact that there is no really effective procedure for appeal from the security findings of department and agency heads. The Eisenhower administration jettisoned the Loyalty Review Board which operated effectively under the Truman administration. In our opinion, that board should be revived for the reason that without such final check by nongovernmental people the tendency will be to resolve any doubt against an accused employee, just to play it safe.

There is still another fatal flaw, we believe. We all remember the numbers game that was

played for the first 2 years of the present administration. First it was 2,200, then the figure fluctuated back and forth many times. The 2,200—or whatever number you happen to prefer—were all under a cloud of disloyalty, inasmuch as the Federal Government was at no great pains to screen those who were screened—to say how many had subversive information against them and could therefore be classified as truly disloyal and how many were merely blabbermouths or loose-tongued in their cups and therefore might talk out of school. The revised security rules, so far as we have been able to interpret them, would do nothing to ban this little numbers game.

There are other flaws which we need not go into here. They will, however, undoubtedly be gone into in great detail when the Subcommittee on Organization, of the Government Operations Committee, opens hearings today on a resolution by Senators HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and JOHN C. STENNIS, of Mississippi, which would establish a bipartisan Committee on Government Security. This would be a sort of Hoover Commission with a specific, not a general slant, composed of 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats, 6 from the Government itself, 6 from outside the Government.

Two other groups will have a close look at the internal security picture. The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will investigate and so will a nongovernmental group, the Bar Association of the City of New York, which has a \$100,000 grant from the Fund for the Republic to conduct an 18-month study of our security regulations—what they aren't and what they should be.

From these three studies should come valuable information which will enable the administration and the Congress to arrive at security rules which not only afford the most complete protection to the Government but which, at the same time, will give individuals involved in security checks the complete protection they are entitled to under the laws and the Constitution. That many Federal employees have not been getting such protection in recent years has been plain to every citizen who wanted to take the trouble to follow such cases as those of Wolf Ladejinsky, Val Lorwin, Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, and Dr. John P. Peters, the Yale professor of medicine who, as an occasional medical consultant to the Surgeon General, was discharged without having been informed of the charges against him and without the right to confront his accusers.

The Burley Tobacco Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, subcommittees of the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry of both Houses of Congress are presently engaged in holding joint hearings looking into the problems affecting the burley tobacco industry. In the issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal of Monday, March 7, there was an editorial bearing on this problem which I believe to be of interest and value to all Members of the Congress. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rx. FOR TOBACCO QUALITY, NOT QUANTITY

When burley tobacco is in trouble, Kentucky is in trouble. And at the moment burley tobacco is in trouble.

The supply of burley now on hand is equivalent to about a 3½ years' supply. That is not as bad as it may sound. Under the price-support crop-control program which has been in effect for most of the last 20 years, the Federal Government has been performing a storage function for the tobacco trade which ordinarily it would perform itself. But it is true that we do have now a surplus of burley equal to about 1 year's supply.

What is worse, we have on hand a lot of burley that is of low quality. It is high-nicotine tobacco that needs to be blended with much lower-nicotine leaf to make good smoking tobacco.

The situation, however, is not yet so serious that it cannot be improved. The solution to the problem will be costly to Kentuckiana growers and as a result to all of Kentuckiana, but it need not be as costly to the community as many think at the moment.

Because tobacco is held for several years before it is used, it will be possible to work off the surplus of lower-grade burley over the next few years if burley growers are willing to cooperate. What is needed in the next few years is the production of a series of high-quality burley crops. In fact, the need is for production of high-quality burley from now on out.

Burley growers obviously have made a mistake in translating acreage controls into a demand for greater production per acre. For once, at least the philosophy of growing two blades of grass where only one grew before has been proved wrong.

Lower production per acre with increasing attention to quality—low nicotine content and fine leaf—can be equated into higher incomes per acre than high yields from smaller allotments.

The solution to the burley problem lies in the hands of burley growers themselves. The burley control and price-support program grew out of the recognition on the part of burley growers for an orderly method of production and marketing.

The present situation is nowhere near as serious as the one that brought about the program. Surely the common sense that prevailed to provide that program will prevail again to save it.

Constitutionality of Executive Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Times of March 8, 1955, an article by Mr. Arthur Krock. It is most timely and accentuates our need to safeguard our constitutional liberties from any encroachment upon them by the provisions of any treaty or these so-called executive agreements. I congratulate Mr. Krock upon the timeliness of his article, and his clear exposition of the critical situation confronting the Senate whenever it considers the provisions of a treaty and what our courts may do in their con-

struction and the interpretation of them. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

IN THE NATION
(By Arthur Krock)

STILL ANOTHER COURT TEST OF EXECUTIVE AGREEMENTS

WASHINGTON, March 7.—Unless the Government retreats in the case involving the Army's use in 1945 of the Austrian property of Maria Jeritza Seery, the opera singer, the Supreme Court will be presented with another constitutional issue involving executive agreements. And it could appear in a form which would make it unusually difficult for the high Court to refuse review.

The Supreme Court has full and arbitrary power to ignore constitutional issues created by lower court findings and appeals from these findings. Recently it has twice followed this course. In the Capps potato case the Supreme Court left undecided Circuit Judge Parker's opinion that an involved executive agreement was unconstitutional, and confined itself to passing on a factual issue of breach of contract. In the case of Private First Class Keefe the Supreme Court, by declining to review a lower court decision that the GI's constitutional rights had not been violated by trial and sentence in a French court for a vicious criminal offense against a French citizen, refused directly to pass on the issue whether the treaty was constitutional under which the Army turned him over to the French authorities.

But, if a contention made by the Government in the case of Mme. Jeritza is carried to the Supreme Court on appeal from the court of claims, the high tribunal will squarely have before it an inner conflict between an executive agreement and the fifth amendment. This contention is that a 1947 agreement between an Army commander and the Federal Government of Austria precluded an American citizen—Mme. Jeritza—from suing or recovering from the United States damages for the loss and destruction of property she owned in Austria that was used by the Army for an officers' club.

Terms of the agreement

Under this agreement the United States paid Austria 308,382,509 schillings (valued at 5 cents apiece in 1947) in full settlement for all obligations incurred by our forces from April 9, 1945, to June 30, 1947, including damage to all property by whomsoever owned. In return the Austrian Government agreed to settle all such claims and protect the United States from any of them. One such claim was that of Mme. Jeritza. On visiting her Austrian property in 1948, she testified, she found the realty badly damaged and all her personal possessions—of great value—gone. Vainly she sought compensation from the Army under the guarantees of the fifth amendment that public use of private property must be paid for.

Justice Madden, for a unanimous Court of Claims, rejected the Government's denial of its jurisdiction, also motions for summary judgment made both by the Government and Mme. Jeritza, and ordered a court commissioner to make an inquiry into and report on the facts. After the court evaluates these the Government will have the choice of paying some amount in damages or appealing to the Supreme Court on the contention that the executive agreement with Austria absolves it from payment and sets aside the fifth amendment from the case.

Before, however, turning over the factual inquiry to a commissioner, Judge Madden disposed of the basic constitutional issue insofar as the Court of Claims is concerned. Among the Government's assertions was that,

though the executive agreement involved was not ratified by the Senate, it was nevertheless a treaty within the meaning of the Constitution and hence "the supreme law of the land."

The Madden finding

"Whatever may be the true doctrine as to formally ratified treaties which conflict with the Constitution [wrote Judge Madden], we think there can be no doubt that an executive agreement, not being a transaction which is even mentioned in the Constitution, cannot impair constitutional rights. Statements [made by this court hitherto] which point in the opposite direction are hereby overruled. * * * It is probably still the law that Congress could effectively destroy a citizen's constitutional right, such as, for example, * * * to just compensation upon the taking of his property by the Government, by a statute withdrawing the Government's consent to be sued. But Congress has given consent to be sued for such a taking and has conferred jurisdiction on this court to adjudicate such a suit. It would, indeed, be incongruous if the executive department alone, without even the limited participation of Congress which is present when a treaty is ratified, could not only nullify the act of Congress consenting to suit on constitutional claims, but, by nullifying * * * destroy the constitutional right of a citizen."

Should the Government contest this, the constitutional issue would be squarely presented to the Supreme Court. It could escape rendering judgment. But Louis B. Wehle, a New York lawyer, has commented that the "John Marshall formula for escape was evolved almost a century and a quarter ago in the days of the Court's political weakness. * * * Long since, in the days of its strength, the Court should discard the formula, as Chief Justice Hughes did in the Ashwander case involving the constitutionality of the TVA.

Termination of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Stassen Go Home" published in the Indianapolis Star of March 6, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STASSEN GO HOME

The other day a reporter asked President Eisenhower if he planned any big economic aid program for Asia this year. The President answered, "There is evolving a plan soon to be crystallized that will be brought out to the Congress for approval."

So there we go again. The last Congress voted to end the life of the Foreign Operations Administration by next June 30. Now the administration is planning to resurrect it—as has been done before.

Americans who are interested in how their tax money has been spent abroad should get a copy of a book called Billions, Blunders, and Baloney, by Eugene Castle, if they want some help in supplying Congress with ideas for economy. You don't have to agree with all of Mr. Castle's conclusions to realize just

from the facts presented that FOA is not only worse than useless, it is harming American policy abroad.

The United States Information Agency, another target of Castle's, has 10,171 employees in Washington and overseas. What do they all do? They duplicate the private press services in supplying news overseas which is rarely used because it is considered propaganda. They make movies that they take out to show people how wonderful America is which often create the reverse impression and which are shown mostly to captive audiences. Yet the private United States film industry has daily audiences abroad of 290 million people. They live in nice homes with nice allowances in nice districts and put up nice exhibits in places where the average citizen rarely goes. They do not mingle with the people or adopt their customs or try to learn their cultural and psychological natures. As a result the USIA has, to date, done more to antagonize our foreign friends than to woo them. The results are obvious, of course. Never has the United States been held in less respect than today. Never have we had less support from our allies. Never have our enemies been able to sneer at us with such impunity. Until we began sending these journalistic gauleiters abroad to sell the United States we were not only respected and admired, we were liked.

We have sent \$112 billion abroad in foreign aid in less than 15 years. What good did it do us? Are we more secure than 10 years ago? Are we better liked than 10 years ago? Do we have more loyal allies than 10 years ago? Are our enemies weaker than 10 years ago? Do we have more friends in other countries than 10 years ago? Is our aim of supporting freedom further along than 10 years ago? It is not.

Think what schools and highways that \$112 billion could have built in the United States. Think of the military power we could have built with that \$112 billion. We could have paid off nearly half of our national debt with it. Which would have done us more good? Which will do us more good in the future?

Last year Congress allocated \$5,245,575,795 for FOA. Yet there was already a backlog of \$10 billion unspent and \$2 billion of this was not even allocated. But when Congressmen objected and tried to slash it, the administration put on the pressure and cried "wolf" once more and they buckled under. If Congress had eliminated FOA last year, as it had planned, we would have a balanced budget now with something left over for tax reduction.

But Mr. Stassen says, "We cannot, nor must we ever trim our aid to needy free nations just for the sake of cutting our own budget." So we owe everybody in the world a living, including those who oppose us, except ourselves.

We have tried to buy allies and we failed. We have tried to buy peace and got 3 wars. We have tried to buy friendship and bought only enmity. The most conspicuous example is India, to which we will have given \$378 million by next year. India not only refuses to join us in our peace and security efforts; India joins the other side against us. Yet we keep on. And Stassen's minions keep calling this success.

Mr. Castle cites a conversation with a Turkish newspaperman. "There are no 'Yank go home' signs in Turkey," he said. "Turks like Yanks; Yanks like Turks. The only Yanks the Turks don't like are your propagandists all over our country. If they would go home, it would be still better for Turkish-American relations."

If we want to buy propaganda in foreign countries, we should hire foreign press agents who know something about their own countries and how people think. We have

built huge monuments to our psychological stupidity in our lavish embassies and official residences abroad which excite envy, not admiration, sneers, not praise from local citizens. Our troops abroad are another source of irritation. If the next war is to be fought in the air with atomic weapons, why not bring them home and eliminate this ever-present source of irritation?

But America's chief failure in foreign policy, a failure that still persists stems from trying to do with dollars and propaganda what can only be done with sound policy. The Soviets make successful propaganda only because they have successful diplomatic and military policies. When they win a victory in the Tachen Islands it is worth 1,000 SEATO's. Every Geneva is worth a score of Marshall plans. Every victory in Indochina is worth billions spent on propaganda. Every diplomatic or military retreat by the United States is worth 1 million Harold Stassens. A successful and dynamic foreign policy will automatically bring successful propaganda, more solid alliances, more respect and admiration abroad. Retreats do not excite either confidence or respect.

So Congress should end all foreign aid this year and force the administration to concentrate on building sound policy. By balancing our budget we would be greatly strengthened at home. By bringing home our despised propagandists and resented troops we would be strengthened psychologically abroad. The slogan for this Congress should paraphrase the slogan that our stupidities and naivetes abroad have brought upon us, "Stassen go home"—and stay there.

New Virgin Island Governor Aims To Improve Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a great many of use here in the Senate, particularly those from the Southeastern States, have been acutely aware for some time of the problems relating to the United States Territories and island possessions which are close to us. We have sought to keep abreast of developments in the governments of Puerto Rico, for instance, where the people have been given self-government under a commonwealth status, and where great progress has been seen under Puerto Rican leaders.

Also of great interest and concern to us is that group of islands off the southern shores of Florida in the Caribbean Sea—the archipelago known as the Virgin Islands.

Recently, one of the Nation's outstanding newspaper correspondents, whom we all know for his sterling worth here in Washington, visited these islands, along with an official party from the Government, headed by Secretary of Interior McKay and Secretary of Agriculture Benson. This reporter made firsthand observations of conditions in the islands, and in his reports to his newspaper put his finger on some of the problems which the Virgin Islands face.

I recommend that all Senators give their attention to the article I am about

to present for the RECORD, not only because it is written in a very lucid, precise style, but also because it makes available authoritative, up-to-date information. The author is Mr. Radford Mobley, who is the Washington correspondent for the Knight newspapers, and this article appeared in the Miami Herald and other Knight newspapers on March 3, 1955.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW VIRGIN ISLAND GOVERNOR AIMS TO IMPROVE ECONOMY (By Radford Mobley)

ST. THOMAS, V. I.—The English-speaking Virgin Islanders, situated between Puerto Rico and Latin America, have a new governor who is asking them to take a sharper look at realities if they want to improve their economy.

Self-made Gov. Archie A. Alexander, who was a millionaire contractor in Washington before he took his present job, was not a popular choice when he was appointed last year.

He was a nonresident Negro and the natives talk increasingly about electing their own resident governor.

Furthermore, he talked very candidly with the local population. He advised them to apply themselves more. This didn't sit too well with a part of the 26,000 population, many of whom have been content since the Roosevelt administration to depend on Washington to take care of these islands, partly wrecked by prohibition and the handout.

The local people hope the governor will lose some of his energy and eventually see things their easy-going way in this delightful tropical climate. But this seems unlikely. Governor Alexander is a determined man and would like to see the islands stand on their own feet.

The reward for such an accomplishment will be more local self-government. This goal is presently aimed at.

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay and other Federal officials made a recent survey of the islands, particularly to take a look at the Virgin Islands Corporation (VICORP), set up during the former Democratic administration to improve the islands' economy.

VICORP started out on a big scale. Former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes put it into the rum business, reviving the principal industry under Government sponsorship. It then went into the hotel business and finally into the sugar business.

Today the Corporation, which has dropped rum, hotels, and tourism, leaving power and sugar, is losing \$500,000 a year. There is little chance for doing better unless the Virgin Island sugar quota is raised, and local workers get interested in sugar field work now left mainly to imported labor.

Congress soon will consider what to do about VICORP. McKay has been advised to ask that Congress kill it, turning over its operations to the Virgin Islands government under Governor Alexander.

Last year the United States Government stopped direct grants to the Virgin Islands government to meet deficits, and has cut down on grants for welfare purposes.

Now the Treasury turns back to the Virgin Islands tax revenue collected on sale within the United States of Virgin Islands goods. This is mainly rum.

But it seems probable VICORP will be stuck with its sugar business for some time. Chances for a private sale, as was arranged for the rum and hotel businesses, seem slight in view of current losses.

Eventually the local government may be given control, but it is officially recommended this step be delayed until the government demonstrates its ability to manage its own affairs.

The VICORP board is taking steps to clean up what it found when it took over.

It found there was no adequate inventory of corporation equipment. Inventory accounts were adjusted to agree with storekeeper records without reason given for differences. An inventory is now underway.

During the past few years the corporation spent half a million dollars for tractors and other farm equipment. This was left in the fields and villages at the end of the grinding season. Vehicles were open for rains to flood them. Some equipment was almost invisible because of the overgrowth of weeds.

"In these lovely islands we did find a lovely mess," said Dr. K. A. Bartlett, president of the corporation. "We now have top technical aid to make things more efficient. But whether we can make money out of sugar, I can't say. Labor is the chief problem."

Younger Virgin Islanders leave for the States whenever they can. Six of 10 drafted for military service never return home.

Governor Alexander had long sessions with McKay and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson on needed water projects, more diversified agriculture, forestry development, and other pressing problems.

Some of the natives say they would like to go back to Navy control, where they were from 1917 to the 1930's. The reason: "Because the Navy was always building things."

Governor Alexander is a builder himself and should capture their confidence if he builds a few things, assuming he can find the labor.

Oil Price Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "U. N. and Economics: Global Group Asks Oil Price Regulation To Set Right Rate," published in the Wall Street Journal of February 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. AND ECONOMICS: GLOBAL GROUP ASKS OIL PRICE REGULATION TO SET RIGHT RATE—COST IN EUROPE TOO HIGH, TIED TO UNITED STATES LEVELS, SECRET REPORT ARGUES—DULL DOCUMENT PACKS A PUNCH

(By Henry Gemmill and Mitchell Gordon)

GENEVA.—Less than 2 weeks from now, on March 9, delegates to a United Nations committee—including representatives of Russia, Poland, and other Communist countries—will meet here to discuss what has suddenly become the most violently publicized economic issue on the continent.

This is a proposal by the secretariat of the U. N.'s Economic Commission for Europe that governmental machinery be set up to fix what it calls the right prices for crude oil produced in the Middle East—mostly by 5 American companies and 3 European ones—and for petroleum products refined and marketed in Western Europe. The right price

for Middle East crude, the secretariat argues, would be a lot lower than the going rate.

Officially, this proposal is still a secret and every effort has been made to confine circulation of a document in which it is contained, bearing the colorless title "The Price of Oil in Western Europe," to governments of participating countries, including the United States. But newspapers from Britain to Switzerland to Italy have learned much of its contents and are currently headlining it—rather misleadingly—as an assault on monopoly.

PACKS POTENTIAL WALLOP

An examination of the complete text of the document, obtained by the Wall Street Journal, shows it to be at first glance, a scholarly and rather dull dissertation. It contains 3 pages of algebraic equations and 14 pages of tables, charts, and maps in addition to 39 pages of analysis and suggestions. But whatever its merits as an economic study, it does pack a potential political wallop, so its arguments and proposals are perhaps worth attention.

This is not a trustbusting effort of the sort the big American oil companies have become accustomed to at home—though the ECE document does draw on facts and allegations contained in the 1952 report of the Federal Trade Commission entitled "The International Petroleum Cartel" and though it does make reference to "the current civil action against the five major United States oil companies operating abroad for alleged violation of the antitrust laws."

(The Justice Department's antitrust case against the so-called international oil cartel, filed in April of 1953, has come almost to a standstill. Government lawyers have been studying thousands of documents submitted by the five United States oil firms involved, and sometime after mid-March, Federal and company attorneys are expected to get together to discuss ways of getting the case off the district court inactive list.)

Instead, this United Nations staff group recognizes and appears to welcome the power of the five big companies and the governments backing them. But it proposes that this be countered by governmental power and action to be exercised by the consuming nations.

NO SOLID DETAILS

As to the details of what it wants, the Secretariat gives only a number of broad hints. It asserts that "the special circumstances of crude-oil production make it impossible to say, on purely economic grounds, where the right price lies," except within a very wide range. So the decision must be political—"one which represents a compromise generally felt to be fair between the interests of producers and consumers."

The United Nations planners recall with apparent nostalgia "the Anglo-American Oil Treaty of 1945 which explicitly recognized the interests of all governments, consuming as well as producing." This draft treaty "was never ratified and the particular approach which it envisaged may now be no longer appropriate," their report concedes, but adds that "the transition from conditions of scarcity to conditions of plenty in oil poses anew the problems which were already foreseen at that time."

What the Secretariat seeks is stability, through agreed-upon pricing. It denounces the price of Middle East crude as too high today, but it is equally fearful of a price collapse. Says the report: "The danger is that if governments in consuming countries remain so detached from these problems as heretofore they may persist unsolved until the further accumulation of strains produces a disorderly rupture in the present price structure."

MAY PARALLEL WHEAT PACT

At the moment only one major commodity—wheat—has its price controlled by in-

ternational governmental agreement. The United Nations group does not cite this as a model, though it would seem to fit the definitions of what is desired for oil.

Communist countries might have to be included in any oil price-fixing arrangement, the report indicates. It notes that so far, East Europe's crude-oil exports have been small; at last count in 1953 they came to roughly 1.5 million tons out of total consumption in Western Europe of roughly 70 million tons, and most sales by the Soviet Union and Rumania seem to have been made at prices little different from those charged by the major private companies.

But already East Europe has completely taken over the Icelandic and Finnish petroleum markets, the Secretariat declares, and if oil comes to figure still more prominently in the export efforts of Eastern Europe, the problem of opening up outlets for it without price cutting is likely to become more serious.

The United Nations officials do not hesitate to name the private companies which it would subject to price control, both for crude oil produced in the Middle East and for products refined and distributed in Europe. They are the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), the Texas Co., Socony-Vacuum, Standard Oil of California, and Gulf Oil Corp., all American, the Royal Dutch Shell group of companies and the British Petroleum Co., formerly called Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. In addition it cites one French Government-backed concern, Compagnie Française des Pétroles.

DOMINATE REGION'S OIL

Together these firms produce nearly all Middle East oil, largely through joint companies. For instance, in Saudi Arabia the joint enterprise is Arabian American Oil Co., representing the two Standard Oil concerns, Socony-Vacuum and the Texas Co. Iraq Petroleum is a joint venture of Socony-Vacuum, Jersey Standard, British Petroleum, Royal Dutch, Shell, and Compagnie Française.

The United Nations theorists seem to feel that the big private petroleum companies may embrace their plan for political price fixing. In this they are very likely wildly overconfident but their sentiment is explained thus:

"Alone and unaided the oil industry may find it impossible to evolve a more rational price structure or pricing mechanism. The development of any new formula by the industry itself, even though it produced a more defensible structure and a lower level of prices in Europe, would doubtless increase the difficulties experienced by the American companies with regard to the administration of United States antitrust laws. And without some agreement reached in advance on an alternative standard of pricing the industry is understandably reluctant to abandon the present one since, given the conditions of supply and the insensitivity of demand to price changes, it is difficult to see where prices will come to rest once they start to move."

INTRICATE ECONOMIC REASONING

The economic reasoning behind the United Nations proposals is intricate but boils down to this:

Oil prices in America are kept high by regulatory agencies of State governments, such as the Texas Railroad Commission, which aim to cover the expenses of the highest cost domestic producers and promote a high rate of oil exploration.

Europe, which before World War II got most of its oil from the Western Hemisphere in the form of refined products, now gets nearly all its imports from the new fields of the Middle East, and it takes it as crude oil because refineries have been built in Europe. About \$1 billion is paid annually now for

this crude and it is argued that this is far too much.

The Secretariat contends that the cost of production in the rich Middle East fields is amazingly low. It cites figures showing that while "in the United States average output per well in 1950 was only some 11.6 barrels a day, or 31 barrels if stripper (marginal producing) wells are excluded," in the Middle East the average was some 5,000 barrels. The report contends that in 1952 crude oil from Saudi Arabia that sold for \$1.75 a barrel returned a net profit in the neighborhood of \$1.40.

SAID TIED TO UNITED STATES

The price of Middle East crude is somewhat below the American price, it is conceded, but the United Nations group contends it is nevertheless arbitrarily "tied to that in the United States, with due allowance for freight charges." The planners conclude that "the wide divorce which persists between prices and production costs in the Middle East suggests that if this link were severed the price charged on sales to European countries by the Middle East could be significantly lowered without adverse effects on the further development of its crude oil production."

The present high profitability of Middle Eastern operations is depicted by the Secretariat as a standing invitation to the potentates of the area to increase their demands for a cut of it. "The present position in which royalties and taxes in most Middle East countries amount to about 50 percent of the net profits of crude oil production is the outcome of very recent advances over the last few years," the report says, and "there is no reason to think that the present position is one of permanent stability."

New price-fixing mechanisms must be applied not only to Middle East crude oil but to petroleum products refined in Europe, the economic commission contends. Its charts depict some big companies which dominate the Middle East production as controlling more than 70 percent of Western Europe's refining capacity although they control only a bit more than 40 percent of the refineries in the United States.

PRICE PEGGING CHARGED

It is charged that most of these big companies—and most independent ones, too—peg their prices upon prices of refined products in the Western Hemisphere through a technique known as import parity. In other words prices in Western Europe tend to be equal to the price at which products could be delivered from the Caribbean, except in the eastern Mediterranean which is closer to the Middle East, where the yardstick is delivered prices from the Persian Gulf.

The asserted result is that European refined prices dance to the tune of demand for various products in the United States and the pattern of prices imposed is bound to be inappropriate, especially because the demand for fuel oil relative to that of motor spirit is much higher in Western Europe. Another alleged effect is to make the profitability of refining in most parts of Western Europe vary in erratic fashion with changes in the level of freight rates.

Any new scheme for fixing refined product prices would need to be consistent with two objectives, according to the economic commission. One objective is to kick loose from the American price patterns and establish instead prices which will respond to demand in Western Europe. The second is to insure that the pricing practices adopted are such that efficient nonintegrated refiners, who cannot subsidize refining out of profits made in crude-oil production, transport or distribution, can compete on equal terms with the integrated companies.

SENSATIONAL PUBLICITY

The economic commission secretariat is headed by Gunnar Myrdal, Socialist from

Sweden. While he was still in domestic politics, Mr. Myrdal negotiated soon after the war a big Swedish deal with Russia. He explained to a Wall Street Journal reporter at the time in 1946 that this was not from fondness for the Communists but because the danger of an American depression was imminent and Sweden must diversify its trade interests.

Accounts of the economic commission's oil report have been sensationally publicized even by some newspapers whose economic and political views are conservative. For example, Lord Beaverbrook's London Express this week threw 8-column page 1 headlines on a story proclaiming: "Big Combines Accused of Keeping Up Prices in Britain."

An exception is the London Financial Times which rehearses what it terms the oil industry's answer to the criticism:

"Under the 50-50 profit-sharing arrangement which has been gradually extended throughout the Middle East any attempt to reduce the selling price of crude oil would be bitterly resisted by the governments of that area whose revenues would be reduced in consequence. It is idle to suggest that they would be able to sell much more oil at lower prices. The only big new market that they could hope to capture by offering their oil at prices below the United States gulf level is the United States itself, and there is no doubt about the promptness of the measures that would be taken if the threat of foreign oil 'dumping' of this kind ever materialized."

Stories about the United Nations oil critique have been given spirited play in Swiss newspapers, which have been critical of recent United States antitrust action against their country's watchmakers. The Italian news agency decided to file a story on the issue after worrying whether doing so would supply Italian Communists with political ammunition.

UNITED STATES FIRMS ASSAIL REPORT

Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) assailed a United Nations agency's report on prices of crude oil produced in the Middle East as a "gross misstatement." Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., said it makes no specific recommendations and the Texas Co. noted the paper "has no official status."

A Jersey Standard spokesman said the paper apparently was based "on charges which have been made in the past about the oil industry . . . which have never been tried or proved. Such things can be and are used as propaganda by Communists and others to attack the West. . . . The net received by the oil companies from Middle East crudes have been overstated in the paper by exactly 100 percent."

Socony-Vacuum said in a statement, "Apparently the authors of the report make no specific recommendations. But they seem to suggest that the oil industry has in some way failed to price its products appropriately and that perhaps some form of international governmental control ought to be imposed. . . . We are confident that when the final report of the ECE is officially released such questions as it raises will be readily understandable in the light of accepted economic principles."

The Texas Co. declared, "This working paper, as far as we know, has not been approved and has no official status. The Texas Co. believes in the basic principles of free enterprise and competition. We also believe that these natural economic forces in the long run operate most favorably in the public interest."

How the Right-To-Work Fight Lines Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the February 16, 1955, political memo of Labor's League for Political Education of the American Federation of Labor:

How THE RIGHT-TO-WORK FIGHT LINES UP

Passage of a so-called right-to-work law by the Utah Legislature brought into sharp focus the whole dark and bitter history of the corrupt big business fight against men and women who have joined unions to help gain higher wages, shorter hours, and better working conditions.

It also retold an old, old story. This one: There is not a union security contract in America that cannot be wiped off the books by legislative action.

The postscript to that tale is this: Trade unionists must be active politically in order to protect themselves. If they don't want each individual worker to be forced to plead with his employer for fair treatment, they must learn where candidates for the legislatures and Congress stand on labor issues. And then they must register and vote for those who will support the interests of working people, and the State and country as a whole, because what is good for the country is good for the worker.

THE POLITICAL PARTY LINEUP

In Utah, which, with Governor Lee's signature, became the 18th State to pass the law aimed at destroying trade unions by outlawing all union security agreements, every one of the 33 Republicans in the House and 13 of the 16 GOP Senators voted for the bill. On the other hand, all 27 Democrats in the House and all 7 Democrats in the Senate opposed it.

The Utah voting pattern was cut from the same cloth which has been woven in other right-to-work States. There, without exception, legislatures are controlled by greedy men who sit in the front offices of corporations and the board rooms of banks.

In the 11 Southern States which have passed the union-wrecking legislation, that has meant control by the Dixiecrat battalions commanded by such labor-hating warriors as Talmadge, of Georgia; Shivers, of Texas; and Byrnes, of South Carolina.

But outside the solid South, it has meant that in seven States the Republican regiments have wheeled their artillery into line and cannonaded the Democratic prolabor troops to death.

And yet the generals of the Grand Army of the Republican Party profess to wonder why Labor's League for Political Education so often supports liberal Democrats for legislative offices.

In the words of AFL President George Meany, labor is not wedded to the Democratic Party. Rather it is wedded to the idea that it is a mite smarter to vote for a man who will vote for us rather than for one who will vote to let organized labor be destroyed on the order of big business.

THE PRESSURE GROUP LINEUP

Utah witnessed an organization with a high-sounding and oh-so-respectable label fronting for the reactionary characters behind the scenes in their battle to strip working people of the right to organize. And the citizenry of other States watched phony fronts in their statehouses plot and execute legislative assaults on union members.

In Salt Lake City, it was called the Industrial Relations Council of Utah. That sounds nice. It even sounds fancy. Who in the world would have anything against an outfit that wants to promote better labor-management relations, as the council's name so slyly implies is its intent? Of course, one way to guarantee big-business men of having peaceful relations with unions is to have no unions.

As a matter of brutal fact, the Utah representative who introduced the right-to-work-unions measure is the council's attorney.

One of the earliest front groups to fight the union shop was the high-sounding DeMille Political Freedoms Foundation, run by the movie magnate, Cecil B. DeMille. The foundation deluged Wyoming legislators with propaganda mailed in an envelope carrying the return address of: Labor's Legislative Committee, Casper, Wyo. This gave the impression that the outfit had labor support—which it surely did not.

In North Carolina and Virginia, there were groups solemnly calling themselves right-to-work committees. In reality, they consisted of low-wage manufacturers and should have been known as right-to-work-for-what-we-want-to-pay-you-for-as-long-as-we-want-to-work-you committees.

In Louisiana, there was a ghost group tagged as the Citizens Committee. It paid for reams of newspaper advertisements and endless hours of radio propaganda. Its goal was plainly obvious inasmuch as it was teamed up with such hot-eyed groups as the New Orleans Association of Commerce, the Louisiana Manufacturers Association, and the Farm Bureau.

In other Dixie States, the Southern States Industrial Council played a leading anti-union role.

In Oklahoma, the false face for the reactionary boys who lurked stealthily behind the scenes was a thing known as Jobs, Inc. Fortunately, trade unionists and their friends in the legislature killed the proposed right-to-wreck bill in a bitter, uphill drive.

Then there is the spook group known as the National Economic Council, Inc., a blood brother of the notorious Committee for Constitutional Government. Among those who have contributed money to the NEC are such friends of the workingman as Gulf Oil, Monsanto Chemical, Vick Chemical, Lamont Du Pont, Irénée du Pont, Lone Star Cement, and the Texas Co.

The president of the National Economic Council, Inc., is one Merwin K. Hart, who in 1940 had this to say:

"I wonder sometimes if one of the causes of our trouble today arises from the fact that we have been overdrilled into believing we are a democracy."

It was Hart who told an amazed committee of the United States House of Representatives in 1950 that the Supreme Court should be abolished because it's dedicated to socialism.

Perhaps the most fraudulent label that has been pasted on such phantom forces is the one that trickily implies it is sponsored by church people. These include the Chris-

tian American Association and the Christian Front.

Their names give off an aroma of morality. You might mistakenly infer from them that they are benevolent organizations dedicated to good and prayerful endeavors. But their works give off the noxious odors of assassins of the trade-union movement.

It was the hippity-hoppy Christian American Association which fathered the right-to-wreck law in Texas; which claimed ownership of the law in Louisiana; which cosponsored it with chambers of commerce and manufacturers' associations in Georgia; which put over a labor peace act in Colorado (later torpedoed by the State supreme court); and which was so effective in pressuring members of the Tennessee Legislature that a right-to-wreck law sailed through that assembly despite the fact that not a single, solitary supporter of the bill testified before the senate labor committee.

THE REAL CHURCH LINEUP

Most of the leading spokesmen of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish churches who have taken public positions about so-called right-to-work laws have upheld the moral, as well as legal, right of workers and employers to enter into contracts when they see fit.

Among these is the executive committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which said in 1949: "We believe that compulsory union membership should be neither required nor forbidden by law."

The Most Reverend Francis Rummel, Catholic archbishop of New Orleans, told a Louisiana legislative committee in 1954: "Labor no less than management needs reform, but neither should be virtually outlawed."

Rabbi E. J. Lipman, director of the Commission on Social Action of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, stated in 1954: "The right-to-work law is a fraud. . . . Against such attempts to impair the right of labor to organize, the adherents of religious faith—whether Judaism or Christianity—must speak out with candor and courage."

Just the other day, Senator HERBERT LEHMAN inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the 1955 New Year's Day statement of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. One paragraph said:

"It is not the American worker who has been bleating so loudly about a man's right to work. The new exponents of the right-to-work are those who would have the worker stand alone before them in his request to exercise that right—where they can dictate the conditions of that work—conditions which in the past have brought untold misery and hardship to the workingman."

And that, of course, is absolutely true. How many workers, either union or non-union members, have pleaded for a right-to-work law? How many employees in a union shop have quit their job to work in a non-union shop because they don't like union security?

The questions answer themselves.

THE HYPOCRITICAL LINEUP

We should not forget one thing. A number of big-business men practice the deepest hypocrisy in their attempts to outlaw the union shop. The union shop—a result of the American principle of majority rule—is more than 150 years old. During that time it became entrenched firmly in many industries.

And some of the leaders in those industries have union agreements right today. But, nothing daunted, they continue to blather about how terrible unionism is.

The prime, 24-carat, gold-plated model of such a man with his feet planted firmly in the air is none other than the president of the National Association of Manufacturers, Henry Riter III. He says "State right-to-work laws are designed to restore to the

individual his basic rights to decide for himself whether to join or not to join a union."

It so happens that Mr. Riter is chairman of the board of the Copperweld Steel Co. which has a union-shop contract with the steelworkers.

WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE LINEUP?

Forty-six legislatures meet this year and the jowls of the NAM and the chamber of commerce are quivering with anticipation of more legislative worlds to conquer. Thus it behooves all trade union leaders to generate a very active participation in affairs in their State capitals by organized labor.

Only by practical, hardheaded mobilization of union members will more right-to-work laws be defeated.

Only in that way can they stop antilabor forces who want to remove from the tomb the days of not-so-long-ago, days that have been described by a late Chief Justice of the United States in these words:

"A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent upon his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and his family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment."

And then the Chief Justice said: "Union was essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on equality with their employer."

The name of the Chief Justice was William Howard Taft, father of the father of the Taft-Hartley Act.

MR. DOOLEY EXPLAINS THE RIGHT TO WORK

The present right-to-work drive against the union shop recalls a famous piece by Mr. Dooley, a character created by Finley Peter Dunne, noted newspaper writer of years ago. Wage rates and working hours have changed since then, but the fundamental situation he discussed remains the same. Nobody has ever described it better than Dooley, in his Irish brogue, as follows:

"What is the open shop? Sure, 'tis where they kape the doors open to accommodate the constant stream of min comin in to take jobs cheaper than the min that has the jobs."

"'Tis like this, Hinnissey: Suppose wan of these freeborn citizens is workin in an open shop f'r the princely wages av wan large iron dollar a day av tin hours. Along comes anither son av gun and he sez to the boss, Oi think Oi could handle the job nicely f'r 90 cints."

"'Sure,' sez the boss, an the wan dollar man gets out into the crool wuruld t' exercise his inalienable rights as a freeborn American citizen and scab on some other poor devil."

"And so it goes on, Hinnissey. And who gits the benefit? True, it saves the boss money, but he don't care no more for money thin he does f'r his right eye. It's all a matter of principle with him. He hates to see min robbed av their independence."

"'But,' said Mr. Hennessey, 'these open-shop min ye menshun say they are f'r unions if properly conducted.'

"'Sure,' said Mr. Dooley, 'if proper conducted. An' there we are: How would they have thim properly conducted? No strikes, no rules, no contracts, no scales, hardly in wages, and dam few members.'"

Soil Conservation Districts in Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Soil Conservation Districts Expanding," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS EXPANDING

More than three-fourths of Minnesota's good agricultural land lies within the 69 soil conservation districts already organized. Yet in all that area less than a fourth of the farmers are cooperators in the program, following basic soil conservation plans. As M. A. Thorfinnson, extension soil conservationist on the university's farm campus, put it in an article in the Conservation Volunteer, "We are three-fourths organized for the job and have more than three-fourths of the job still to do in the organized area."

The process of expanding the organization framework has been speeded by Mr. Thorfinnson in his position as executive secretary of the State soil conservation committee. Seventeen of sixty-nine districts were organized in the last 3 years and 9 of these in just the past year. Yet research must have continuing impetus, and direct participation in the plan will have to be expanded.

Urging legislative appropriations to carry the program forward, the Conservation Volunteer articles makes this sound statement as to the value of research: "It has been estimated that Minnesota is losing \$100 million worth of topsoil annually through soil erosion, in addition to a similar amount in fertility going into crops shipped out of the State. The latter can be largely replaced through use of commercial fertilizer; the former can never be replaced. A few hundred thousand invested annually can go a long way in preventing this loss."

Red Propaganda Against the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "His Master's Voice," prepared by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, pastor of the Foundry Methodist Church and Chaplain of the United States Senate, which was published in Foundry Facts for Foundry Folks of February 24, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIS MASTER'S VOICE

We have never yet known President Syngman Rhee to be wrong in his reactions and judgments regarding anything that has to do with communism. Few men in the world know better the blackness of the heart—if it has a heart—of this conspiracy of slavery.

It was his deliberate judgment last summer that no representatives of the subversive churches back of the Iron Curtain should be allowed to come to Evanston. It was also the best judgment of the State Department that they ought not to come. But, at last, a milder attitude prevailed, on the basis that, perhaps, they could do no harm, especially if carefully watched, and might

see and hear some things here that would affect their attitudes when they returned.

What these so-called church leaders have said and done since their return, for instance, to Hungary, shows how right Syngman Rhee was.

Dr. Eugene Gonda, a former European journalist, now living in Washington, has these comments, among many others, to make:

"The four Hungarian Protestant bishops took the lead recently in a new kind of Red propaganda aimed at the United States. The 4-2 Lutherans and 2 Calvinists—were members of a Hungarian delegation which attended the Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Evanston last August. The Lutherans were Dezery and Veto; the Calvinists were Bereczky and Peter.

"Bishop Bereczky has been giving well-publicized lectures since his return about his sad American experiences. Bishops Peter, Dezery, and Veto wrote articles about the horrors of American life and the successes of Iron Curtain churches at the Evanston Assembly."

In spite of all the courtesies that were extended them, the bishops agreed that they received "humiliating treatment reserved only for Communists." They didn't receive that sort of treatment; but even if they did they ought not to have been surprised, inasmuch as they represent a gangster government.

Speaking of American cafeterias—into which one need not go unless he wants to—one of these pseudo bishops told his countrymen: "One of the slanders by the western reactionary press about Communist countries is that there people wait in line for food in collective restaurants. The truth is that America is the country of waiting in line in cafeterias."

Another pronouncement by one of these ecclesiastical leaders is: "It is not possible to buy beer in bottles in America. Even this is delivered in canned form. Milk is sold in square paper boxes. American food is tasteless and is permeated with all kinds of unpleasant odors of fish, melted butter, and food oil."

Each one of these leaders described in his own way a cute magazine cover, which all unregimented Americans understand perfectly, as follows: "A father with two loaded guns terrorizing his young son in a sickbed and thus forcing him to take a bitter medicine." The writer succeeded in identifying the picture which so horrified these Hungarian bishops. It was on the cover of American Weekly, and it showed a smiling father kneeling at the bedside of his little boy, who was grimacing over a spoonful of castor oil. The father wore toy holsters and a toy sheriff's hat; and he was terrorizing the youngster with two cap pistols.

Fortunately, the State Department would not let some of these discredited and suspected church representatives go very far out of Evanston. But, even then, they pounced upon an Evanston war memorial. This man Peter (pronounced Pater) devoted an entire article, published in many Hungarian newspapers, to the Evanston memorial, and concluded that "the United States is suffering from war hysteria." Really, the shaft to which these Reds took exception was in memory of men who had fallen in all conflicts since the Civil War.

One of these men, unfortunately announced as representatives of ecumenical Christianity, told the Hungarian people when he got back: "Many people came to see us secretly and shook our hands warmly in the absolute privacy of hotel elevators."

An anonymous Protestant minister was quoted as saying: "President Eisenhower was elected on a program of peace and social progress. This has proved to be an empty illusion. Believe me, the American people have lost their faith in everybody. They are

only anxious for their future. While reading a newspaper, the average American can do nothing but turn the chewing gum in his mouth."

Well, we might comment that it would be better to have one's mouth filled with chewing gum than with the lies that these churchmen took back as part of their Red propaganda in Hungary. Their remarks which we have quoted here give just a little sample of the distortions which these men from Hungary (one of whom, instead of being called a bishop, is called a stooge and an informer by the Hungarian Government in exile) took back with them from this land of the free, as they returned to their totalitarian paradise—out of which they never would have been allowed to go had their masters not been sure of their loyalty. It is a case of his master's voice.

All who know really the ecumenical picture of world Christianity cannot help but deeply deplore that at Evanston the voice of this Hungarian Peter was heard, and the voices of such ecumenical Christians as Chiang Kai-shek and Syngman Rhee were not heard.

Again, let us say, Syngman Rhee was absolutely right.

Hoover Comes Back Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 10, 1955:

HOOVER COMES BACK STRONG—EX-PRESIDENT SEEN INSTRUMENTAL IN MOVE TO RETURN CONTROL OF CREDIT TO NATION'S BANKING INDUSTRY

It is doubtful if the American people understand or properly assess the powerful influence that Herbert Hoover exerts on the Eisenhower administration, which is, as we know, the first Republican administration since Mr. Hoover's own which had to devote itself chiefly to wrestling with the depression that broke only 6 months after it began.

Mr. Hoover had to wait a long time for a Republican administration after his own was repudiated so overwhelmingly at the polls in the 1932 election. But he has come back strong. He offers his advice in many fields to the Eisenhower regime, though his impact is directed through the Commission on Reorganization of the Government, of which he is chairman, and chairman in fact as well as name.

The former President was, as you recall, brought back into public service by ex-President Truman to head the commission. Then, however, the Commission was limited to recommending ways to make the Government more efficient and less wasteful by eliminating duplication of services and functions, overlapping, and such.

In the Eisenhower administration, however, the Hoover Commission was given authority to invade the field of policy in many areas of Government and this Mr. Hoover has set out religiously to accomplish. You can imagine he is directing this with some relish; for the policy chiefly affected is that body of laws and principles passed and established in the 20 and more years since Mr. Hoover left the White House—the New

Deal which he so vigorously assails from time to time.

This will become clear with the release shortly of the Hoover Commission report on Federal lending agencies, and some time hence in the report on water resources. If the recommendations of these should be approved by Congress, we would get a revision of the aims of many New Deal reforms, as well as some dating back beyond that, and even beyond Mr. Hoover's ill-starred administration. The forthcoming reports are worth careful public scrutiny; for nothing like the drastic policy revision urged was before the people in the candidacy of General Eisenhower in 1952.

If carried out, the recommendations in the Hoover report on Federal lending agencies would turn back credit control, with a nice profit, to the bankers. That would wipe out the victory, won at much cost and culminating in the Roosevelt administration, which gave the people through their Government control over money and credit. Or, as the late Franklin D. Roosevelt put it, "moved the money capital of the United States from Wall Street to Washington"; or, as he stated his aim more dramatically in his first inaugural, "to drive the money changers from the temple."

More and more this administration is taking on the colors and contours of a bankers' administration. The bankers and big finance have been moving into position, as is manifest in such operations as bonds-for-schools, bonds-for-roads, as well as in the Hoover proposals.

Under the latter, loans for farmers, for veterans, for homeowners, for small business, for rural electric cooperatives and the like, would be removed from Government agencies and institutions and, by one device and another, turned back to private bankers. The result would be higher interest rates and higher fees of all sorts.

It is hard to imagine that the many groups affected would take this lying down, especially farmers, small-business men and veterans. One of the greatest economic battles of our time, and it was bitter, was the struggle of the farmers to free themselves of banker control so they could get reasonable interest rates. It was this battle that William Jennings Bryan led around the turn of the century; that Woodrow Wilson joined in his time and which resulted during his administration in new credit facilities for farmers and small-business men; that flared up again in the Harding administration, with its brief postwar depression, to bring additional credit facilities for farmers, and which finally ended with basic banking and credit reforms in the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration.

It is possible that Herbert Hoover finally has handed the Democrats the issue for which they have been seeking.

They have made him an issue ever since 1932; but it had been wearing thin the last couple of elections.

Now he is asking for it.

Bad for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following portion of Drew Pearson's column which appeared in the Washing-

ton Post and Times Herald of March 9, 1955:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)
BAD FOR FARMERS

It will be a blow to the little farmers, but the Hoover Commission will soon spring drastic, new recommendations to tighten farm credit. The main effect will be to transfer the benefits of farm price supports, in part, from the farmers to the bankers.

These to-heck-with-the-farmers recommendations aren't supposed to be made public for several weeks, but this column has received a copy of the forthcoming Hoover Commission's report on streamlining the farm financing agencies.

Most jolting to farmers will be a recommendation "that the Commodity Credit Corporation cease to make loans on commodities and that it confine itself to purchase agreements on commodities."

This would revolutionize the whole price-support program, since most farmers draw their price supports in advance in the form of commodity loans. At harvest time, the farmers repay the Government on as much of their crop as they can sell, then forfeit the rest as collateral.

The Hoover Commission's idea is to turn the juicy, \$3 billion annual crop-loan business over to private banks. Explains the forthcoming report: "A considerable saving of administrative expenditures could be made if the Corporation abandoned making loans to farmers on commodities and used the method of purchase agreements alone. The farmer could with such a Government contract finance himself by loans on his commodities from private institutions pending his determination as to when he would sell, and thus the private financial machinery could finance the crop at a considerable saving to the Government."

In other words, the farmers would be forced to go to their banks and pay commercial interest rates for their crop loans. The bankers wouldn't risk a nickel since the purchase agreements would be tantamount to a Government guaranty of the loans. What this would amount to is price supports for bankers.

TIGHTER CREDIT

Another Hoover recommendation that will knock the little farmers for a loop calls for tightening credit on farm-home loans. This will make it next to impossible for little farmers to buy their own homes. As it now stands, the Farmers' Home Administration will loan up to 90 percent on the appraised value of a farm. The Hoover Commission, however, wants the FHA to require adequate equities under all its loan programs except disaster and emergency crop and feed loans.

Though vague, this indicates the FHA should, in Hoover's opinion, toughen its loan policy in line with private banks. Yet the whole purpose of FHA is to provide loans to farmers who have been turned down by their local bankers.

The Hoover report further urges "that the Congress require such interest fees, premiums, or other charges as will cover administrative expenses, cost of money to the Treasury, and losses."

The effect of this will be to boost interest rates to the little farmers up to 12 or 13 percent. One of the biggest administrative expenses, for example, is to make sure these small-farm loans are sound. This has resulted in a 99 percent FHA repayment record.

The Hoover proposals would practically knock out the small-farm ownership program on the justification that "this Commission, except in disaster and emergency loans, cannot approve of indirect subsidies to a fraction of the people from the taxpayers at large."

Yet, in the same breath, the Commission proposes what amounts to indirect subsidies to the bankers who, mysteriously, seem to be the beneficiaries of so many Hoover recommendations.

If the Hoover proposals go through, the little farmers can look forward to a new kind of drought—a credit drought.

Through Being a "Paper Tiger"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1955

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 9, entitled "Through Being a 'Paper Tiger.'"

The report of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on his recent visit to southeast Asia should serve as a strong assurance to the free peoples of Asia and of the Pacific that the United States will work with them in every way possible to prevent their enslavement by the Communists.

I have found the Secretary's report very encouraging: In the first place, it has clarified some of the doubts about United States policy with regard to southeast Asia. Secondly, it demonstrated that the free nations of that area are taking unified and positive steps to defend themselves against Communist internal subversion or possible overt aggression.

The progress made to date in this field by the signatories of the Manila pact should hearten all the free peoples of the world who are determined to resist Communist expansion and domination. It proves once again that in unity of purpose and of action there is tremendous strength—strength adequate to preserve our freedoms and our liberty. This should encourage and inspire us in our efforts to further the attainment of just and lasting peace in the world.

THROUGH BEING A "PAPER TIGER"

The United States and the Communists are drawing close to a showdown in the Far East. This was the obvious meaning of Secretary Dulles' calm and measured report to the country Tuesday night.

It was a warning not only to the government of Red China, but to the American people.

We are through being pushed back, he said in effect. We are through yielding free territory to Red China through surrendering more free people to communism. We are through being represented as a "paper tiger."

The decision, of course, is up to the masters of Red China. If they try to carry out their boasts to conquer Formosa, they will be met by American force. If they abandon such plans, the United States stands ready to work for a cease fire in that area and for ultimate peace.

However, Secretary Dulles said, in grim tones:

"The Chinese Communists seem to be determined to try to conquer Formosa * * *

seem determined to challenge the deterrent power of the United States and our willingness to use that power in response to a military challenge."

Dulles is right in his diagnosis. The Chinese Reds have—both to their own people and to all Asia—represented Korea, Indochina, and the evacuation of the Tachens as great victories over the United States. They have boasted that the United States will always fall back when faced by brutal and uncompromising force. The Chinese Reds dishearten the free nations along the rim of China with the charge that American love of peace means peace at any price.

In view of this, Dulles said:

"We must, if occasion offers, make it clear that we are prepared to stand firm and, if necessary, meet hostile force with the greater force that we possess."

This was a frank speech, with grave warning.

Safety on the Pennsylvania Turnpike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Fine Safety Achievement," which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of March 10. I make this request at this time because the editorial relates to the safety work which has been done on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, and as there is now under consideration a road program, I thought this editorial would be of interest to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FINE SAFETY ACHIEVEMENT

Despite increased use by passenger cars, the Pennsylvania Turnpike last year recorded the best safety record in its 14-year history. This fine achievement reflects a police and educational effort for which the turnpike commission deserves a great deal of credit.

The reduction in the number of fatalities is particularly impressive. In 1953, 91 persons lost their lives in turnpike accidents, for a fatality rate of 7.5 per hundred million vehicle miles. But last year there were only 51 fatalities, for a rate of only 4.2. Similarly, only 899 persons were injured in turnpike accidents last year, a decline of 17.5 percent from the 1,090 in 1953.

In obtaining this improvement, the turnpike commission has expended much money, thought and effort. Last year it spent a record \$726,207 on enforcement. That included the salaries of 115 State policemen assigned exclusively to turnpike duty, the greatest number ever employed by the commission. In 1953, only 66 policemen were employed and the enforcement effort cost only \$502,541.

While the amount spent on enforcement seems high, actually it constituted only 3½ percent of last year's turnpike revenues, which totaled \$23,093,393. It represented a sound investment in public safety.

When the turnpike was opened in 1940, it extended for only 160 miles. Fifty-nine State troopers were assigned to police it. But when the war came and highway use was sharply curtailed by fuel rationing, the num-

ber of police dropped by 1944 to a low of 12.

After the war, turnpike usage jumped tremendously, but there were only 24 officers policing it as recently as 1950. The number was increased to 50 in 1952, when the Philadelphia extension had been opened; to 66 in 1953, following the opening of the western extension, and to 115 last year when the Delaware River extension went into service. Today, 118 highly trained officers police the completed 360-mile turnpike.

While numbers in themselves are an important phase of effective policing, they do not tell the whole turnpike safety story. Methods mean as much as manpower. The officers assigned to this pioneer toll expressway combine education with policing. They don't just pinch offending motorists; they also instruct them. Last year, for example, the troopers issued 22,009 warning tickets while making only 16,965 arrests. They also banned from the road more than 4,400 defective vehicles.

The turnpike commission has enough money not only to retire bonds ahead of schedule but to provide effective policing. We are glad to see it do just that.

The Great Lakes Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. THYE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, there appeared on March 9, 1955, in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, an editorial entitled "Seaway No Longer Frightens the East." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEAWAY NO LONGER FRIGHTENS THE EAST

Before Congress finally authorized the Great Lakes seaway, public officials in the East habitually used crying towels whenever discussing this project. It would just about ruin the big eastern seaports, was the story. Now the attitude has changed. The East has decided it is going to get along all right.

In a current magazine interview with Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, on the problems and prospects of that metropolis are these questions and answers:

"Question. What about the St. Lawrence seaway? It is said that might take away business—

"Answer. Well, I'm peculiar in this, because most mayors have been opposed to the seaway. I've always been for it. I've tried to look at it as a little bigger than just New York City. I think it would be a great boon to the northern part of our State and be a boon to areas in the Midwest. I have never felt that it would hurt us to any degree, given the proper facilities and if we have peace here in our labor.

"Question. It has been testified that it might take away 19 percent of the port of New York's business.

"Answer. Yes. Well, I think you can find testimony on both sides on that. The more facilities we can have in this whole area, the more it will help. We've got to realize that we've had competition from Philadelphia, from Houston and from all of the other ports all along the line. We've got to fight our own problems here. We can't stand in the way of progress of any other ports."

The interview appears in a copyrighted article in U. S. News & World Report, a weekly news magazine published at Washington.

The United States Oil Industry and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11, 1955

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The U. N. and the United States Oil Industry," written by Raymond Moley, and published in Newsweek magazine of March 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. N. AND THE UNITED STATES OIL INDUSTRY (By Raymond Moley)

The proposal of a commission of the United Nations for fixing the prices of oil produced in the Middle East is now under discussion in Geneva and is attracting wide interest in the European press. It may well provide a valuable lesson in international economics and politics for American oil companies and, in fact, for all of us.

This oil issue has been crystallized in a report of a commission operating under the vague auspices of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). It is the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE). There is also a commission for Latin America (ECLA) and another for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE). Our representatives on these are very loosely responsible to our representative on the ECOSOC. Preston Hotchkiss, an Eisenhower appointee.

This ECE report has been top secret for a long time over here but it has been plentifully leaked to the European press. It is hailed there as a body blow to the monopolistic practices of the American oil companies. A copy was obtained by the Wall Street Journal 2 weeks ago in Geneva and another was used to prepare this article. It bears the title "The Price of Oil in Western Europe." It says that the oil companies are getting oil in the Middle East at a very low price and are selling it at an excessively high price. It is suggested that there should be price-fixing by international governmental machinery. This control is veiled by the innocent word stability. Pains were taken to include in the report details of actions by the United States Government against the American oil companies involved. There is also an attack upon the companies in a 1952 report of the Federal Trade Commission.

The ECE report is aimed at 5 American and 3 European companies. They are Standard of New Jersey, Standard of California, Socony-Vacuum, Texas, and Gulf. Also Royal Dutch-Shell, the British Petroleum, and Compagnie Française.

It is alleged that most of these companies tend to peg their European prices to the prices in the Western Hemisphere.

The allegations of fact in this ECE report are violently denied by the American companies. One of them says that the report overstates the net received by the various companies from Middle Eastern crude by 100 percent.

These regional commissions—the ECE, ECLA, and ECAFE—go it pretty much as they choose. The ECAFE, for example, organized studies of the marketing of hides in Pakistan, the relative advantages of electric or hydraulic transmission in diesel locomotives, and the planning of waiting rooms at Indian railway stations.

The oil proposal is not on a par with these trivia. It would provide an opportunity for the Soviet not only to use an international

commission to smear American companies but to get its paw into the Middle Eastern oil situation. For since the Soviet is on the ECE, it would in fact be playing an important part in regulating the industry there and in fixing the prices of American oil companies.

The United States is represented, too, but would be hopelessly outnumbered by Communist and Socialist countries.

This oil proposal is only the latest of many plans which have been made through the U. N. to fuse our economy with those of other nations. And in every case our tradition of freedom was imperiled by the presence among the collaborators of a heavy majority of nations in which communism or socialism is firmly established, or in which economic liberty has never existed or has become only a faded memory, or in which cartels and other restrictions on enterprise have been traditional. Moreover, the Foreign Service officers and professors who have represented us on the many groups for the most part have believed that our freedom and independence must be yielded for international friendship.

Most of this goes back to the commitment of the United States in article 55 of the U. N. Charter adopted in 1945 which somewhat vaguely pledged us to a large number of international experiments in social and economic affairs. To implement this, the ECOSOC busied itself early in 1946. It had as a guide a document of our State Department entitled "Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment." There was created a preparatory committee to make plans. Then there ensued 4 years of naïveté when compromise with Marxism seemed not only inevitable but desirable.

The Habana Charter of 1948 would have committed us to international price fixing of basic commodities, tariffs, and trade controls, measures for full employment, and, strangely enough, trustbusting. President Truman sent the Habana Charter to Congress which refused to do anything more than to hold some hearings. But in 1949 we entered the International Wheat Agreement and through the State Department actively participated in many international economic committees and commissions. Prime Minister Attlee came here in December 1950 to plead for international control and allocation of raw materials so that his country could get the things it needed at the right price. Our State Department complied the next month and created what was known as the International Materials Conference. This had no legal standing but set out to allocate strategic materials and fix prices. This brought forth plans for agreements covering cotton, wool, copper, lead, zinc, sulfur, and other materials.

In 1952 the Paley Commission (President's Materials Policy Commission) made the statement that, regardless of the failure of Congress to act, the United States was bound under a resolution of the ECOSOC to "recognize chapter VI [of the Habana Charter] as a general guide." Despite violent protests in Congress, the collaboration went on in one form or another. In 1953 we entered the International Sugar Agreement and extended the International Wheat Agreement for 3 years.

Thus encouraged, the State Department proposed a tin agreement last year. It was given up by the administration after a hard fight between the State Department on one side and the Interior and Commerce Departments on the other. Meanwhile, the Randall Commission roundly condemned participation by the United States in international commodity agreements and Preston Hotchkiss, of ECOSOC, has vigorously opposed them. The ECE seems to assume that these objections can be avoided.

It is significant that the current oil report is the product of the secretariat of the ECE at the head of which is Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist. He first appears in Amer-

ican annals as a beneficiary of a Rockefeller fellowship. Next he was employed by the Carnegie Corp. to make a \$250,000 survey of the Negro problem in our South. This report in 1944 had some strong things to say about the United States. Our Constitution was "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions" and its adoption was "nearly a plot against the common people." We had "a low degree of respect for law and order" although we "desire to regulate human behavior tyrannically." Our legal culture, moreover, was "anarchistic."

Myrdal in 1946 told a Wall Street Journal reporter that in behalf of Sweden he had made a big deal with Soviet Russia because he believed that the United States was going into a depression. In 1949, as executive secretary of the ECE, he received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for scholarships for European students. Last year Columbia University selected Myrdal as one of those to be highly honored at its bicentennial. He was given a degree of doctor of humane letters as one who had made "the world his classroom."

In any event, these many benefits and honors for Myrdal, coupled with the present attack upon the American oil companies, can prove to Americans not only that they are a very generous people but that when oil money is given for cultural purposes it has no strings. This at least can give our oil companies some melancholy comfort.

National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1955

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1955, I was privileged to participate with Mr. Quincy Howe, news analyst and author, in the panel session at the annual conference of the New York Civil Liberties Union at the Hotel Roosevelt.

I am pleased to set forth Mr. Howe's remarks as follows:

REMARKS OF QUINCY HOWE, NEWS ANALYST AND AUTHOR, AT THE PANEL SESSION OF THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON AND CONFERENCE OF THE NEW YORK CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1955, AT THE HOTEL ROOSEVELT

One of Bernard Shaw's epigrams illuminates the subject we are discussing this afternoon. If a people, said Shaw, do not take the trouble to get what they like, they will wind up liking what they get. Shaw spoke here of a popular taste in the popular arts. But his words apply to other fields and are a kind of variation on the theme that a people get the Government—or the security program—that they deserve. Of course politicians and pressure groups wield influence, too. But how can politicians or pressure groups lead the people unless they know where the people want to go? And where the people want to go is determined, among other things, by the trend of events, by the climate of the times. Today, for instance, fear of the hydrogen bomb, of communism, of war with Russia or China or both, give us the jitters. On the other hand, our prosperity encourages complacency and lethargy. From President Eisenhower, with his experience in military affairs plus his progressively moderate personality, the American people are getting the kind of leadership they seem to like. But unless they exert more

pressure on the White House, they may end up having to like the kind of leadership they are going to get.

If that leadership, in respect to national security, does not seem good enough, don't blame the man in the White House, or Senator McCarthy either. Blame yourself. I am not saying that the American people are wholly and solely to blame if our security program has proved more and more self-defeating. I am saying that it is unfair and untrue to lay all the blame for the failure of that program on politicians or pressure groups. More than 5 years ago, industry and the advertising agencies let themselves be pressured by a book called *Red Channels* into denying employment to actors and writers merely on the ground that they had become controversial. There was never enough popular clamor to persuade the moguls of Madison Avenue, who make it their business to give the public what it wants, to cause them to throw their copies of *Red Channels* in the ashcan. Instead, they hired their own security officers, and presently speakers were being dropped from controversial debate programs because—God save the mark—they were controversial. The Madison Avenue moguls knocked controversy out of their television debate programs for the same reason John Foster Dulles knocked John Paton Davies, Jr., out of the State Department. They lacked the guts to buck public opinion. Or, as they preferred to put it themselves, they heeded the ancient saying that the voice of the people is the voice of God.

Although the recent elections suggest that the market for hearing aids is not yet completely saturated, there is also every evidence that the sovereign people continued to like Ike in November as much as they did in May. Many of them respond to the noble aspirations he expresses with such manifest sincerity. Others like still better the inaction that usually follows. But can the American people live forever on a diet of wall mottoes? Do they want as their President a kind of glorified sandwich man? Is that the President's own conception of his function? Of course not. But human nature, inside the White House and out, is such that it requires constant needling to bring out its better side. And here we come to one of the root causes for some of our present discontents, including our discontent with our national security program. Not enough of us dare to take chances. The young college instructor, the journalist just beginning his career in radio or television cannot be expected to risk his future security for principle's sake. These young men have marked, learned, and inwardly digested the recent advice of a pamphlet issued by the Socony Vacuum Oil Co. informing them that, "Personal views can cause a lot of trouble. The 'isms' are out. Business, being what it is, it naturally looks with disfavor on the wild-eyed radical or even the moderate pink." But note this. Such is the force of public opinion that when some men of courage, like Ed Murrow in radio and television, like Senator Fulbright in politics, like Prof. Henry Steele Commager, of Columbia University, here today stand up on their hind legs and challenge this kind of talk, the voices of caution sing a new tune and Socony Vacuum has since issued a new version of its advice to young men, commending those who dare to uphold and proclaim their own views.

So it may be that the pendulum has begun to swing in the other direction and that a reaction against reaction has already set in. But it may also be that our basic trouble is not that our professors or our commentators, our businessmen, or our housewives lack the courage of their political convictions. The trouble may be that they lack the convictions in the first place. This applies especially to convictions relating to politics and economics. Perhaps the American people have accepted and applied so many new political and economic ideas during these

past 22 years of treason—treason, that is, to the spotless memory of President Harding—that it would be idle to expect any administration to sponsor further innovations. If this be true, then the most that can be expected of the Eisenhower administration is that it gain bipartisan acceptance for the welfare state at home and for a foreign policy based on solidarity with other democratic nations. In other words, this is no time for political and economic innovation. But is it not, for that very reason, the time to apply some tried and tested ideas and, if you will pardon the expression, ideals to the new situation in which we find ourselves? The first 10 amendments to the Constitution, usually known as the Bill of Rights, set forth most of these ideas and ideals. An older decalog from a higher authority sets forth others, notably the injunction not to bear false witness. And that man in the White House told the faculty and students of Dartmouth College, almost 2 years ago: "Don't join the book burners. Don't think you're going to conceal faults by concealing evidence that they ever existed." Another of President Eisenhower's favorite wall mottoes also has applicability under present conditions: "Nothing is lost by magnanimity." In responding to President Eisenhower's words, the American people have shown their hearts are in the right place. If they will now see to it that he carries these words into action, they will prove that they also know how to keep and use their heads.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate reached agreement limiting debate on tax extension bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2248-2261

Bills Introduced: 10 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1404-1413; S. Con. Res. 16; and S. Res. 75 and 76. Pages 2252-2254

Bill Reported: Report was made as follows: S. 948, to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Alaska and the U. S., with amendments (S. Rept. 59). Page 2251

Bill Referred: One House-passed bill was referred to appropriate committee. Page 2247

Taxation: Senate continued consideration of H. R. 4259, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, reaching unanimous-consent agreement that on Tuesday, March 15, after close of morning business, debate on any amendment or motion will be limited to 2 hours, equally divided between proponents and opponents; debate on each substitute will be limited to 4 hours, equally divided; debate on passage of bill will be limited to 2 hours, equally divided; and that no amendment that is not germane will be received, except for a series of amendments intended to be proposed by Senator Johnson of Texas, and others. Senate agreed earlier by unanimous consent that these Johnson amendments would be considered en bloc. Pages 2261-2262, 2270-2288

Confirmations: Two nominations to U. N. groups were confirmed. Page 2289

Nominations: 68 Foreign Service nominations were received, including that of Homer Ferguson, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines, along with 21 Army nominations. Pages 2288-2289

Lobbyists: The compilation by the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of all registrations and quarterly reports for the fourth quarter of 1954, filed by persons engaged in lobbying activities, appears in this issue of the Congressional Record. Pages 2290-2319

Program for Monday: Senate recessed at 5:24 p. m. until noon Monday, March 14, when it will continue on H. R. 4259, tax extension bill.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Subcommittee on Disposal of Agricultural Surpluses continued its hearings, with testimony today from the following witnesses: Herschel D. Newsom, master, National Grange; Gwynn Garnett, director of trade development, American Farm Bureau Federation; John A. Baker, assistant to president, National Farmers Union; and Paul C. French, executive secretary, and J. T. Sanders, agricultural consultant, both of CARE, New York City. Hearings continue Monday, March 14.

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Continuing its hearings on 1956 budget estimates for the Department of Interior, subcommittee heard testimony today in behalf of funds for the Bureau of Land Management from the following departmental witnesses: Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management; and Edward Woozley, Director; William G. Guernsey, Associate Director; Depue Falck, executive officer; Earl J. Thomas, Assistant to Director; T. M. Tyrrell, area range and forestry officer, Portland, Oreg.; and James P. Beirne, budget and finance officer—all of the Bureau of Land Management. Hearings continue Monday, March 14.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Civil Defense Subcommittee continued its hearings, with testimony today from Governor Herter and Col. John J. Maginnis, Director of the Civil Defense Agency, both of Massachusetts, and Maj. Gen. Edgar C. Erickson, Chief of National Guard Bureau.